

# GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY



## GEF PARTNERSHIP

The GEF connects 185 governments with civil society, Indigenous Peoples, the private sector, and other environmental financiers.

[Explore](#)

## GEF FUNDING

The GEF is the world's largest funder of biodiversity protection, nature restoration, pollution reduction, and climate change response.

[Explore](#)

## STAR COUNTRY ALLOCATION

GEF 144 recipient countries have a STAR country allocation for Biodiversity, Climate Change, and Land Degradation in GEF-8 (July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2026)

[Explore](#)

## GEF PROJECT CYCLE

GEF projects follow a time-bound cycle for technical and policy review before Council or CEO approval

[Explore](#)

## GEF POLICY FRAMEWORK

GEF projects must comply with a set of mandatory policy requirements.

[Explore](#)

## GEF FOCAL AREAS

The GEF Focal Areas consist of Biodiversity, Climate Change Mitigation, Land Degradation, Chemicals & Waste, and International Waters.

[Explore](#)

## GEF INTEGRATED PROGRAMS

GEF-8 11 Integrated Programs will deliver global environmental benefits across multiple focal areas.

[Explore](#)

## GEF GOOD PRACTICE BRIEFS

The GEF Good Practice Briefs showcase successful project examples.

[Explore](#)

## GEF FACTSHEETS

The GEF provides Country and Agency Factsheets as the portfolio management tools.

[Explore](#)

## RESULTS & MONITORING

GEF projects use Core Indicators and a M&E system that underpin the GEF-8 Results Measurement Framework.

[Explore](#)





# GEF GOVERNANCE

## GUIDANCE

### ASSEMBLY

### CONVENTIONS

CBD  
UNFCCC  
UNCCD  
Stockholm (POPs)  
Minamata

### COUNCIL

32 Constituencies

## OPERATIONS

### SECRETARIAT

INDEPENDENT  
EVALUATION OFFICE

STAP

TRUSTEE

## ACTION

185 MEMBER GOVERNMENTS

### COUNTRIES

Operational & Political Focal Points,  
Convention Focal Points, Government, Civil  
Society, Indigenous peoples, Private Sector

18 AGENCIES



EXECUTING ENTITIES




# GEF GOVERNANCE: 18 GEF AGENCIES



Scan for more details

## The GEF Agencies are the operational arm of the GEF.

They work closely with project proponents—government agencies and other stakeholders, including civil society organizations—to design, develop and implement GEF-funded projects and programs.





# GEF FUNDING

## FUNDING OVERVIEW

[Explore](#)

STAR COUNTRY  
ALLOCATION

[Explore](#)

INTEGRATED PROGRAM  
INCENTIVE STRUCTURE

[Explore](#)

SMALL GRANTS  
PROGRAM (SGP)

[Explore](#)

NON-GRANT  
INSTRUMENTS (NGI)

[Explore](#)

SPECIAL CLIMATE CHANGE  
FUND (SCCF)

[Explore](#)

LEAST DEVELOPED  
COUNTRIES FUND (LDCF)

[Explore](#)





# GEF-8 FUNDING OVERVIEW

GEF-8: July 2022-June 2026

## GEF TRUST FUND (\$5.33B)

### BIODIVERSITY



### CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION



### LAND DEGRADATION



### CHEMICALS & WASTE



### INTERNATIONAL WATERS



## GEF-8 STAR allocation

Fully flexible



Integrated Programs Incentive & Contributions

Enabling Activities, CBIT

Global & Regional Set-aside

Non-Grant Instrument (NGI)

Small Grants Program (SGP)

Innovations Window

## LDCF / SCCF

### CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION

LDCF  
\$20M per LDC

SCCF-A  
For SIDS

SCCF-B  
Innovation,  
tech transfer,  
private sector

# GEF-8 STAR COUNTRY ALLOCATION

COUNTRY	BIODIVERSITY	CLIMATE CHANGE	LAND DEGRADATION	TOTAL
Afghanistan	4.00	2.00	4.96	10.96
Albania	3.00	1.00	4.24	8.24
Algeria	4.94	2.49	4.82	12.25
Angola	11.23	3.52	3.70	18.45
Antigua and Barbuda	4.00	2.00	4.42	10.42
Argentina	18.75	5.24	2.82	26.80
Armenia	3.00	1.05	4.24	8.30
Azerbaijan	3.00	2.33	3.88	9.21
Bahamas	5.58	2.00	2.00	9.58
Bangladesh	4.00	4.58	2.00	10.58
Barbados	4.00	2.00	3.25	9.25
Belarus	3.00	2.75	1.21	6.96
Belize	4.00	2.00	2.00	8.00
Benin	4.00	2.00	6.63	12.63
Bhutan	4.00	2.00	2.00	8.00
Bolivia, Plurinational State of	15.59	2.17	2.86	20.61
Bosnia and Herzegovina	3.00	1.00	1.46	5.46
Botswana	3.00	1.00	3.89	7.89
Brazil	62.59	15.19	2.06	79.83
Burkina Faso	4.00	2.00	7.74	13.74
Burundi	4.00	2.00	4.89	10.89
Cambodia	4.65	2.00	3.14	9.80
Cameroon	17.12	1.26	2.01	20.40
Central African Republic	4.00	2.00	2.89	8.89
Chad	4.00	2.00	5.39	11.39
Chile	18.84	3.51	3.27	25.62
China	43.64	47.02	3.03	93.68
Colombia	55.28	6.46	2.63	64.36
Comoros	4.08	2.00	2.00	8.08





# GEF-8 STAR COUNTRY ALLOCATION

COUNTRY	BIODIVERSITY	CLIMATE CHANGE	LAND DEGRADATION	TOTAL
Congo	3.89	1.00	1.00	5.89
Cook Islands	4.00	2.00	2.00	8.00
Costa Rica	13.96	1.00	1.26	16.22
Côte d'Ivoire	7.61	1.00	4.25	12.86
Cuba	12.10	2.00	2.00	16.10
Democratic Republic of the Congo	22.60	4.53	2.26	29.40
Djibouti	4.00	2.00	3.87	9.87
Dominica	4.00	2.00	2.81	8.81
Dominican Republic	7.26	2.00	2.57	11.83
Ecuador	33.68	1.96	3.49	39.13
Egypt	5.40	4.46	4.40	14.25
El Salvador	3.00	1.00	1.13	5.13
Equatorial Guinea	3.00	1.00	1.00	5.00
Eritrea	4.00	2.00	3.92	9.92
Eswatini	3.00	1.00	3.50	7.50
Ethiopia	14.88	4.19	4.73	23.80
Fiji	7.96	2.00	2.00	11.96
Gabon	5.23	1.00	1.00	7.23
Gambia	4.00	2.00	6.08	12.08
Georgia	3.00	1.09	2.92	7.01
Ghana	5.60	1.50	4.63	11.73
Grenada	4.00	2.00	2.00	8.00
Guatemala	8.78	1.00	1.52	11.29
Guinea	5.54	2.00	3.62	11.16
Guinea-Bissau	4.00	2.00	2.20	8.20
Guyana	4.07	2.00	2.00	8.07
Haiti	7.60	2.00	2.08	11.67
Honduras	12.80	1.00	2.10	15.90
India	43.78	41.65	3.89	89.32





# GEF-8 STAR COUNTRY ALLOCATION

COUNTRY	BIODIVERSITY	CLIMATE CHANGE	LAND DEGRADATION	TOTAL
Indonesia	82.15	20.05	1.45	103.65
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	3.51	2.75	2.00	8.27
Iraq	3.00	1.00	2.43	6.43
Jamaica	6.50	2.00	2.95	11.45
Jordan	3.00	1.62	4.23	8.85
Kazakhstan	4.84	8.90	3.85	17.58
Kenya	13.42	3.06	4.82	21.30
Kiribati	4.58	2.00	2.00	8.58
Kyrgyz Republic	3.00	1.02	4.69	8.71
Lao People's Democratic Republic	6.75	2.00	2.15	10.90
Lebanon	3.00	1.08	3.81	7.89
Lesotho	4.00	2.00	3.90	9.90
Liberia	4.63	2.00	2.00	8.63
Madagascar	50.67	2.00	4.03	56.69
Malawi	4.40	2.00	5.52	11.92
Malaysia	19.90	5.01	1.41	26.32
Maldives	4.00	2.00	2.00	8.00
Mali	4.00	2.00	5.69	11.69
Marshall Islands	4.41	2.00	2.00	8.41
Mauritania	4.00	2.00	4.52	10.52
Mauritius	5.79	2.00	2.00	9.79
Mexico	58.70	9.83	3.38	71.90
Micronesia (Federated States of)	5.15	2.00	2.00	9.15
Mongolia	4.72	1.60	3.77	10.08
Montenegro	3.00	1.00	2.29	6.29
Morocco	4.88	1.60	4.98	11.46
Mozambique	16.79	2.05	6.53	25.37
Myanmar	13.34	3.96	2.00	19.30



# GEF-8 STAR COUNTRY ALLOCATION

COUNTRY	BIODIVERSITY	CLIMATE CHANGE	LAND DEGRADATION	TOTAL
Namibia	8.90	1.00	6.55	16.45
Nauru	4.00	2.00	2.00	8.00
Nepal	5.19	2.00	2.13	9.33
Nicaragua	6.92	1.10	1.75	9.77
Niger	4.00	2.00	6.39	12.39
Nigeria	8.36	8.30	4.76	21.41
Niue	4.00	2.00	2.00	8.00
Pakistan	5.74	7.35	4.68	17.77
Palau	4.00	2.00	2.00	8.00
Panama	14.15	1.00	1.28	16.43
Papua New Guinea	25.04	2.00	2.00	29.04
Paraguay	3.27	1.82	3.06	8.16
Peru	43.28	4.17	2.81	50.26
Philippines	45.51	5.45	1.80	52.76
Republic of Cabo Verde	9.57	2.00	2.64	14.22
Republic of Moldova	3.00	1.08	4.71	8.80
Republic of North Macedonia	3.00	1.00	2.74	6.74
Russian Federation	17.96	36.04	1.60	55.60
Rwanda	4.00	2.00	3.61	9.61
Saint Kitts and Nevis	4.00	2.00	2.07	8.07
Saint Lucia	4.00	2.00	2.11	8.11
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	4.00	2.00	2.39	8.39
Samoa	4.00	2.00	2.00	8.00
São Tomé and Príncipe	4.78	2.00	3.63	10.41
Senegal	6.02	2.00	6.15	14.17
Serbia	3.00	1.37	1.57	5.94
Seychelles	6.82	2.00	2.00	10.82
Sierra Leone	4.00	2.00	2.46	8.46
Solomon Islands	9.33	2.00	2.00	13.33





# GEF-8 STAR COUNTRY ALLOCATION

COUNTRY	BIODIVERSITY	CLIMATE CHANGE	LAND DEGRADATION	TOTAL
Somalia	8.88	2.00	5.10	15.97
South Africa	35.69	7.36	6.05	49.10
South Sudan	4.00	2.00	2.41	8.41
Sri Lanka	13.91	2.04	3.05	19.00
State of Libya	3.00	1.00	1.80	5.80
Sudan	4.37	2.00	3.89	10.26
Suriname	4.00	2.00	2.00	8.00
Syrian Arab Republic	3.00	1.00	2.13	6.13
Tajikistan	3.00	1.00	5.01	9.01
Thailand	11.64	5.75	1.71	19.10
Timor-Leste	4.00	2.00	3.59	9.59
Togo	4.00	2.00	5.54	11.54
Tonga	4.00	2.00	2.00	8.00
Trinidad and Tobago	4.00	2.00	2.55	8.55
Tunisia	3.00	1.00	4.68	8.68
Türkiye	5.64	5.52	3.30	14.46
Turkmenistan	3.00	3.71	2.78	9.49
Tuvalu	4.00	2.00	2.00	8.00
Uganda	5.62	2.00	3.93	11.54
Ukraine	3.00	7.12	3.27	13.39
United Republic of Tanzania	23.93	4.81	4.85	33.59
Uruguay	3.36	1.35	1.00	5.72
Uzbekistan	3.00	5.13	5.03	13.16
Vanuatu	5.30	2.00	2.00	9.30
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	18.69	5.68	2.10	26.46
Viet Nam	17.72	14.74	1.98	34.44
Yemen	7.61	2.00	4.05	13.66
Zambia	7.80	4.04	5.65	17.49
Zimbabwe	5.43	1.59	6.19	13.22





# INTEGRATED PROGRAM INCENTIVE STRUCTURE


## RESOURCE PROGRAMMING BY COUNTRIES

Example: Two countries selected for an Integrated Program

### STAR AMOUNTS



### INTEGRATED PROGRAM



# SMALL GRANTS PROGRAM (SGP)

## RESOURCE ALLOCATION

US\$155 Million



SGP CORE  
US\$ 135M

CSO INITIATIVES  
US\$ 20M

*Resources will be operationalized through two tranches split 50/50*

- *1<sup>st</sup> tranche open to UNDP only*
- *2<sup>nd</sup> tranche open later during the GEF-8 period once selection of new Agencies process is completed*

1

All countries can access SGP Core Resources

2

SGP Core Resources are allocated **equally**

3

Countries are encouraged to utilize **STAR**

## SGP 2.0 CSO INITIATIVES

### MICROFINANCE INITIATIVE

**Support Microfinancing Institutions** to facilitate microenterprises' access to finance for climate and environmental solutions

### CSO CHALLENGE PROGRAM

**Support competitive opportunities** for local civil society organizations to access financial and technical resources to scale up innovative environmental solutions

- **Pilot new GEF models** to engage and support civil society actors to catalyze environmental actions and solutions
- **Support innovation** of youth, women, Indigenous Peoples and local communities in LDCs and SIDS
- **Capitalize on expertise** of the GEF expanded Agency network and specialized organizations



# NON-GRANT INSTRUMENTS (NGI): 2 ENTRY POINTS

	GOAL	FEATURES	PROJECTS
<p><b>“BLENDED FINANCE PROGRAM” (NGI SET-ASIDE)</b></p>	<p>Mobilize <b>private sector</b> investment</p>	<p>Investment has potential for generating <b>reflows back to the GEFTF</b></p> <p><b>Separate Call for Proposals (CfP)</b> and rules for selection of projects</p>	<p><b>NGI window GEF-7 supported projects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>GEFID 9370 Meloy Fund (CI)</i></li> <li>• <i>GEFID 10330 Wildlife Conservation Bond (WB)</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>STAR OR IW/CW ALLOCATION</b></p>	<p>Mobilize <b>public/private sector</b> investment</p>	<p>Investment <b>reflows stay in the country</b></p> <p>Selection and allocation depend on <b>Country priorities.</b></p>	<p><b>GEF-5:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>GEFID 4918 Partial Risk Sharing Facility for Energy Efficiency (INDIA, WB) US\$ 16 M 1st Loss Guarantee</i></li> </ul>

# SPECIAL CLIMATE CHANGE FUND FINANCING SCENARIO

SCENARIO A: \$200M



SCENARIO B: \$400M

**WINDOW A**  
Adaptation support for SIDS

**FLOOR**

**WINDOW B**  
Innovation, tech transfer, private sector

**WINDOWS A AND B**  
(shared expenses)



# LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES FUND FINANCING SCENARIOS

Initial cap per country  
(46 LDCs at \$20 million  
initial cap per country)

**\$920M**

Dedicated programs **\$8M**

Administrative expenses **\$9M**



## FLOOR

**SCENARIO A**  
Total: \$1 billion

**SCENARIO B**  
Total: \$1.3 billion

Reserve to go  
beyond initial cap  
for national projects

\$0M

**\$193M**

Challenge Program  
for Adaptation  
Innovation

\$30M

**\$40M**

Regional and  
global projects  
and initiatives

\$33M

**\$130M**







# GEF PROJECT CYCLE

Scan for  
more details



FULL-SIZED  
PROJECT CYCLE

[Explore](#)

PROJECT  
CANCELLATION

[Explore](#)

AGENCY FEE

[Explore](#)

PROJECT  
IDENTIFICATION FORM  
(PIF)

[Explore](#)

LETTER OF  
ENDORSEMENT


[Explore](#)

PORTAL

[Explore](#)




# FULL-SIZED PROJECT CYCLE



# REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS


FULL-SIZED PROJECT CYCLE





# PROJECT FUNDING DISBURSEMENT

FULL-SIZED PROJECT CYCLE



## TRUSTEE

sets aside *GEF project funding* & *disburses 20% of the Agency fee*

## TRUSTEE

disburses *GEF project funding*

## TRUSTEE


disburses *50% of the Agency fee*

## TRUSTEE

disburses *the last 30% of the Agency fee*

# PROJECT MONITORING

## FULL-SIZED PROJECT CYCLE



### Project-level Implementation & Monitoring Reports & Tools

- Annual Implementation Report
- Terminal Evaluation
- Portal
- Country Factsheets



### GEF Portfolio level Monitoring Reports

- Annual Monitoring Report
- Corporate Scorecards
- Geomapping Data

Scan for more details



- **OBJECTIVE:** to set out principles, rules, and procedures to cancel or suspend projects  
*Deadlines for CEO Approval/Endorsement*

## 2 STEP MEDIUM SIZE PROJECTS

**12 MONTHS**

*After PIF approval by the CEO*

MSP cancellation if CEO Approval request not submitted in **8 months**

MSP cancellation if CEO Approval not obtained in **12 months**

## FULL SIZE PROJECTS

**18 MONTHS**

*After PIF approval by the Council*

FSP cancellation if CEO Endorsement request not submitted in **12 months**

FSP cancellation if CEO Endorsement not obtained in **18 months**

## PROGRAMS

**18 MONTHS**

*Commitment deadline before which all child projects need to receive CEO endorsement/approval*

Child project cancellation if it has not been endorsed by the CEO within the Program Commitment Deadline



# PROJECT CANCELLATION POLICY

• FULL-SIZED PROJECT



# PROJECT CANCELLATION POLICY

• 2 STEP MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT




Scan for more details



**OBJECTIVE:** To define the fee structure that will be used to pay for the services provided by GEF Agencies that implement GEF projects


HOW Agencies are paid		
Agencies	Fee Structure for projects	
	\$10M or less	Over \$10M
<b>10 Agencies</b> ADB, AFDB, EBRD, FAO, IDB, IFAD, UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO, WB	9.5%	9.0%
<b>8 Accredited Agencies</b> BOAD, CAF, CI, DBSA, FECO, FUNBIO, IUCN, WWF-US	9.0%	
<b>SGP</b>	9.0%	
<b>Project Preparation Grant (PPG)</b>	Same rate as the baseline project	



**Child project under a Program:** Fee is based on the Program Financing amount irrespective of Child project financing amount



# PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)



## A. Project Rationale

## B. Project Description

*Core Indicators, Risks to Project Preparation & Implementation, Safeguards Rating*

## C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming strategies and country/regional priorities

## D. Policy Requirements

*Gender Equality, Stakeholder Engagement, Private Sector, Environmental and Social Safeguards*

## E. Knowledge Management

## Annex A: Financing Tables

*Project Indicative resources requested from GEF Trust Fund or other funding sources*

*Preparation Grant (if requested)*

*Sources of Funds for Country STAR Allocation*

*Indicative Focal Area elements*

*Indicative co-financing*

## Annex B: OFP Letter of Endorsement

## Annex C: Project Location

## Annex D: Environmental & Social Safeguards Screen & Rating

## Annex E: Rio Markers

## Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

## Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

# LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT

- **LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT** is a **requirement** to initiate the review process of a project. It reflects the **ownership** and **commitment** from the country and the OFP's agreement with the content of the project.



## REQUIREMENTS

- **All national projects:** Letter of Endorsement signed by OFP with PIF submission
- **For global or regional projects:** all participant countries may not be identified by the time of PIF submission. If, during the preparation phase, a new country is identified, the OFP Letter of Endorsement for the new participant country needs to be submitted by the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval request at the latest.



## EXCEPTIONS

- Global or regional projects with **NO** GEF project-funded activities in the countries
- Projects or Programs using Non-Grant Instruments – OFP needs to be informed
- Global or Regional coordination child projects for Programs



# WHY A NEW LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT?

- **TO MEET THE COUNCIL REQUIREMENT: reporting on country utilization of star flexibility**



- **Monitor the utilization of STAR resources relative to portfolio-level targets on focal area financing**
- Monitor achievement of results over the GEF-8 period
- **Report on progress towards those targets with each Work Program of GEF-8 and in the semiannual Corporate Scorecard.**



- Organize a **mid-term review to assess portfolio performance under full flexibility**, and to identify potential measures if portfolio-level focal area financing are not progressing to meet the agreed targets.





# DROP-DOWN MENU IN LOE TEMPLATE – FOCAL AREA SOURCE

## Focal area source

- BD STAR Allocation
- BD Set-Aside
- CC STAR Allocation
- CC Set-Aside
- CBIT Set-Aside
- LD STAR Allocation
- LD Set-Aside
- STAR IP Matching Incentives
- International Waters
- IW IP Contributions
- Chemicals and Waste
- CW IP Contributions
- NGI
- SGP
- Innovation Window



**[Government Letter Head]**

**[Date of Endorsement Letter]**

To: **[Name of Agency's GEF Executive Coordinator]**  
**[GEF Implementing Agency Name]**  
**[GEF Implementing Agency Address if available]**

Subject: Endorsement for **[Title of Project Proposal]**

In my capacity as GEF Operational Focal Point for **[country]**, I confirm that the above project proposal (a) is in accordance with my government's national priorities [including, if available, the priorities identified in the National Adaptation Plan of Action and/or the National Capacity Self-Assessment.], and our commitment to the relevant global environmental conventions; and (b) was discussed with relevant stakeholders, including the global environmental convention focal points.

I am pleased to endorse the preparation of the above project proposal with the support of the GEF Implementing Agency(ies) listed below. If approved, the preparation of the proposal will be supported by and the project executed by **[to be terminated if not selected yet / local - national - regional - global organization]**<sup>1</sup>. I request the GEF Implementing Agency(ies) to provide a copy of the project document before it is submitted to the GEF Secretariat for CEO endorsement / Approval.

The total financing (from **[GEF/IF, LDCF, SCCE]**) being requested for this project is US\$ **[ ]**, inclusive of project preparation grant (PPG), if any, and Agency fees for project cycle management services associated with the total GEF Project Financing. The financing requested for **[country]** is detailed in the table below.

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area Source	Amount (in US\$)			Total
			GEF Project Financing	GEF Project Financing Agency Fee	Project Preparation Grant (PPG)	
<b>[select]</b>	<b>[select]</b>	<b>[select]</b>	<b>[ ]</b>	<b>[ ]</b>	<b>[ ]</b>	0
<b>[select]</b>	<b>[select]</b>	<b>[select]</b>	<b>[ ]</b>	<b>[ ]</b>	<b>[ ]</b>	0
<b>[select]</b>	<b>[select]</b>	<b>[select]</b>	<b>[ ]</b>	<b>[ ]</b>	<b>[ ]</b>	0
<b>[select]</b>	<b>[select]</b>	<b>[select]</b>	<b>[ ]</b>	<b>[ ]</b>	<b>[ ]</b>	0
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>			0	0	0	0

<sup>1</sup> Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate.

## Landing page

- **Focal Point landing page** lists all the Focal Point projects in their own country, including **regional and global projects** in which their country is involved.
- It also includes **all the PFDs** regardless of the countries involved.
- **The project list includes links** to access the underlying documents, a roadmap of the project timeline, and other project-related information.

gef GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY INVESTING IN OUR PLANET | GEF Portal

Focal Point Projects

Enter Project Title or GEF ID

Country  Type of Project  GEF Period

Focal Area  Agency  NGI/CBIT

Funding Source  Status

Enter Taxonomy

Filters Applied:


GEF ID	Project Name	Type	Country	Agency	Focal Area	Program Manager	Status
11029	<a href="#">Global Biodiversity Framework Early Action Support (Asia Pacific 7)</a>	EA	Regional	UNDP	Biodiversity	Mark Zimsky	CEO Endorsement Cleared
10921	<a href="#">Enhancing Political Will for Sustainable Protected Areas Financing</a>	MSP	Global	UNEP	Biodiversity	Hannah Fairbank	CEO Endorsement Pending
10913	<a href="#">Protection of biodiversity and sustainable land-use in conservation landscapes in South Sulawesi, Gorontalo and East Nusa Tenggara</a>	FSP	Indonesia	UNEP	Multi Focal Area	Hannah Fairbank	Council Approved

[Download list in CSV](#)



## Reporting page

- This feature is available for both recipient and non-recipient countries.
- It includes data on all projects in GEF-6, GEF-7 and GEF-8, as well as on STAR utilization for GEF-7 and GEF-8.



# STAR UTILIZATION REPORT




 Reporting page

The screenshot shows the GEF Portal interface. At the top, it says 'gef GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY INVESTING IN OUR PLANET' and 'GEF Portal'. Below that is a breadcrumb 'Home / STAR Allocation' and the title 'STAR Allocation Reports'. A table lists allocation data for various countries. A sidebar on the left contains navigation icons: a home icon, a bar chart icon (highlighted), an 'AZ' icon, and a document icon.


Country	Agency Submitted Biodiversity	Agency Submitted Land Degradation	Agency Submitted Climate Change	Allocated Climate Change	Allocated Biodiversity	Allocated Land Degradation	Allocated Total Amount
Indonesia	0.00	0.00	20,045,731.92	82,152,902.40	1,450,417.91	103,649,052.23	
Iran	0.00	0.00	2,754,458.89	3,511,743.17	2,000,609.51	8,266,811.57	
Iraq	0.00	0.00	1,000,000.00	3,000,000.00	2,431,980.79	6,431,980.79	
Jamaica	0.00	0.00	2,000,000.00	6,503,786.67	2,950,270.00	11,454,056.67	
Jordan	0.00	0.00	1,622,554.93	3,000,000.00	4,226,638.25	8,849,193.19	
Kazakhstan	0.00	0.00	8,895,625.18	4,838,061.50	3,848,147.70	17,581,834.38	





**Glossary page**

—● This page displays a list of terms from the STAR utilization report and its description.




# COUNTRY FACTSHEET PAGE



## Country factsheet page

- The country factsheet page is ready to be read from the GEF Portal and it can be downloaded or printed directly.





# GEF POLICY FRAMEWORK



Scan for  
more details

**STAKEHOLDER  
ENGAGEMENT**

*Explore*

**GENDER EQUALITY**

*Explore*

**ENVIRONMENTAL AND  
SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS**

*Explore*

**MONITORING**

*Explore*

**CO-FINANCING**

*Explore*

**KNOWLEDGE  
AND LEARNING**

*Explore*

**FIDUCIARY  
STANDARDS**

*Explore*



# STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Scan for more details



## OBJECTIVE

To promote the inclusive and meaningful participation of stakeholders in GEF's governance and operations

## REQUIREMENTS

### PIF

- Consultations during project development
- Information on how stakeholders will be engaged and means of engagement

### CEO ENDORSEMENT/ APPROVAL

- Stakeholder Engagement Plan

### PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION & REPORTING

- Progress, challenges and outcomes of the implementation of Stakeholder Engagement Plan



# STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

## Stakeholder Engagement by Step

### ENGAGEMENT PRINCIPLES

- Constructive, responsive, accountable and transparent
- Fair, balanced, and inclusive participation
- Sustained commitment and action
- Supported by appropriate documentation and information

### PROJECT CONCEPT (PIF)

- Provide a description of any consultations conducted during project development
- Provide information on how Stakeholders will be engaged and means of engagement throughout the project cycle

### PROJECT DEVELOPMENT (CEO ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL)

- Provide Stakeholder Engagement Plans (SEP) or equivalent documentation
  - *Stakeholders who have been and will be engaged*
  - *Means of engagement*
  - *Dissemination of information*
  - *Roles and responsibilities*
  - *Resource requirements*
  - *Timing of engagement*

### PROJECT MONITORING & REPORTING

- Report progress, challenges and outcomes of the implementation of stakeholder engagement

# GENDER EQUALITY

Scan for more details



## OBJECTIVE

To ensure equal opportunities for women and men to participate in, contribute to and benefit from GEF-financed interventions

## REQUIREMENTS

### PIF

- Indicative information on gender considerations in project description and relevant project components

### CEO ENDORSEMENT/ APPROVAL


- Detailed gender analysis & action plan
- Gender-responsive measures for each project component
- Gender-sensitive indicators, sex-disaggregated targets

### PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION & REPORTING

- Information in PIRs, MTRs, TEs progress on gender-sensitive indicators, results
- Share good practice, methodologies and lessons learned

# GENDER EQUALITY

## • Gender Equality Requirements by Step



# ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

Scan for more details



## OBJECTIVE

To enhance the environmental and social outcomes of GEF-financed projects

## MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

to identify and address environmental and social risks and potential impacts in GEF projects and programs



Anticipate social and environmental risks and impacts



Plan to avoid or mitigate risks and impacts



Manage and monitor implementation



Respond to issues as they arise






# ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

## MINIMUM STANDARDS



# ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

## • *Environmental and Social Safeguards by Step*



# MONITORING

Scan for more details



## OBJECTIVE

To enable systematic collection, analysis, and application of data, information, and lessons learned on the GEF's Results and performance

## REQUIREMENTS

### PIF

- **INDICATIVE** expected results across 11 Core Indicators
- **Theory of Change**

### CEO ENDORSEMENT/ APPROVAL

- **EXPECTED** results across 10 core indicators
- Project Results Framework, including indicators, baselines and targets
- Monitoring and Evaluation framework and plan

### MONITORING, LEARNING AND ADAPTING

Tracking **ACTUAL** Results:

- *Project Implementation Reports (annually)*
- *Tracking Actual Results*
- *Mid-term Review*
- *Terminal Evaluation*
- *Share good practice, methodologies and lessons learned*

# CO-FINANCING

Scan for more details



## OBJECTIVE

Set out the definitions, level of ambition and requirements for Co-Financing in GEF projects

## REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

### PROJECT CONCEPT (PIF)

- **INDICATIVE** co-financing

### PROJECT DEVELOPMENT (CEO ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL)

- **CONFIRMED** co-financing

### PROJECT MONITORING & REPORTING (MTE & TE)

- **ACTUAL** co-financing




# KNOWLEDGE AND LEARNING

*Process of capturing and sharing results and lessons from projects to:*

- **INFORM** global, regional and national policy dialogues
- **IMPROVE** the impact of GEF projects

## PRODUCTS



Scan for more details



Scan for more details



## RESULTS

*Good Practice Briefs*

## PUBLICATIONS AND LEARNING


*The Art of Knowledge Exchange*  
*GEF Academy*  
*GEF Kaleo "Ask the Expert"*

## KNOWLEDGE PLATFORMS

*GEF OFP Knowledge & Collaboration Platform (KCP)*




# ENHANCING KNOWLEDGE AND LEARNING IN GEF PROJECTS



- 1** An overview of existing lessons and best practice that inform the project/program concept
- 2** Plans to learn from relevant projects, programs, initiatives & evaluations
- 3** Processes to capture, assess and document info, lessons, best practice & expertise generated during implementation
- 4** Tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning & collaboration (at both program & project levels), including knowledge platforms and websites
- 5** Knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders (at both program & project levels)
- 6** A discussion on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project/program impact and sustainability
- 7** Plans for strategic communications
- 8** Budget and timelines for KM Approach implementation/delivery (required at CEO endorsement stage)

# KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT & LEARNING

## Using, Generating, Capturing and Sharing Knowledge



# FIDUCIARY STANDARDS

Scan for  
more details



## OBJECTIVE

To Strengthen financial and programmatic accountability of the GEF by requiring that all GEF Partner Agencies meet the agreed minimum fiduciary standards

## MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

### I. Project/Activity Processes and Oversight Criteria

- *Project Appraisal Standards*
- *Procurement Processes*
- *Monitoring and Project-at-Risk Systems*
- *Project Completion and Financial*
- *Evaluation Function*

### II. Governance Framework Criteria

- *External Financial Audit*
- *Financial Management and Control Frameworks*
- *Oversight of Executing Entities*
- *Code of Ethics/Conduct for GEF Partner Agency staff*
- *Internal Audit*
- *Investigation Function*
- *Hotline & Whistleblower*
- *Anti-Money Laundering and Combating the Financing of Terrorism*



# FOCAL AREAS

**BIODIVERSITY**

*Explore*

**CLIMATE  
CHANGE**

*Explore*

**LAND  
DEGRADATION**

*Explore*

**CHEMICALS  
AND WASTE**


*Explore*



**INTERNATIONAL  
WATERS**

*Explore*

# BIODIVERSITY



## GOAL

**Globally significant biodiversity conserved, sustainably used, and restored.**

## MAJOR OBJECTIVES

To improve conservation, sustainable use and restoration of natural ecosystems.

To effectively implement the Cartagena and Nagoya protocols.

To increase mobilization of domestic resources for biodiversity.

## MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO GEBS AND MEAS

Comprehensive implementation support to the post-2020 GBF

Integrated landscape/seascape management.

Domestic resource mobilization.

# CLIMATE CHANGE

## GOAL

**Support developing countries to make transformational shifts towards net-zero GHG emissions and climate-resilient development pathways.**

## MAJOR OBJECTIVES

1. Innovation, technology transfer, and enabling policies for mitigation options with systemic impacts.
  - 1.1. Accelerate the efficient use of energy and materials.
  - 1.2. Enable the transition to decarbonized power systems.
  - 1.3. Scale up zero-emission mobility of people and goods.
  - 1.4. Promote Nature-based Solutions with high mitigation potential.
2. Enabling conditions to mainstream mitigation concerns into sustainable development strategies.
  - 2.1. Support capacity-building needs for transparency under the Paris Agreement through the CBIT.
  - 2.2. Support relevant Convention obligations and enabling activities.





# LAND DEGRADATION



## GOAL

**To avoid, reduce, and reverse land degradation, desertification and mitigate the effects of drought.**

## MAJOR OBJECTIVES

Sustainable land management.

Landscape restoration.

Address Desertification, Land Degradation and Drought (DLDD), particularly in drylands.

Improve the enabling policy and institutional framework for LDN.

## MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO GEBS AND MEAS

Specific objective on addressing DLDD issues.

Increased emphasis on land-based interventions for drought mitigation.



# CHEMICALS AND WASTE



## GOAL

**Prevent pollution from harmful chemicals and waste particularly POPs and Mercury.**

## MAJOR OBJECTIVES

Policy reform to cleaner chemistry and eliminate existing waste.

Preventing a future build up of harmful chemicals and waste in the environment.

Eliminating harmful chemicals and waste in current waste streams and that are stockpiled in existing infrastructure and processes.

## MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO GEBS AND MEAS

Focus on gaps preventing sound management and to prevent a future buildup of chemicals in the environment

Harmonized approaches across jurisdictions to allow transparency in supply changes

# INTERNATIONAL WATERS



## GOAL

**Supporting nations in transboundary cooperation in shared marine and freshwater ecosystems through 3 step process:**

1. *Assess ecological & socioeconomic conditions*
2. *Agree on a regional strategic action program (SAP)*
3. *Implement the SAP*

## MAJOR OBJECTIVES

Support Large Marine Ecosystems to accelerate Blue Economic Development.

Advance management in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ).

Enhance water security in shared freshwater ecosystems.

## MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO GEBS AND MEAS

GEBS:

- Strengthened collaboration among countries with shared water body
- New or improved marine protected areas (MPAs)
- More sustainable fisheries and aquaculture
- Reduced pollution, including from wastewater, agricultural run-off and plastics





# GEF INTEGRATED PROGRAMS

OVERVIEW

[Explore](#)

CIRCULAR SOLUTIONS TO PLASTIC POLLUTION

[Explore](#)

ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

[Explore](#)

FOOD SYSTEMS

[Explore](#)

NET-ZERO NATURE-POSITIVE ACCELERATOR

[Explore](#)

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION FOR DEVELOPMENT

[Explore](#)

AMAZON, CONGO, AND CRITICAL FOREST BIOMES

[Explore](#)

BLUE AND GREEN ISLANDS

[Explore](#)

CLEAN AND HEALTHY OCEAN

[Explore](#)

ELIMINATING HAZARDOUS CHEMICALS FROM SUPPLY CHAINS

[Explore](#)

GREENING TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

[Explore](#)

SUSTAINABLE CITIES

[Explore](#)





## GEF-8: Moving Toward an Equitable, Nature-Positive, Carbon-Neutral and Pollution-Free World

## Overview

Despite some improvements over the last decade, many **indicators of planetary health** are headed in the wrong direction. Environmental threats from climate change, biodiversity loss, chemical pollution, and pressures on forests, land, oceans, and wildlife are undermining human development, livelihoods, and social justice.


- The loss of **biodiversity** and its associated ecosystems services threatens human well-being.
- The **oceans** are under increasing threat from **climate change** and associated acidification, loss of coral reefs, overfishing, and pollution.
- **Freshwater systems** are being depleted rapidly, threatening livelihoods and triggering conflicts.
- Global **forest** loss and possible tipping points in the Amazon can trigger unexpected and irreversible global damage to the environment.<sup>1</sup>
- In addition, **hazardous chemicals** remain a significant threat to human health, ecosystems, and biodiversity.

At the same time, the world still faces one of the greatest health and economic threats in a generation: the COVID-19 pandemic. These challenges are a stark reminder that the well-being of humanity is dependent on a healthy planet. The systemic nature of environmental challenges also calls for solutions to be integrated. To that end, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) anchors its overall approach on interdependency between people and the planet. This interdependency is key to ensuring that GEF investments are targeted toward tackling the breakdown in food, energy, urban, health, and natural systems that underpin human development. The GEF is therefore well-placed to harness its comparative advantage as “integrator” across multiple dimensions. The eighth replenishment cycle from 2022-2026 (GEF-8) will support transformative change to economic systems to address the risk of emerging diseases and pandemics.

### A Pathway to Transformative Change for Blue and Green Recovery

GEF-8 focuses on integration for both impact and scale, consistent with global aspirations to seek bold results by 2030 and beyond (Figure 1). By integrating actions across sectors, focal areas, or drivers, it can address drivers of environmental degradation at global or regional scales; avoid leakage and promote policy coherence; and work across scales and sectors. Transformative investments will promote greater private sector engagement, as well as innovations and measured risks for higher returns. Ultimately, this approach will strengthen resilience in the face of uncertainty and build economic systems and financing to sustain impact. In this way, we can help create a Healthy Planet for Healthy People.

<sup>1</sup> <https://advances.sciencemag.org/content/5/12/eaba2949>



GEF-8: Moving Toward an Equitable, Nature-Positive, Carbon-Neutral and Pollution-Free World 1






Figure 1. Global Responses and Commitments to Seek Bold Results by 2030 and Beyond

## Healthy Planet, Healthy People

The *Healthy Planet, Healthy People* framework explicitly recognizes that human health and well-being depend on a healthy environment. It relies on linkages between biodiversity and ecosystem services with food security and human health; between abundant and clean freshwater and human health; maintenance of a stable and livable climate and human health; a clean and hazardous chemical-free environment and human health; and healthy oceans that can provide sustainable and resilient livelihoods and food security for people. With this in mind, the GEF has set the following goals through 2030:

- **Scale up “green” and “blue” recovery** actions in priority landscapes and seascapes through post-COVID-19 strategies by state and non-state actors.
- Provide incentives and improved policy options to **promote innovations and behavior change** for sustainability and resilience in target systems.

- **Transform target systems** by maintaining and enhancing natural capital and ecosystem services through Nature-based Solutions.
- **Promote circularity in value/supply chains** to increase efficiency and reduce or eliminate negative externalities like pollution.

GEF-8 will deploy funds from a record replenishment in 2022 to promote a green, blue, and resilient recovery. GEF-8 will invest in both integrated programming and specific focal areas. All told, 11 integrated programs will deliver global environmental benefits across multiple focal areas (Figure 2). At the same time, GEF-8 will continue to invest resources in single focal areas to support the goals of Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs).

## GEF-8: HEALTHY PLANET, HEALTHY PEOPLE

Unified action towards 2030 Goals and Commitments

### FOCAL AREAS

- Biodiversity
- Climate change mitigation
- Land degradation
- International waters
- Chemicals and waste

### INTEGRATED PROGRAMS

Food Systems  
Ecosystem Restoration  
Sustainable Cities  
Amazon, Congo, and Critical Forest Biomes  
Circular Solutions to Plastic Pollution  
Blue and Green Islands  
Clean and Healthy Ocean  
Greening Transportation Infrastructure Development  
Net-Zero Nature-Positive Accelerator  
Wildlife Conservation for Development  
Elimination of Harmful Chemicals from Supply Chains

### GLOBAL PROGRAMS

Mobilizing the Financial Sector for Environmental Goals through Blended Finance  
  
Community Action for Global Transformation - Small Grants Program and Beyond

### CROSS-CUTTING

Circular economy \* Nature-based solutions \* Gender responsiveness \* Resilience \* Private sector engagement

Figure 2. The Healthy Planet, Healthy People Framework

## Integrated Programming

GEF-8 will support integrated programs that can “move the needle” toward systems transformations. This framework positions the GEF well in its work to help developing countries pursue transformational change in key systems in line with national priorities. Collectively, the proposed 11 integrated programs address major drivers of environmental degradation and/or deliver multiple benefits that fall under the GEF’s mandate. Many priorities also make use of increasingly more relevant global or regional platforms that are attracting a multitude of stakeholders and resources in response to political commitments.

## Individual Focal Area Investments

Investments in specific focal areas respond to guidance from the different MEAs. The integrated programs will deliver substantial global benefits across the different focal areas, while some issues are best addressed through distinct investments in specific focal areas.

## Global Programs

To rapidly scale up investment in the environment and meet the unfolding environmental crises and tipping points, global leaders, the private sector, the financial sector, and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) are converging in their calls for action. The GEF Blended Finance program is an effective tool to help mobilize private investment but still represents a small portion of total global investment. Similarly, the Small Grants Programme (SGP) plays a critical role in mobilizing grassroots and community action for global transformation.



## The Amazon, Congo, and Critical Forest Biomes Integrated Program

### The Issue

In the tropics, primary forests, or Intact Forest Landscapes (IFLs),<sup>1</sup> store more carbon than any other forests. It is estimated that forest ecosystems soak up to a third of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions, 84% coming from old and primary forests.<sup>2</sup> These forests are also irreplaceable in terms of biodiversity and are critical for other ecosystem services (water), and Indigenous Peoples and local communities. The conservation and sustainable management of the remaining IFLs has become crucial to combat global environmental degradation before it is too late. IFLs are also the cheapest solution to the twin crisis of climate change and biodiversity loss.

Remaining IFLs comprise only 20% of tropical forest area. Only 22% of intact forests are found in Protected Area Categories.<sup>3</sup> Primary forests in the most extended tropical biomes continue to be lost or degraded at an alarming rate. In addition, the continuation of the carbon sink's role of IFLs is not guaranteed due to climate change and deforestation.

The drivers of deforestation and forest degradation are well known. Some depend on local specificities, including agriculture, logging, mining, and infrastructure development. These drivers are fueled by poverty, policy incoherence, weak capacities, or industrial businesses.

### The Integrated Solution

The Amazon, Congo, and Critical Forest Biomes Integrated Program aims to maintain the integrity of globally important and critical tropical primary forests. This, in turn, will maximize multiple global environment benefits, notably related to carbon and biodiversity.


The Amazon and the Congo Basin are the two largest blocks of tropical forests in the world.<sup>4</sup> These two basins are globally critical for biodiversity and carbon storage. They provide livelihoods and subsistence to communities that rely on forests and agriculture for their survival

Beyond the large intact biomes, some regions are also home to smaller patches of primary forests. These are vital as biodiversity refugia and can serve as a cornerstone for ecological restoration efforts in fragmented landscapes. The Indo-Malaya region, Papua New Guinea, Mesoamerica, and the Guinean forests of West Africa include such vital primary forests and are therefore also targeted by the program.

### Expected Outcomes

At the global level, the program will contribute to better conservation of primary forests, providing information and visibility of IFLs in the climate and biodiversity agendas. It will give particular attention to their definition, mapping, sustainable management, and financing. Several platforms should be targeted to catalyze the engagement of multiple stakeholders at global, regional, national, and local levels. This would enable the needed changes in governance models, policies, financial frameworks, information, and social systems. Beyond governments, the targeted stakeholders should include the private sector and various platforms involved in forest protection, sustainable use, and finance.

At the sub-regional level, countries will be invited to work together to increase and strengthen the protection



Map by Hugh S. & Mackey B. (Griffith University), from various sources: Turubanova et al. (2013), Potapov et al. (2017) & FAO Global Ecological Zones (2012).

and governance of IFLs. They will tackle the drivers of deforestation at the landscape and jurisdictional levels. This could include, for instance, developing land use planning instruments at various levels and finding innovative ways to promote integration. Beyond the establishment and improved management of protected areas, the program will consider other effective area-based conservation measures.

Countries will have the opportunity to develop Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES), corridors, and coordinated landscape management to improve connectivity at the transboundary or regional level.

The roles and empowerment of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, as well as marginalized groups including women, will be central. This will require robust safeguard systems.

- 1 Potapov et al. (2017). The last frontiers of wilderness: tracking loss of intact forest landscapes from 2000 to 2013. *Science Advances*, 2017: 3:e1600821.
- 2 Funk et al (2019). Securing the climate benefits of stable forests. *Climate Policy*, 19:7, 845-860.
- 3 Mackey et al. (2015). Policy Options for the World's Primary Forests in Multilateral Environmental Agreements. *Conservation Letters*, 8(2), 139-147.
- 4 UNEP (2021). Emissions Gap Report 2021. *The Heat Is On – A World of Climate Promises Not Yet Delivered*. UNEP Nairobi.

The Global Environment Facility is the world's largest funder of biodiversity protection, nature restoration, pollution reduction, and climate change response in developing countries. **In June 2022, donor governments pledged \$5.33 billion to the GEF for its next four year operating period (GEF-8). Much of the funding will be delivered through a set of 11 integrated programs that address multiple environmental threats at once.**

Contact for Amazon, Congo, and Critical Forest Biomes IP:

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy  
jsinnassamy@thegef.org





## Blue and Green Islands Integrated Program

### The Issue

Nowhere is the interconnection between nature and people's livelihoods and well-being more obvious than in Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Countries worldwide are faced with accelerating change and environmental challenges. However, for SIDS, these challenges tend to be more intense and rapidly felt. They are physically small, geographically isolated and remote from international markets, with small economies that rely on a limited resource base, including unique biodiversity. SIDS are also highly vulnerable to the results of a changing climate. This includes sea level rise, more frequent and severe tropical storms, and the loss of coral reefs.

Around the world, the value of nature for the well-being of societies is often not understood and incorporated into decision-making. This leads to decisions and policies that undermine long-term societal health. Cutting down a mangrove to build a hotel or shrimp farm, for example, means the loss of an important fish nursery and storm surge protector.

SIDS economies are visibly and directly dependent on ecosystem health through tourism, agriculture, and fisheries, and are vulnerable to natural disasters exacerbated by climate change. Thus, disconnects in understanding and policy action become even more problematic in SIDS; but there are also opportunities for transformational change by addressing this challenge.

### The Integrated Solution

The Blue and Green Islands Integrated Program will support SIDS to value ecosystem services and incorporate them into decision making as a basis for protecting nature as the foundation of thriving and resilient societies. At the same time, the program will support the scaling up of Nature-based Solutions (NBS) on the ground and in the water in the tourism, food, and urban sectors. The global platform will provide key technical support and capacity building, support knowledge sharing, and build collaborative initiatives with the private sector and others.

Therefore, the program will work with countries to support integrated decision-making that incorporates the value of nature through methods such as ecosystem valuation and natural capital accounting. Building on this approach, SIDS are also uniquely positioned to pioneer NBS approaches to development and recovery. As part of the program, each country will choose a set of activities to implement based on national circumstances and priorities.

#### National projects will have two primary areas of work:

- Addressing cross-cutting upstream issues to create a coherent enabling environment such as accounting and valuing of ecosystems and domestic public and private sector resource mobilization
- Addressing landscape level challenges in one or more of three sectors through Nature-based Solutions.

#### Potential Nature-based Solutions:

**Tourism** — Conservation, sustainable use, and restoration of ecosystems; integrated sustainability planning and decision making for tourism development; protected areas management; engaging tourism enterprises in the care and restoration of nature; and coral reef insurance.



**Food (agriculture and fisheries)** — Support for farmers and fishers to move toward sustainable practices; maintaining, improving, and restoring agro-ecosystems; regenerative agriculture and integrated pest management to reduce agrochemical use; promoting NBS to curb sources of land-based pollutants, including persistent organic pollutants; building robust and sustainable supply chains and strengthening producer organizations; and improving community-based or commercial fisheries management, aquaculture, and/or protected area management.

**Urban** — Innovative NBS to wastewater management, water security, urban flooding, renewable energy, and/or solid waste management; and restoration of degraded productive landscapes or conservation of natural areas in peri-urban and rural areas to improve the ecosystem services they provide in urban areas.

The Global Environment Facility is the world's largest funder of biodiversity protection, nature restoration, pollution reduction, and climate change response in developing countries. In June 2022, donor governments pledged \$5.33 billion to the GEF for its next four year operating period (GEF-8). Much of the funding will be delivered through a set of 11 integrated programs that address multiple environmental threats at once.

#### Contacts for Blue and Green Islands IP:

Asha Bobb Semple  
abobbsemple@thegef.org  
Sarah Wyatt  
swyatt@thegef.org



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY  
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

### Expected Impacts

The **Global Coordination** function of the program will provide technical support and national-level capacity for enabling environment interventions; support learning, knowledge exchange and collaboration; coordinate and leverage external funding opportunities for impact at scale across multiple benefits; and meaningfully engage the local and international private sectors for innovative NBS. Individual SIDS may lack the scale to address certain issues or sectors that threaten the global environment and the global platform will seek to make significant progress in one or more of these areas.

Often described as large ocean, small island states, the SIDS manage 30% of the world's territorial oceans, including many areas of high biodiversity and carbon value. With just 3% of the Earth's land surface, SIDS are home to 20% of all plants, birds, and reptiles. By supporting countries to bring the value of nature into planning and policy and implementing NBS, the program will protect unique biodiversity, mitigate and adapt to climate change, and lead in demonstrating pathways for a Healthy Planet and Healthy People.

SEPTEMBER 2022

www.thegef.org



## Circular Solutions to Plastic Pollution Integrated Program

### The Issue

Plastic production, consumption, and waste is expanding exponentially, affecting marine, freshwater, and terrestrial ecosystems and contributing to greenhouse gas (GHG) and hazardous chemical emissions with consequent implications for human health, economies, and social well-being around the world. Plastic production—from car tires to water bottles—has increased 9% since 1950, outpacing any other manufactured material. Most recently, during the COVID-19 pandemic, single-use plastic consumption and subsequent waste has further increased. Packaging (e.g. bags, lids, bottles, clamshells) is the primary use of plastic (30%) with single-use plastic constituting over half of plastic waste.<sup>1, 2</sup> The food and beverage industry is a particular concern due to the high volume of single-use packaging. Nine out of 10 of the most common beach clean-up items are tied to the food and beverage sector.<sup>3</sup> Meanwhile, the top brands tied to plastic pollution are associated with the food and beverage industry.<sup>4</sup> Historically, action on plastic has focused on disposal (i.e. collection, recycling, waste-to-energy, incineration, landfill). However, eliminating plastic pollution requires stopping the flow of plastic at its source by controlling production and consumption. Such solutions require addressing the entire plastic value cycle: material engineering; product and process design; consumer use and behavior; and collection systems and recycling.

### The Integrated Solution

The Circular Solutions to Plastic Pollution Integrated Program tackles plastic pollution using a circular economy approach. Packaging, particularly single-use related to the food and beverage sector, will be the priority since it is the main source of plastic waste in developing countries.

Interventions will cross the entire plastic value chain—from production to consumption to disposal. Such a holistic approach leverages the interlinkages across the processes and sectors contributing to plastic pollution. As plastic pollution efforts tend to focus on waste collection, recycling and clean-ups, the GEF will prioritize actions early in the plastic value chain, i.e. production and consumption. By aligning with existing waste management efforts, the program will address the full value chain.

The program emphasizes upstream measures to reduce plastic production and consumption, the engagement of the private sector, and single-use packaging in the food and beverage sectors. It has several objectives:

- Eliminate production and use of problematic and unnecessary plastic products (e.g. single-use plastic packaging) and phase out plastic products containing chemicals of concern, using green chemistry to create sustainable materials.
- Innovate for circularity through increased reusability, recyclability, and composability of products; innovate better reuse, refill, repair, remanufacturing, and recycling business models, including service as product; reengineer products toward materials made from recycled materials, are recyclable and are ocean-safe if they leak into the ocean; and promote innovative solutions such as reuseable to-go food container programs.



- Ensure products are actually reused or recycled by shifting consumer behavior, by improving waste collection and recycling, and by fostering markets for recycled material.
- Create cross-cutting enabling conditions by strengthening coordination along the plastic value chain, sharing best practices, and establishing transparent means of monitoring and evaluation.

The program will include global, regional, national and city-level projects. At the global scale, the program will pursue establishing metrics, benchmarks and standards; addressing the trade of plastic products and waste; advising businesses on moving toward circular practices through innovation; sharing best practices; and raising awareness of circular economy opportunities and the business case for adopting circular practices. At the regional, national and city levels, the program will tackle plastic pollution by working with governments on circular policies, with businesses to adopt circular practices, with financiers to invest in circular solutions, and with the general public to raise awareness and shift consumer behavior.

### Expected Impacts

Reducing the production, consumption, and disposal of plastic products will reduce GHG emissions in support of the Paris Agreement. It will also reduce emissions of hazardous chemicals, including unintentional persistent organic pollutants (uPOPs), in support of the Stockholm Convention. In addition, reducing plastic waste from entering the environment will help maintain the health of ecosystems and the species affected by entanglement and ingestion. This, in turn, will support the Convention on Biological Diversity, and other relevant agreements.

The program will also contribute to socioeconomic co-benefits, including diversified livelihoods and economic growth. It will achieve these benefits through innovative,

circular solutions; improved labor conditions for the informal sector; women's empowerment throughout the value chain; and improved human health through potable water and uncontaminated food. Increased job opportunities are also expected from the business opportunities associated with zero waste solutions. At a global scale, such a system change is predicted to cut government costs by \$70 billion and save businesses \$1.3 trillion compared to a business-as-usual trajectory.

The program will generate the following direct global environmental benefits:

- 1 shared water ecosystem under improved governance
- 16 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (Mt CO<sub>2</sub>e) mitigated
- 10 Mt hazardous chemicals eliminated
- 1,400 grams of toxic equivalent (gTEQ) emissions reduced

1 <https://www.unep.org/resources/report/mapping-global-plastics-value-chain-and-plastics-losses-environment-particular>  
 2 <https://www.unep.org/interactive/beat-plastic-pollution/>  
 3 [https://oceanconservancy.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Final-2019-ICC-Report\\_EMBARGOED-UNTIL-9.3.19.pdf](https://oceanconservancy.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Final-2019-ICC-Report_EMBARGOED-UNTIL-9.3.19.pdf)  
 4 <https://www.breakfreefromplastic.org/globalbrandauditreport2020/>

The Global Environment Facility is the world's largest funder of biodiversity protection, nature restoration, pollution reduction, and climate change response in developing countries. In June 2022, donor governments pledged \$5.33 billion to the GEF for its next four year operating period (GEF-8). Much of the funding will be delivered through a set of 11 integrated programs that address multiple environmental threats at once.

Contact for Circular Solutions to Plastic Pollution IP:

Leah Karrer  
lkarrer@thegef.org





GEF-8 INTEGRATED PROGRAM

## Clean and Healthy Ocean Integrated Program

### The Issue

The ocean provides \$2.5 trillion each year to the world economy in market goods and services and many times that in non-market amenities. Today, about 45% of the world's population lives within 150 km of a coastline. Meanwhile, two-thirds of the planet's largest cities are in low-lying coastal areas. While living near water—rivers, lakes, and oceans—supports livelihoods, many human activities put pressure on these same water systems by altering flows and contributing to pollution. According to recent estimates, 70-80% of global wastewater is discharged untreated into the ocean, either directly or via rivers.

Coastal pollution from land-based activities is one of the most serious threats to the world's coastal ecosystems. It directly impacts health, livelihoods, biodiversity, and ecological goods and services. One of the main threats to coastal waters is the increasing levels of nutrients reaching the ocean from point source and/or diffuse land-based sources, such as cities and agricultural activities.

Alarmingly, dramatic declines in oxygen levels in the ocean have been observed over the past 50 years. This has led to the identification of more than 500 dead zones, covering an area roughly the size of the European Union. Dead zones occur when oxygen levels drop so low that marine life is unable to survive. While dead zones likely have occurred seasonally across history, recent research has

shown they have nearly quadrupled across the globe since 1950. Climate-induced warming is adding to the severity and frequency of these events.

### The Role of the Integrated Program

The Clean and Healthy Ocean Integrated Program will aim to accelerate global efforts to curb coastal pollution from agricultural, industrial, and municipal sources. These sources are directly on the coast or else reach coastal waters from often distant sources via major rivers. The program aims to accelerate both global commitments and national reforms and investments to prevent excessive and uncontrolled nutrient loads from reaching coastal waters.

Curbing the inflow of land-based pollution to the coastal environment is expected to lift the triple bottom line of ecological, social, and economic well-being in countries along the coasts of the world's large marine ecosystems (LMEs). It will deliver substantial global environmental benefits: renewed attention to the impact of untreated wastewater and nutrient run-off in the ocean; and greater knowledge to inform and incentivize national coordinated policy formulation processes and investments.

This program is one of 11 under the GEF-8 cycle. Together with other programs, it will draw attention to the need



for global commitment and action. To that end, it will accelerate a frank debate on the need for national policy coherence to address excessive pollution loads in rivers and connected coastal waters.

### A Two-Pronged Approach

The program takes a two-pronged approach to address coastal nutrient pollution:

- **A global multi-stakeholder platform** will inform economic and social perspectives critical for understanding the drivers, opportunities, and limitations to achieving better nutrient management at global and regional scales. It will include key cross-sectoral public and private sector actors, civil society groups, and academia, among others. This global platform aims to accelerate action to curb land-based sources of pollution building on recent momentum, such as UNEA 4 and 5 resolutions. It will strengthen science-to-policy linkages; provide policy and technical advice to child projects; and aim to leverage finance for innovative approaches and investments (e.g. providing seed finance to competitive innovation grants and incubators to design and roll out innovative technologies). It will also help facilitate the exchange of knowledge, experiences, and lessons learned.
- **To significantly scale up action in LMEs**, the program will focus on a subset of countries that contribute significantly to pollution loads in two or three LMEs, one of which prioritizes the needs of Small Island Developing States. Focusing on a limited number of LMEs—and only those with a ministerially approved joint Strategic Action Program—will deliver measurable impact that can be scaled up across their respective regions. On the LME and country level, the program aims to focus on supporting policy and regulatory reforms, including retooling perverse/competing subsidies across sectors; incentivizing increased domestic finance; scaling up deployment of Nature-based Solutions (NBS) and efforts to combine NBS/green with existing grey infrastructure; and accelerating deployment of innovative finance tools and technology to curb pollution.



### Expected Impacts

The end goal of the Clean and Healthy Ocean Integrated Program is to significantly decrease land-based pollution of the coastal environment. In so doing, it would advance ecological, social, and economic well-being in countries along the coasts of the world's LMEs. Specifically, the program aims to decrease the length and extent of hypoxic zones. It will achieve this by curbing coastal nutrient pollution from agricultural, industrial, and municipal sources through policy and regulatory measures and infrastructure investments combined with NBS.

The causes of nutrient pollution require a cross-sector approach that will improve human and environmental health beyond nutrient and dead zone reduction and restoration of biodiversity. The program will improve health by decreasing sources of nitrates, waterborne diseases, and other contaminants from cities and agriculture. It will improve livelihoods by significantly improving coastal water quality. This, in turn, will restore fish habitats, supporting local fisheries, furthering sustainable coastal tourism, and therefore enhancing local income opportunities and tax revenue. Finally, it will improve food security. In addition to increasing fish yields, it will decouple agricultural yield from inputs of industrial fertilizers and incentivize sustainable and climate-smart agriculture.

The Global Environment Facility is the world's largest funder of biodiversity protection, nature restoration, pollution reduction, and climate change response in developing countries. In June 2022, donor governments pledged \$5.33 billion to the GEF for its next four year operating period (GEF-8). Much of the funding will be delivered through a set of 11 integrated programs that address multiple environmental threats at once.

#### Contact for Clean and Healthy Ocean IP:

Andrew Hume  
ahume@thegef.org



SEPTEMBER 2022

www.thegef.org





GEF-8 INTEGRATED PROGRAM

# Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Program

## The Issue

An estimated 2 billion hectares (ha) of agricultural land, pasture, forest, and woodland are degraded globally, with negative impacts on food systems, ecosystem services, and habitats for wildlife. While restoration efforts are underway in many regions, degradation continues at a large scale. There has thus never been a more urgent need to arrest further degradation and to restore and heal ecosystems.

Ecosystem restoration is the process of assisting the recovery of ecosystem types and habitats that have been degraded, damaged, or destroyed. It encompasses a continuum of activities that contribute to protecting intact ecosystems and repairing degraded ecosystems. Restoration can range from rehabilitating and improving systems under human use to restoring disturbed natural ecosystems to their natural state and ensuring their conservation.

Restoration, a key nature-based solution, has both economic and environmental benefits. Restoration contributes to green recovery by stimulating investments, creating jobs primarily in rural areas, and helping to secure livelihoods of local communities. It generates ecological benefits by safeguarding ecosystem services, such as soil protection, pollination, nutrient cycling, and soil water-holding capacity. Such services are crucial for both short- and long-term agricultural productivity and food security. In addition, restoration provides biodiversity benefits,

including avoided species extinctions, as well as climate change mitigation benefits through carbon sequestration.

## The Integrated Solution

The Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Program aligns with the vision of the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration and supports the global commitments toward restoration under the Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs). As such, it mobilizes a diverse coalition of stakeholders from all relevant sectors, catalyzing finance, and fostering global cooperation.

The program aims to generate multiple environmental and socioeconomic benefits by applying integrated approaches to restore degraded ecosystems. It will focus on restoration of ecosystem types with a high potential to generate multiple benefits, including the following:

- Converted or degraded ecosystem types and habitats, such as wetlands; peatlands; headwaters and watersheds; estuaries; riverine forests; mangroves; coastal areas, including near-shore coral reefs and seagrass ecosystems; native woodlands; shrub and grasslands; ecological networks and corridors; and steppingstone habitats. It will use best practices for ecological restoration.
- Degraded natural forest landscapes, drylands, grasslands, and pastures. It will apply a range of best practices and cost-effective interventions such as natural regeneration and assisted natural regeneration to restore ecosystem functions and services.
- Degraded agro-ecosystems in mosaic landscapes with a high potential for multiple environmental benefits. It will achieve this through investments in sustainable land management, including agro-silvo-pastoral models and agro-ecological diversification, and rangeland restoration



## Approach

Conventional planning and policy decisions for natural resource management at landscape level are still siloed in individual ministries and discussed with different stakeholders ad hoc. The program will apply comprehensive integrated land-use planning, including spatial land-use planning. It will also promote cross-sectoral coordination between environment, agriculture, forestry, water, energy, tourism, transport, mining, and finance sectors. In this way, it will harmonize policies and financing streams.

The program will also engage with stakeholders more strategically. A programmatic approach will complement biophysical and technical interventions on the ground. Instruments focused on national policies, governance, institutional, financial, and local social structures will bring all relevant stakeholders together for transformational impact on reversing environmental degradation globally.

The lead agency of the program will provide technical- and science-based expertise, and support spatial land-use planning built on multi-stakeholder, cross-sectoral participatory processes. This will facilitate Indigenous- and community-led restoration that fosters capacity of civil society organizations. It will design and deploy innovative financing solutions to sustain impact. Finally, it will conduct effective policy engagement to strengthen enabling conditions for restoration interventions.

As part of this approach, a global platform will deliver program-level objectives by guiding and supporting national child projects under the program in:

- Outreach and communication
- Knowledge generation and exchange
- Policy support
- Mobilization of finance
- Monitoring and evaluation

The program will work with and through existing platforms to create the global cooperation and synergies needed for transformational change and scaling, and enhanced impact.

## Expected Impacts

The program provides a vehicle to meet many of the restoration targets that countries have set within their MEAs and other international commitments. This includes avoiding further degradation of land and ecosystems. Besides these indirect impacts, the program will generate the following direct global environmental benefits:

- 4.3 million ha under restoration
- 9.4 million ha under improved management
- 80 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) sequestered/avoided
- One shared freshwater ecosystem under new/improved cooperative management

The Global Environment Facility is the world's largest funder of biodiversity protection, nature restoration, pollution reduction, and climate change response in developing countries. **In June 2022, donor governments pledged \$5.33 billion to the GEF for its next four year operating period (GEF-8). Much of the funding will be delivered through a set of 11 integrated programs that address multiple environmental threats at once.**

Contact for Ecosystem Restoration IP:

Ulrich Apel  
uapel@thegef.org



SEPTEMBER 2022

[www.thegef.org](http://www.thegef.org)





## Eliminating Hazardous Chemicals from Supply Chains Integrated Program

### The Issue

Fashion and construction are among the top three economic sectors that contribute significantly through their supply chains to pollution, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, land degradation, water pollution, and threats to biodiversity. Fashion, for example, contributes more GHG emissions than all global transport, including air travel. For its part, construction contributes 39% of global GHG emissions, and contributes significantly to water pollution, land degradation, biodiversity loss, and chemicals pollution.

Previous attempts to green both sectors have made little progress. A more circular supply chain can only be achieved if the sectors are free of harmful chemicals that prevent materials recovery, recycling, etc. Such an approach also ensures technologies and practices to green these supply chains will eliminate harmful chemicals in addition to promoting carbon neutrality and nature-positive actions.

### The Integrated Solution

The Supply Chain Integrated Program seeks to address environmental degradation from globally significant supply chains through the lens of chemicals. Ideally, it will be the catalyst for integrating actions across several environmental dimensions. The program aims to create clean, circular (as far as possible), regenerative, and transparent supply chains that drive innovations in new materials, methods, and policy.

The supply chains of fashion and construction supply chains are not necessarily related, but they have common activities that affect sustainability. The program will stimulate innovations in new materials, technologies, and practices and in tandem, it will create markets and demand for new materials in these supply chains. This will enable products and materials to be green by design.

The program will support institutional and policy changes to support market uptake, barrier removal, and access to finance. These changes will incentivize the flow of new materials into these supply chains. At the same time, it will reduce production of unsustainable materials and practices, so they do not end up in other supply chains.

The program will support strategic actions that unlock investment and innovation in the private and public sectors. In so doing, it will draw on work in green chemistry and waste management where GEF resources help bring new technologies and to commercial scale. The program complements will work with commercial finance, enabling entrepreneurs to access finance to create businesses that can supply new materials and products.



### Coordination

The program would need to engage with multistakeholder platforms, engaging with the global private sector. This is especially true of brands, firms, and relevant sectors to secure offtake of new materials and facilitate access to these materials. It would also need to match with ongoing innovation platforms and identify additional areas to influence new materials, products, and practices. For example, it can bring these criteria into sourcing programs such as gold for the planetGOLD program.

Ideally, the coordination component will share and exchange knowledge and lessons from the program. It will also collect, synthesize, and disseminate best practices to child projects. In this way, it would ensure child projects are working efficiently.

The selection of child projects should consider several criteria. They should ignite imagination and innovation, surfacing technologies, processes, products, and materials that can replace unsustainable ones. All projects should ideally focus on unlocking resources from the private sector and public sector to drive sustainability.

### Expected Results

The program has targets across several focal areas:

- Minimum Core Indicator Estimates:
- C14 Area of landscapes under improved practices: **1 million hectares (Mha)**
- C16 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated: **6 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e)**
- C19 Reduction of chemicals of global concern and their waste: **25,000 metric tons**
- C110 Reduction of POPs to air: **246 grams of toxic equivalent (gTEQ)**

The Global Environment Facility is the world's largest funder of biodiversity protection, nature restoration, pollution reduction, and climate change response in developing countries. **In June 2022, donor governments pledged \$5.33 billion to the GEF for its next four year operating period (GEF-8). Much of the funding will be delivered through a set of 11 integrated programs that address multiple environmental threats at once.**

Contact for Eliminating Hazardous Chemicals from Supply Chains IP:

Anil Bruce Sookdeo  
 asookdeo@thegef.org



## Food Systems Integrated Program

### The Issue

Food systems globally are a major driver of environmental degradation, including loss of forests and biodiversity, degradation of lands, depletion of freshwater resources, agricultural nutrient pollution, and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Agriculture occupies about 37% of the world's total land area and agricultural production accounts for up to 80% of global deforestation; 70% of the terrestrial loss and 50% of the freshwater biodiversity loss; and 70% of global freshwater withdrawals. According to a new study, food systems emit about 20 metric gigatons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) per year (about 35% of global GHG emissions).<sup>1</sup> The consequences of unsustainable food production extend into aquatic systems. This makes agriculture the largest source of water pollution, which then runs off into aquatic ecosystems and coastal areas.

Many factors contribute to the increased negative impacts in food systems:

- Rising global population and changes in consumption patterns toward higher protein diets resulting in more carbon-intensive agriculture that will further strain global land-use systems.
- Limited access of small-scale producers and agri-enterprises to viable markets.
- High levels of food loss and waste and increased incidences of food safety, and animal and human health issues.

- Increased energy intensity and ecological footprint associated with the lengthening and industrialization of food supply chains.

Tackling these challenges in isolation will not deliver the desired shift in food systems toward sustainability and resilience for people and the planet. Such transformational change calls for collective engagement by diverse actors involved in food systems. They need to move toward integrated solutions across entire supply chains, from supply (production) to consumption.


### The Integrated Solution

Since its inception, the GEF has provided financing to countries for innovative projects seeking to tackle environmental degradation from agricultural production.

During the sixth and seventh replenishment cycles (GEF-6 and GEF-7), the GEF supported ongoing efforts to transform agriculture through investments in sustainable practices for safeguarding natural capital (land, soil, water, and biodiversity). GEF projects also promoted deforestation-free supply chains for globally important commodities, and reduction of negative externalities (GHG emissions and nutrient pollution).

The GEF-8 strategy will build on this experience. It will focus explicitly on sustainable, regenerative, nature-positive production systems. It will also support efficient value/supply chains covering food crops, commercial commodities, livestock, and aquaculture.

As its overall objective, the GEF-8 Food Systems Integrated Program seeks to catalyze the transformation to sustainable food systems that are nature-positive, resilient, and pollution-reduced. In so doing, the program aims to reduce environmental degradation and negative externalities in food production systems (food crops, commercial commodities, livestock, and aquaculture) and on the demand side across supply chains.



Integrated diverse portfolio of practices to achieve sustainable food systems and impacts at scale

### Delivery Framework

To maximize potential for transformative change, the program will operate at two levels—global and national—and consider the four proposed “levers” (governance and policies, financial leverage, multi-stakeholder dialogues, and innovation and learning) for advancing systems transformation.

At the global level, the program will support:

- Leveraging private and financial sectors through encouraging concrete actions on both the production and demand sides toward use and expansion of sustainability standards and commitments to environmental and socially responsible sourcing.
- Catalyzing access to knowledge, technical expertise, and capacity development on issues that represent common challenges across multiple countries or specific geographical regions.
- Catalyzing new opportunities across spatial (landscapes) or vertical (supply chain) dimensions to help maximize scale potential for impact beyond national boundaries.

At the country level, and depending on the context, there are three areas of interventions:

- Creating an enabling environment to shift toward sustainable and regenerative food production sustainability through a diversity of approaches.
- Reducing livestock's impact on the environment and contribution to zoonotic spillover and supporting production of alternative protein sources.
- Expanding investment in sustainable aquaculture management that is explicitly linked to land-based practices impacting freshwater and coastal marine ecosystems.

### Expected Impacts

A more diverse portfolio of practices will be key in achieving sustainable food systems. This will include implementing practices that shift food production to least emission-intensive, sequester carbon, and adopt diet shifts. It will also embrace new-horizon technologies supported by improvements in countries' governance, political commitment and technical assistance, and innovative financial mechanisms. As a result, the program will generate global environmental benefits for climate change mitigation, biodiversity conservation, land degradation and water resources, and contribute to food security, livelihood and climate resilience, and better health and nutrition.

<sup>1</sup> Ciniro Costa Jr et al. Roadmap for achieving net-zero emissions in global food systems by 2050 Nature Scientific Reports 2022

The Global Environment Facility is the world's largest funder of biodiversity protection, nature restoration, pollution reduction, and climate change response in developing countries. **In June 2022, donor governments pledged \$5.33 billion to the GEF for its next four year operating period (GEF-8). Much of the funding will be delivered through a set of 11 integrated programs that address multiple environmental threats at once.**

Contact for Food Systems IP:

Peter Umunay  
pumunay@thegef.org





## Greening Transportation Infrastructure Development Integrated Program

### The Issue

Infrastructure development is essential to meet humanity's social and economic needs, including ramping up a global energy transition to meet net-zero targets. This is especially true in developing economies where millions of people continue to lack access to basic services like water, energy, transportation, and telecommunications. It has been estimated that \$95 trillion in new infrastructure is needed by 2040 alone to meet demand—twice the infrastructure that existed in 2012.<sup>1, 2</sup> This level of investment will have profound social and environmental consequences, including biodiversity loss, deforestation, and greenhouse gas emissions.

Anticipated investments in transportation and energy sectors are expected to be particularly impactful. More than 25 million km of new roads are anticipated by 2050, 90% in developing countries.<sup>3</sup> New roads will drive further deforestation in the last remaining old-growth forests. This, in turn, will increase habitat fragmentation and loss of ecosystem connectivity, while elevating risks for zoonotic disease spillover.

There are two important drivers of these impacts. First, transportation infrastructure is based on an insufficiently holistic understanding of true investment risks and environmental costs and benefits. Second, decision makers are not realizing the full potential of nature-based infrastructure solutions.

While ecosystem services are increasingly valued, their benefits are rarely incorporated into infrastructure sector plans. This is because current cost-benefit analysis standards and practices do not sufficiently consider the true negative costs of built assets or the positive benefits of these solutions.

Without significant change in the status quo, additional infrastructure development investment in the coming decades will make it impossible to meet the goals of the UNFCCC, CBD, and UNCCD.

### The Integrated Solution

The Greening Transportation Infrastructure Development Integrated Program aims to enable countries to develop portfolios of transportation infrastructure projects at national or land/seascape levels that build in sustainability from inception through:

- Avoiding placement of transportation infrastructure in globally important and particularly sensitive ecological areas, thus significantly reducing negative impacts to ecosystems from essential infrastructure development.
- Enabling countries to recognize ecological services that must be maintained to either serve infrastructure needs, such as free-flowing rivers that enable multi-modal transport systems, or reduce risks to engineered infrastructure, such as forested slopes that protect roads from landslides and erosion.



- Striking a balance between investment in new transportation infrastructure and maintaining existing assets to meet sustainable infrastructure service delivery requirements.

The program will achieve this by improving planning, regulatory, financial, and institutional and management frameworks geared to the differential needs of countries and landscapes. Important criteria that will be considered as part of these frameworks include whole life costs, holistic investment, net-zero, resilience, flexibility, and multi-use design. These framework elements are essential for a well-operating transportation infrastructure industry and more importantly for embedding sustainability into infrastructure operations.

### Expected Outcomes

The program seeks to ensure that transportation infrastructure projects will emphasize and produce biodiversity, avoided land degradation, and climate change mitigation benefits. It will do this by (i) avoiding placing infrastructure in critical ecosystems; (ii) restoring biodiversity around the right of way of a road; (iii) maintaining flows/connectivity for fluvial transport; and (iv) maintaining or enhancing wildlife crossings or other natural infrastructure to increase ecosystem connectivity and facilitate the movement of animals.

1 Oxford Economics. 2017. Global Infrastructure Outlook. Global Infrastructure Hub. <https://www.oxfordeconomics.com/recent-releases/Global-Infrastructure-Outlook>  
 2 Bhattacharya, A., Oppenheim, J. & Stern, N. 2015. Driving Sustainable Development through Better Infrastructure: Key Elements of a Transformation Program. Brookings Institution, The New Climate Economy and Grantham Research Institute, Washington, DC, USA.  
 3 Alamgir M., M.J. Campbell, S. Sloan, M. Goosem, G. R. Clements, M.I. Mahmoud, W. F. Laurance, 2017. Economic, Socio-Political and Environmental Risks of Road Development in the Tropics. *Curr Biol.* 27(20): R1130-R1140.

The Global Environment Facility is the world's largest funder of biodiversity protection, nature restoration, pollution reduction, and climate change response in developing countries. In June 2022, donor governments pledged \$5.33 billion to the GEF for its next four year operating period (GEF-8). Much of the funding will be delivered through a set of 11 integrated programs that address multiple environmental threats at once.

Contact for Greening Transportation Infrastructure Development IP:

Mark Zimsky  
 mzimsky@thegef.org





GEF-8 INTEGRATED PROGRAM

## Net-Zero Nature-Positive Accelerator Integrated Program

### The Challenge

According to the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report, holding the global temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels will require 45 percent CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reductions by 2030 compared to 2010 levels, and reaching net-zero emission globally by 2050.

Countries need to roll out coherent strategies and operationalize investment pipelines that pursue deep decarbonization pathways. This will require holistic and cross-sectoral approaches, which are often hindered by fragmented or incoherent decision-making structures and slowed down by mis-aligned incentives and subsidies. Such integrated approach needs to be built upon the growing evidence showing that the twin threats of global biodiversity loss and climate change are inextricably linked. There is considerable scope and opportunity for harnessing synergies, and a strong need to minimize tradeoffs. With the urgency to tackle both threats toward achieving carbon neutral, nature-positive, and reduced pollution economies, we need to act now to support countries making informed decisions on how to embark swiftly towards decarbonized economies, while protecting nature at the same time.

### The Net-Zero Nature-Positive Accelerator Integrated Program

The Net-Zero Nature-Positive (NZNP) Accelerator Integrated Program aims to accelerate the implementation nature-positive and net-zero pathways by investing in nature and new technologies. The program aims to push the ambition of national climate plans beyond the current levels and contribute to closing the gap between the expected combined impacts of adopted national policies and the well-below 2°C path enshrined in the Paris Agreement.

Supporting a whole-of-government approach, the program will help countries to prepare and implement long-term strategies that are consistent with the temperature goals of the Paris Agreement, translate them into short- and medium-term targets and with coherent and enforceable policies. It will then invest in pipeline of projects focusing on innovative climate technologies and nature-based solutions, to move swiftly from planning to implementation.

The program is one of the 11 Integrated Programs under GEF-8. It is expected to start implementation in the second half of 2023.

### The Program Delivery Framework

Depending on the country context and readiness, specific objectives to be supported by the NZNP Accelerator Integrated Program will include the following:

- Support the adoption of net-zero strategies and policies that are coordinated with national biodiversity conservation and land degradation strategies and objectives.
- Contribute to the effective integration of the climate and biodiversity agendas at the national and global level.



- Invest in NZNP-aligned pipelines of projects that generate multiple global environmental benefits.
- Support the development of robust data systems to monitor progress towards NZNP targets.

The program will require integration at three levels: i) across sectors: requires a system approach and the participation of relevant line ministries; ii) across value chains; and iii) across governance: integrations across national and local governments, civil society as well as across the public and private sectors.

The NZNP Accelerator Integrated Program will prioritize countries with the highest level of political commitment to net-zero targets. It will also work closely with private sector coalitions to galvanize its engagement and increase likelihood of adoption of private sector commitments to NZNP targets.

### Expected Impacts

Decarbonization of economies while protecting nature and reducing pollution offer significant opportunities for shaping healthy environments and can contribute substantially to the post-pandemic economic recovery, including by supporting the alignment of domestic stimulus packages and international climate finance flows to the principles of the build back greener agenda.

By advancing the integrated approach, the NZNP Accelerator Integrated Program will complement the bottom-up processes to develop and implement Nationally Determined Contributions, with top-down actions that fully integrate biodiversity and land degradation neutrality in climate mitigation policies and investments. As a result, the program will contribute to generate multiple global environmental benefits and practical lessons beyond those created by programming solely within the GEF Focal Areas.

The Global Environment Facility is the world's largest funder of biodiversity protection, nature restoration, pollution reduction, and climate change response in developing countries. **In June 2022, donor governments pledged \$5.33 billion to the GEF for its next four year operating period (GEF-8). Much of the funding will be delivered through a set of 11 integrated programs that address multiple environmental threats at once.**

Contact for Net-Zero Nature-Positive Accelerator IP:

Filippo Berardi  
fberardi@thegef.org



# Sustainable Cities Integrated Program

## The Issue

Cities are growing at an unprecedented scale and pace, accounting for nearly 70% of global greenhouse gas emissions. Rapid urban sprawl is driving degradation of land and loss of biodiversity. Meanwhile, unsustainable consumption is causing a rapid increase in solid and toxic waste and pollution in cities.

Unplanned urban growth affects both the environment and urban populations, leading to increased vulnerability to climate extremes of flooding, heat waves, and sea level rise. In addition, it increases inequality in cities. Vulnerable urban communities are the most affected by environmental degradation and other stressors such as the COVID-19 pandemic.

## The Opportunity

By 2050, cities are expected to host two-thirds of the global population. Therefore, they will be key economic systems for transformative actions to address environmental degradation and achieve the global climate change, nature, and sustainability goals. As naturally integrated systems and strategic hubs for innovation in technology, policies, and business models, cities bring many effective entry points for sustainable investments that can deliver large-scale global environmental benefits. They are showing strong political leadership toward sustainability with city networks, multi-stakeholder

platforms and other urban actors playing a critical role in scaling up their ambitions. Further catalytic support to cities can drive green and equitable growth in cities, which is key for healthy people and a healthy planet.

## The Integrated Solution

The Sustainable Cities Integrated Program aims to advance integrated and systems-based approaches toward building net-zero carbon, nature-positive, inclusive, and climate-resilient cities. It will also focus on urban priorities, including the reduction of chemicals and waste, plastics, and air pollution as key co-benefits.

The program will work with countries and cities on the following strategic entry points:

1. Advancing integrated land use planning and governance to support institutional coordination at multiple levels, and catalyze integrated spatial approaches to scale up innovative sustainability solutions with strengthened collaboration between sectors.
2. Integrating nature into urban development and regional planning, demonstrating urban Nature-based Solutions and supporting enabling policy and regulatory environment to bring nature into cities.
3. Decarbonizing the built environment by supporting development of plans, policies, and strategies to design and implement solutions to decarbonize urban infrastructure, including buildings, energy, waste management, water and transportation systems.
4. Adopting circular economy approaches through policies and physical infrastructure targeting strategic entry points such as building materials, water and waste management, urban food systems, plastics, and industries.

GEF-8 INTEGRATED PROGRAM

5. Promoting innovative financing to increase flow of finance to cities to meet the sustainability financing gap, in collaboration with financial institutions, the private sector, and other institutional investors.




Figure 1: SC IP Key Entry Points




Figure 2: SC IP Implementation approach

These entry points will be supported by cross-cutting priorities of i) inclusion and environmental justice; ii) gender-inclusive approaches; and iii) private sector engagement at the global, national, and local levels.

The program will seek to deliver transformative results through its two interlinked components:

- A global platform—to catalyze knowledge creation and city-to-city learning, promote innovation and strengthen multi-stakeholder partnerships.
- Country- and city-level interventions—to support cities and national governments in implementing integrated urban sustainability solutions in selected cities.

## Expected Impacts

The program will enable cities in tackling key drivers of environmental degradation to deliver multiple global environmental benefits. This includes climate change mitigation and adaptation, biodiversity conservation, reduced land degradation, and reduction of chemicals and waste. Its support to cities will result in improved land use planning, enabling policies, accelerated investments in nature and decarbonization, and capacity building of urban institutions. It will promote integration of gender, health, and inclusion to ensure equitable distribution of environmental benefits. The program will create a space for diverse stakeholders to collaborate and co-create innovative and impactful urban sustainability solutions. These could range from governments, city networks, and financial institutions to civil society and the private sector.

The Global Environment Facility is the world's largest funder of biodiversity protection, nature restoration, pollution reduction, and climate change response in developing countries. In June 2022, donor governments pledged \$5.33 billion to the GEF for its next four year operating period (GEF-8). Much of the funding will be delivered through a set of 11 integrated programs that address multiple environmental threats at once.

Contact for Sustainable Cities IP:

Aloke Barnwal  
 abarnwal@thegef.org  
 Mia Linnea Callenberg  
 mcallenberg@thegef.org





## Wildlife Conservation for Development Integrated Program

### The Challenge

The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted the interconnectedness of people and nature via zoonotic disease spillover. It has shown the vulnerability of economies and protected areas dependent on the international tourism market. And it has made obvious the value of diversification, resilience, and an integrated approach to the health of ecosystems, health of wildlife, livestock, and well-being of people.

Wildlife crime continues to be a lucrative global business, with high demand driving high prices, and with low risk of apprehension. Nearly 6,000 species of fauna and flora have been seized between 1999 and 2018, with nearly every country in the world playing a role in the illegal wildlife trade. The Red List Index shows there has been no reduction in the rate at which species are moving toward extinctions because of human impacts. Indeed, threats to species and the Key Biodiversity Areas and wider landscapes and seascapes they depend upon are growing. A complex set of drivers including land/sea use changes, climate change, overexploitation of resources, pollution, and invasive alien species are behind these declines.

### An Integrated Solution

The Wildlife Conservation for Development Integrated Program (WCD IP) will support countries to secure terrestrial, freshwater, and marine wildlife populations and key landscapes. An integrated approach to combat the illegal and high-risk consumption and trade will address key elements of the supply chain (poaching, trafficking, and demand). It will also support strategies for the coexistence of human and wildlife populations through landscape-level conservation and by managing human-wildlife conflict. At the same time, it will incorporate a new focus on zoonotic spillover risk reduction by promoting control and proper regulation of wildlife trade and unsustainable wildlife exploitation for non-trade purposes. The WCD IP will work across the human health-wildlife health nexus, providing participating countries with support and incentive to explicitly address this critical element of the Healthy Planet, Healthy People framework.

The program aims to conserve wildlife and landscapes by transforming the drivers of species loss and ensuring that countries and communities are benefiting from these natural assets. Achieving this requires an approach with both global and national dimensions, with regional coordination and engagement. The IP will directly address wildlife-health system links and support innovative cross-sectoral partnerships.

The WCD IP builds on GEF's experience with the Global Wildlife Program and will focus on three components. First, **Human Wildlife Coexistence** will support countries to conserve the extent, integrity and connectivity of key wildlife landscapes; deploy actions and policies to reduce zoonotic spillover; and avoid and mitigate human wildlife conflict. Second, **Illegal and High-Risk Wildlife Trade** takes a supply chain approach to curbing



poaching, disrupting trafficking, and reducing demand for illegal, unsustainable and high zoonotic-risk wildlife within and between countries. Third, **Wildlife for Prosperity** strives to ensure that local communities and governments value, invest-in and benefit from wildlife and habitat conservation including the recovery of nature-based tourism, landscape restoration and diversification of sustainable livelihoods and private sector engagement for building sustainable wildlife-based economies. At the same time, it will broaden attention to capture potential zoonotic spillover risks at the human-animal-ecosystem interface. A range of aligned interventions will work in globally significant wildlife habitats, across illegal supply chains, and in close partnership with local communities and multiple sectors. In so doing, the program will allow countries to achieve transformative change through sustainable management and conservation of terrestrial, coastal, and marine wildlife and ecosystems. As such, it will deliver integrated impacts for biodiversity, land degradation, climate change, and local communities.

The global program will include targeted activities in challenging areas for national projects. These include: i) international trafficking and transboundary issues; ii) behavior change for reducing consumer demand for illegal or unsustainable wildlife (prioritizing high-zoonotic risk and nationally and internationally illegally traded and consumed wildlife); iii) support for One Health approaches to reducing zoonotic spillover risks; and iv) global and regional donor coordination and knowledge management, with emphasis in South-South collaboration.

The three WCD IP components for national projects will work together, reinforcing each other with support of a global platform and targeted regional coordination and engagement. At the same time, they will consider compliance with international obligations.

WCD IP will consist of a set of national projects that will work across the IP components depending on the in-country conditions and national priorities. The platform will work at a global, regional, or transnational level. It will

include a set-aside grant window to support social and behavioral sciences approaches to demand reduction for internationally trafficked and high-risk species. Such efforts to change behavior in domestic markets should be mainstreamed in national projects as well.

### Expected Results

The GEF-8 Wildlife Conservation for Development Integrated Program is designed to achieve results across multiple sectors. This includes the conservation of globally important biodiversity (species and landscape conservation and sustainable use); land degradation (restoration of key wildlife habitats); climate change (greenhouse gas avoidance through habitat conservation); and human-wildlife health (reduce risk of zoonotic spillover from wildlife into humans, livestock or domestic animals). The program will generate the following direct global environmental benefits, (among others):

- 1785 million hectares (ha) of terrestrial protected areas created/under improved management
- 157000 ha of area of land restored
- 1365 million ha of landscapes under improved management
- 44 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (Mt CO<sub>2</sub>e) greenhouse gas emissions mitigated

The WCD IP will also explore opportunities to engage new investor groups/asset classes to support innovative financial solutions and work with the financial sector to curb wildlife trafficking. For the development of small- and medium-sized enterprises, there is also the possibility of blended finance or outside sources of concessional finance, and grant funding for technical assistance. The private sector commitments to biodiversity, climate change mitigation and adaptation, land restoration, and social equity represent further opportunities for channeling resources to target protected areas/landscapes and diversified livelihood activities. The GEF's participation in relevant multi-stakeholder platforms and finance initiatives will be used to capitalize on these opportunities.

The Global Environment Facility is the world's largest funder of biodiversity protection, nature restoration, pollution reduction, and climate change response in developing countries. **In June 2022, donor governments pledged \$5.33 billion to the GEF for its next four year operating period (GEF-8). Much of the funding will be delivered through a set of 11 integrated programs that address multiple environmental threats at once.**

Contact for Wildlife Conservation for Development IP:

Adriana Moreira  
amoreira@thegef.org  
Hannah Tomkinson Fairbank  
hfairbank@thegef.org





# GEF GOOD PRACTICE BRIEFS

AFRICA

[Explore](#)

EASTERN EUROPE/  
CENTRAL ASIA/MIDDLE EAST

[Explore](#)

ASIA/  
PACIFIC

[Explore](#)

## BY REGION

LATIN AMERICA/  
CARIBBEAN

[Explore](#)

GLOBAL

[Explore](#)

## BY THEME

NATURE-BASED CLIMATE  
CHANGE ADAPTATION

[Explore](#)

FOOD SECURITY AND  
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

[Explore](#)

PRIVATE SECTOR  
ENGAGEMENT


[Explore](#)

MULTI-STAKEHOLDER  
ENGAGEMENT

[Explore](#)




# AFRICA



GEF-5

GEF ID 5503

*Mainstreaming ecosystem-based approaches to climate-resilient rural livelihoods in vulnerable rural areas through the Farmer Field School methodology*



GEF-6

GEF ID 9136

*Family Farming Development Programme*



GEF-7

GEF ID 10141

*Circular Economy approaches for the electronics sector in Nigeria*

COUNTRY		
SENEGAL	NIGER	NIGERIA
FOCAL AREAS		
Climate Change <LDCF>	Multi <IAP> (Land Degradation, Biodiversity, Climate Change)	Chemicals & Waste
AGENCY		
FAO	IFAD	UNEP



# EASTERN EUROPE/CENTRAL ASIA/MIDDLE EAST



GEF ID 4469

*Integrated Approach to Management of Forests in Turkey, with demonstration in high conservation value forests in the Mediterranean region*



GEF ID 9491

*Mainstreaming Conservation of Migratory Soaring Birds into Key Productive Sectors along the Rift Valley / Red Sea flyway*

**COUNTRY**

TURKEY

REGIONAL (Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Jordan, Lebanon, and Sudan)

**FOCAL AREAS**

Multi (Biodiversity, Sustainable Forest Management, Climate Change)

Biodiversity (Climate Change)


**AGENCY**

UNDP

UNDP



# ASIA/PACIFIC



GEF-4

GEF ID 3103

*Climate Resilient Rural Infrastructure in Northern Mountain Province of Vietnam*



GEF-5

GEF ID 5764


*Sustainable Management of Peatland Ecosystems in Indonesia (SMPEI)*



GEF-6

GEF ID 9103

*Building Adaptive Capacity through the Scaling-up of Renewable Energy Technologies in Rural Cambodia (S-RET)*



GEF-5

GEF ID 4612

*Development and promotion of non-POPs alternatives to DDT*

**COUNTRY**

VIET NAM

INDONESIA

CAMBODIA

INDIA

**FOCAL AREAS**

Climate Change <SCCF>

Multi (Climate Change, Land Degradation, Sustainable Forest Management)

Climate Change <SCCF>

Chemicals & Waste (Biodiversity)

**AGENCY**


ADB

IFAD

IFAD


UNIDO

# LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN




GEF-5

GEF ID 4792



GEF-5

GEF ID 5304



GEF-5

GEF ID 4772



GEF-6

GEF ID 9127

Conservation of Coastal Watersheds to Achieve Multiple Global Environmental Benefits in the Context of Changing Environments

Sustainable management of bycatch in Latin America and Caribbean trawl fisheries

Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in dry ecosystems to guarantee the flow of ecosystem services and to mitigate the processes of deforestation and desertification

Asuncion Green City of the Americas – Pathways to Sustainability

COUNTRY

MEXICO

REGIONAL (LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN)

COLOMBIA

PARAGUAY

FOCAL AREAS

Multi (Biodiversity, Land Degradation, Sustainable Forest Management)

International Waters

Multi (Biodiversity, Land Degradation, Sustainable Forest Management)

Multi <IAP> (Biodiversity, Climate Change, Chemicals & Waste)


AGENCY

WB

FAO

UNDP

UNDP



GEF-5

GEF ID 5508

*Transforming the Global maritime Transport Industry towards a Low carbon Future through Improved Energy Efficiency*



GEF-5

GEF ID 4934

*Enhancing Capacity Knowledge and Technology Support to Build Climate Resilience of Vulnerable Developing Countries*

**COUNTRY**

GLOBAL

GLOBAL (Seychelles, Mauritania, Nepal)

**FOCAL AREAS**

Multi (Climate Change, International Waters)

Climate Change <SCCF>

**AGENCY**

UNDP

UNEP



# NATURE-BASED CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION

**Green Infrastructure for a Climate Resilient Society**  
Nature-Based Solutions for Erosion Control in Vietnam

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY	EXECUTING AGENCIES
Climate Resilient Rural Infrastructure in Northern Mountain Province of Vietnam	Vietnam, East Asia	Asian Development Bank, United Nations Development Programme	Agriculture Propects Management Board (APMB), Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD)
GEF PROJECT ID: 3193		04/2010 - 02/2012	02/2012 - Project Closure
PROJECT TYPE: FSP	IMPACT AREAS		
IMPACT AREAS	Climate Change Adaptation Climate Change Mitigation Rural Livelihoods Rural Resilience	04/2010 - 02/2012 Project Approval	02/2012 - 04/2015 M&S Review
FISCAL AREA		GEF Project Cost: \$3,400,000	Co-financing Total: \$96,150,000

**Summary**

The project aimed to demonstrate and promote the application of innovative measures to build and enhance local communities' resilience to the impacts of climate change and extreme weather events. The project also promoted sustainable land-use management practices, including agroforestry and soil conservation, to improve soil health and prevent land degradation. The project also provided training and technical assistance to local farmers and communities to improve their resilience to climate change and extreme weather events.

**Renewable Energy Technology for Smallholder Farmers**  
Collaboration with Local Companies for Adaptive Agriculture in Cambodia

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	EXECUTING AGENCIES	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY
Building Adaptive Capacity through the Scaling up of Renewable Energy Technologies in Rural Cambodia	Cambodia	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), Cambodia	International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
GEF PROJECT ID: 3193			
PROJECT TYPE: FSP, SCCF	IMPACT AREAS		
IMPACT AREAS	Climate Change Rural Livelihoods Rural Resilience	04/2010 - 02/2012 Project Approval	02/2012 - 04/2015 M&S Review
FISCAL AREA		GEF Project Cost: \$4,000,000	Co-financing Total: \$21,082,000

**Summary**

Climate change projections show Cambodia becoming hotter with increased rainfall in the wet season and reduced rainfall in the dry season. These changes will make it difficult for farmers, who have already reported that the climate has become less predictable, to select the optimal time for plant and other crops. The Scaling up of Renewable Energy Technologies (S-RET) project targeted 800 smallholder farmers in five provinces comprising 380 villages, particularly women and poor households in remote areas, who lack access to modern, affordable, and reliable energy services. Building on strong collaboration and with learning from existing projects, engaging small and medium-sized enterprises through a Call for Proposal, and active women's participation with innovative ideas from private sector, the project succeeded in introducing appropriate and affordable RET for smallholder agriculture in rural areas of Cambodia.

**Strengthening Climate Resilience through People-Centered Approaches**  
Farmer Field Schools and Dimitra Clubs in Senegal

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	EXECUTING AGENCIES	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY
Maximizing ecosystem-based approaches to climate resilient and nutritious agriculture and food security through the Farmer Field School methodology	Senegal	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD)	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
GEF PROJECT ID: 3203		02/2012 - 04/2015	02/2012 - 04/2015
PROJECT TYPE: FSP, LDCF	IMPACT AREAS		
IMPACT AREAS	Climate Change Adaptation Rural Livelihoods Rural Resilience	02/2012 - 04/2015 Project Approval	02/2012 - 04/2015 M&S Review
FISCAL AREA		GEF Project Cost: \$6,228,095	Co-financing Total: \$4,607,385

**Summary**

Senegal's productive sector is progressively being exposed to the effects of climate change, with direct consequences for food and livelihood security. Farmers and agro-entrepreneurs are challenged to increase risks and losses to adapt their agricultural and pastoral systems to a warmer and drier future. Women face more constraints than men in being able to respond appropriately to these new challenges, as they have less access to resources, information, and participation in decision-making. This methodology of Farmer Field Schools (FFS) and Dimitra Clubs (community and women's empowerment groups) is a people-centered approach that empowers people to climate change was enhanced by the project by including the diversity of communities and women through two innovative people-centered approaches: Farmer Field Schools (FFS) and Dimitra Clubs, and by strengthening agro-climate information communication and setting up a climate resilience fund for scaling up project achievements.

**South-South Cooperation for Upscaling Nature Based Solutions for Climate Adaptation**  
Technology Transfer through Long-term Research of Pilot Projects in Mauritania, Nepal, and Seychelles

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPACT AREAS	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY
Enhancing Capacity, Knowledge and Technology Support to Build Climate Resilience of Vulnerable Developing Countries (ESA South)	Global (Mauritania, Nepal, Seychelles)	• Biodiversity • Land Degradation • Sustainable Forest • Forest Resilience • Food Security • Socio-economic Benefits • Education	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) National Development and Reform Commission of China through the Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research and Chinese Academy of Sciences (IGSNRR, CAS)
GEF PROJECT ID: 4534			
PROJECT TYPE: FSP	FISCAL AREA		
IMPACT AREAS	Climate Change Adaptation	04/2010 - 02/2012 Project Approval	02/2012 - 04/2015 M&S Review
FISCAL AREA		GEF Project Cost: \$4,000,000	Co-financing Total: \$24,700,000

**Summary**

The SCCC project is recognized as a flagship initiative for South-South cooperation, inspiring an exchange of technology between countries by building a strong partnership between countries in the Global South. The project delivered good and regional information on Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA), especially during COVID-19 pandemic and research information on ecological, meteorological and climate change adaptation. Nature-based solutions for climate adaptation were proved to be valuable components, first done in Mauritania, Mauritania, in Nepal, and coasts in Seychelles. The project demonstrated various best practices, such as collaborating with local universities on long-term research, which resulted in the publication of many research papers that share key lessons from pilot sites.

**Enhancing Engagement of Private Sector and Local Communities on Peatland Management**  
Innovative Policies and Monitoring System in Indonesia

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPACT AREAS	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY
Sustainable Management of Peatland Ecosystems in Indonesia (IMPESI)	Indonesia	• Climate Change Mitigation • Land Degradation • Sustainable Forest Management • Peatland Rehabilitation • Food Security • Socio-economic Benefits • Education	International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
GEF PROJECT ID: 5764			
PROJECT TYPE: FSP	FISCAL AREA		
IMPACT AREAS	Climate Change Adaptation	04/2010 - 02/2012 Project Approval	02/2012 - 04/2015 M&S Review
FISCAL AREA		GEF Project Cost: \$4,786,736	Co-financing Total: \$21,745,000

**Summary**

Indonesia has nearly 25 million hectares of peatlands, which provide unique ecosystem services and a source of livelihood to local populations. Peatlands in Indonesia store an estimated 40 billion tonnes of carbon equivalent to approximately 8-10 percent of global soil carbon. Despite the food and global importance of these ecosystems, they face a growing number of threats, including peatland degradation caused by unsustainable land use and large private sector plantations. Peatland degradation results in carbon losses, soil acidification, and waterlogging, which impacts the livelihoods of local communities. Key findings of the project include the need for strong government commitment to peatland development and management, to an increasing monitoring system developed with the private sector and 10 community-based peatland action groups with multi-stakeholder partnerships. As a result, the government has developed 12 regulations for sustainable use of peatland ecosystems, as well as 10 technical guides on peatland management. Furthermore, in collaboration with partners, it has established an innovative early warning system to protect against peatland degradation by addressing soil development at the national level, oil palm and forest plantations in peatland areas, and peatland rehabilitation and peatland management, reduce carbon stocks, and collaboration of biodiversity, which improves the living standards of local communities. Key findings of the project include the need for strong government commitment to peatland development and management, to an increasing monitoring system developed with the private sector and 10 community-based peatland action groups with multi-stakeholder partnerships.

# FOOD SECURITY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

**Integrated Coastal Watershed Conservation**  
Cross-sectoral and participatory conservation, and monitoring in the context of climate change in Mexico

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY	EXECUTING AGENCIES
Conservation of Coastal Watersheds to Achieve Multiple (COWA) Environmental Benefits in the Context of Changing Environments	Mexico, Latin America	World Bank	National Commission for Protected Areas (CONANP), National System of Forestry and Rural Development (SENER), National Institute of Ecology and Climate Change (INECC), and a private institution, the Mexican Fund for the Conservation of Nature (FONDEN)

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4792  
**PROJECT TYPE:** FSP  
**GEF PERIOD:** GEF-5

FISCAL AREAS	IMPACT AREAS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> <li>Climate Change Mitigation</li> <li>Land Degradation</li> <li>Sustainable Forest Management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water</li> <li>Climate Change Mitigation</li> <li>Land Degradation</li> <li>Climate Change Adaptation</li> </ul>

**Project Start:** \$39,516,181  
**Co-Funding Total:** \$238,886,000

**Summary**  
The project promotes integrated management of coastal watersheds to conserve biodiversity, contribute to climate change mitigation, and enhance sustainable livelihoods in the Gulf of Mexico and Gulf of California, among projects from climate change and significant and habitats of globally significant biodiversity are provided. Collaborating with these stakeholders and a private foundation, the project focused on promoting sustainable local communities, protected areas and surrounding watersheds including the areas where local communities manage agroecology systems. In addition, local communities were engaged through the project that supported sustainable cattle ranching, honey production, adventure tourism and other. They

same stakeholders were involved in project monitoring and assessment of the Integrated Watershed Action Plans. The project achieved improvement of protected areas management covering 1,748,204.77 hectares, improved management of productive landscapes in the watersheds covering 35,784 hectares, and due to the integrated and community participation, strengthened socio-ecological resilience of the watersheds to climate change and other potential future environmental and social perturbations. Community gender and social performance, sustainable management of watersheds was a key outcome. Based on all these outcomes, an integrated watershed management approach is being scaled up at the local and national level.

**Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Niger**  
Tackling climate change and land degradation, and scaling up sustainable natural resource management for family farming

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY	EXECUTING AGENCIES
Family Farming Development Programme (FFDP)	Niger, Africa	IFAD	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, High Commission for the Nigerien Food Systems Initiative (HCFI)

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 8136  
**PROJECT TYPE:** FSP  
**GEF PERIOD:** GEF-6

FISCAL AREAS	IMPACT AREAS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> <li>Climate Change Mitigation</li> <li>Land Degradation</li> <li>Climate Change Adaptation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> <li>Climate Change</li> <li>Land Degradation</li> <li>Food Security</li> </ul>

**Project Start:** \$7,636,422  
**Co-Funding Total:** \$65,309,000

**Summary**  
Family farming is highly vulnerable to environmental degradation in Niger, and climate change has further amplified this vulnerability. Applying integrated natural resources management and land restoration techniques to improve food security, enhance resilience, and increase income, climate change and conserve biodiversity, the Family Farming Development Programme (FFDP) is making progress in

isolating the most drivers of environmental degradation together with the most vulnerable family farmers in Niger. The project also recovered 10,461 ha (50% of the total target) of degraded land (out of the watershed), and rehabilitated 73,063 ha (100% of the total target) of land. FFDP as a village level of the National Food Systems (NFS) is one of the three CBF-6 Programmatic Approach Phase IAP.

**Sustainable Management of Bycatch in Bottom Trawl Fisheries**  
Improved institutional and regulatory frameworks through multi-stakeholder dialogue in Latin America and the Caribbean

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY	EXECUTING AGENCIES
Sustainable Management of Bycatch in Latin America and the Caribbean Trawl Fisheries (REVE-LAC)	Latin America & the Caribbean, Middle East, Southern and Central Asia	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	Inter-American Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5304  
**PROJECT TYPE:** FSP  
**GEF PERIOD:** GEF-5

FISCAL AREAS	IMPACT AREAS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>International Waters</li> <li>Climate Change Mitigation</li> <li>Land Degradation</li> <li>Sustainable Forest Management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> <li>International Waters</li> <li>Food Security</li> </ul>

**Project Start:** \$5,800,000  
**Co-Funding Total:** \$17,130,491

**Summary**  
The Sustainable Management of Bycatch in Latin America and the Caribbean Trawl Fisheries (REVE-LAC) project is a partnership between the countries and regional organizations to manage bycatch and to support sustainable development of bottom trawl fisheries and the people who depend on them. Over the last few years, it has sought to reduce bycatch and to encourage sustainable livelihoods through improving collaborative institutional and regulatory arrangements for bycatch management, strengthening management of bycatch through an Ecosystem Approach for Fisheries (EAP-F), and enhancing information sharing in the region. The project has created an enabling environment that has exceeded goals and objectives between government and stakeholders, leading to improved dialogue, national rules and regulations, and reduction of over 10% of unsustainable bycatch in at least one pilot site per country.

**Participatory Conservation and Peacebuilding in Dry Forest as Production Landscape**  
Nature-based Solutions for Local and Global Benefits in Colombia

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY	EXECUTING AGENCIES
Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in dry forests to guarantee ecosystem services and to mitigate the effects of climate change and desertification	Colombia	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MADS), Autonomous Regional Corporation of the Upper Magdalena (CAR), Regional Autonomous Corporation of the Cauca and Valle (CORCAO), Regional Autonomous Corporation of Cauca (CORCAUCA), Regional Autonomous Corporation of Cauca (CORCAUCA), Regional Autonomous Corporation of Cauca (CORCAUCA), Regional Autonomous Corporation of Cauca (CORCAUCA)

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4772  
**PROJECT TYPE:** FSP  
**GEF PERIOD:** GEF-5

FISCAL AREAS	IMPACT AREAS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land Degradation</li> <li>Sustainable Forest Management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> <li>Sustainable Forest Management</li> </ul>

**Project Start:** \$ 8,787,819  
**Co-Funding Total:** \$ 26,934,099

**Summary**  
The dry forest ecosystem is a high conservation priority in Colombia. This project seeks to promote the sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity in dry forests to ensure the flow of ecosystem services and to mitigate desertification and desertification in the Caribbean region and the Inter-Andean Valley of the Magdalena River (IVM) in Colombia. The project contributed to the flow of multiple global and local ecosystem services, including carbon storage, food production, water supply, fodder supply, and biodiversity habitat. The project also established protected areas, implemented reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) pilot projects, and promoted sustainable land management. At the same time, the project built trust with local communities, promoted participatory conservation in the tropical dry forest as a production landscape and ensured benefits for local communities from dry forest ecosystem services, including reviving traditional agricultural products. As a result, the project fostered strong ownership by local communities and contributed to peacebuilding in the post-conflict areas. Since maintaining the good environmental condition of the dry forest and its ecosystem services provide for local livelihoods and food security, which were the basis for assessment between the government and local communities. Based on multistakeholder capacity building of local governments and other organizations, the project contributed to develop an information database for the government and local communities. Key lessons learned from this project are importance of good marketing strategy to link small producers to entrepreneurs for selling biodiversity, adaptive management to improve peacebuilding and socio-economic intervention, and participatory biodiversity monitoring that turned local communities into strategic partners.

**Renewable Energy Technology for Smallholder Farmers**  
Collaboration with Local Companies for Adaptive Agriculture in Cambodia

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY	EXECUTING AGENCIES
Building Adaptive Capacity through the Scaling up of Renewable Energy Technologies in Rural Cambodia (RETC)	Cambodia	IFAD	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), Cambodia

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 8103  
**PROJECT TYPE:** FSP, SCCF  
**GEF PERIOD:** GEF-4

FISCAL AREAS	IMPACT AREAS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate Change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate Change Mitigation</li> <li>Climate Change Adaptation</li> <li>Peace and Stability</li> <li>Resilient Ecosystems</li> </ul>

**Project Start:** \$ 4,600,000  
**Co-Funding Total:** \$ 21,092,000

**Summary**  
Climate change projections show Cambodia becoming drier with increased rainfall in the wet season and reduced rainfall in the dry season. These changes will result in a difficult for farmers, who have already reported that the climate has become less predictable to assist the optimal time to plant rice and other crops. The Scaling up of Renewable Energy Technologies (S-RETC) project targeted 8,000 smallholder farmers in five provinces across 100 villages, particularly women and poor households in remote areas. The project provided grants and technical assistance to small producers to entrepreneurs for selling biodiversity, adaptive management to improve peacebuilding and socio-economic intervention, and participatory biodiversity monitoring that turned local communities into strategic partners.

with innovative ideas from private sector, the project succeeded in installing appropriate and affordable RETC for smallholder agriculture in rural areas of Cambodia. As a result, the project contributed to reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) and improved climate resilience for the local communities by promoting economically viable RETC for agriculture production, processing, and post-harvest activities. Key lessons learned from this project are: importance of gender equality and medium sized enterprises, scaling up for peace and stability, and knowledge sharing for awareness raising of RETC.



# PRIVATE SECTOR ENGAGEMENT

GOOD PRACTICE BRIEFS—2020/1

## Sustainable Management of Bycatch in Bottom Trawl Fisheries

Improved institutional and regulatory frameworks through multi-stakeholder dialogue in Latin America and the Caribbean.

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY	EXECUTING AGENCIES
Sustainable Management of Bycatch in Latin America and the Caribbean Trawl Fisheries (RECYC-SEA)	Latin America and the Caribbean West, Central, East, South, Mexico, Caribbean, Trinidad and Tobago	United Nations Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	Various national governments, such as the Ministry of Fisheries, Aquaculture and Maritime Affairs in Chile, the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock in Colombia, and the Ministry of Fisheries, Aquaculture and Maritime Affairs in Ecuador.

IMPACT AREAS	FOCAL AREAS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>International Waters</li> <li>Indigenous Communities</li> <li>Watersheds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coastal Fisheries</li> <li>Small-Scale Fisheries</li> <li>Marine Ecosystems</li> </ul>

GEF PROJECT ID: S304  
 GEF PERIOD: GEF-5

Summary

The Sustainable Management of Bycatch in Latin America and the Caribbean Trawl Fisheries (RECYC-SEA) project is a partnership between six countries and regional organizations to manage bycatch and to support sustainable development of bottom trawl fisheries and the people who depend on them. Over the last few years, it has sought to reduce bycatch loss and to encourage sustainable livelihoods through improving environmental and regulatory frameworks for bycatch management, strengthening management of bycatch through the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAP) and enhancing information sharing in the region. The project has created an enabling environment that has increased trust and collaboration between governments and stakeholders, leading to improved dialogue, updated rules and regulations, and reduction of over 30% in unsustainable bycatch in at least one port site per country.



GOOD PRACTICE BRIEFS—2021/1

## Renewable Energy Technology for Smallholder Farmers

Collaboration with Local Companies for Adaptive Agriculture in Cambodia

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

IFAD Investing in rural people

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	EXECUTING AGENCIES	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY
Building Resilient Capacity through the Scaling up of Renewable Energy Technologies in Rural Cambodia (RETC)	Cambodia	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), Cambodia	International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

IMPACT AREAS	FOCAL AREAS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate Change</li> <li>Climate Change Mitigation</li> <li>Climate Change Adaptation</li> <li>Women's Empowerment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Smallholder Farmers</li> <li>Agroforestry</li> <li>Renewable Energy</li> <li>Small-Scale Fisheries</li> </ul>

GEF PROJECT ID: 9103  
 GEF PERIOD: GEF-6

Summary

Climate change projections show Cambodia becoming hotter with increased rainfall in the wet season and reduced rainfall in the dry season. These changes will make it difficult for farmers, who have already reported that the climate has become less predictable, to select the optimal time to plant rice and other crops. The Scaling up of Renewable Energy Technologies in Rural Cambodia (RETC) project addresses these challenges by providing energy-saving, climate-smart technologies and training to smallholder farmers in 400 villages, particularly in the coastal and poor households, who lack access to modern, affordable, and viable energy resources. Building an enabling environment and with learning from existing projects, engaging small and medium-sized enterprises through a Call for Proposal, and active women's participation with innovative ideas from private sector, the project succeeded in introducing appropriate and affordable RET for smallholder agriculture in rural areas of Cambodia.

GOOD PRACTICE BRIEFS—2021/4

## Promoting Non-POPs Alternatives to DDT and Environmental Health Through Engaging Key Local Partners:

Low-cost Local Technology and Neem-based Agroforestry in India

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

UN Environment Programme

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPACT AREAS	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY
Development and promotion of non-POPs alternatives to DDT	India	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chemical and Pesticides</li> <li>Biodiversity</li> <li>Poison Resistance</li> <li>Land Use/Soil Science</li> <li>Health</li> </ul>	United Nations Environment Programme, United Nations Environment Programme

IMPACT AREAS	FOCAL AREAS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chemical and Pesticides</li> <li>Biodiversity</li> <li>Poison Resistance</li> <li>Land Use/Soil Science</li> <li>Health</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Smallholder Farmers</li> <li>Agroforestry</li> <li>Renewable Energy</li> <li>Small-Scale Fisheries</li> </ul>

GEF PROJECT ID: 4812  
 GEF PERIOD: GEF-5

Summary

Through the GEF investment, India has taken the first steps to promote agroforestry and DDT by promoting locally appropriate, cost-effective, and sustainable alternatives to DDT. This includes the development of neem-based agroforestry and neem-based pesticides (NBP) for agricultural and domestic uses. The project is the first of its kind in the world to demonstrate the production of neem-based and neem-based pesticides (NBP) and to promote agroforestry and neem-based agroforestry in rural areas of India. The project is the first of its kind in the world to demonstrate the production of neem-based and neem-based pesticides (NBP) and to promote agroforestry and neem-based agroforestry in rural areas of India.

GOOD PRACTICE BRIEFS—2022/1

## Enhancing Engagement of Private Sector and Local Communities on Peatland Management

Innovative Policies and Monitoring System in Indonesia

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

IFAD Investing in rural people

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPACT AREAS	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY
Sustainable Management of Peatland Ecosystems in Indonesia (SMPE)	Indonesia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate Change Mitigation</li> <li>Land Degradation</li> <li>Sustainable Forest Management</li> <li>Human Well-being</li> <li>Food Security</li> <li>Socio-economic</li> <li>Health</li> <li>Education</li> </ul>	International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

IMPACT AREAS	FOCAL AREAS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate Change Mitigation</li> <li>Land Degradation</li> <li>Sustainable Forest Management</li> <li>Human Well-being</li> <li>Food Security</li> <li>Socio-economic</li> <li>Health</li> <li>Education</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Smallholder Farmers</li> <li>Agroforestry</li> <li>Renewable Energy</li> <li>Small-Scale Fisheries</li> </ul>

GEF PROJECT ID: 5764  
 GEF PERIOD: GEF-5

Summary

Indonesia has nearly 25 million hectares of peatlands, which provide unique ecosystem services. As a result, the government has developed 10 regulations for sustainable use of peatland ecosystems as well as 10 national guidelines on peatland management. Furthermore, it has introduced a peatland monitoring system to protect against illegal logging, peatland fires, and peatland degradation. This project is promoting sustainable peatland management, peatland restoration, and peatland conservation. It is also promoting peatland restoration and peatland conservation in peatland ecosystems. This project is promoting peatland restoration and peatland conservation in peatland ecosystems. This project is promoting peatland restoration and peatland conservation in peatland ecosystems.

GOOD PRACTICE BRIEFS—2022/3

## Building Capacity Towards Reducing GHG Emissions from Global Shipping

With Multi-Sectoral Collaboration and Private Sector Engagement

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

IMO

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY	EXECUTING AGENCIES
Building Capacity Towards Reducing GHG Emissions from Global Shipping through Increased Energy Efficiency (SHIP-CLIMATE)	Worldwide	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)	International Maritime Organization (IMO)

IMPACT AREAS	FOCAL AREAS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate Change Mitigation</li> <li>Climate Change Adaptation</li> <li>Women's Empowerment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Smallholder Farmers</li> <li>Agroforestry</li> <li>Renewable Energy</li> <li>Small-Scale Fisheries</li> </ul>

GEF PROJECT ID: 5008  
 GEF PERIOD: GEF-5

Summary

International shipping contributes approximately 2.5 percent to global CO2 emissions. The need for shipping services is projected to increase over the coming decades, and emissions are expected to rise. To help the shipping industry reduce its carbon footprint, the project is providing technical assistance to the International Maritime Organization (IMO) to support its efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from shipping. The project is also providing technical assistance to the IMO to support its efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from shipping. The project is also providing technical assistance to the IMO to support its efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from shipping.

GOOD PRACTICE BRIEFS—2022/4

## Finding Solutions for Electronic Waste with the Private Sector and Multi-Stakeholders Engagement

Developing Global Model of Circular Economy in Nigeria

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

UN Environment Programme

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	EXECUTING AGENCIES	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY
Circular Economy Approach for E-waste in Nigeria	Nigeria	Nigeria's National Environmental Standards and Regulations Enforcement Agency (NESREA)	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

IMPACT AREAS	FOCAL AREAS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chemicals and Waste</li> <li>Health and safety</li> <li>Gender and employment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Smallholder Farmers</li> <li>Agroforestry</li> <li>Renewable Energy</li> <li>Small-Scale Fisheries</li> </ul>

GEF PROJECT ID: 10141  
 GEF PERIOD: GEF-7

Summary

According to the Africa Waste Management Outlook, 120 million tons of municipal solid waste were generated in Africa in 2015, and this amount is expected to double by 2025. Electronic waste is a particularly important and rapidly growing waste stream that the same amount of e-waste is estimated to be produced annually in Africa, representing 6.7 percent of total e-waste generated in Africa. This project is addressing the challenge of e-waste management in Africa by providing technical assistance to the National Environmental Standards and Regulations Enforcement Agency (NESREA) to develop a circular economy approach for e-waste in Nigeria. The project is also providing technical assistance to the NESREA to develop a circular economy approach for e-waste in Nigeria.

GOOD PRACTICE BRIEFS—2022/5

## Strengthening Regional Cooperation to Mainstream Migratory Soaring Birds Safeguards:

Strong Partnership with Private Sector and CSOs in Middle East and Africa

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY
Mainstreaming Conservation Safeguards into Key Productive Sectors along the Red Sea Flyway	Regional (Libania, Egypt, Ethiopia, Jordan, Lebanon, and Qatar)	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

IMPACT AREAS	FOCAL AREAS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> <li>Land Degradation</li> <li>Sustainable Forest Management</li> <li>Human Well-being</li> <li>Health</li> <li>Education</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Smallholder Farmers</li> <li>Agroforestry</li> <li>Renewable Energy</li> <li>Small-Scale Fisheries</li> </ul>

GEF PROJECT ID: 9491  
 GEF PERIOD: GEF-6

Summary

This project has achieved successful and transformative results in mainstreaming migratory soaring birds safeguards into key productive sectors along the Red Sea Flyway. The project is providing technical assistance to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to develop a circular economy approach for e-waste in Nigeria. The project is also providing technical assistance to the UNDP to develop a circular economy approach for e-waste in Nigeria.



# MULTI-STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

**GOOD PRACTICE BRIEFS—2020/3**

## Building Capacity Towards Reducing GHG Emissions from Global Shipping with Multi-Sectoral Collaboration and Private Sector Engagement

**PROJECT FULL NAME:** Transforming the Global Maritime Transport Industry Towards a Low Carbon Future through Improved Energy Efficiency (GDMESP)

**COUNTRY & REGION:** Global

**IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES:** United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), International Maritime Organization (IMO)

**IMPACT AREAS:**

- Multi-Tier Area
- Climate Change Mitigation
- International Trade

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5008 | **GEF PERIOD:** GEF-5

**PROJECT TYPE:** MEDIUM SIZE PROJECT | **GEF Project Cost:** \$1,900,000 | **Co-Funding Total:** \$17,154,000

**Summary:** International shipping contributes approximately 2 percent to global CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The need for shipping services is projected to increase and the global demand for seaports and related infrastructure is expected to rise. GDMESP is designed to address these challenges by supporting the development of the Port of Piraeus in Greece through the implementation of a series of projects. The project focuses on improving energy efficiency, reducing emissions, and enhancing port infrastructure. It involves multi-stakeholder collaboration, including the private sector, to build capacity and improve operational efficiency. The project also aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality in the region.

**GOOD PRACTICE BRIEFS—2019/2**

## Data Driven Integrated Forest Management

Establishing a new system to identify multiple forest ecosystem services in Turkey

**PROJECT FULL NAME:** Integrated approach to management of forests in Turkey with incorporation in SDG communication via travels to the Mediterranean region

**COUNTRY & REGION:** Turkey, Europe

**IMPLEMENTING AGENCY:** UNDP

**EXECUTING AGENCIES:** General Directorate of Forestry, Government of Turkey

**IMPACT AREAS:**

- Biodiversity
- Climate Change Mitigation
- Sustainable Forest

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4462 | **GEF PERIOD:** GEF-5

**PROJECT TYPE:** FSP | **GEF Project Cost:** \$7,120,000 | **Co-Funding Total:** \$21,430,000

**Summary:** The project promoted integrated forest management in Turkey, demonstrating multiple environmental benefits in high conservation value forests in the Mediterranean forest region. The project delivered 438,023 ha of end-of-end management plan, identifying multiple environmental benefits at landscape level and provided training to strengthen implementation capacity. Twenty-eight forest management plans (FMPs) for target forest types in two pilot areas were developed, including biodiversity zoning, forest fire planning, pest management, carbon focused reforestation, non-forest forest production and eco-tourism plans, and protected forest areas management. Beyond the forest level, the project also established and operationalized a forest fire early warning system of national scale. Furthermore, the project created and operationalized the first ever open access computer platform to project, quantify and optimize forest ecosystem services at landscape level, called Forest and Ecosystem Management Systems. This computer platform enables reporting on Sustainable Development Goals from the benefits of integrated forest management.

**GOOD PRACTICE BRIEFS—2020/1**

## Sustainable Management of Bycatch in Bottom Trawl Fisheries

Improved institutional and regulatory frameworks through multi-stakeholder dialogue in Latin America and the Caribbean.

**PROJECT FULL NAME:** Sustainable Management of Bycatch in Bottom Trawl Fisheries in Latin America and the Caribbean (BIFC)

**COUNTRY & REGION:** Latin America and the Caribbean

**IMPLEMENTING AGENCY:** Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

**EXECUTING AGENCIES:** General Directorate of Forestry, Government of Turkey

**IMPACT AREAS:**

- Biodiversity
- International Trade
- Food Security

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5204 | **GEF PERIOD:** GEF-5

**PROJECT TYPE:** FSP | **GEF Project Cost:** \$5,300,000 | **Co-Funding Total:** \$17,130,491

**Summary:** The Sustainable Management of Bycatch in Latin America and the Caribbean (BIFC) project is a partnership between the countries and regional organizations in the region. The project has created an enabling environment that has increased trust and collaboration between government and stakeholders, leading to improved dialogue, updated rules and regulations, and reduction of over 10% of unsustainable bycatch in at least one pilot site per country.

**GOOD PRACTICE BRIEFS—2021/5**

## Innovative Governance for Participatory Design of a Green City

Land-use Planning, Sustainable Mobility, Solid Waste Management, and Urban Biodiversity Conservation in Paraguay

**PROJECT FULL NAME:** Assesione Green City of the Americas - Pathways to Sustainability

**COUNTRY & REGION:** Paraguay

**IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES:** Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MDES)

**IMPACT AREAS:**

- Priority Reduction
- Local economic benefits
- Health
- Education
- Resilience

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5127 | **GEF PERIOD:** GEF-6

**PROJECT TYPE:** FSP | **GEF Project Cost:** \$7,483,120 | **Co-Funding Total:** \$23,340,000

**Summary:** Assesione Green City of the Americas - Pathways to Sustainability is one of the GEF investments aiming to support Assesione's ambition to become a green and sustainable city. Through an integrated approach, which seeks to advance integrated land use planning of the Metropolitan Area of Assesione (AMA), reduce persistent gas GHG emissions from transportation and waste, reduce atmospheric produced persistent organic pollutants, and improve protected area management in the AMA. Since the AMA population has dramatically increased in the last couple of decades, congested roads have created a series of challenges, such as lack of efficient and integrated urban planning, sustainable transportation, solid waste management, and management of green areas. The project has strengthened inter-governmental cooperation and a roadmap of integrated sustainable and resilient urban planning. It has also adopted a people-centric approach demonstrated through a participatory design of a 600m longed linear network and community-led restoration of an ecological reserve in the AMA. Furthermore, it developed National Plans for the Integrated Management of Solid Waste and Hazardous Waste Management, and outlined a proposed plan to recognize and consolidate a green corridor with riparian substrates. This brief introduces key success factors for the project and lessons learned. Adaptive management

**GOOD PRACTICE BRIEFS—2022/4**

## Promoting Non-POPs Alternatives to DDT and Environmental Health Through Engaging Key Local Partners:

Low-cost Local Technology and Neem-based Agroforestry in India

**PROJECT FULL NAME:** Development and promotion of non-POPs alternatives to DDT

**COUNTRY & REGION:** India

**IMPACT AREAS:**

- Chemical use reduction
- Biodiversity
- Priority Reduction
- Local Social Economic Benefits
- Health

**IMPLEMENTING AGENCY:** United Nations Industrial Development Organization, United States Environmental Programme

**EXECUTING AGENCIES:** Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Ministry of Chemicals and Fertilizers, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4612 | **GEF PERIOD:** GEF-5


**PROJECT TYPE:** FSP | **GEF Project Cost:** \$10,000,000 | **Co-Funding Total:** \$43,147,167 | **GEF Period:** GEF-5

**Summary:** Through the GEF investment, India has taken the first step towards dependency on DDT by promoting locally appropriate, cost-effective, and sustainable alternatives, including the long-lasting insecticidal net (LGN) and neem-based and biopesticide based biopesticides in the State Limited Public (SLP), a public sector enterprise, is the only manufacturer of DDT in the world and committed to produce 10 million LTNs per year and plans to double production capacity, benefiting them across the country through the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. It is an enterprise, large-scale production of neem-based and Bt biopesticides based biopesticides for control of vector-borne diseases. Since neem trees are available in India and large parts of Asia, it will also work with partners to transfer neem-based local technology to other parts of the world. The project contributes to a global effort to control toxic chemicals and reduce persistent organic pollutants (POPs) following the Stockholm Convention on POPs. Since India is the only country producing DDT, it allows our GEF investment helps improve the health of millions involved in chemical production. The project will also benefit those living in mosquito-infested areas who are exposed to DDT by their drinking. Using an opportunity model, the project supports



# Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Niger

Tackling climate change and land degradation, and scaling up sustainable natural resource management for family farming

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY	IFAD
Family Farming Development Programme (ProDAF)	Niger, Africa	<b>EXECUTING AGENCIES</b>	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, High Commission for the Nigeriens Feed Nigeriens Initiative (HC3N)
GEF PROJECT ID: <b>9136</b>		09/07/2016 CEO Endorsement	06/30/2022 Project Closure
PROJECT TYPE: <b>FSP</b>		06/01/2015 Project Approval	06/22/2019 Mid-Term Review
GEF PERIOD: <b>GEF-6</b>		<b>GEF Project Grant</b>	<b>Co-financing Total</b>
<b>FOCAL AREAS</b>	<b>IMPACT AREAS</b>	<b>\$7,636,422</b>	<b>\$65,300,000</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity,</li> <li>Climate Change Mitigation</li> <li>Land Degradation</li> <li>Climate Change Adaptation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity,</li> <li>Climate Change</li> <li>Land Degradation</li> <li>Food Security</li> </ul>		

## Summary

Family farming is highly vulnerable to environmental degradation in Niger, and climate change has further amplified that vulnerability. Applying integrated natural resources management and land restoration approach to improve food security, enhance resilience, adapt and mitigate climate change and conserve biodiversity, the Family Farming Development Programme (ProDAF) is making progress in

tackling the main drivers of environmental degradation together with the most vulnerable family farmers in Niger. The project, so far, recovered 10,491 ha (50% of the total target) of degraded land upstream of the watersheds, and regenerated 75,065 ha (39% of the total target) of land. ProDAF is an integral part of the Resilient Food Systems (RFS), one of the three GEF-6 Integrated Approach Pilots (IAP).



Harvesting forage for animals after regeneration of degraded lands @IFAD ProDAF Niger

## Results and Global Environmental Benefits

By its mid-term review, the project had achieved the following global environmental benefits as well as direct benefits for local communities:

- 10,491 ha (50% of the total target) of degraded land upstream of the watersheds recovered,
- 75,065 ha (39% of the total target) of land is regenerated through assisted natural regeneration,
- 39% resurgence rate of woody and herbaceous plant species that had disappeared due to climate change,
- Reduction of GHG emission, currently estimated at -6.3 tCO<sub>2</sub>e per hectare per year for biomass, and -5.3 tCO<sub>2</sub>e per hectare per year for soil,
- Increase in agricultural production up to 3 times higher yields through the adoption of sustainable land management best practices,
- Increase in household income to XOF 70,000 (approximately \$117) per year through the sale of products and by-products (mainly straw), and
- Improve market access for smallholder farmers through construction of wholesale markets and crop collecting

facilities, and construction / rehabilitation of 850 km of rural roads to support local infrastructures.

Ultimately, the project is expected to recover 20,500 ha of land upstream of the watershed, promote 190,000 ha of land under assisted natural regeneration and improved seed, and strengthen soil carbon storage (350,000 tons of carbon equivalent per year).

## Environmental Challenge

The project was designed to address both long-term (climate change impacts on production potential) and short-term (food and nutrition security) impacts. Climate change impacts on production potential are related to the fertility, soil quality, and water availability of family farms in Niger. Wind and water erosion is leading to siltation of watersheds, deforestation, loss of animal and vegetal biodiversity, and declining groundwater level in the regions. These threats are also resulting from land tenure pressures exacerbated by high population densities, widespread unsustainable land and natural resources management practices, and increasing conflicts over natural resources. The project adaptively addresses these issues through knowledge sharing of successful natural resource management approaches and learning across three regions, Maradi, Tahoua and Zinder.






Figure 1: Family Farming Development Programme area in Niger @ IFAD ProDAF Niger

## Integrated Approach and Key Project Features

ProDAF is working on integrated solutions to improve food security while addressing drivers of environmental degradation. The project is demonstrating and scaling up innovative approaches to enhance resilience and climate adaptation.

### Scaling up successful practices through capacity building

Strong engagement of beneficiaries, the most vulnerable family farmers in the regions, is an important element of the program's success and sustainability. The adapted approach, assisted natural regeneration and land rehabilitation practices, allowed the poorest to participate in the activities and to take the best advantage of them, improving quality of their land and increasing yields with locally appropriate simple techniques. These direct benefits to the most vulnerable family farmers are vital incentives for them to actively engage in the project.

Capacity building for both family farmers and local and national governments is another important feature of the project. For smallholder farmers, training on sustainable land management practices and climate resilient farming techniques were provided through farmer's school in

the villages. With the capacity building for local and national governments, national policy on sustainable land management started fully implementing on the ground and mainstreaming into the Niger's Economic and Social Development Plan 2017-2021.

### Strengthening institutional framework

The project is executed by the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, which works closely with the High Commission for the Nigeriens Feed Nigeriens Initiative (HCl3N). In addition to the agriculture and food related institutions, the project also collaborated with major stakeholders related to water, irrigation, environmental issues and local small businesses including the Regional Directorate of the Environment, Water User Associations, local authorities (communes), Public Building and Works, regional and departmental services for waterworks, specialized service providers, and the Regional Agriculture Chambers. These major stakeholders engagement in the project promoted synergy of action across different stakeholders.

## Lessons Learned

Building on a successful series of IFAD and GEF projects, the project scaled up sustainable natural resource management approaches and ensured resilient family



Women's contribution to land restoration activities @IFAD ProDAF Niger

farming in Niger's the most affected regions by wind and water erosion. Knowledge sharing and exchanging platforms on sustainable land management practices and ascertaining land tenure among both family farmers and local governments was a key to scaling up the project in other regions. As a result of the project, the Platform for Dialogue on Sustainable Land Management was established both at the national and regional levels. Niger's successful practices are now shared beyond the country, as integrated approach to address land degradation, water, GHG emission and biodiversity loss (for instance, at the UNCCD COP14 in India, September 2019). In addition, strong partnership with local research institutions was useful to improve scientific monitoring and impact evaluation.

- Abdoulaye Soumaila, Family Farming Development Programme (ProDAF), [abdoulaye.soumaila@prodaf.net](mailto:abdoulaye.soumaila@prodaf.net)

Available at:

<http://www.thegef.org/topics/knowledge-learning>

*The GEF Good Practice Briefs showcase examples of GEF investments that align with GEF 2020 Strategies and GEF-7 Programing Directions and Policy Recommendations. Featured projects were selected by the GEF Secretariat from a pool of nominations by GEF Agencies, taking into consideration approaches used to generate multiple global environmental benefits and co-benefits, and to achieve clear results and/or sustainability. Because the Briefs include projects that are implemented under different contexts, the practices highlighted should not necessarily be considered as universally applicable.*

## References and Multimedia

- Resilient Food Systems website: <http://www.resilientfoodsystems.co/>
- ProDAF's factsheet, available at [http://www.resilientfoodsystems.co/sites/default/files/2019-09/Niger\\_Country\\_Fact\\_Sheet.pdf](http://www.resilientfoodsystems.co/sites/default/files/2019-09/Niger_Country_Fact_Sheet.pdf)

## Contact

- Jean-Marc Sinnassamy, GEF, Sr. Environmental Specialist, [jsinnassamy@thegef.org](mailto:jsinnassamy@thegef.org)
- Jonky Tenou, IFAD Task Manager for the Programme, [y.tenou@ifad.org](mailto:y.tenou@ifad.org)



# Enhancing Engagement of Private Sector and Local Communities on Peatland Management

## Innovative Policies and Monitoring System in Indonesia

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPACT AREAS	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY
<b>Sustainable Management of Peatland Ecosystems in Indonesia (SMPEI)</b>	Indonesia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate Change Mitigation</li> <li>Land Degradation</li> <li>Sustainable Forest Management</li> <li>Poverty Reduction</li> <li>Food Security</li> <li>Socio-economic Benefits</li> <li>Education</li> </ul>	International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
GEF PROJECT ID: <b>5764</b>			<b>EXECUTING AGENCY</b>
PROJECT TYPE: <b>FSP</b>	<b>FOCAL AREAS</b>		Ministry of the Environment and Forestry (MOEF), Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
GEF PERIOD: <b>GEF-5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multi Focal Area</li> </ul>	GEF Project Grant <b>\$ 4,766,756</b>	Co-financing Total <b>\$ 21,745,000</b>

### Summary

Indonesia has nearly 25 million hectares of peatlands, which provide unique ecosystem services and a source of livelihood to rural populations. Peatlands in Indonesia store an estimated 46 gigatons of carbon equivalent to approximately 8-14 percent of all global soil carbon. Despite the local and global importance of these ecosystems, they face a growing number of threats, including logging; agricultural conversion by smallholder farmers and large private sector plantations; fires; and drainage. The project is promoting sustainable peatland management, secure carbon stocks, and conservation of biodiversity, while improving the living standards of local communities. Key features are i) strong government commitment to policy development and implementation; ii) an innovative

monitoring system developed with the private sector; and iii) community-based peatland action with multi-stakeholder partnership.

As a result, the government has developed 12 regulations for sustainable use of peatland ecosystems, as well as 10 technical guides on peatland management. Furthermore, in collaboration with plantations, it has established an innovative early warning system to protect against peatland fire. In addition to policy development at the national level, oil palm and forest plantations in the target landscape in Riau province improved agricultural practices on 300,000 ha. Moreover, 14 villages have developed Community-based Peatland Action Plans, constructing 313 units of canal blocks.



Field monitoring and evaluation for SMPEI – Community Self-Sustaining Program@ SMPEI

The GEF has supported the continuous efforts of Indonesia for sustainable peatland management from GEF-3 (2002) to GEF-7 (2021), building on successes and learning along the way.<sup>1</sup> The GEF-5 project generated several key lessons. First, strengthening food security and local socio-economic benefits was critical for active community engagement in peatland management, including women and youth. Second, sharing national and local levels of experience with others to initiate and strengthen sustainable tropical peatland management on a global level was critical.

### Results and benefits

The project's key results to date are below.

- Reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission: **19,270,183 tCO<sub>2</sub>e** (140 percent beyond the target goal of 14 million tCO<sub>2</sub>e)
- Oil palm and forest plantations in the landscape area under improved agricultural practices: **300,000 ha**

- Water levels in the village land raised by 313 units of canal blocks constructed in 14 villages: estimated at **9,200 ha<sup>2</sup>**
- Development of new national policy/regulation: finalization and approval of **12 government regulations** and subregulations for the sustainable use of peatland ecosystems (400 percent beyond target goal of 3 subregulations)
- Development of technical guidance: **10 technical guides** on peatland management
- Development of innovative and integrated peatland monitoring system as an early warning system of peatland fire
- Number of direct beneficiaries: **7,326** (including 6,486 with improved drinking water supply and 840 directly benefiting from livelihood demonstration plots)
- Number of indirect beneficiaries: **22,000** (from 313 units of canal blocks, which provide water for agriculture and reduce exposure of local communities to peatland degradation and fires)

<sup>1</sup> Continuous GEF investments include the Integrated Management of Peatlands for Biodiversity and Climate Change (GEF-3, GEF ID 1769), ASEAN Peatland Forests Project (GEF-4, GEF ID 2751), Integrated Management of Peatland Landscapes in Indonesia (GEF-6, GEF ID 9239), and Strengthened Systems for Community-based Conservation of Forests and Peatland Landscapes in Indonesia (GEF-7, GEF ID 10731).

<sup>2</sup> This figure is based on 30 ha per canal block multiplied by 313 units of canal blocks constructed.



- Increase in income generation: 76 percent of the 152 respondents earning additional monthly income of more than 500,000 Indonesian Rupiah (IDR) with demonstration plot activities
- Knowledge products/sharing: **videos introducing project activities, books**, and the Directorate of Peatland Degradation Control's (DPDC) **website** <http://pkgppkl.menlhk.go.id> (in both Bahasa Indonesia and English) to compile all relevant knowledge products related to peatlands.

## Environmental challenge

Peatland forests in Indonesia provide unique ecosystem services and are a source of livelihood to rural populations, and peatland ecosystems are rich in biodiversity, containing many endemic, rare and endangered species. These ecosystems represent an important source of goods and services that benefit both local and international communities, including flood and fire prevention, carbon sequestration and storage, provision of timber and non-timber forest products, and cultural and spiritual well-being. Peatlands in Indonesia store an estimated 46 gigatons of carbon equivalent, the largest in tropical peatlands, which is about 8-14 percent of all global soil carbon. Thus, Indonesian peatlands are critical "irrecoverable carbon" that remains within human capacity to manage. If lost, the carbon could not be recovered by mid-century, the deadline for reaching net-zero emissions to avoid the worst climate impacts.<sup>3</sup>

Despite the local and global importance of these ecosystems, they face growing threats. These include logging; agricultural conversion by smallholder farmers and large private sector plantations; fires; and drainage of peatlands. Between 2015-19, around 1.9 million ha of peatland in the country have been burned. The expansion of plantations for oil palm and pulp and paper, and the associated drainage of peatlands, has been the primary cause of deforestation, biodiversity loss, and peatland subsidence. The drying out of peatlands due to drainage has made peat forests extremely susceptible to fire; this is further exacerbated by drought effects from El Niño. The ensuing fires have led to massive loss of biodiversity, depletion of carbon stocks, and premature deaths from respiratory diseases,

among other negative impacts. Thus, it is important to transition to fire-free sustainable peatland management in both large plantations and smallholder farms.

## Integrated approach and key features

### Government commitment to policy development and implementation

Supported by a strong commitment by the Indonesian government, the project has developed and implemented 12 government regulations and subregulations for the sustainable use of peatland ecosystems and an additional 10 regulations and/or technical guides on peatland management. This supported the roll out of Regulation for the Protection and Management of Peatland Ecosystem (PP71/2014 amended as PPS7/2016), an innovative national policy on sustainable peatland management and restoration. It focuses more on establishing peatland degradation characteristics, criteria, and standards requirements and guidelines for protecting and managing the peatland ecosystem. Under Regulation PPS7/2016, the private sector must develop workplans for rehabilitation and restoration of peatland in its concession areas. In the project area, 11 companies with total areas of 295,703 ha have enhanced water management of oil palm and forest plantations.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, a specific guidance on protection and management of peat doom was also established based on a corrected map at a scale of 1:250,000 using Peatland Hydrological Unit (PHU) demarcation.<sup>5</sup>


Most importantly, the Ministry of the Environment and Forestry (MOEF) enacted a new National Peatland Strategy in 2020: the National Peatland Ecosystems Protection and Management Plan (RPPEG) 2020-2049 (SK 246/2020). This decree is the first national peatland strategy to cover such a long period in the world. With another regulation,<sup>6</sup> the decree provides guidance to local governments in establishing RPPEGs at provincial and district/city level. These plans identify the entire process — from preparation, stipulation, and amendment, to monitoring, evaluation, and financing. Copies of the National RPPEG have been distributed to 154 districts and cities throughout Indonesia.<sup>7</sup> To fully implement peatland management

regulations, the government has developed, approved, and implemented a series of subregulations and technical guidelines. These included the Procedures for Inventory and Determination of Peat Ecosystem Functions (P14/2017), Procedures for Measuring Groundwater Levels in Peat Ecosystem at Designated Monitoring Points (P15/2017), and Technical Guidelines for Functions Recovery of Peat Ecosystem (P16/2017).<sup>8</sup> The project pioneered application of landscape-level approaches, such as Peatland Hydrological Units (PHU), in the national regulatory and planning frameworks. As a key unit for planning and management, PHU is critical to ensure long-term sustainability of peatlands for a proper ecosystem approach to prevent fire and minimize degradation. Under the new regulations, the Determination of National Peatland Hydrological Units (PHU) Map (SK129/2017) and Determination of Map of

National Peatland Ecosystem Functions (SK130/2017), 214 PHUs have been mapped at 1:50,000 scale since the project started.

### Innovative monitoring system developed with private sector

Based on an inventory and determination of peatland ecosystem function, procedures for measuring groundwater levels in peat ecosystem, and PHU maps developed under the regulations, the project has developed innovative national peatland monitoring systems with a combination of remote-sensing data and ground-level data collection. This monitoring system established Indonesia's first National Media Control Room for fire prevention. With this monitoring data on peatland ecosystem and groundwater level, MOEF has established a new web-based Peatland



Project area in Riau Province, Sumatra<sup>9</sup> © IFAD

<sup>3</sup> Indonesian peatlands are critically important to "irrecoverable carbon" worldwide (Noon et al. 2021), <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41893-021-00803-6.pdf>.

<sup>4</sup> A technical guide on peatland ecosystem recovery function for government at the national/provincial/local level, business units, and community was also developed.

<sup>5</sup> The regulation is a breakthrough policy to protect peat doom areas as the areas dictated as a conserved and protected areas for water reservoir in the Peatland Hydrological Unit (PHU) (P10/2019).

<sup>6</sup> The other regulation is the Procedures for Preparation, Determination and Amendment of Peatland Ecosystem Protection and Management Plan (P60/2019).

<sup>7</sup> A Provincial RPPEG of Central Kalimantan has been stipulated by the Governor of Central Kalimantan, and the Provincial RPPEG of Riau Province and the RPPEG for Pelalawan District are under development.

<sup>8</sup> This technical guideline (P16/2017) emphasizes peat-related matters, including definitions and additional requirements to protect/conservate peatland areas within plantation concessions.

<sup>9</sup> The project area is part of the three administrative districts of Indragiri Hilir, Indragiri Hulu, and Pelalawan, including 14 target villages. The PHUs (highlighted yellow) cover about 850,000 ha and include about 5 percent of the nation's peatlands.

Water Level Information System (SIMATAG-0.4m) under national budget and further developed by the project.<sup>10</sup> The system will also be able to cross-check validity of data from plantation companies on water levels. It was developed to provide information on the progress of peatland restoration through analysis of peatland water level monitoring data and rainfall in peatlands, development of rewetting infrastructure, and monitoring of vegetation rehabilitation results. SIMATAG-0.4m measures over 3.2 million ha of peatlands under management of private sector at more than 10,000 sites. In addition, each month it monitors information from the Peatland Restoration Agency (BRG) at 154 points outside of concessions in seven provinces. Thus, the private sector plays a pivotal role in strengthening the national peatland fire prediction, monitoring, and warning system. In partnership with the private sector (oil palm and forest plantations), an automatic data logger for water management sensors in peatlands within concession areas transmits groundwater-level information to the national monitoring system through live updates.

MOEF is developing a more comprehensive system — the Information System for the Protection and Management of Peat Ecosystems (SiPPEG) — under the project. The SiPPEG incorporates several systems: SIMATAG-0.4m; SiPALAGA (water-level monitoring data from community area provided by the Peatland and Mangrove Restoration Agency); Sekat Kanal Infrastructure (canal blocking); and other information on land cover, forest fire, and weather to generate peatland fire warning alerts, including FAO's earth observation data.<sup>11</sup> The SiPPEG aims to provide real time information and be a platform for 8 applications, namely IKEG (peat ecosystem quality index), Neraca Air (water balance/soil moisture), RPPEG, PROPER (Program for Pollution Control Evaluation and Rating), WASGAKKUM (law enforcement oversight), GHG emissions, early warning system, and TMAT (groundwater level). The system will also be able to generate information on changes in average water tables across peatland landscapes, which can more accurately estimate GHG emissions and reductions. MOEF is using this system to develop a new internationally recognized methodology for GHG emission prediction and monitoring for tropical peatlands and potentially enable the refinement of IPCC emission factors.

<sup>10</sup> SIMATAG-0.4m ultimately informs peatland fire prevention based on the level of groundwater on peatlands, which also describes level of moisture in the peatland itself (soil moisture). The level of groundwater on peatlands (0.4m below the peatland surface) is one of the indicators to anticipate or prevent fires on peatlands.

<sup>11</sup> To support development of the system, the project team negotiated with FAO to get technical support and access to its data from the System for Earth Observation Data Access, Processing, and Analysis for Land Monitoring (SEPAL). Large amounts of data from FAO have now been downloaded and integrated into the system.

### Community-based peatland action with multi-stakeholder partnerships

In addition to national regulations and monitoring systems, Community-based Peatland Action Plans (RKMs) have been developed through multi-stakeholder partnership for 14 villages within the three target districts. RKMs are used to develop and promote rewetting activities, revegetation, and revitalization of community economic activities/livelihood. District Project Management Coordinators and Village Facilitators guided participatory assessment and RKM in each village in 2019 and 2020. Community peatland management groups — the Working Team for Protection and Management of Peatland Ecosystem (TK-PPEG) — were also established to develop and implement the RKMs. They included members of different groups such as local fire brigades, farmers' groups, and the village committee. As a result, 313 units of canal blocks were constructed in the project area by the end of 2021, which restored the hydrology of the landscapes in the PHUs. Since the RKMs and TK-PPEG model worked well, the Directorate of Peatland Degradation Control (DPDC) has replicated a similar model in 53 villages in other peatland provinces.

Different multi-stakeholder partnerships among local governments, local communities, and companies collaborated to prevent fires and enhance water management in peatlands. For example, different community groups were established/re-activated for fire prevention and control measures through participatory assessment and the RKM development process. A WhatsApp group was established in 2018 to link government representatives from the Riau province, districts, villagers, and people involved in project implementation. This group is intended to support communication, coordination, and information and knowledge exchange related to peat ecosystem management. At the same time, it is used to share information and build links across the three districts and share good practices such as fish cultivation in canals. For members without access to mobile devices, face-to-face community forums and training for the three districts took place to share information and lessons learned. Coordination and partnership activities were also carried out in each village. Participants included village government, village heads, community fire brigade, TK-PPEG members, village consultative body, Bhayangkara Trustees of Community Security and

Order, police representatives, and Natural Resources Conservation Agency.

### Lessons learned

#### Strengthening food security and local socio-economic benefits

It was critical to ensure food security and socio-economic benefits for local communities to promote sustainable peatland management at the community level. To complement the dominance of cash crops (rubber and oil palm) in the target villages, the project interventions have enhanced the availability of fish in rewetted peatlands in some target villages. The project also adopted a series of intercropping systems of short-term crops (e.g. spinach, chili, water spinach), medium-term crops (e.g. pineapple, avocado) and long-term crops (e.g. jelutong, sago) in the demonstration plots to improve local communities' nutritional status. This has increased food and nutrition security, as well as climate resilience of local communities via diversification of subsistence and cash crops. The impact survey has shown local smallholder farmers have replicated these crops and cultivation methods in their own land, especially for vegetables (28 percent of respondents), pineapple (24 percent), ginger (12 percent), areca nut (4 percent), and others. In

addition, 43 livelihood activities have been undertaken since 2019 as a part of RKMs.

Aside from local food security, the project has provided other local socio-economic benefits. The impact survey during the Mid-term Review Mission (May-June 2021) revealed that 78 per cent of 152 respondents have benefited from the canal blocks. These provided a water source for agriculture and made the local communities less vulnerable to peatland degradation and fires. The survey also showed that both women and youth have benefited from project activities. The women especially engaged in the demonstration plot activities such as planting, monitoring, maintaining, and harvesting crops, as well as harvesting fish in canal blocks. Youth groups in the project villages have been helping build canal blocks, develop demonstration plots, and implement fire prevention and protection activities in fire-prone peatland areas. The participatory planning process of RKMs has considered all these aspects for each project village through TK-PPEG. These RKMs will be updated yearly. Furthermore, three drinking water treatment plants were developed to serve 6,400 people in three project villages. The plants have brought significant benefits by reducing the cost of clean water by 80 per cent and saving significant time spent to purchase/collect water from distant sources.



Discussion in a village © SMPPEI



### South-South cooperation to initiate global tropical peatland management

The Government of Indonesia has widely shared its experience on peatland management strategy, innovative monitoring systems, and development and implementation of community peatland management action plans. It also actively engaged in other peatland management initiatives through the UNFCCC COPs, ASEAN Task Force on Peatlands, Global Peatland Initiative, and others. These examples of South-South cooperation are contributing to regional and global initiatives to strengthen tropical peatland management. By sharing its experience, Indonesia's National RPPEG will serve as an example to ASEAN neighbouring countries. Specifically, it will inform an update of the ASEAN Peatland Management Strategy and the ASEAN Haze-Free Roadmap for 2021–2030. This cooperation with ASEAN is key to advance sustainable peatland and a haze-free agenda in the region. The Government of Indonesia also founded the International Tropical Peatland Center with the Democratic Republic of Congo, Republic of Congo, and Peru. In addition, it sponsored and adopted the resolution on "Conservation and Sustainable Peatland Management" in the fourth United Nations Environment Assembly in March 2019.

### References and multimedia

- **Corrective Action on Peatland Protection and Management in Indonesia - Towards Sustainable Peatlands Management 2019-2020 (2021)**, [http://pkgppkl.menlhk.go.id/v0/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/CORRECTIVE-ACTION-ON-PEATLAND-PROTECTION-AND-MANAGEMENT-IN-INDONESIA-06des\\_.pdf](http://pkgppkl.menlhk.go.id/v0/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/CORRECTIVE-ACTION-ON-PEATLAND-PROTECTION-AND-MANAGEMENT-IN-INDONESIA-06des_.pdf)
- **Directorate of Peatland Degradation Control (DPDC) Website**, <http://pkgppkl.menlhk.go.id/v0/en/>
- **Mid-term Review Final Aide Memoire (2021)**, <https://www.thegef.org/projects-operations/projects/5764>
- **Project design report**, <https://www.thegef.org/projects-operations/projects/5764>
- **Project Implementation Report 2021**, <https://www.thegef.org/projects-operations/projects/5764>
- **Video about the project**, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q54j-RAMzRY&feature=youtu.be>



Development of Canal Blocking by Community Group @ SMPEI



Participatory Monitoring Canal Blocking @ SMPEI

### Contact

- Hannah Fairbank, Asia Regional Coordinator and Senior Biodiversity Specialist, GEF, [hfairbank@thegef.org](mailto:hfairbank@thegef.org)
- Ulrich Apel, Land Degradation Focal Area Coordinator and Senior Environmental Specialist, GEF, [uapel@thegef.org](mailto:uapel@thegef.org)
- Ivan Cossio Cortez, Indonesia Country Director, IFAD, [i.cossio@ifad.org](mailto:i.cossio@ifad.org)
- Dilva Terzano, Environment and Natural Resource Management Specialist, IFAD, [d.terzano@ifad.org](mailto:d.terzano@ifad.org)
- Sri Parwati Murwani Budisusanti, SMPEI Project Director and Director of Peatland Degradation Control Directorate, Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MOEF), Republic of Indonesia, [spm\\_budisusanti@yahoo.com](mailto:spm_budisusanti@yahoo.com)

*The GEF Good Practice Briefs showcase examples of GEF investments that align with GEF strategies and GEF programming directions and policy recommendations. The GEF Secretariat selected featured projects from a pool of nominations by GEF agencies, taking into consideration approaches used to generate multiple global environmental benefits and co-benefits, and to achieve clear results and/or sustainability. Because the Good Practice Briefs include projects implemented under different contexts, the practices highlighted should not necessarily be considered universally applicable.*

The Global Environment Facility was established on the eve of the Rio Earth Summit to tackle our planet's most pressing environmental problems. Since then, it has provided more than **\$21.7 billion** in grants and mobilized an additional **\$119 billion** in co-financing for more than **5,000 projects** and programs. The GEF is the largest multilateral trust fund focused on enabling developing countries to invest in nature, and supports the implementation of major international environmental conventions including on biodiversity, climate change, chemicals, and desertification. It brings together **184 member governments** in addition to civil society, international organizations, and private sector partners. Through its Small Grants Programme, the GEF has provided support to more than 26,000 civil society and community initiatives in 135 countries



FEB 2022  
978-1-948690-90-4  
[www.thegef.org](http://www.thegef.org)






GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY  
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET



# South-South Cooperation for Upscaling Nature Based Solutions for Climate Adaptation

Technology Transfer through Long-term Research of Pilot Projects in Mauritania, Nepal, and Seychelles

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPACT AREAS	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY
<b>Enhancing Capacity, Knowledge and Technology Support to Build Climate Resilience of Vulnerable Developing Countries (EbA South)</b>	Global (Mauritania, Nepal, Seychelles) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> <li>Land Degradation</li> <li>Sustainable Forest</li> <li>Poverty Reduction</li> <li>Food Security</li> <li>Socio-economic Benefits</li> <li>Health</li> <li>Education</li> </ul>	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
	<b>EXECUTING AGENCIES</b>		National Development and Reform Commission of China through the Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research – Chinese Academy of Sciences (IGSNRR-CAS)
GEF PROJECT ID: <b>4934</b>	<b>FOCAL AREAS</b>		
PROJECT TYPE: <b>FSP</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate Change Adaptation</li> </ul>		
GEF PERIOD: <b>GEF-5</b>	GEF Project Grant <b>\$4,900,000</b>	Co-financing Total <b>\$34,700,000</b>	GEF Fund <b>SPECIAL CLIMATE CHANGE FUND (SCCF)</b>

## Summary

This SCCF project is recognized as a flagship initiative for South-South cooperation, enabling an exchange of technology transfer, capacity-building, policy support or fundraising between countries in the Global South. The project catalysed global and regional collaboration on Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA), especially sharing China's experience and research know-how in ecological restoration and climate change adaptation. Nature-based solutions for climate adaptation were piloted in key vulnerable ecosystems, like deserts in Mauritania, mountains in Nepal, and coasts in Seychelles. The project demonstrated various best practices, such as collaborating with local universities on long-term research, which resulted in the publication of many research papers that share key lessons from pilot EbA

in three countries. In addition, the project produced a wide range of tools and knowledge products to encourage nature-based solutions for adaptation through South-South cooperation. As a result, 450 ha in the deserts of Mauritania and 20 ha of mangroves in Seychelles are going to be restored ecologically once the trees have matured; 840,000 seedlings were planted in Nepalese watersheds to increase water supplies and reduce soil erosion; 34 technical reports and research papers were developed; and almost 4,900 people were reached through public awareness activities. A dedicated website for the project focused not only on sharing project approaches and outcomes but also lessons, toolkits, and best practices on EbA for a broad audience: <http://www.ebasouth.org/>.



Tree nursery on Praslin Island in the Seychelles. @UN Environment Programme / Aidan Dockery

The project generated several key lessons. First, project preparation needs to be rigorous and scientifically based to generate valid and reliable evidence for interventions; early capacity-building would help for sound implementation. Second, continuous consultation with local communities to understand local socio-economic conditions, and consensus building and communication with local communities and governments about long-term benefits and trade-offs, are critical for sustainability of EbA. Third, adaptive management is necessary to ensure the sustainability of interventions and needs to be integrated into project design. Fourth, EbA investments are still experimental in nature, which means it is critical to document lessons learned. Finally, cross-nation exchanges were important due to limited local EbA experiences and to improve quality of South-South cooperation; professional interpreters help improve the flow of knowledge and learning.

## Results and benefits

The project's key results to date are below.

- Successfully promoted South-South cooperation on EbA, particularly through exchanging knowledge

and experience from China to the pilot countries and beyond, as well as peer to peer learning among the pilot countries. This created a community of practice for further replication and extension of the EbA approach.

- Ecologically restore 450 ha in the deserts of Mauritania and 20 ha of mangroves in Seychelles once the trees have matured and planted over 840,000 seedlings on the mountain slopes in Nepal, with multiple alternative livelihood options piloted.
- Established long-term research programs in partnership with local universities in three countries to measure the short- and long-term effects of EbA interventions within the project and developed 34 technical reports and research papers.
- Developed a large number of knowledge products, such as EbA planning tools, handbook, education curriculum, good practice case studies, lessons learned from the project, and an interactive web-based platform for effective EbA planning and implementation.
- Reached almost 4,900 people through climate change awareness-raising at international, national and community levels.



HOME

GEF Good Practice Briefs

South-South Cooperation for Upscaling Nature Based Solutions for Climate Adaptation / 1



NEXT



- Supported 187 households to diversify their food production through vegetable farming and beekeeping, which increased resources for personal consumption and extra income in Nepal.
- Put forward the revision of related policy, which was later approved as the Seychelles wetland policy and action plan (2018-2022) by the Ministers of the Cabinet. The policy defines wetlands and the types of wetlands, as well as their status, trends, and threats.
- Developed sustainable financing plans for ecological restoration in Seychelles based on market assessments of ecosystem services (e.g. ecotourism), which have been used for cost-benefit analyses of adaptation interventions.<sup>1</sup>
- Create multi-use greenbelts once the trees have matured in Mauritania using indigenous drought-resilient species. These greenbelts protect crops from wind erosion and desertification by holding the soil and retaining moisture in the ground.
- Built community-managed tree nurseries to supply the required trees for desertification control in Mauritania. Training was also provided to understand which trees to plant for desertification control.

### Environmental challenge

Climate change has substantial impacts on local communities in Asia-Pacific and Africa regions because communities heavily rely on ecosystems for their livelihoods. Temperatures are rising and the frequency and intensity of climate-related disasters such as floods, landslides, fires, and droughts is increasing. Thus, associated negative effects include, inter alia, a decline in agricultural productivity, deterioration in the natural resource base, and undermined livelihoods. Furthermore, communities have limited capacity to cope with the effects of climate change. Given that livelihoods of vulnerable local communities are integrally linked to natural resources, EbA potentially offers low risk and cost-effective means of building the resilience of such communities to climate change. This is because such an approach focuses on maintaining the flow of goods and services provided by well-managed ecosystems such as hydrological regulation, soil retention, climate regulation, and the provision of food, building materials, or medicinal plants.



In Seychelles, Planting mangroves@ EbA South

However, there is limited information and technical capacity available for effective implementation of EbA—guided by evidence-based decision-making—across Africa and Asia Pacific. This is because i) information on the long-term efficacy of climate change adaptation and ecosystem management interventions is not being collated, synthesized, analyzed, and disseminated; ii) EbA interventions are not being implemented within a rigorous scientific framework of long-term research; iii) policy and legal frameworks are not incentivizing large-scale EbA; and iv) training on good practices for EbA is not being provided to ecosystem managers and adaptation practitioners. This SCCF project aimed to enhance the climate resilience of communities in Mauritania, Nepal, and Seychelles by building institutional capacity, mobilizing knowledge, and transferring appropriate EbA technologies. The project also planned to address these gaps by catalyzing large-scale implementation of EbA technologies across Africa and Asia-Pacific regions.

### Integrated approach and key features

#### EbA interventions for technology transfer and long-term research

Although EbA intervention and post-project maintenance vary according to social, economic, and biophysical contexts, knowledge sharing and practical learning on EbA technology took place mainly through the joint development and implementation of the Long-Term Research Programme (LTRP) and EbA

interventions. In Nepal, for example, the development of EbA interventions started with assessing local practices and determining whether these practices can be improved or upscaled before introducing new approaches. A local expert identified practices through extensive field visits and interviews with local stakeholders, including community forest groups, women's groups, farmers, and district officers. Based on these findings, the Chinese and South African experts designed possible interventions together with the local expert and advised on their implementation and monitoring against project indicators and targets. The EbA interventions included setting up plant nurseries and seedling propagation; mixed plantation of bamboo, banana, and salix on degraded riverbanks for soil erosion control; and cardamom plantations and crop diversification to improve livelihoods.

The LTRP included establishment of a permanent monitoring site, as well as research on the short- and long-term effects of EbA interventions. For instance, to establish the monitoring site in Nepal, the Nepalese experts were first invited to visit the Ecosystem Research Network stations in China to see how the monitoring sites were set up, operated, and contributed to research activities. Specific research data and equipment needs for watershed management from the Nepalese side were jointly identified with South African experts. The Ministry of Population and Environment (now called the Ministry of Forests and Environment), together with Chinese experts, then identified Tribhuvan University as a partner to lead the LTRP. The site with monitoring plots and a meteorological station was established in 2016 and complemented by a hydrological station in 2017. The data collected are used at local level and integrated into the national level through the Ministry of Hydrological and Meteorology. This site will be independently managed by Tribhuvan University together with the Government of Nepal beyond the project period.<sup>2</sup> The project also contributed to the development of Nepal's national adaptation plan.

Chinese and South African experts on data-collection methodologies provided trainings to develop early capacity in countries. These trainings included developing and conducting household surveys to measure vulnerability and awareness changes in response to EbA interventions. Technology transfer took

place between Chinese and Nepalese experts, as well as between experts from Mauritania and Seychelles through interregional capacity-building workshops, exchange visits, and a web-based knowledge platform. The Chinese technology involving EbA in the Green Wall in the heart of the Takalamakan deserts was of value for the Mauritania work. In addition, Chinese and Mauritanian ecologists and scientists involved in the project held many exchanges.<sup>3</sup>

#### South-South cooperation for knowledge exchange and capacity building

South-South cooperation was at the centre of this project. Starting from its design stage, the project jointly developed an EbA implementation plan among the three pilot countries, while interregional cooperation in Africa and Asia-Pacific on knowledge exchange and capacity building was designed in parallel to enable and enhance the EbA piloting process. EbA is considered as one of the most cost-effective, durable and pro-poor solutions for developing countries, hence South-South cooperation allows effective EbA exchange among developing countries that have common challenges and solutions of conservation and livelihoods. Joint development of the plan enabled the three countries to exchange ideas and challenges with others and experts despite different ecosystems and social and political backgrounds. These exchanges continued throughout implementation. The three countries, EbA experts, and the project coordinators regularly met through the steering committee, workshops, training, site visits, and conferences. By trying to achieve the common goal of building climate resilience through EbA, the participating countries created an organic community of practice to address design and implementation challenges.

To exchange EbA experience among the three pilot countries and beyond, workshops for knowledge sharing took place in Asia-Pacific, Africa and Latin America for the benefits of developing countries at large. For instance, "South-South Exchange Workshop: Ecosystems for Climate Change Adaptation and Sustainable Livelihoods Knowledge Sharing" was held in Beijing, China in April 2018. Advanced training workshops on ecosystem monitoring and management for developing countries were organized in 2015 and 2016.<sup>4</sup> A capacity-building workshop for access to finance for EbA and EbA mainstreaming was also organized in South Africa in 2017. An international

<sup>1</sup> Based on ecosystem services assessment, the analysis provided comparative information of human benefit and cost on EbA between the "2028 Without Intervention scenario", "2028 With Intervention scenario", and "2028 Catchment management + Drains scenario", which could be good quantitative information for decision making on continuous intervention. A detail of ecosystem services assessment is in the "Ecosystem Services Supply, Demand and Values at Petit Barbarons, Seychelles – Final Report (September 12, 2020)", available at [http://www.ebasouth.org/sites/default/files/attachments/Seychelles%20EbA%20Ecosystem%20Services%20Scenarios%20Final%20Draft%20v2\\_cleared.pdf](http://www.ebasouth.org/sites/default/files/attachments/Seychelles%20EbA%20Ecosystem%20Services%20Scenarios%20Final%20Draft%20v2_cleared.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> In Seychelles, the Ministry of Environment, Energy, and Climate Change signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the University of Seychelles to develop a long-term research program focused on climate change adaptation. The Ecole Normale Supérieure de Nouakchott and the Government of Mauritania also signed an MoU.

<sup>3</sup> Seychelles requested Geographic Information System (GIS) training. Thus, GIS workshops in China were organized for three pilot countries and ten other countries.

<sup>4</sup> Training workshops were funded by the Chinese Ecosystem Research Network / Chinese Academy of Sciences.







In the Nepalese mountains, a tree nursery contains seedlings to protect crops from floods, drought, and erosion. @EbA South

exchange visit to Mauritania was organized in July 2018, gathering project members from Seychelles and Nepal.<sup>5</sup> This visit was an opportunity for project members to share experience and lessons learned from implementation of EbA interventions in a South-South Cooperation perspective. A web-based knowledge platform allows China to share its wealth of ecosystem management experiences with other developing countries. The platform facilitates collaboration via webinars, case studies, and EbA planning tools and other knowledge products.

This South-South exchange of knowledge culminated in an array of publications and tools now used by practitioners across the Global South. For example, the project produced an EbA planning tool, "ALiVE —Adaptation, Livelihoods and Ecosystems" in partnership with the International Institute for Sustainable Development and the International Union for Conservation of Nature. The application of this tool and interest in it have been extended beyond the geographical focus of the project, including potential use by government planners through the process of national adaptation plan development. Government staff in the three pilot countries were trained on the planning tool as well. In addition, the "Ecosystem-based Adaptation: A Handbook for EbA in Mountain, Dryland and Coastal Ecosystems" was developed in partnership with the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) and widely disseminated through different platforms. The handbook is listed among the top 10 most downloaded IIED publications in

<sup>5</sup> It included a two-day field visit and a half-day wrap-up meeting.

2018. These workshops and knowledge products provided great opportunities to share and exchange various experiences of the project to scientists and practitioners in the wider EbA community. Applying the project experience and knowledge tools, another EbA project with a similar concept has been developed in the Mekong river basin. More importantly, the high-level Forum on South-South Cooperation on Climate Change was initiated by the project on the side-lines of UNFCCC COP during 2013-2017 that has been taken up by the Executive Office of the UN Secretary-General later on. This forum provides a unique complementary avenue for strengthening global partnerships, through cooperation among Southern partners. The importance of South-South Cooperation on Climate Change was highly acknowledged by ministers, principals of UN agencies and other prominent international organizations.

### Lessons learned

#### Science-based intervention and continuous consultation

Preparation of EbA interventions should include rigorously and science-based analyses to generate valid and reliable evidence for intervention, potential benefits, and trade-offs at the project sites. In addition, in-depth stakeholder consultations and agreement for short-term compensation to community members for losing productive land are important. Without clear understanding of long-term benefits and trade-

offs of EbA and agreement with local communities, sustainability of interventions will be difficult. Project sites in Nepal and Mauritania had potential trade-offs (planting trees for products such as fruit, medicine, and timber and restoring lands versus keeping land as grazing ground for cattle). For example, some local communities in Nepal did not fully recognize they could not use land as grazing ground for cattle after the project. Once they understood the trade-off, they were no longer interested in planting and taking care of trees. As a result, after having spent considerable time and funding on propagating seedlings in nurseries, the project needed other sites.<sup>6</sup> In Mauritania, the first identified project site was abandoned after several years because of land-use conflict within affected communities, and project sites were replaced. In both Nepal and Mauritania, some community members found that using certain degraded ecosystems for livelihoods was better than restoring ecosystems, which would only result in benefits in the future. Interest of community members in EbA intervention also depends on land tenure.

The project started consulting with local communities at the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) stage, successfully building trust and understanding

of the complex socio-economic situation. The PPG period, however, was not long enough to reach the local communities that would engage on the ground; to build trust between local communities and a project team and governments; or to fully understand the complex socio-economic situation and local governance in project sites. Therefore, it is vital to continue consulting beyond the PPG period. From the project experience, incentives for commitments to EbA included desires to: i) manage climate change for society; ii) claim rights to abandoned agricultural land; iii) increase income from timber and non-timber forest products; iv) improve the aesthetics of the landscape; v) reduce soil erosion; and vi) leave a legacy for future generations.

#### Adaptive management to ensure the sustainability of Interventions

Opportunities for project sustainability vary according to each EbA site. Thus, adaptive management is key to ensure sustainability of interventions, and should be built into project design. Early-stage design of the project needed to adjust to ecological conditions, extreme weather, socio-economic situations, political changes, and delays. For example, extreme winds and high temperature in Mauritania killed about half the



Tree planting day in Mauritania. @ EbA South

<sup>6</sup> These seedlings were still used so they weren't wasted.



planted seedlings at some sites. They also reduced the amount of time staff could spend in the field, which greatly delayed planting. This, in turn, led to planting seedlings at the end of the rainy season. The project overcame these issues by irrigating and planting additional trees. Nepal experienced a big earthquake and political change, and Seychelles had serious flooding during project implementation. EbA projects always need to adapt to unexpected ecological and socio-economic conditions in various ecosystems. Thus, adaptive management is indispensable, and documentation of how the projects addressed challenges and lessons learned are vital assets for planning.

#### Documentation of lessons learned from EbA interventions

EbA investments are still experimental, making it critical to document the long-term efficacy of climate change adaptation and ecosystem management interventions on both successes and failures, particularly for upscaling of EbA. Early capacity-building in countries also helped share scientifically sound data and lessons learned. There are many environmental, economic, and social variables involved in getting EbA to be sustainable, and it is important to document good practices, as well as lessons and challenges from the pilot sites. The project design enabled all three countries to employ LTRP in partnership with local universities. Together, they measured and reported the short- and long-term effects (ecological, hydrological, and socio-economic) of EbA interventions. Activities included establishing monitoring sites, research, collecting data and publishing findings.<sup>7</sup> Permanent plots to monitor the impacts of interventions (e.g. on run-off, soil erosion, and landscape as a whole) have been established and were taken over by the universities after the project ended. Institutional cooperation with the Chinese Academy of Sciences was strengthened in sharing experience in long-term research and monitoring of climate change and effects of ecosystem management in pilot countries. With this strong data collection and research component, the project identified lessons that can inform scaling up of EbA.

#### Professional interpreters to improve the flow of knowledge and learning

The project generated significant engagement among EbA practitioners, government officials, and scientists from China, Nepal, Seychelles, and Mauritania. However, flow of knowledge and learning can be

improved with hiring of professional interpreters during expeditions and workshops. Cross-nation and regional scale EbA exchanges were always important due to limited local EbA experiences, and upscaling or policymaking needs to refer to successful experiences. Data, findings, ideas, and experiences from a wide range of ecosystems were shared during field trips and workshops in all four countries. Communication in these engagements was, however, often greatly constrained by the language barrier. English was the medium of collaboration although it was a second or third language of most participants. The language barrier also limited collaboration after workshops. Knowledge exchange in a workshop setting is relatively short-lived unless the experience leads to personal relationships and professional collaborations. Thus, the hiring of professional interpreters with scientific knowledge during expeditions, as well as in workshops, would have increased the benefits of collaboration.

#### References and multimedia

- Adaptation, Livelihoods and Ecosystems Planning Tool: User Manual (ALivE) (2018). <https://www.iisd.org/projects/alive-adaptation-livelihoods-and-ecosystems-planning-tool>
- Ecosystem-based Adaptation: A Handbook for EbA in Mountain, Dryland and Coastal Ecosystems (2018). <https://pubs.iied.org/17460iied>
- Integrating Ecosystem-based Adaptation in Education Curriculum: A Resource Guide (2019). [http://www.ebasouth.org/sites/default/files/attachments/Integrating%20Ecosystem-based%20Adaptation%20in%20Education%20Curriculum%20Resource%20Guide\\_EbA%20South.pdf](http://www.ebasouth.org/sites/default/files/attachments/Integrating%20Ecosystem-based%20Adaptation%20in%20Education%20Curriculum%20Resource%20Guide_EbA%20South.pdf)
- Mills, AJ, and others (2020). Ecosystem-based adaptation to climate change: Lessons learned from a pioneering project spanning Mauritania, Nepal, the Seychelles, and China. *Plants, People, Planet*, vol 2, pp. 587–597. <https://nph.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/ppp3.10126>
- Project Document (2013). <https://www.thegef.org/project/enhancing-capacity-knowledge-and-technology-support-build-climate-resilience-vulnerable>
- Project Implementation Report (2020). <https://www.thegef.org/project/enhancing-capacity-knowledge-and-technology-support-build-climate-resilience-vulnerable>



Planting day with school children @EbA South

- Project website. Ecosystem-based Adaptation through South-South Cooperation | [ebasouth.org](http://ebasouth.org)
- Research on Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA): A reference guide (2019). [http://www.ebasouth.org/sites/default/files/attachments/Research%20on%20EbA\\_a%20reference%20guide\\_by%20EbA%20South\\_0.pdf](http://www.ebasouth.org/sites/default/files/attachments/Research%20on%20EbA_a%20reference%20guide_by%20EbA%20South_0.pdf)
- The Green Wall in the heart of the Takalamakan Desert (2015). Ecosystem-based adaptation through south-south cooperation. Good Practice Case Study. [http://www.ebasouth.org/sites/default/files/case\\_study\\_full/EBA-SSC%20Case%20Study%201\\_0.pdf](http://www.ebasouth.org/sites/default/files/case_study_full/EBA-SSC%20Case%20Study%201_0.pdf)

#### Contact

- Chizuru Aoki, Lead Environmental Specialist, GEF, [caoki@thegef.org](mailto:caoki@thegef.org)
- Atifa Kassam Manji, Programme Officer, Climate Change Adaptation Unit, Ecosystem Division, UNEP, [atifa.kassam@un.org](mailto:atifa.kassam@un.org)
- Anthony Mills, Chief Technical Advisor, C4 EcoSolutions, [anthony.mills@c4es.co.za](mailto:anthony.mills@c4es.co.za)
- Guoqin Wang, UNEP-IEMP, [guoqin.wang@unep-iemp.org](mailto:guoqin.wang@unep-iemp.org)
- Tatirose Vijitpan, UNEP-IEMP, [tatirose.vijitpan@unep-iemp.org](mailto:tatirose.vijitpan@unep-iemp.org)

The GEF Good Practice Briefs showcase examples of GEF investments that align with GEF strategies and GEF programming directions and policy recommendations. The GEF Secretariat selected featured projects from a pool of nominations by GEF agencies, taking into consideration approaches used to generate multiple global environmental benefits and co-benefits, and to achieve clear results and/or sustainability. Because the Good Practice Briefs include projects implemented under different contexts, the practices highlighted should not necessarily be considered universally applicable.

The Global Environment Facility was established on the eve of the Rio Earth Summit to tackle our planet's most pressing environmental problems. Since then, it has provided more than **\$21.7 billion** in grants and mobilized an additional **\$119 billion** in co-financing for more than **5,000 projects** and programs. The GEF is the largest multilateral trust fund focused on enabling developing countries to invest in nature, and supports the implementation of major international environmental conventions including on biodiversity, climate change, chemicals, and desertification. It brings together 184 member governments in addition to civil society, international organizations, and private sector partners. Through its Small Grants Programme, the GEF has provided support to more than 26,000 civil society and community initiatives in 135 countries

<sup>7</sup> In total, 14 technical reports and research papers were developed for Nepal; 7 for Seychelles; 12 for Mauritania; and 1 for the whole project. These included research reports co-authored by government, theses for bachelor's and master's programs, and peer-reviewed papers.





GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY  
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET



UN  
environment  
programme

# Promoting Non-POPs Alternatives to DDT and Environmental Health Through Engaging Key Local Partners:

Low-cost Local Technology and Neem-based Agroforestry in India

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPACT AREAS	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY
Development and promotion of non-POPs alternatives to DDT	India	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chemical and Waste</li> <li>Biodiversity</li> <li>Poverty Reduction</li> <li>Local Socio-Economic Benefits</li> <li>Health</li> </ul>	United Nations Industrial Development Organization, United Nations Environment Programme
	<b>FOCAL AREAS</b>		<b>EXECUTING AGENCIES</b>
GEF PROJECT ID: 4612	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chemical and Waste</li> </ul>		Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change; Ministry of Chemicals and Fertilizers; Ministry of Health and Family Welfare
PROJECT TYPE: FSP			
GEF PERIOD: GEF-5	GEF Project Grant <b>\$10,000,000</b>	Co-financing Total <b>\$43,147,167</b>	GEF Period <b>GEF-5</b>

## Summary

Through the GEF investment, India has taken the first step to eliminate dependency on DDT by promoting locally appropriate, cost-effective, and sustainable alternatives, including the Long-Lasting Insecticidal Net (LLIN)<sup>1</sup> and Neem<sup>2</sup>-based and bacteria-based biopesticides. HIL (India) Limited (HIL)<sup>3</sup>, a public sector enterprise, is the only manufacturer of DDT in the world and committed to phase-out production of DDT by 2024. It now produces 5 million LLINs per year and plans to double production capacity, supplying them across the country through the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. HIL is also preparing large-scale production of Neem-based and Bti bacteria-based biopesticides for control of vector-borne diseases.

Since Neem trees are available in Africa and large parts of Asia, HIL will also work with partners to transfer Neem-based local technology to other parts of the world.

The project contributes to a global effort to control toxic chemicals and reduce persistent organic pollutants (POPs) following the Stockholm Convention on POPs. Since India is the only country producing DDT, its phase-out of DDT production helps improve the health of millions involved in chemical pesticides. The phase-out also benefits those living in mosquito-endemic areas who are exposed to DDT in their dwellings. Using an agroforestry model, the project supports



Gender participation in Long-Lasting Insecticidal Nets (LLINs) making @UNIDO



HOME

GEF Good Practice Briefs

Promoting Non-POPs Alternatives to DDT and Environmental Health Through Engaging Key Local Partners / 1



NEXT



large-scale plantation of new cultivars of Neem trees. In addition to providing high quality raw material to make Neem-based pesticides, this model generates additional income for rural populations and farming communities. Engagement of key local partners made the project locally relevant, cost-effective, and sustainable. The project is also strengthening capacity of national stakeholders through training on integrated vector pest management (IVPM). Further, the project will recommend laws and provide guidance on DDT alternatives to the government of India.

## Results and global environmental benefits

- Reduced production of DDT and POP pesticides in India and globally.
- Introduced 5 million LLINs per annum into the market to replace indoor residual spraying, including DDT.
- Prepared to register and produce five environmentally sound Neem-based biopesticides for mosquito coils, repellent creams and other uses, and two Bti bacteria-based biopesticides, all of which are highly effective against mosquito larvae.
- Identified four Neem cultivars with high yielding limonoids<sup>4</sup>, standardized the protocol for clonal propagation of Neem (through stem cuttings and tissue culture), and started pilot Neem-based agroforestry plantations in five different agroclimatic zones in India.
- Developed four training modules for field workers to adopt DDT alternatives.
- Prepared gap analysis, action plan, and guidance documents for legal framework for DDT alternatives in India.
- Reduced exposure to DDT of millions of production workers of chemical pesticides, handlers, packagers, and applicators, particularly

women, as well as populations exposed to DDT year round in their dwellings.

## Environmental challenges

About 95% of India's population resides in malaria-endemic areas, exposing them to increased morbidity and mortality from vector-borne diseases such as malaria, kala-azar, and dengue. Such diseases are particularly severe in rural areas where the most vulnerable communities live. The World Health Organization (WHO) recommends seven insecticides for indoor residual spraying, including DDT. India produces DDT exclusively for vector control as per WHO guidelines,<sup>5</sup> and strictly regulates DDT use for public health. As of 2013, India has used 6,183 metric tons of DDT for public health in 27 states. With this continued use of DDT, some Anopheles mosquito species have developed resistance.

The government of India has prioritized replacing DDT with cost-effective, locally relevant, and sustainable alternatives to prevent malaria and other vector-borne diseases. To phase out DDT production, IVPM strategy encourages use of LLINs and biopesticides in high-risk areas. However, there is not enough production of LLINs to meet demand. The farming community has increasingly used Neem-based biopesticides for agriculture, reducing its use of toxic pesticides in consequence. However, Neem-based biopesticides such as mosquito coil, and cream, oil, and spray repellent are produced at small scale for local areas. India needs to scale up production of LLINs and biopesticides and reduce reliance on DDT in public health through IVPM.

The project is a part of a wider effort of the GEF to address use of DDT in vector control. As a supply-side approach, this wider effort aims to replace DDT with alternatives. Meanwhile, several other projects in Africa and Asia aim to reduce DDT use and promote alternatives. Thus, the project aims to phase out production of DDT in India and also ensure that other countries have access to DDT alternatives.

## Integrated approach and key features

### Environment, health, and socio-economic benefits through low-cost local technology

In collaboration with local institutions, and producers/distributors of DDT and its alternatives, the project began commercial production of LLINs. It also laid the groundwork for commercial production of bio- and botanical pesticides. These are locally relevant, cost-effective, and sustainable alternatives to DDT. During India Chem 2021, LLIN technology was awarded the "Innovator of the Year" Award.<sup>6</sup>

Through developing these low-cost local technologies, the project achieved global environmental benefits. It also generated health and socio-economic benefits for millions of workers involved in the various stages of production, packaging, and application of DDT, especially women. At the same time, it promoted the health of populations in mosquito-endemic areas exposed to DDT in their homes.

Neem has been used in India for agriculture and health benefits since ancient times. However, over the years, use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides in intensive agriculture has increased due to industrialization. Meanwhile, the use of Neem-based fertilizers and pesticides is decreasing because high quality Neem varieties are not available.

Under the project, the Institute of Pesticide Formulation Technology (IPFT)<sup>7</sup> developed five environmentally sound Neem-based biopesticides for mosquito coils, repellent creams, and sprays, and two Bti bacteria-based biopesticides. These are all highly effective against mosquito larvae.

IPFT transferred the technology to HIL for commercial production and is willing to share its technology with others. The market for mosquito repellents is \$183 million, half of which is for mosquito coils alone. Large-scale production of biopesticides is planned to cover the entire country and technology transfer is planned to other countries.

In addition, the project engaged with women from states in the rural and tribal belt. This includes Chhattisgarh (Central), West Bengal (East), and

Jharkhand (East), which manufacture LLINs. Since women make close to 80% of LLINs, the project empowered them economically; 6,000 women are employed to manufacture LLINs in these three states.

So far, nine pilot testing training sessions for IVPM have been organized, covering over 16 states and benefiting more than 330 participants. The training covered various aspects of vector control, emphasizing alternatives developed under the project and the legal framework. Overall, project components complement each other and help the government of India meet its obligations toward the Stockholm Convention.

### South-South cooperation for technology transfer

The project has also promoted technology transfer of biodegradable DDT alternatives such as botanical pesticides and Neem-based biopesticides through synergizing with other projects at country, regional, and global level particularly in Asia Pacific and Southern Africa. HIL, for example, has prepared exporting LLIN to Nepal. The project will also enhance synergies between regional DDT projects managed by WHO and the United Nations Environment Programme.

## Lessons learned

### Engaging with key local partners to find solutions

The engagement and commitment of relevant local partners were key to ensure the successful development and promotion of locally appropriate, cost-effective, and sustainable alternatives to DDT in India. Collaboration with HIL was critical for commercial production of LLINs and Neem-based and bacteria-based biopesticides. The project also engaged with the Central Institute for Petrochemical Engineering and Technology (CIPET) and IPFT to produce LLINs and formulate Neem-based and bacteria-based biopesticides. The National Botanical Research Institute (NBRI) is playing an important role to identify four Neem cultivars with high yielding limonoids, to standardize the protocol for clonal propagation of Neem (through stem cuttings and tissue culture), and to start pilot Neem plantations in five different agroclimatic zones in India. NBRI also contributed to further development of Neem-based agroforestry based on consultation with local farmers.

1 LLIN is a factory-treated mosquito net made with netting material that incorporates insecticide within the fibers. The net must retain its effective biological activity without re-treatment for at least 20 standard washes under laboratory conditions as defined in World Health Organization (WHO) guidelines. The national standard for LLIN is already established in India based on WHO specifications.

2 Neem is a deciduous tree native to India. Besides being tolerant to high temperatures, Neem can also be grown easily on waste and barren land. Different chemical substances are found in the bark, leaves, and seeds. These are collectively known as limonoids. In addition to wood and shade, Neem trees provide many types of health and agricultural benefits due to their biologically active chemicals. They are known as the "village pharmacy" (NBRI 2022).

3 HIL (India) Limited changed its name from Hindustan Insecticide Limited (HIL).

4 Limonoids are phytochemicals of the triterpenoid class. They are abundant in sweet- or sour-scented fruit and alter plants of families Meliaceae, Cucurbitaceae, and Rutaceae. Many limonoids possess biological qualities to fight insect pests.

5 The government banned DDT for agriculture use in 1989. Order No. S.O. 378(E), 26 May 1989. It also restricted DDT use to control disease vectors.

6 HIL (India) Limited has also begun to pack and supply LLINs in biodegradable packing to overcome the issue of disposal of packing material, thereby safeguarding the environment.

7 IPFT was established in 1991 under the Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals, Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilizers as an autonomous institution. It has been working toward development of safer, efficient, and environmentally friendly pesticide.







"LIN packaging" @ UNIDO



Agroforestry model of Neem plantation with different medicinal and aromatic plants @NBRI



The project has also brought together relevant government institutions on a common platform to discuss development and promotion of DDT alternatives. These include Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC), Ministry of Chemicals and Fertilizers; Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (MoHFW) and state governments in charge of IVP. Led by MoEFCC, the National Environment Engineering Research Institute (NEERI) developed four training modules to adopt alternatives to replace DDT in the IVP program. To that end, NEERI consulted with state governments and the National Vector-Borne Disease Control Programme under the MoHFW. Development of low-cost local technology using local resources identified by local research institutions has enabled the country to produce safe and environmentally friendly alternatives to combat mosquitoes. These efforts can save the lives of millions of people in India and across the globe.

#### Strong co-finance by the industry for sustainability of the project

HIL is committed to phase out DDT by 2024. It arranged co-financing of 160 million Indian rupees (around \$2.4 million) to produce DDT alternatives. This co-finance is based on a strong commitment of HIL, which made the commercial production of DDT alternatives sustainable. However, the project has gone through challenges due to the involvement of key stakeholders.

In the early stage of the project, HIL, the sole producer and supplier of DDT for malaria and kala-azar vector control in the country, was unwilling to participate. This led to an amendment in the project document to substitute the Defense Research & Development Organization (DRDO) for HIL in February 2016. DRDO invented the LLIN local technology and could have been a good partner for the commercial production of LLINs. However, it was not ready for the responsibility. In March 2017, after a change in management, HIL announced its interest in establishing the infrastructure and developing capacity to produce LLIN as a viable alternative to DDT. CIPET has transferred technology to HIL to produce 5 million LLINs per annum at commercial level. Subsequently, HIL put up the co-financing for building infrastructure of the LLIN manufacturing facility. It completed construction in 2019, installed machinery, and undertook trial runs and master batch production.

HIL also took over commercial production of Neem-based and bacteria-based pesticides as a part of its facilities. The key lesson: it is critical to engage key local stakeholders of the project regardless of challenges.

#### Moving toward Neem-based agroforestry with support of local farmers

For large-scale cultivation of Neem-based products, NBRI identified four Neem cultivars with high yielding limonoids. It standardized the protocol for clonal propagation of Neem (through stem cuttings and tissue culture). And it started pilot Neem plantations in five different agroclimatic zones in India.

Through consultation with local farmers on a pilot plantation, the project proposed an approach for Neem-based agroforestry. For the first four to five years of a Neem plantation, farmers cannot harvest Neem seeds and Neem seeds can be harvested only once a year after four to five years. Because of these conditions, farmers caring for a Neem plantation need other sources of income for the first four to five years and non-harvest season of Neem seeds. In response, NBRI proposed Neem-based agroforestry that would make dwarf cultivars of Neem available to cultivate other crops in Neem plantations. Consultation with local farmers and understanding the socio-economic context of large-scale cultivation were critical to make the Neem plantation sustainable.

Under the project, NBRI is studying the cultivation of several types of medicinal (Asparagus) and aromatic plants (Lemongrass, Vetiver, Turmeric, Pipli, and Sarpagandha) in the field of four dwarf cultivars of Neem. As they are dwarf cultivars, a single area can accommodate many plants. There is also enough light on the surface of the field for farmers to cultivate different types of crops.

Based on preliminary data, cultivation of medicinal plants on waste land among Neem plants can provide additional economic benefits and increase soil fertility. NBRI is working for national-level propagation of four high quality cultivars of Neem, setting up plantation at multiple locations, and promoting Neem-based agroforestry. As a unique example of an inclusive and sustainable development model, it integrates the three components of sustainable development: social (employment), economic (higher income) and environmental (increasing soil fertility, supporting biodiversity and reducing use of synthetic chemicals). Thus, the Neem tree holds tremendous potential in sustainable agricultural systems around the world.

## References and multimedia

- CEO Endorsement document and Project Implementation Report 2021, <https://www.thegef.org/projects-operations/projects/4612>
- Video: HIL New Initiative – LLIN, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lihz5NcaUq0&t=116s>
- Neem – A versatile Tree, <https://nbri.res.in/media/English-neem-Folder.pdf>

## Contact

- Anil Bruce Sookdeo, [asookdeo@thegef.org](mailto:asookdeo@thegef.org), Chemical and Waste Focal Area Coordinator and Senior Environmental Specialist, GEF
- Yash Pal RAMDEV, [Y.RAMDEV@unido.org](mailto:Y.RAMDEV@unido.org), National Coordinator of the project, United Nations Industrial Development Organization
- Alessandro AMADIO, [A.AMADIO@unido.org](mailto:A.AMADIO@unido.org), United Nations Industrial Development Organization
- Jitendra Sharma, [jitendra.sharma@un.org](mailto:jitendra.sharma@un.org), Economy Division, Chemicals and Health Branch, GEF Unit, United Nations Environment Programme
- N. Subrahmanyam, [n.subrahmanyam@gov.in](mailto:n.subrahmanyam@gov.in), Joint Director, Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change
- S. P. Mohanty, [cmd@hil.gov.in](mailto:cmd@hil.gov.in), Chairman and Managing Director, HIL (India) Limited
- Jitendra Kumar, [jitendrakumar7@yahoo.com](mailto:jitendrakumar7@yahoo.com), Director, Institute of Pesticides Formulation Technology
- SK Barik, [director@nbri.res.in](mailto:director@nbri.res.in), Director, National Botanical Research Institute
- A. Ramesh Kumar, [ar\\_kumar@neeri.res.in](mailto:ar_kumar@neeri.res.in), National Environmental Engineering Research Institute

*The GEF Good Practice Briefs showcase examples of GEF investments that align with GEF strategies and GEF programming directions and policy recommendations. The GEF Secretariat selected featured projects from a pool of nominations by GEF agencies, taking into consideration approaches used to generate multiple global environmental benefits and co-benefits, and to achieve clear results and/or sustainability. Because the Good Practice Briefs include projects implemented under different contexts, the practices highlighted should not necessarily be considered universally applicable.*

**Author:** Ikuko Matsumoto, Knowledge and Policy Officer

The Global Environment Facility was established on the eve of the Rio Earth Summit to tackle our planet's most pressing environmental problems. Since then, it has provided more than **\$22 billion** in grants and mobilized an additional **\$120 billion** in co-financing for more than **5,200 projects** and programs. The GEF is the largest multilateral trust fund focused on enabling developing countries to invest in nature, and supports the implementation of major international environmental conventions including on biodiversity, climate change, chemicals, and desertification. It brings together 184 member governments in addition to civil society, international organizations, and private sector partners. Through its Small Grants Programme, the GEF has provided support to more than 27,000 civil society and community initiatives in 136 countries.



SEPT 2022  
978-1-948690-99-7

[www.thegef.org](http://www.thegef.org)



HOME

GEF Good Practice Briefs

Promoting Non-POPs Alternatives to DDT and Environmental Health Through Engaging Key Local Partners / 4


PREVIOUS





# Strengthening Regional Cooperation to Mainstream Migratory Soaring Birds Safeguards:

Strong Partnership with Private Sector and CSOs in Middle East and Africa

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION		IMPLEMENTING AGENCY
<b>Mainstreaming Conservation of Migratory Soaring Birds into Key Productive Sectors along the Rift Valley / Red Sea flyway</b>	Regional (Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Jordan, Lebanon, and Sudan)		United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
			
GEF PROJECT ID: <b>9491</b>	<b>FOCAL AREAS</b>	<b>EXECUTING PARTNERS</b>	
PROJECT TYPE: <b>FSP</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> </ul>	BirdLife International with BirdLife local partners	
GEF PERIOD: <b>GEF-6</b>	GEF Project Grant <b>\$3,500,000</b>	Co-financing Total <b>\$10,534,885</b>	

## Summary

This project has achieved successful and transformational results in mainstreaming migratory soaring bird (MSB) safeguards into the five key sectors directly affecting MSBs along the Rift Valley/Red Sea flyway: hunting, energy, tourism, agriculture, and waste management. The project has generated numerous global environmental benefits through the establishment of governmental and private sector policies and practices across the five sectors. Initiated by BirdLife International and its partners, the project also developed sector-specific guidance to share across the flyway countries in order to increase MSB conservation awareness and build the capacity of local partner organizations.

The Rift Valley/Red Sea flyway is the second most important MSB flyway in the world. Each year, over 1.5 million birds of at least 37 species, including five globally threatened species, use this corridor between their breeding grounds in Europe and West Asia and wintering areas in Africa. The project builds on success achieved in Tranche I of the project in GEF-3, which includes establishment of the Regional Flyway Facility (RFF). Under Tranche II, the project aims to mainstream MSB considerations into the productive sectors along the flyway that pose the greatest risk to the safe migration of these birds. The project focuses on 7 out of the 11 flyway countries:<sup>1</sup> Djibouti, Egypt,

<sup>1</sup> The 11 flyway countries are Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Jordan, Lebanon, Palestine, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen.



Workshop on 'A Road Map to tackle illegal bird killing in the Middle East' (October 2021) @ BirdLife International

Eritrea, Ethiopia, Jordan, Lebanon, and Sudan. The project established strategic partnerships with the private sector and international financial institutions and applied an integrated approach to collaborate with local youth in all five sectors. The project's approach of implementing the project through international and local CSOs as executing partners worked well in a complex region to engage various stakeholders. With the RFF and local CSOs initiatives, regional corporation and exchange on MSB conservation are building trust, promoting dialogue, and fostering solid relationships in the flyway countries. Key elements of the success of the project are building on learning from Tranche I and the long commitment of GEF engagement.

## Results and benefits

The project's key results to date:

- MSB concerns incorporated into 94 new private sector policies and schemes, and 29 new and revised public sector policies on hunting, energy, tourism, agriculture, and waste management.<sup>2</sup>
- Around 5,802,706 hectares of land at bottlenecks along the flyway managed for hunting, energy, agriculture, and waste management applying "flyway

sensitive" practices (exceeding the 40 percent increase in the project target).

- 20 new sites along the flyway apply "flyway sensitive" practices.
- 130 governments and private sector requested guidance on "flyway sensitive" best practices developed by the project.
- In Egypt, mandatory MSB safeguards are now built into Power Purchasing Agreements with private sector wind farm developers.
- In Ethiopia, the International Finance Corporation (IFC)/ World Bank (WB) have engaged BirdLife in sensitivity mapping for nine proposed sites for wind farm development.
- In Lebanon and Jordan, the project established strong ties with tourism operators and hotels to promote the guidance and best practice in the tourism sector that considers MSB risks and concerns.
- The project is effectively influencing the enactment of new and revised country sector policies and won two awards in 2020: the Energy Globe National Winner in Egypt, and the Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature Environmental Protection "Good Practice of the Year" in Jordan.

<sup>2</sup> These 29 new and revised public sector policies include Inclusion of Important Bird Areas and flyway bottleneck sites into National Land Use Plans and the new Decree on regulating bird hunting and trade in Jordan, and bird monitoring obligation on energy sector in Egypt.



## Environmental challenge

The Rift Valley/Red Sea flyway is the second most important flyway for MSBs in the world, with over 1.5 million birds of at least 37 species, including five globally threatened species. They use this corridor between their breeding grounds in Europe and West Asia and wintering areas in Africa each year. However, this is where MSBs are the most physiologically stressed and for some species 50-100 percent of their global or regional populations pass along the route and through flyway “bottlenecks” (strategic points where soaring birds are funneled, either to make water crossings or to maintain flying height) in the space of just a few weeks. As a result, during the migration along the flyway these large, slow-moving birds are highly vulnerable to localized threats such as hunting and collision with wind turbines and associated power lines (particularly when they fly low or come into land). These threats could have severe impacts on global populations.




Figure 1: Map of the flyway © BirdLife International

Unfortunately, it is difficult to predict where the birds will come down to roost or sit out bad weather because their migrations are dependent upon weather conditions. This makes it unfeasible to improve the safety of the flyway simply by protecting key sites. Consequently, conservation actions need to address the flyway as a whole, at a regional or multi-regional level rather than the national level and not through

a traditional site-based approach. Therefore, the project aims to mainstream MSB considerations into the productive sectors along the flyway that pose the greatest risk to the safe migration of soaring birds. The five key sectors that create the most extensive, urgent, and critical threats are hunting, energy, tourism, agriculture, and waste management. This is a complex project with a regional and multi-national scope ranging over five different sectors in a highly volatile region with multiple risks. Thus, the mainstreaming is challenging given varying ecological, socio-economic, and political contexts along the flyway exacerbated by a lack of policy and regulatory frameworks and institutional capacities. Lack of awareness on impacts of the five sectors on safe migration of MSB is another challenging factor.

## Integrated approach and key features

### Strategic partnership with private sector and international financial institutions

The project has achieved successful and transformational results in mainstreaming MSB safeguards into the energy, hunting, and tourism sectors in partnership with the private sector and has produced guidance and tools for key stakeholders. For the energy sector, the project has established a strategic partnership with the private sector and international financial institutions such as IFC/WB, Japanese International Corporation Agency, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and KfW to ensure that new projects in the region consider MSB risks and concerns. This strategic partnership has contributed to mainstreaming MSB concerns into 65 private sector energy projects along the flyway in Egypt, Jordan, Ethiopia, and Djibouti. This includes the upscaling of shutdown-on-demand operations, which is being successfully piloted at wind farms in the Gulf of Suez. In Jordan, eight windfarm projects have incorporated MSB pre-construction requirements into their designs.

In Egypt, mandatory MSB safeguards are now built into Power Purchasing Agreements with private sector wind farm developers. In Ethiopia, the IFC/WB have engaged BirdLife in sensitivity mapping for nine sites proposed for wind farm development. Egypt, Jordan, and Ethiopia became members of the Convention of Migratory Species Energy Task Force on Reconciling Selected Energy Sector Developments with Migratory Species Conservation. Various guidance materials and case studies for wind energy, solar energy, and

electrical power lines to conserve migrating soaring birds in the Rift Valley/Red Sea Flyway were developed, including shutdown-on-demand for wind turbines and an impact assessment of power grids on MSB. These materials are tailored to different target audiences such as governments, development banks and donors, developers and consultants, partners/civil society. Sensitivity mapping developed by the project has attracted several international financial institutions and the Asian Development Bank is working on sensitivity mapping with BirdLife in India, Thailand, Myanmar, and Viet Nam.


### Integrated approach collaborating with local youth

The project contributed to a huge increase in land managed for hunting, energy, agriculture, and waste management under flyway-sensitive practices from the baseline 187,939 hectares to a total of 5,802,706 hectares, far exceeding the 40 percent increase in the target. Restrictions regarding illegal bird killing around Lake Nasser in Egypt and the designation in Lebanon of 25 Himas<sup>3</sup>—community-based conservation of key biodiversity sites—that give special considerations to MSBs largely account for this increase. Since 2004, the Society for the Protection of Nature in Lebanon (SPNL) is promoting Himas in collaboration with local authorities. These 25 Himas cover more than 8 percent of the total surface area of Lebanon. This approach involves local communities in decision making, promotes sustainable use of natural resources, and supports poverty alleviation by providing alternatives for income generation. Capacity building trainings targeting local youth to manage Himas raise awareness about MSB conservation as a regional issue and the importance of protecting nature in the region. SPNL expects these local training to contribute to regional peace-building through conservation across the flyway.

In Lebanon, the Ministry of Tourism is promoting eight locations, including five Himas, as tourism destinations, highlighting birdwatching MSBs at the sites. In collaboration with the Ministry, SPNL also organized training on ecotourism and biodiversity for tourist guides. Sixty-nine guides attended the training from all over Lebanon and these guides were certified as MSB friendly guides. The Ministry has adopted this ecotourism training that incorporates MSB issues as an official training program for a tour guide in Lebanon.

<sup>3</sup> The Himas is a traditional system of resource tenure that has been practiced for more than 1,400 years in the Arabian Peninsula. Under Islamic law, a Himas signifies a natural area that is set aside permanently or seasonally for the public good and may not be privately owned. Himas have helped conserve natural resources and biodiversity in the Arabian Peninsula and adjacent areas. They have secured sustainable use of renewable natural resources by and for the people living adjacent to them.

<sup>4</sup> These local organizations are Society for the Protection of Nature in Lebanon (SPNL), Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature (RSCN) in Jordan, Sudanese Wildlife Society, Association Djibouti Nature, Ethiopian Wildlife and Natural History Society, Nature Conservation Egypt, and Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (government agency).



Western reef heron (Egretta garzialis)

## Lessons learned

### CSOs as executing partners to engage diverse stakeholders

The project's executing partners are CSOs: BirdLife International and their local partners in the flyway countries.<sup>4</sup> They facilitated collaboration and exchange among flyway countries and this CSO modality works well in this complex region to work together. Good governance across the flyway is critical to mainstream conservation of MSBs into key productive sectors where the member states are at varying levels of development and indeed many are in or close to conflict situations. Thus, BirdLife International is positioning the RFF as a key facilitator and coordinator in the flyway and is working with national governments, private sector,






Figure 2: Project Governance @ BirdLife International

and international financial institutions to help continue the good work and effectively monitor MSBs on the flyway. The RFF plays a pivotal role in the project, coordinating with the seven countries, identifying key projects together with local partners, negotiating contracts, supervising and monitoring their progress, and providing technical support. In addition, BirdLife International and their local partners are committed and enthusiastic about MSB conservation. All stakeholders of the project highlighted the importance of the high-quality technical support the RFF provides and the key coordination role it plays. In fact, it is easier for local and international CSOs in the region to collaborate with neighboring countries without political constraints. The CSO implementation modality is efficient in terms of facilitating project implementation and reducing operational costs as well.

The project has promoted proactive engagement and participation of diverse stakeholders, which vary considerably due to the geographic scale of the MSB project and its focus on different sectors. The project worked closely with diverse government agencies that

go beyond the statutory environmental agencies in the countries because of the sector engagement in energy, tourism, and agriculture. Other key stakeholders include local CSOs and community organizations. In five of the seven target countries, the lead executing partner is a national CSO which forms part of the Middle East or Africa Partnership of BirdLife. For example, expansion of Himas in Jordan was possible through strong engagement with local CSOs that built trust with local communities. The private sector is also involved in the project mainly through the sub-projects as well as international financial institutions. Across all key sectors, the project was harnessing, encouraging, and building solid relationships among the different stakeholders and promoting dialogue.

#### Strengthening regional cooperation through South-South exchange

The RFF's regional facilitation and coordination were vital to promote cooperation for exchange experiences in the flyway countries. With BirdLife local partners, the project has advanced mainstreaming conservation on MSBs in the different sectors in Jordan, Egypt, and

Lebanon and is moving ahead in Ethiopia and Sudan. The RFF's continuous monitoring of the regional and national activities is time consuming but enables it to quickly identify potential mainstreaming activities in the other flyway countries. Strengthening the RFF as a key player in the region ensures sustainability of the actions and robust monitoring to support better planning and decision making in the flyway region. The establishment of the RFF, serving as the leading regional institution, ensures capacity-building in the region and sustainability and provides expertise and technical know-how. It also contributes to mainstreaming MSB risks in the flyway countries through collaboration with BirdLife local partners.

One of the highlights of regional cooperation is the regional hunting workshop, the first attempt for regional exchange of regulations and their implementation. Hunting has huge cultural and traditional roots in most of the countries in the north of the flyway, and it remains prevalent along the Rift Valley/Red Sea flyway. The extent and impact of hunting is much lower in the African states. Thus, 10 countries including Bahrain, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Syria and UAE organized a regional workshop, "A road map to tackle illegal

killing, taking and trade of birds (IKB) in the Middle East," in Jordan (October 2021). Aside from exchanges of country experiences, the workshop published a regional booklet, "How to prevent trafficking in protected bird species," and a report on "killing in the Arabian Peninsula, Iran and Iraq." The workshop included a field trip to the Fifa Nature Reserve and Feynan Eco-lodge, and a Booted Eagle was released in celebration of the World Migratory Birds Day.

The "Safe Flyways: Conference on Energy and Birds" was held in Cairo, Egypt (October 2022) with participation from HE Yasmine Fouad, Minister of Environment, Arab Republic of Egypt. The Conference aimed to ensure closer ties and mutual understanding between the energy industry and the conservation community along the African-Eurasian Flyway towards a win-win relationship between nature conservation and energy infrastructures along with the flyway. It was a great introduction for Egypt before UNFCCC COP27 in November 2022. Moreover, the event brought together the energy industry - such as national and international utility companies, industry organizations, academia, governments – in addition to the conservation community from all over the Mediterranean, North Europe, the Middle East, and East Africa.



"The Safe Flyways: Conference on Energy and Birds" on October 2022 in Cairo, Egypt with participation from HE Yasmine Fouad, Minister of Environment, Arab Republic of Egypt @BirdLife International

Common kestrel (*Falco tinnunculus*)

## References and multimedia

- Project Document (2014), Project Implementation Report 2021, Project Mid-term Review (2021). <https://www.thegef.org/projects-operations/projects/9491>
- Migratory Soaring Birds Project website, <https://migratorysoaringbirds.birdlife.org/en#gsc.tab=0>
- Soaring Birds Sensitivity Map – A planning tool for wind energy and other sectors, <https://maps.birdlife.org/MSBtool/>
- Video: Migratory Birds Are Our Guests, Database for the Bird Monitoring program in Energy Projects and others, <https://migratorysoaringbirds.birdlife.org/en/videos#gsc.tab=0>
- Guidelines of Best Practice for Bird Friendly Hotels in Egypt – Nature Conservation Egypt, [https://migratorysoaringbirds.birdlife.org/sites/default/files/guidelines\\_of\\_best\\_practices\\_for\\_bird\\_friendly\\_hotels\\_in\\_egypt.pdf](https://migratorysoaringbirds.birdlife.org/sites/default/files/guidelines_of_best_practices_for_bird_friendly_hotels_in_egypt.pdf)
- Review and guidance on use of “shutdown-on-demand” for wind turbines to conserve migrating soaring birds in the Rift Valley/Red Sea Flyway, [https://migratorysoaringbirds.birdlife.org/sites/default/files/msb\\_guidance\\_shutdown\\_on\\_demand.pdf](https://migratorysoaringbirds.birdlife.org/sites/default/files/msb_guidance_shutdown_on_demand.pdf)
- Guidance on appropriate means of impact assessment of electricity power grids on migratory soaring birds in the Rift Valley / Red Sea Flyway, [https://migratorysoaringbirds.birdlife.org/sites/default/files/msb\\_guidance\\_impact\\_assessment\\_of\\_power\\_grids.pdf](https://migratorysoaringbirds.birdlife.org/sites/default/files/msb_guidance_impact_assessment_of_power_grids.pdf)
- Birdwatching in Jordan – Where birds from three continents converge, [https://migratorysoaringbirds.birdlife.org/sites/default/files/jordan\\_birding\\_brochure.pdf](https://migratorysoaringbirds.birdlife.org/sites/default/files/jordan_birding_brochure.pdf)

## Contact

- Ulrich Apel, [uapel@thegef.org](mailto:uapel@thegef.org), Senior Environmental Specialist, Regional Coordinator, and Coordinator of Land Degradation Focal Area, GEF
- Ikuko Matsumoto, [imatsumoto@thegef.org](mailto:imatsumoto@thegef.org), Knowledge and Policy Officer, GEF
- Walid Ali, [walid.ali@undp.org](mailto:walid.ali@undp.org), UNDP-NCE Technical Adviser
- Osama Al Nouri, [osama.alnouri@birdlife.org](mailto:osama.alnouri@birdlife.org), Project Manager, Middle East Partnership Secretariat, BirdLife International
- Assad Serhal, [aserhal2013@gmail.com](mailto:aserhal2013@gmail.com), General Director, Society for the Protection of Nature in Lebanon (SPNL), Lebanon
- Mohamed Mostafa El-Khayat, [chairperson@nrea.gov.eg](mailto:chairperson@nrea.gov.eg), Executive Chairman, New and Renewable Energy Authority (NREA), Egypt
- Belal Qtishat, [bqtishat@yahoo.com](mailto:bqtishat@yahoo.com), Director of Nature protection Directorate, Ministry of Environment, Jordan

*The GEF Good Practice Briefs showcase examples of GEF investments that align with GEF strategies and GEF programming directions and policy recommendations. The GEF Secretariat selected featured projects from a pool of nominations by GEF agencies, taking into consideration approaches used to generate multiple global environmental benefits and co-benefits, and to achieve clear results and/or sustainability. Because the Good Practice Briefs include projects implemented under different contexts, the practices highlighted should not necessarily be considered universally applicable.*




Lake Abhe Bad volcanic Landscape with Flamingos and rock formations, Djibouti, East Africa, Horn of Africa

The Global Environment Facility is the world's largest funder of biodiversity protection, nature restoration, pollution reduction, and climate change response in developing countries. Through its network of 184 member governments, it works with civil society, Indigenous Peoples, the private sector, and other environmental financiers towards achievement of international environmental conventions and country-driven initiatives. Over the past three decades, the GEF has provided more than \$22 billion in grants and blended finance and mobilized another \$120 billion in co-financing for more than 5,000 national and regional projects, plus 27,000 community-led initiatives through its Small Grants Programme.



# Innovative Governance for Participatory Design of a Green City

Land-use Planning, Sustainable Mobility, Solid Waste Management, and Urban Biodiversity Conservation in Paraguay

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPACT AREAS	EXECUTING AGENCIES
<b>Asuncion Green City of the Americas – Pathways to Sustainability</b>	 Paraguay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poverty Reduction</li> <li>Socio-economic benefits</li> <li>Health</li> <li>Education</li> <li>Inclusion</li> </ul>	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MADES)
GEF PROJECT ID: <b>9127</b>	<b>FOCAL AREAS</b>		<b>IMPLEMENTING AGENCY</b>
PROJECT TYPE: <b>FSP</b> IAP: <b>SUSTAINABLE CITIES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> <li>Climate Change Mitigation</li> <li>Chemicals and Waste,</li> <li>Climate Change Adaptation</li> </ul>		United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
GEF PERIOD: <b>GEF-6</b>		GEF Project Grant <b>\$ 7,493,120</b>	Co-financing Total <b>\$240,340,000</b>

## Summary

"Asuncion Green City of the Americas – Pathways to Sustainability" is one of the GEF investments aiming to support Asuncion's ambition to become a green and sustainable city. Through an integrated approach, which seeks to advance integrated land use planning of the Metropolitan Area of Asuncion (AMA), reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from transportation and waste, reduce unintentionally produced persistent organic pollutants, and improve protected area management in the AMA. Since the AMA population has dramatically increased in the last couple of decades, unstructured growth has created a series of challenges, such as lack of adequate and integrated urban planning, sustainable transportation, solid waste management, and

management of green areas. The project has strengthened inter-governmental coordination and a roadmap of integrated sustainable and resilient urban planning. It has also adopted a people-centric approach demonstrated through a participatory design of a 600km bicycle lane network and community-led restoration of an ecological reserve in the AMA. Furthermore, it developed National Plans for the Integrated Management of Solid Waste and Hazardous Waste Management, and validated a proposed plan to recognize and consolidate a green corridor with relevant stakeholders.

This brief introduces key success factors for the project and lessons learned. Adaptive management



Cycling for climate @ MADES-UNDP-GEF - Bruno Ferreira

was necessary to absorb changes and institutional capacity building was critical. In addition, a key to successful implementation was an innovative governance system for relevant stakeholder engagement to improve lack of coordination among different national and local government institutions. The project also promoted joint initiatives between government and the private sector to advance good practices in waste segregation and promote a circular economy together with local vulnerable communities. Development of different kind of knowledge products and training to provide technical guidance was another success factor to ensure and scale up the activities.

## Results, Global Environmental Benefits and Other Benefits

The project's key results to date are the following.

- Governance mechanism.** Inter-governmental coordination has been strengthened through the project's Working Groups on Land use planning and Municipal financing that integrated by relevant national and local government institutions, which led to the creation of an Association of Municipalities of the AMA to consolidate integrated sustainable and resilient urban planning and budget.

- DRR Plan and Strategy.** A roadmap of integrated sustainable and resilient urban planning of the AMA for 11 cities applying the Sendai framework has been developed. The roadmap has led to comprehensive disaster risk reduction (DRR) plans and strategies in ten cities, risk scenarios in 11 AMA municipalities, and Asuncion's flood response plan. Asuncion is currently building their DRR.
- Bicycle Lane Network.** Participatory design of a bicycle lane network in the AMA has been developed through a working group for sustainable transport and mobility. It includes a complete design of 600 km of connected bicycle lanes, detailed design of 61km of bicycle lanes connecting four cities and main historic attractions and green areas, and a guideline for design of bike lane in the AMA.
- Chemicals and Waste Management System.** National Plans for the Integrated Management of Solid Waste and Hazardous Waste Management, as well as technical guidance and training for municipalities were developed by the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MADES). A waste segregation campaign with the private sector contributed to provision of safer and cleaner materials for recycling.
- Green Corridor.** 13,000 ha of green corridor in the AMA were mapped out and the proposed green space conservation plan was validated with relevant stakeholders.



- **Restoration of Ecological Reserve.** The project restored the Banco San Miguel ecological reserve in collaboration with local communities. For example, the brigade cleaned 7.3 ha of area, removed 98,480 kg of waste from informal dumpsites. A small dam had been built to restore a shallow beach ecosystem, key for migratory birds. Around a hundred members of the local community benefited through recycling, segregating waste and composting workshops; three local schools with 200+ students benefited from workshops on recycling, health, and segregating waste; and 19 ha of exotic invasive species were removed from the ecological reserve.
- **Biodiversity Monitoring.** Biodiversity monitoring and assessment of five globally significant migratory bird species in Asunción Bay has started in the ecological reserve in the AMA, and all species increased their numbers or achieved the mid-term target.<sup>1</sup>

### Environmental Challenge

As in many other developing countries, the urban population in Paraguay has dramatically increased. Unstructured growth has created a series of challenges, such as the need for integrated urban planning, sustainable transportation, solid waste management, and management of green areas. Although covering less than 0.2 percent of the country's surface area, the AMA generates almost 47.9 percent of Paraguay's gross national product. Thus, Asunción and the ten municipalities of the AMA play a key role in the sustainable development of the country. It is critical to have integrated sustainable and resilient urban planning across the 11 municipalities.

The challenges in the AMA are interlinked. They originate in the little or lack of adequate and integrated urban planning to face the accelerated expansion due to weak institutional capacities, little or lack of medium- and long-term planning and of inter-institutional coordination. One of the main problems in the AMA is its urban transport network. The rapid, unplanned urban expansion in the AMA has resulted in an unsustainable transportation system that accounts for around 40 percent of total greenhouse gas emissions in the transport sector. The other issue is solid waste management. The amount of municipal solid waste produced by the AMA reaches about 1,440 tons per day. However, waste collection services cover only 68 percent of the population with the rest disposed of at 20 illegal dumpsites. Management of green areas is another issue.

Asunción has an extraordinary endowment of natural resources in part because of its location on the shores of the Paraguay River and its position at the confluence of four distinct ecoregions. However, habitat conversion and degradation are eroding the global value of this biodiversity endowment, and reducing the viability of species. This habitat conversion is largely due to expansion of services of all kind, including transport system to accommodate the daily influx of people from surrounding cities and settlements, and the increased production of solid and liquid waste.

### Integrated Approach and Key Features

#### Innovative Governance to Facilitate Multi-stakeholder Dialogues

Little or lack of coordination among different national and local government institutions was one of the key challenges in developing integrated sustainable and resilient urban planning in the AMA. Thus, the project established innovative governance for relevant stakeholder engagement. The governance mechanism works effectively as a key decision-making body. The Project Board, for example, meets annually to approve project activities and annual budget, and review project implementation. The Board consists of representatives from all relevant government institutions namely 1) Minister of MADES, 2) Minister of Ministry of Urbanism, Housing and Habitat (MUVH), 3) Minister of Ministry of Public Works and Communications (MOPC), 4) Minister of Secretariat of Technical Planning (STP), 5) Minister of the National Emergency Secretariat (SEN), 6) Mayor of Asunción, 7) Representative of Asunción Municipal Development Council and Platform of AMA Municipal Development Councils, 8) Inter-American Development Bank Resident Representative, and 9) UNDP Resident Representative. The Project Board was particularly effective in prioritizing and building consensus about cross cutting urban planning among different national government institutions, 11 municipalities in the AMA and key donors of projects.

The other key governance mechanisms are a technical committee and eight thematic working groups.<sup>2</sup> These served as more practical and open dialogues and a coordination platform that aims to build trust among different stakeholders. This more frequent inter-



Ecological reserve cleaning brigade @ MADES-UNDP-GEF - Santiago Davalos

institutional dialogue helps coordination and build trust among the working group members, leading to successful implementation of the project together with the technical committee. The committee provides technical support in four areas: land-use planning, transportation, waste management and urban green areas. The working groups consists of representatives of the partner institutions, academia, the private sector, NGOs, public institutions, and consultants, and serves as a great platform for active engagement of diverse stakeholders. Each working group consists of over 12 different institutions around 20 people per group, and meets every one to two months to discuss action plans for each topic. These working groups are particularly helpful for 11 municipalities in the AMA to exchange information, learn from each other and build consensus towards integrated urban planning.

#### Collaboration with the Private Sector and Local Communities

Joint initiatives between the Municipality of Asunción and MADES and private sector entities such as Coca Cola Paraguay and other local enterprises supported advancing good practices in waste segregation and

promoted a circular economy together with local vulnerable communities. The joint initiatives achieved objectives through discussion and finding the mutual interest of stakeholders in the solid waste management working group. First, the Asunción Green City project with MADES led to develop the mapping of the urban solid waste value chain in the AMA, which provided information on recycling companies, intermediaries, public institutions, waste pickers, and their relationships. This mapping exercise led by governments identified all members of the value chain and included them in discussions about the separation pilot. In the AMA, there is no large-scale waste recycling or recovery initiatives, and only a few small and medium size enterprises exist. Therefore, the informal sector mostly makes a living from waste picking, and an estimated 3,500 people in Asunción make a living out of waste separation. Thus, it was critical to include them in the discussion of solid waste management.

Based on the working group discussion and in a joint initiative with the private sector, a waste segregation campaign, "Asunción Recycles," was launched. The campaign engaged 17 neighborhoods providing great awareness raising and training opportunities.

<sup>1</sup> Since the start of monitoring in 2018 until December 2020, the following bird species have been registered: Pectoral Sandpiper (*Calidris melanotos*) (3120 individuals), White-rumped Sandpiper (*Calidris fuscicollis*) (754 individuals), American Golden Plover (*Pluvialis dominica*) (509 individuals), Lesser Yellow legs (*Tringa flavipes*) (614 individuals), and Buff-breasted Sandpiper (*Calidris subruficollis*) (138 individuals).

<sup>2</sup> The eight working groups are on 1) land-use planning, 2) municipal financing, 3) institutional capacities, 4) disaster risk management, 5) platform on sustainable cities indicators, 6) sustainable transport and mobility, 7) chemical substances and solid waste management, and 8) urban green and protected areas.





The campaign successfully recovered 37,225 kg of recyclable waste (plastics, cardboard, paper, and aluminum). It reached 2,521 residents, and trained more than 20 recyclers/waste pickers through the campaign. After that, the "My Neighborhood Without Waste", a joint campaign between the project and Coca Cola, was launched to implement a Separation Pilot in five neighborhoods of Asunción and to connect recyclers (an Association of Waste Pickers of the San Francisco Neighborhood) with the five pilot neighborhoods. Collaborating with other circular economy projects initiated by the private sector and other stakeholders, this campaign also supported provision of safer and cleaner materials for recycling. Furthermore, to promote larger scale recycling in the AMA, the Business Plan for the Separation Pilot Plant was completed. It will segregate for recycling materials such as paper, cardboard, metals, plastics, and tetra brick.

#### Multiple Knowledge Products and Training for Scaling up Impact

To ensure and scale up activities beyond the 11 municipalities in the AMA to include other cities in Paraguay, the project developed different knowledge products and organized training and workshops to provide technical guidance. For example, the National Plan for the Integrated Management of Solid Waste and the National Plan for Hazardous Waste Management included guidelines for municipalities to develop their own plan to integrate solid waste management. Furthermore, the project developed technical and

operational guidance and training for solid and hazardous waste management. In addition, it carried out training sessions for solid and hazardous waste management beyond the 11 municipalities in the AMA, extending invitation for training session to 17 other municipalities.

To incorporate green infrastructure concepts into city planning and develop a proposed green corridor in the AMA, the project developed a Green Infrastructure Manual, and MUVH organized related training. The manual includes guidelines to promote urban green corridors and conserve green spaces. Through bimonthly meetings of the working group for urban green and protected areas and support from technical officers, directors of local governments reinforced commitment and follow-up actions to establish the AMA green corridor. To ensure institutional capacity, training for urban forest nurseries management was carried out; the manual for the creation and management of urban forest nurseries was provided to municipal technical officers and directors. This was because urban trees are keys to connect green areas within the AMA and to enhance biodiversity within and around the urban areas. To further promote biodiversity conservation in the AMA, native tree seeds were collected and incorporated into municipal forest nurseries as well. Furthermore, the project has developed a good practice manual to provide guidelines and criteria for the 600 km bicycle network, which is linked to the corridor in the AMA and has trained municipal officers in the use of technological tools for land-use planning and DRR management.



Capacity building - Urban forest nurseries workshop @MADES-PNUD - Irene Gauto



Recording green areas TV show - Photo credit Paraguay TV



Metropolitan land-use strategy building process - Launch event - Photo credit MADES-UNDP-GEF - Eliana Tolces



## Lessons learned

### Communication and Coordination for Adaptive Management

For this project, the working group was an effective platform for communication among relevant stakeholders. In addition, the Project Coordination Unit's role in coordination and facilitation of consensus building among different stakeholders was critical for flexible adaptation. Since sustainable urban planning involves many different national and local government institutions, it was indispensable to frequently share and discuss updates of project activities among all institutions involved. These frequent communications through the working groups enabled different institutions to build trust with each other, and exchange successes and challenges. At the same time, it was vital to take time in the beginning to ensure all relevant stakeholders were involved in the process, and that they felt comfortable to participate and speak up. Facilitation of discussion towards consensus building was also important among different stakeholders.

Frequent communication and coordination among key stakeholders were also critical for adaptive management. The project has faced many small and big changes almost every day and needed to adapt to all these changes (involving government, government staff, priority of action plans, NGO staff, and even government priorities (e.g. cancellation of the Metrobus Project)). The Covid 19 pandemic required changes in work schedules and implementation. These changes affected campaign activities, workshops, seminars, training, consultations (e.g. delay of activities, holding several small group meetings instead of one big meeting, and meeting online if possible) to accommodate recovery from the pandemic in the country. Frequent communication and strong coordination were vital to accommodate these changes and agree upon alternative plans of action in the working groups.

### Institutional Capacity and Technical Capabilities for Sustainability

Stronger institutional and technical capacity to carry out activities and maintain initiatives are vital for appropriate implementation and sustainability. This is a fundamental requirement to develop implementing programs properly so they have a lasting impact. For this project, almost every activity includes an adequate preparation

and training for technical professionals. Apart from a training course, it produced many valuable tools for municipal governments such as the Green infrastructure Manual, Manual for Urban Nurseries, Guide to elaborate local DRR Plans, Guide for the elaboration of Local Municipal Solid Waste Management Plans – Small and Medium Cities and Large Cities, Guide for Best Practices and Best Technology available for Hazardous Waste.

The project also organized a series of capacity building and awareness raising activities for local communities. For example, the Association of Waste Pickers of the San Francisco Neighborhood took part in capacity building sessions on how to formalize the association, keep track of documents, develop internal procedures, and manage social media. These sessions helped them become more coordinated as a group. The project has also worked with leaders of community organizations to organize workshops and trainings on tire recycling, composting, and organic gardens. It also launched a photo contest for young people to identify the natural resources of their community and the problem of waste in the area. In addition, it produced awareness raising materials including i) videos on the impacts of waste on the environment, composting and the 3Rs in solid waste management and informative brochures for students; and ii) composting workshops for women who are waste pickers and leaders of their communities. As a result, the income of waste pickers increased by 48 percent as of June 2021.

### References and multimedia

- Mid-term Review (2020). <https://www.thegef.org/project/cities-iap-asuncion-green-city-americas-pathways-sustainability>
- Project Implementation Report 2021. <https://www.thegef.org/project/cities-iap-asuncion-green-city-americas-pathways-sustainability> Project Document. <https://www.thegef.org/project/cities-iap-asuncion-green-city-americas-pathways-sustainability>
- Project website. <https://www.py.undp.org/content/paraguay/es/home/projects/proyecto--asuncion--ciudad-verde-de-las-americas--vias-a-la-sust.html>
- Best practices and lessons learned: Integrated planning of Asuncion's Metropolitan Area (April 2020) <https://www.thegpsc.org/knowledge-products/integrated-urban-planning/best-practices-and-lessons-learned-integrated-planning>



Sustainable bus stops opening - Photo credit to MADES-UNDP-GEF - Eliana Tolces

### Contact

- Aloke Barnwal, Senior Climate Change Specialist, Sustainable Cities Program Coordinator, GEF, [abarnwal@thegef.org](mailto:abarnwal@thegef.org)
- Mia Callenberg, Junior Professional Officer, GEF, [mcallenberg@thegef.org](mailto:mcallenberg@thegef.org)
- Ludmilla Diniz, Technical Adviser, UNDP, [ludmilla.diniz@undp.org](mailto:ludmilla.diniz@undp.org)
- Veronique Gerard, Programme Officer, UNDP, [veronique.gerard@undp.org](mailto:veronique.gerard@undp.org)
- Alejandra Kemper, Project Coordinator, UNDP, [alejandra.kemper@undp.org](mailto:alejandra.kemper@undp.org)

Available at:  
<http://www.thegef.org/topics/knowledge-learning>

*The GEF Good Practice Briefs showcase examples of GEF investments that align with GEF strategies and GEF-7 programming directions and policy recommendations. The GEF Secretariat selected featured projects from a pool of nominations by GEF agencies, taking into consideration approaches used to generate multiple global environmental benefits and co-benefits, and to achieve clear results and/or sustainability. Because the Good Practice Briefs include projects that are implemented under different contexts, the practices highlighted should not necessarily be considered universally applicable.*



NOV 2021

[www.thegef.org](http://www.thegef.org)



HOME

GEF Good Practice Briefs

Innovative Governance for Participatory Design of a Green City / 4


PREVIOUS





# Renewable Energy Technology for Smallholder Farmers

Collaboration with Local Companies for Adaptive Agriculture in Cambodia

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	EXECUTING AGENCIES	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY
Building Adaptive Capacity through the Scaling-up of Renewable Energy Technologies in Rural Cambodia (S-RET)	Cambodia 	Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), Cambodia	International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
GEF PROJECT ID: <b>9103</b>		<b>FOCAL AREAS</b>	<b>IMPACT AREAS</b>
PROJECT TYPE: <b>FSP, SCCF</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate Change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate Change Mitigation</li> <li>Climate Change Adaptation</li> <li>Poverty Reduction</li> <li>Women's Empowerment</li> </ul>
GEF PERIOD: <b>GEF-6</b>		GEF Project Financing <b>\$ 4,600,000</b>	Co-financing Total <b>\$ 21,092,000</b>

## Summary

Climate change projections show Cambodia becoming hotter with increased rainfall in the wet season and reduced rainfall in the dry season. These changes will make it difficult for farmers, who have already reported that the climate has become less predictable, to select the optimal time to plant rice and other crops. The Scaling-up of Renewable Energy Technologies (S-RET) project targeted 8,000 smallholder farmers in five provinces comprising 980 villages, particularly women and poor households in remote areas, who lack access to modern, affordable, and reliable energy sources. Building on strong collaboration with and learning from existing projects, engaging small and medium sized enterprises through a Call for Proposal, and active women's participation

with innovative ideas from private sector, the project succeeded in introducing appropriate and affordable RET for smallholder agriculture in rural areas of Cambodia.

As a result, the project contributed to reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) and improved climate resilience for the rural communities by investing in economically viable RET for agriculture production, processing, and post-harvest activities. Key lessons learned from this project are transparent grant mechanism for small and medium sized enterprises, scaling up and strengthening sustainability of RET by private sector initiatives, and knowledge sharing for awareness raising of RET.



Figure 1. Ms. Khat Sa Em uses a portable solar pump to grow vegetables in Ponleu village, Takeo province. @IFAD

## Results, Global Environmental Benefits and Adaptation Benefits

The project has achieved the following global environmental benefits as well as direct adaptation benefits for local communities as of June 2020:

- 5,233 direct and indirect small farmer beneficiaries (34 percent female)<sup>1</sup> adopted sustainable and environmentally friendly RETs at farm level for agricultural production, processing, and post-harvest activities such as irrigation, drying, cooling, and storage (65 percent of target goal).
- The project has installed 1,192 RETs (non-biodigesters) to date, of which 309 units (20 percent of total) are owned by female-headed households.
- The project was able to identify various appropriate and affordable RET options for smallholder farmers, including solar dryers for processing food, portable solar water pumps to irrigate crops, biochar briquettes for heating chicks, solar poultry incubators, solar cricket incubators, and others.
- The National Biodigester Programme (NBP) has installed 1,961 biodigester plants,<sup>2</sup> of which female-headed households own 882 plants (45 percent). Biodigester plants directly benefited women who are responsible for collecting firewood and cooking (65 percent of target goal).
- Biodigester plants reduced 15,120 tons of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and saved 9,594 tons of fuelwood<sup>3</sup> from 2018 to 2020.

1 Indirect beneficiaries include farmers along the value chain that benefit indirectly i.e. by renting RET (e.g. portable solar pump) or buying outputs from a direct beneficiaries' use of RET (e.g. farmers buying chicks and selling them after fattening through the GIC solar incubator).  
2 NBP installed 265 biodigesters in 2017, 646 in 2018, 749 in 2019 and 301 in 2020. NBP also initiated and tested biogas to run irrigation pumps, rice milling machines and heaters for warming chicks. These pilots aim to expand the scope of NBP to support medium and large-scale biodigesters for commercial applications i.e. slaughterhouses and lagoons.  
3 These net environmental benefits are calculated with the methodology subscribed under the Gold Standard based on the assumption that a biodigester has reduction in workload of 2.5 hours per day, and reduction of 4-6 kg of firewood per day or 50 liters of kerosene saved over a duration of 10 years. Emission factor of 71.9 tCO<sub>2</sub>/TJ for kerosene was applied.



- Every kilogram of the Sustainable Green Fuel Enterprise (SGFE)'s Biochar briquettes<sup>4</sup> saves 6.5 kilogram of wood that is not cut from Cambodian natural forests. To date, the company has saved a forest area in Cambodia equivalent to 165 football fields, thus reducing (absorbing) about 28,000 tons of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

### Environmental Challenge

Cambodia is a least-developed country and highly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. Around 80 percent of the population live in rural areas and are dependent on agriculture for their livelihoods. Climate change projections show that Cambodia is becoming hotter, with increased rainfall in the wet season and reduced rainfall in the dry season. These changes will make it difficult for farmers, who have already reported that the climate has become less predictable, to select the optimal time to plant rice and other crops.

Cambodia's GHG emissions are low but rising and the agriculture sector is estimated to produce 80 percent of national carbon-dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e). The contribution of domestic livestock to the total emissions was 48 percent followed by rice cultivation and agricultural soils—hence the rationale for increasing the adoption of biogas digesters.<sup>5</sup> There is high potential for introduction of appropriate and cost-effective renewable energy technologies (RETs) for smallholder agriculture. However, actual adoption rates are low, with only biogas digesters and solar home lighting systems in rural Cambodia due to limited knowledge of RET; limited range of proven technologies; underdeveloped marketing, financing, installation, and after-sale services for RET; high costs relative to the resources of smallholders; and an inadequate policy environment.

### Integrated Approach and Key Features

While promoting RETs for smallholder agriculture to reduce GHG emission and adapt climate change, delivery of RETs also helped to address cross-cutting themes including private sector engagement, youth

capacity building, technologies and knowledge transfer, and women's empowerment, which were objectives under the new National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP) 2019-2023.

#### Strong synergy among other projects to maximize benefits

The project has been built upon key achievements and strong collaboration with the other successful renewable energy and agricultural development projects in Cambodia, namely the National Biogas Programme (NBP), Project for Agriculture Development and Economic Empowerment (PADEE), and Agriculture Services Programme for Innovation, Resilience, and Extension (ASPIRE), both implemented by IFAD. Building on 984 Improved Group Revolving Fund (IGRF) groups established from PADEE, the project provided a subsidy (max \$150) to IGRF members when RET is purchased and add \$50 to the IGRF revolving fund for each RET installation. IGRF groups have established capacity and provided their members with access to credit which can be applied to financing RET installations. Model farmers are supported to facilitate peer-to-peer learning and this has improved beneficiary's participation and interest in RET. At least half of the IGRF members are female household representatives and through the testing of technologies, women are empowered to take up alternative livelihoods and trainings.

Collaborating with the National Biogas Programme (NBP), the S-RET project was able to scale up PADEE's tested pro-poor biogas digesters as well, which are smaller and cheaper than the standard biogas digester models, thus suitable for farmers with few livestock. With the S-RET project, existing social capital and empowerment of local communities have been further strengthening by providing RET solutions that help them improve agricultural productivity and reduce energy costs. After the end of PADEE in 2018, the project has now migrated under ASPIRE and has a scope for nation-wide outreach and application.

#### Active private sector engagement through a Call for Proposal

The entire project relies on the effectiveness of partnering with private sector renewable energy companies to deliver RETs in target areas. Results have been generated in terms of leveraging partnerships with the private sector. To get innovative and affordable RET for smallholder agriculture, the project instituted a Call for Proposal to private companies which awards testing grants (maximum \$80,000) to support testing RET under smallholder farm conditions (i.e. testing carried out on-farm, not at a research facility) and roll-out grants (maximum \$160,000) to establish supply chains and after-sales service networks allowing grantees to scale-up their production and reduce high transaction costs in rural areas.

Out of 30 proposals, the project signed 12 agreements with local private companies (one international) for implementation of RETs to validate the technical, economic, and sociocultural acceptability of RET. As a result, the project was able to identify various appropriate and affordable RET options for smallholder farmers including solar dryers for processing food,<sup>6</sup> portable solar water pumps to irrigate crops,<sup>7</sup> making and using biochar briquettes to heat newly hatched chicks,<sup>8</sup> solar poultry incubator to heat eggs, solar cricket incubators, solar hydroponics for growing vegetable with less water,<sup>9</sup> and solar animal feed processing machines in addition to biogas digesters. After an independent expert conducted an in-depth evaluation of the testing phase, seven grantees with active roll-out grants are currently ongoing to scale-up their RET.



Figure 2 A portable solar pump to grow vegetables @IFAD

<sup>6</sup> Traditional methods of sun drying expose fish and meat to flies, dust, and other contaminants. Thus, the product is perceived to be higher in value due to quality of drying process. More hygienic drying method allows drying during the rainy season as well.

<sup>7</sup> Switching from diesel to solar water pumps can save up to \$2,110 per year. The pump costs \$600 with a 200W panel and a flow rate capacity of 2.4m<sup>3</sup>/hour.

<sup>8</sup> Biochar Briquettes made from coconut husks are a clean alternative to firewood for cooking. The residue can also be used to improve soil fertility.

<sup>9</sup> Hydroponic systems can reduce water use by 82%. Around 400 plants can fit on a bed surface of 13.5m<sup>2</sup>. Each bed contains 1,755L of water which is changed every three cycles.

<sup>4</sup> Biochar Briquettes made from coconut husks are a clean alternative to firewood for cooking. The residue can also be used to improve soil fertility.

<sup>5</sup> Agricultural emissions are largely in the form of CH<sub>4</sub> (methane) and N<sub>2</sub>O (nitrous oxide) which have much higher greenhouse effects than CO<sub>2</sub>.



### Active women's participation with innovative ideas from private sector

Innovative ideas from the private sector also made the active participation of women in the project possible. Most women in rural areas had no financial record of borrowing, but testing grantees had extended flexibility to pilot innovative financial schemes. For example, one of the testing grantees, EcoSun, sells portable solar water pumps and has ventured into "Pay As You Go" rental/lease models, for a portable solar pump purchased as a group investment. According to the data from EcoSun's field testing of portable solar pumps, annual operational cost for solar pumping is \$50, including maintenance. This is much lower compared to the annual operational cost of diesel pumps, which is \$493 for fuel, oil, and maintenance. On average, farmers can save between 2-3 litres of gasoline per day (\$1.50 – \$2.30). The initial capital cost to install solar pumps remains higher compared to diesel pumps (for the same pumping capacity, solar pumps cost \$600 versus \$160), but with saving from gasoline, it is possible to pay back the initial investment. Portable solar water pumps are easy to use and suitable for vegetable producers, especially for women who are growing off-season high-value crops (fruits and vegetables). EcoSun had installed 192 units, of which 59 owned by women headed households (31 percent).

Solar egg incubators became another popular RET for women, because a company made a solar egg incubator package and provided training on how to operate the incubators. The package includes a cage, chicken house, healthy breeds, feed, and the solar incubator system for 300 or 500-egg production capacity. Training on chicken hatching, raising, vaccination, breeding, feeding, cage construction, treatment and operation, and maintenance of the RET have been provided and directly benefitted women as well. As a result, solar incubators are proving as a suitable and easy-to-use RET securing high hatching rates. Hatching rates of 95 percent are being achieved with solar incubators, compared with only 20 percent

<sup>10</sup> Access to solar energy overcomes the need for intermittent electricity access – a reason for higher chick mortality rates due to more frequent storms and rains causing higher frequency of electricity cuts in rural areas.



Figure 3: Solar powered poultry incubators with 300-500 egg-capacity @IFAD

with traditional methods.<sup>10</sup> Chick hatching for mostly women beneficiaries has currently become a main source of income for many families, providing \$350 to \$400 per month. Green Innovet Cambodia (GIC) has installed 50 solar egg incubators, of which women own 32 units (64 percent).

### Lessons Learned

#### Transparent grant mechanism in order to reap more benefits

In order to ensure active engagement of the private sector, it was critical to get agreement on a transparent grant mechanism. While it took time to develop and agree on a transparent grant mechanism for RET through the Call for Proposal, providing more appropriate and affordable RET for smallholder farmers in Cambodia became possible only with active engagement of the private sector and integration of their innovative ideas in the project. For example, one



Figure 4: More hygienic drying method which allows drying during the rainy season @IFAD

of the grantees, Kosol/LES, which sells solar dryers for fish and meat, has set-up innovative finance schemes where 30 percent of the total RET cost (\$950) is paid up front; the remaining 70 percent is paid in the form of dried beef/fish directly to the company (approximately 6kg per day and making a profit of \$20/day<sup>11</sup>). Kosol/LES has set up e-commerce/mobile platforms and is working with retailers.

This business model is promising as it allows farmers to break even within six months from investment and increase production capacity with secure marketing and sales networks. With this model, the company could reduce risks of default payment as well. To date, there are 107 units of solar dryers installed in six provinces, of which 50 are female owned (47 percent). With the testing and roll-out grant, the cumulative amount of disbursement to grantees to date is \$2,568,501: \$1,779,980 in project grants and \$788,521 from private companies. This grant mechanism also encouraged an investment from private companies to RET.

#### Private sector can initiate scaling up and strengthening sustainability of RET

The private sector played a vital role for scaling up and strengthening sustainability of RET. The private

<sup>11</sup> Dried beef sells at \$25/30 per kg.

<sup>12</sup> The 3-day Training of Trainers (ToT) were conducted by RUA team in each PADEE province. All CEWs were invited to participate, as trainees intend to become lead trainers for IGRF members, as well as, other farmers in their communities. Using the knowledge and understanding together with training materials getting from TOT, CEWs organized RET awareness campaigns in their respective IGRFs and other outstanding farmers within their communities.

sector itself could initiate scaling up their RET business outside of the original project areas, and strengthen the sustainability of their RET business through ensuring their maintenance system. The project originally targeted five provinces. However, the companies are reaching out to other provinces to seek further business opportunities. The anticipated integration of S-RET into a nation-wide ASPIRE further enhanced the potential for scaling up and allowed the private sector to establish supply chains throughout Cambodia. IMB Cambodia and NBP are already scaling up their activities to provinces in ASPIRE.

In order to strengthen sustainability of RET, IMB Cambodia who scale-up solar has established and trained six existing suppliers to develop commercial supply chains for RETs to assure that the RETs installation are well maintained, including after-sale services and availability of spare parts at the local suppliers. These six suppliers installed 316 solar pumps, 62 of them (20 percent) with female headed households as a part of roll-out grant. Entrepreneurs Du Monde (EDM) scaled up solar micro-grids, which allowed for remote troubleshooting and monitoring, thus addressing the challenge of poor after-sales services at the village level. EDM is the second roll-out grantee to scale-up a solar Okra network and agricultural equipment for income generation activities such as solar cricket incubators, cooling system for crops and vegetable storage. Okra is an award-winning Australian company, which pioneered the smart solar-power micro grids technology. EDM installed 75 solar poultry incubators in the project areas so far.

#### Knowledge products and their dissemination were crucial to improve awareness of RET

Various knowledge products and training were vital to improve awareness of local and national governments and local communities. Collaborating with the Royal University of Agriculture, the project produced various knowledge products to share RET information including project briefs, training curriculum for PADEE Commune Extension Workers (CEWs),<sup>12</sup> newsletters, brochures, calendars, posters,



Figure 5: More hygienic drying method which allows drying during the rainy season @IFAD

and simple handouts with basic information on RETs. The project also developed two short videos and a case study of the use of solar energy for chicken hatching and breeding. In addition, each grantee has produced a short video which is launched through social networks such as Facebook and YouTube. In collaboration with grantees, the project also produced seven technical booklets of RET in Khmer.<sup>13</sup> These booklets are used during training and promotional events, and have been disseminated to all Provincial Departments of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries (PDAFFs), ASPIRE programme support unit, CEWs, and other stakeholders.

These products carried an important message to share knowledge on RET options to strengthen interest of national and provincial level staff, S-RET team, and CEWs working closely with smallholder farmers. The project's public extension system, namely

CEWs and PDAFFs, played a particularly active role in strengthening knowledge dissemination from national to provincial and village levels. As a result, beneficiary farmers have gradually increased their knowledge on RET including aspects on life-cycle costs compared to conventional energy sources (diesel versus solar pumps), and health benefits (i.e. smoke from combustion of firewood/charcoal). At the same time, improved policy dialogue with the Ministry of Mines and Energy (MME) is also necessary to address critical aspects such as Value-added Tax reduction on solar equipment, feed-in tariffs, and net-metering policies. However, MME has a big expectation for large-scale hydro power projects in the Mekong region; thus, gaining more interest in small-scale renewable energy from MME is still a challenge and it takes longer to convince them about benefits of renewable energy.

<sup>13</sup> These are about solar hydroponic systems, biochar briquette for heating chicks, solar animal feed processing machine, solar egg incubator, solar water pumps, solar dryers and solar hot water dip. The project is in the process of translating the technical booklets into English.



Figure 6: Women farmers are using solar dryers for fish and meat drying @IFAD

### References and multimedia

- **Mid Term Review**, <https://www.thegef.org/project/mainstreaming-ecosystem-based-approaches-climate-resilient-rural-livelihoods-vulnerable>
- **Project Design Report Document**, [https://publicpartnershipdata.azureedge.net/gef/PMISGEFDocuments/Climate%20Change/Cambodia%20-%20\(9103\)%20-%20Building%20Adaptive%20Capacity%20through%20the%20Scaling-up/Final\\_PDR\\_20March2016\\_Clean.pdf](https://publicpartnershipdata.azureedge.net/gef/PMISGEFDocuments/Climate%20Change/Cambodia%20-%20(9103)%20-%20Building%20Adaptive%20Capacity%20through%20the%20Scaling-up/Final_PDR_20March2016_Clean.pdf)
- **S-RET Annual report 2020 Cambodia** (photo book), <https://www.dropbox.com/sh/qezzd3nhd8wc23v/AADU0CoQumzz68n0HLNaSfMia?dl=0>
- **Video program about the S-RET project** (in Khmer with English subtitle), <http://aspirekh.org/s-ret/>

### Contact

- Chizuru Aoki, Lead Environmental Specialist, GEF, [caoki@thegef.org](mailto:caoki@thegef.org)
- Kaushik Barua, Country Director for Cambodia, IFAD, [k.barua@ifad.org](mailto:k.barua@ifad.org)

- Karan Sehgal, Lead Environment & Climate Specialist-Asia & the Pacific Region, IFAD, [k.sehgal@ifad.org](mailto:k.sehgal@ifad.org)

*The GEF Good Practice Briefs showcase examples of GEF investments that align with GEF strategies and GEF-7 programing directions and policy recommendations. The GEF Secretariat selected featured projects from a pool of nominations by GEF agencies, taking into consideration approaches used to generate multiple global environmental benefits and co-benefits, and to achieve clear results and/or sustainability. Because the Good Practice Briefs include projects that are implemented under different contexts, the practices highlighted should not necessarily be considered universally applicable.*

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) was established on the eve of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit to help tackle our planet's most pressing environmental problems. Since then, the GEF has provided more than **\$21.1 billion** in grants and mobilized an additional **\$114 billion** in co-financing for more than **5,000 projects** in **170 countries**. Through its Small Grants Programme, the GEF has provided support to more than 25,000 civil society and community initiatives in 133 countries.



# Finding Solutions for Electronic Waste with the Private Sector and Multi-Stakeholders Engagement

Developing Global Model of Circular Economy in Nigeria

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	EXECUTING AGENCIES	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY
<b>Circular Economy Approaches for the Electronics Sector in Nigeria</b>		Nigeria's National Environmental Standards and Regulations Enforcement Agency (NESREA)	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
			<b>FOCAL AREAS</b>
GEF PROJECT ID: <b>10141</b>		GEF Project Grant <b>\$ 2,000,000</b>	<b>IMPACT AREA</b>
PROJECT TYPE: <b>MSP</b>		Co-financing Total <b>\$ 13,086,582</b>	
GEF PERIOD: <b>GEF-7</b>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chemicals and Waste</li> <li>Health and safety</li> <li>Creating safe employment</li> </ul>

## Summary

According to Africa Waste Management Outlook, 125 million tons of municipal solid waste was generated in Africa in 2012, and this amount is expected to double by 2025. Electronic waste (e-waste) is a particularly important and rapidly growing waste stream due to the severe pollution it creates, notably producing mercury, persistent organic pollutants (POPs) from flame retardants, dioxins, and furans. This project connects and operationalizes pre-existing elements of a multi-stakeholder Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) system in Nigeria. EPR is an innovative policy and financial instrument that requires manufacturers, importers, and retailers of electronic products to be physically and financially responsible for the waste management of their products, but which has thus far struggled to get off the ground in developing countries. Collaborating with a private sector-led Producer Responsibility Organization (PRO) on electrical and electronic equipment (EEE) in Nigeria and local and international stakeholders, the project addresses specific gaps identified by each partner, and has developed the Guidance Document for the Implementation of the EPR Programme for the

Electrical/Electronics Sector in Nigeria (the Guidance for EPR implementation). The project is helping to design and operate a financially self-sustaining circular economy approach for electronic products in Nigeria.

E-waste collection and recycling is a key source of income for many poor families; however, the informal nature of their operations exacerbates global pollution and toxic health effects. Key lessons learned are connecting and building on existing initiatives to establish a sustainable financing mechanism and management system for e-waste under the Guidance for EPR implementation. At the same time, the project also created opportunities to collaborate with the informal sector, and scaled up efforts to build a circular economy in Nigeria and beyond by collaborating with national and international stakeholders. As a result, the project contributes to reducing global pollution from e-waste, and reducing health impacts on local people in Nigeria. For the long term, the project will contribute to increasing healthy and safer employment in Nigeria, and providing a global model for a circular economy in the electronics sector in developing countries.



Figure 1. Pickers dismantle appliances by hand at Odo-Iyalaro to extract salable components @ Irene Galan / UNEP

## Results, Global Environmental Benefits and Other Benefits

The project's key results to date are:

- The Guidance for EPR Implementation was gazetted in August 2020 as an enforcement mechanism of EPR Programme to reduce the severe pollution from e-waste producing mercury, persistent organic pollutants (POPs).
- The Extended Producer Responsibility Organization of Nigeria (EPRON)<sup>1</sup> has registered 41 electronic producers, via joint industry and NESREA notifications. A comprehensive database of producers and their products has been developed and is being piloted by EPRON, in collaboration with NESREA.
- Training 35 government agents, 23 value chain workers, and 25 informal sector workers on the new Guidance for EPR implementation and obligations by November 2020. Feedback received from informal collectors has informed the design of the collection pilot projects, including providing more visibility and security for individuals working on the street.
- Procurement initiated for e-waste collection pilots to demonstrate environmentally and socially-sound practices to collect and recycle 300 tonnes of e-waste.
- Communications strategy being rolled out to raise awareness of the new Guidance for EPR implementation, including press releases, radio jingles, and a media day for journalists. The project has also been presented at international

<sup>1</sup> Producer Responsibility Organisation (PRO) is an entity set up in collective Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) schemes to implement the EPR principle on behalf of all the participating producers. EPRON is the PRO in Nigeria.



events including the World Circular Economy Forum + Climate in April 2021, and the United Nations monthly meeting with Secretary General in April 2021.

- Synergies have been created with other projects, international initiatives, and stakeholders aiming to improving sustainability in the electronics sector.<sup>2</sup>

## Environmental Challenge

E-waste management is projected to grow massively as a sector and getting the right structures in place now will have enormous impacts into the future. Nigeria has been undergoing rapid transformation in information and communication markets of e-waste, mainly by importing new and used EEE, generating an ever-growing amount of e-waste. E-waste recyclers in Nigeria (mainly in Lagos) have reported good recovery rates for base metals such as ferrous metals, aluminum, and copper. At the same time, many waste fractions with no economic value are usually dumped or burned in an uncontrolled manner such as manual dismantling and hand soldering with lead solders by the informal sector. This has caused severe emissions of pollutants such as heavy metals and POPs, including dioxins, furans, and flame retardants (PBDEs) that often adhere to fine dust particles that are then released into the air, water, and soil systems.

At the same time, informal workers including women and youth are directly exposed to hazardous chemicals and commonly suffer respiratory and dermatological problems, eye infections, and lower-than-average life expectancy. According to the International Labour Organization (ILO), up to 100,000 people work in the informal e-waste recycling sector in Nigeria, collecting and dismantling electronics by hand to reclaim the saleable components. It is critical

to fully implement and enforce established formal waste management system with clear guidance and collaboration with producers, recyclers, and formal and informal collectors in Nigeria.

## Integrated Approach and Key Features

The primary focus of the project is to reduce the global mercury and POPs pollution created by imported and produced EEE. In the meantime, it also aims to reduce environment and public health impacts from e-waste and to increase socio-economic benefits and healthy and safer employment in Nigeria.

### Multi-stakeholder approach sharing European experience in Nigeria and beyond

With a multi-stakeholder approach, NESREA was able to develop and gazette the Guidance for EPR Implementation, one of the key outputs of the project, based on Nigeria's local context as well as international best practices and lessons brought from other existing EPR systems across the globe. Project stakeholders range from Nigerian government agencies, to United Nations agencies, the private sector, and NGOs. Under the strategic planning of Platform for Accelerating the Circular Economy (PACE),<sup>3</sup> the project in Nigeria has been designed as its first flagship project to demonstrate a circular economy approach for the electronic value chain. Due to proactive engagement with global dialogues on electronics and circular economy, NESREA and EPRON received specific support from the UNEP technical team and international stakeholders such as the WEEE Forum<sup>4</sup> during establishment of the Guidance for EPR implementation in terms of defining the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders, prioritizing e-waste categories at different stages of the EPR implementation, and setting time-bound e-waste management targets.



**Figure 2:** Informal pickers support their family by collecting and breaking down electronic waste at Odo-Iyaloro @ Irene Galan / UNEP

A multi-stakeholder approach among various Nigerian government agencies is also critical to establish comprehensive producer's data system for the EPR Programme. To enforce registration with EPRON and establish a levy system of fees for collection and recycling from EEE producers and importers, EPRON is setting up a comprehensive database of producers and their products in the Black Box software<sup>5</sup> by collaborating with NESREA. NESREA is exploring the availability of relevant data on EEE sales and market information in the organizations including the Standards Organization of Nigeria, Nigeria Customs Service, Federal Inland Revenue Service, The Central Bank of Nigeria, Federal Ministry of Industry, Trade & Investment, National Bureau of Statistics, and others. NESREA is also exploring the possibility to solicit their support in collecting data that are relevant for the implementation of the EPR Programme under the Guidance for EPR implementation.

### Strong engagement with private sector from national and international levels

Private sector engagement was vital to establish effective and sustainable EPR system in Nigeria.

The project is engaging a mix of national and international experts from the private sector, recognizing the sector's influence on the e-waste value chain. In collaboration with the E-Waste Solutions Alliance for Africa (the Alliance),<sup>6</sup> comprising Dell, HP, Microsoft Mobile, and Philips, NESREA first established the EPR programme as a provision in the national environmental regulation in 2011. The Alliance also supported creation of a blue print for implementing an effective e-waste management system in Nigeria, and this had been adopted and localized in the EPR plan that was subsequently approved by NESREA for implementation in 2017. However, the regulation did not provide enforceable requirements on each stakeholder, including government agencies, producers and Importers, recyclers, and collectors. Therefore, the Nigerian PRO had not managed to sign up member companies to pay levies to make the PRO sustainable or raise and use the levy to support three formal recycling companies.

To establish sustainable EEE PRO and enforce the EPR Programme in Nigeria, NESREA made registration with EPRON compulsory for all producers and importers in 2020 under the Guidance for EPR implementation, and EPRON would be able to collect levies and operate a producer's data system. Therefore, EPRON began registering more producers and preparing future activities to establish recycling schemes for environmentally-sound treatment of e-waste in Nigeria. At a national level, the formalized recyclers provide technical support to establish the recycling center, and the treatment of the collected e-waste in this project. At the international level, the project has received advice from international experts from the private sector, who have experience in a similar EPR and levy system in Europe.

<sup>2</sup> They include WEEE Forum, GIZ's project in Ghana, the Government of the Netherlands, Platform for Accelerating the Circular Economy (PACE) and the World Economic Forum.

<sup>3</sup> PACE is co-chaired by the World Economic Forum, Philips, UN Environment and GEF, and aims to shape global public-private leadership and accelerate action towards the circular economy.

<sup>4</sup> The WEEE Forum is the world's largest multi-national centre of competence as regards operational know-how concerning the management of waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE).

<sup>5</sup> The Black Box is a system to collect, store, manage, analyze, and produce market share information on all producers, including importers of EEE in Nigeria for the EPR Programme.

<sup>6</sup> Since 2011, the Alliance has been pro-actively working to implement a sustainable model for e-waste recycling in Africa.



### Levy system to collect fee for collection and recycling from EEE producers and importers

Establishing a levy system is a way to make the EPR program sustainable through collecting levy/fees from EEE producers and importers to cover the cost of EPRON operations, collection, recycling, and environmentally-sound disposal of e-waste. To establish a practical levy system, NESREA received technical advice from UNEP technical assistance and the WEEE Forum, since the EPR scheme for e-waste already exists in Europe. As a result, the Guidance for EPR implementation has been developed and provides a detailed financial scheme and implementation plan for collecting levies. In Nigeria, the levy to be imposed via the EPR scheme will allow formal recyclers to 'compete' and offer a similar price to the informal recyclers and therefore gain access to a higher proportion of the total e-waste. This will make the formal businesses more viable financially, while at the same time reducing the negative impacts of informal burning and disposal of hazardous components of the waste by providing access to finance and better health protection.

The project also supports NESREA, EPRON, and waste collectors on how to practically disburse levy funds to promote environmentally and socially sound e-waste management. Preparations for the collection and recycling pilots has started based on a feasibility study and collaboration with ILO and other social actors. These pilots will demonstrate how to achieve the new requirements of the Guidance for EPR implementation, test possible collection channels, map the critical networks and stakeholders, understand the actual e-waste treatment cost to help determine the level of levy per product category, and identify the solutions to dispose of hazardous fractions. To integrate formal and informal collectors into the e-waste management system, the Guidance for EPR implementation also determines roles and responsibilities of e-waste collectors, such as: every e-waste collector shall register with EPRON, organize the informal collectors into cooperatives or associations collaborating with NESREA, EPRON,

and States Governments, and provide incentives (monetary, points etc.) for informal collectors to participate in a more organized structure.

### Lessons Learned

#### Connecting with existing mechanisms for policy enforcement

Key lessons learned from this project are:

1) enforcement of policy should be linked to existing mechanisms for company registration, tax, or import processes; and 2) it is vital to link with import and trade regulators, as well as environmental regulators for enforcement. Prior to the project, Nigeria's government EPR policy was not enforced, lacking operational guidelines, targets, or enforcement mechanisms. The project has supported NESREA to develop a new Guidance for EPR implementation to ensure policy enforcement, and to set collection and recycling targets. Enforcement of the new EPR regulations is still a challenging issue and letters from NESREA were only partially effective in driving producers to register with EPRON. Thus, NESREA is joining forces with Customs and the Standards Organization of Nigeria, who accelerate registrations with EPRON as a prerequisite for importing or trading licenses of new electronics.

To connect with existing mechanisms, the Guidance for EPR implementation explicitly explains roles and responsibilities for various stakeholders of EPR system. For example, in the Guidance for EPR implementation the role of the Nigeria Customs Service is defined as to: inform importers of EEE about their obligations; communicate the list of EEE importers detected to EPRON and NESREA for appropriate follow up of EPR responsibilities; ensure importers of new and used EEE have EPRON registration as prerequisite for importation; share data with NESREA on the inflow and outflow of EEE in Nigeria; report illegal import of used EEE and e-waste; and collaborate with NESREA to inspect and control the illegal shipment of e-waste. EPRON's registration system has been also linked with the



Figure 3: Employees at Hinkley dismantle discarded laptops @ Irene Galan / UNEP

Environmental Import Clearance for Electrical/Electronic Equipment, Small and Large Industrial Equipment, and Mixed items to ensure that end-of-life EEE and hazardous wastes are not imported into the country.

#### Building on existing initiatives for sustainability of project

The project impacts are sustainable largely due to a project design supports existing initiatives that demonstrate the commitment of partners to dealing with the problem of e-waste. Both NESREA's EPR regulation and the existing recycling facilities are independent from the project but require a short-term intervention to operationalize them. The project is developing the producer registry database, but it will be handed over to EPRON, which has been given direct oversight and review responsibilities of the IT service provider. The sustainability plan for the

project is for EPRON to take forward its role as the PRO, and NESREA to continue improving the enabling environment for the implementation of the EPR system at the national level.

From previous donor funded projects for informal collectors on health and safety of e-waste handling and the benefits of formalization, worker associations of informal collectors are organized and have received training. A second in-depth training is being developed by ILO, and to be delivered in 2021. However, even with this knowledge, collectors still choose to work in the informal sector because of the relatively higher prices of e-waste. The levy should make up for the difference in prices and make the formal sector competitive. To make the project sustainable beyond the project period, the operational Guidance for EPR implementation also provides specific targets and enforceable provisions on each stakeholder, e.g. types



and quantity of e-waste to be collected over a one-, two-, and five-year period.

#### Scaling up toward Circular Economy in Nigeria and beyond

To develop a large scale 'Country Intervention Model,' that will allow Nigeria to scale up the previous and current pilot activities to national scale, the project interacts closely with the E-waste Coalition, a group of UN agencies and partners including the International Telecommunications Union, UNIDO, ILO, and others. NESREA believes the EPR Programme is a global tool and it will be applicable to other products such as plastics, chemicals, tires, and metals. Toward non-plastic pollution and achieving a circular economy in Nigeria, NESREA is willing to scale up lessons learned from this project to other waste streams. The project is innovative in terms of closely integrating the social and labor aspects of current e-waste management structures, and pilot mechanisms for transforming informal work into decent jobs through a partnership with ILO are important levers for future scaling up of this project.

Based on the project learning, a report on circular economy in Africa is under development and will be released in 2021. The report will identify key challenges faced by Africa and propose a roadmap towards the circular economy for electronics in the region. A global roadmap on circularity and managing the chemicals and waste in the electronic value chain is in preparation as well. Ongoing regional and global knowledge exchange on the circular economy model will scale up beyond Nigeria via regional networking and knowledge sharing to achieve the longer-term aim of reducing the use of harmful chemicals in electronics. UNEP and the World Economic Forum are engaged with major electronics manufacturers at the international level to highlight the lessons learned from this approach and to advocate for more leadership from the major manufacturers to promote circularity.



Children living in Oluosun dumpsite by Irene Galan, UNEP



#### References and multimedia

- Project Implementation Report 2020. <https://www.thegef.org/project/circular-economy-approaches-electronics-sector-nigeria>
- CEO Endorsement. <https://www.thegef.org/project/circular-economy-approaches-electronics-sector-nigeria>
- Guidance Document for the Implementation of the Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) Programme for the Electrical /Electronics Sector in line with Circular Economy (NESREA 2020), [https://www.nesrea.gov.ng/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Finalized\\_EPR\\_Guidance\\_Document.pdf](https://www.nesrea.gov.ng/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Finalized_EPR_Guidance_Document.pdf)
- UNEP Web story. Dark skies, bright future: overcoming Nigeria's e-waste epidemic, <https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/story/dark-skies-bright-future-overcoming-nigerias-e-waste-epidemic>
- From Waste to Wealth: Short promotional video on launch of programme in 2019, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fbc6W4lJAcc>

#### Contact

- Anil Bruce Sookdeo, Chemical and Waste Focal Area Coordinator, GEF, [asookdeo@thegef.org](mailto:asookdeo@thegef.org)
- Evelyn Marie Swain, Environment Specialist, GEF, [eswain@thegef.org](mailto:eswain@thegef.org)
- Eloise Touni, GEF Chemicals and Waste Unit, UNEP, [eloise.touni@un.org](mailto:eloise.touni@un.org)


*The GEF Good Practice Briefs showcase examples of GEF investments that align with GEF 2020 Strategies and GEF-7 Programing Directions and Policy Recommendations. Featured projects were selected by the GEF Secretariat from a pool of nominations by GEF Agencies, taking into consideration approaches used to generate multiple global environmental benefits and co-benefits, and to achieve clear results and/or sustainability. Because the Briefs include projects that are implemented under different contexts, the practices highlighted should not necessarily be considered as universally applicable.*

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) was established on the eve of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit to help tackle our planet's most pressing environmental problems. Since then, the GEF has provided more than **\$21.1 billion** in grants and mobilized an additional **\$114 billion** in co-financing for more than **5,000 projects** in **170 countries**. Through its Small Grants Programme, the GEF has provided support to more than 25,000 civil society and community initiatives in 133 countries.



# Strengthening Climate Resilience through People-Centered Approaches:

## Farmer Field Schools and Dimitra Clubs in Senegal

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	EXECUTING AGENCIES	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY
Mainstreaming ecosystem-based approaches to climate-resilient rural livelihoods in vulnerable rural areas through the Farmer Field School methodology	Senegal 	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MAER)	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
GEF PROJECT ID: <b>5503</b>		GEF Project Grant <b>\$ 6,228,995</b>	<b>IMPACT AREAS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate change adaptation</li> <li>Food security</li> </ul>
PROJECT TYPE: <b>FSP, LDCF</b>		Co-financing Total <b>\$ 24,607,385</b>	<b>FOCAL AREAS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate Change</li> </ul>
GEF PERIOD: <b>GEF-5</b>			

### Summary

Senegal's productive sectors are progressively being exposed to the effects of climate change, with direct consequences for food and forage crop yields. Farmers and agro-pastoralists are subjected to increased risks and have to adapt their agricultural and pastoral systems to a hotter and drier future. Women face more constraints than men in being able to respond appropriately to these new challenges, as they have less access to resources, information, and participation in decisions. The resilience of people to climate change was enhanced by the project by building the capacity of communities and women through two innovative, people-centered approaches—Farmer Field Schools (FFS) and Dimitra Clubs,<sup>1</sup> and by strengthening

agro-climate information communications and setting up a climate resilience fund for scaling up project achievements.

The project operates in 17 communes located in seven administrative regions across three ecogeographical zones of Senegal and supports climate change mainstreaming and integration of FFS approach in national policies and programs. Key lessons learned from this project are related to the methodological alliance between FFS and Dimitra Clubs towards community and women's empowerment, strong partnership with relevant government agencies, and effective engagement with Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and community radio stations.

<sup>1</sup> Farmer Field Schools (FFS) are non-formal education processes characterized by hands-on group learning in the field that builds on local knowledge systems, tests and validates scientific concepts, and fosters group cohesion and community decision-making (FAO 2019). The Dimitra Clubs constitute a community-led and gender-transformative approach that facilitates rural community empowerment. In sub-Saharan Africa, they triggered changes in gender roles as well as substantial improvements in rural livelihoods, climate change adaptation, nutrition, social cohesion, and community governance.

Figure 1. Setting up stone barriers through Dimitra Clubs' collective action as a part of climate change adaptation by the villagers of Sare Roubou (Tambacounda region) @FAO/ Yannick De Mol



### Results, Global Environmental and Adaptation Benefits

By June 2020, the project had achieved the following global environmental benefits and climate change adaptation results:

- 100 percent of targeted farmers and herders (12,576 producers) were trained in climate change adaptation techniques and tools, including 7,335 women (58 percent), through 560 Farmer Field Schools (FFS) and Agro-Pastoral Field Schools (APFS),<sup>2</sup>
- Household incomes and productivity of field school participants have increased up to 20 percent using climate change adaptation (CCA) practices and agro-meteorological information.
- 503 Dimitra Clubs (120 percent of end-of-project target) were created in 142 villages across 11 municipalities with 15,000 members and over 1,000 leaders, the majority of them women. Dimitra Clubs enabled their members (women, men, girls, boys) to enhance their active participation in local development and governance, to improve women's leadership, and to guarantee the wide dissemination and ownership of CCA techniques and tools.
- An information management and exchange system of agro-climatic data was developed under the technical coordination and supervision of the National Agency of Civil Aviation and Meteorology (ANACIM). Eleven local multidisciplinary working groups were installed in the three eco-geographical zones, and around 10,000 farmers and breeders received agro-climatic information through the groups, including through voice messages in local languages.
- The National Agency for Agricultural and Rural Council (ANCAR), the project's partner institution, adapted FFS methodology for their activities, which facilitate the integration of the FFS approach into their advisory system, dissemination of CCA practices, and institutionalization of FFS approach in Senegal.
- A National Climate Change Resilience Fund is operational and has doubled available fund by collaborating with

<sup>2</sup> The APFS approach is a participatory learning model where agro-sylvo-pastoral groups learn through observation and experimentation within a community. This approach relies on the extensive experience of FAO in FFS and Pastoral Field Schools (PFS).




existing funding mechanism, the National Fund for Agro-Sylvo-Pastoral Development (FNDASP).

## Environmental Challenge

In Senegal, more than 80 percent of rural people depend on winter rains to ensure their food security. Senegal's agricultural sector is dominated by small subsistence family farming. Less than 2 percent of harvested land is irrigated. Livestock is the second pillar of Senegal's economy and involves about 350,000 families, or a total labor force of about 3,000,000 people (over 23 percent of the national population), primarily the most vulnerable. Thus, climatic disturbances have notable effects on the lifestyles of these populations and their socio-economic activities. This means that all households are facing permanent risk situations and high vulnerability due to the lack of means at their disposal to deal with shocks.

An analysis of climate change shows that the spatial and temporal variability of rainfall in the Sahel is among the largest in the world and is a major constraint that farmers and agro-pastoralists have adapted to with extensive farming systems. Therefore, climate change is not just an environmental problem; it also affects the food security of the most vulnerable people, including women who depend on agriculture and agro-pastoral production as their main livelihood. While seeking to improve their food and nutritional security and increase their incomes, it is important to strengthen the capacity of agro-sylvo-pastoral producers to withstand shocks and adapt to climate threats. The main barriers to effectively addressing climate change challenges include: insufficient awareness of climate change risks, best practices, and strategies among institutions, producers, and consumers; lack of capacity in adopting drought-resilient agropastoral and agroforestry practices; and weak policies and programs to confront climate

change in key productive sectors. The project filled these gaps and reduced climate change-induced threats by introducing CCA dimensions into FFS and Dimitra Club approaches.



**Figure 2.** Map of the six eco-geographical zones of Senegal. The target areas of the project are three ecogeographical zones: the Sylvo-Pastoral Zone (yellow area), the Groundnut Basin (green area) and the Eastern Senegal area (brown area)<sup>3</sup> (Source: ANACIA & CSE)

## Integrated Approach and Key Features of the project

The project was developed based on successful approaches in neighboring countries (Mali, Niger, and Burkina Faso) to mainstream climate resilient approaches through the FFS methodology. The project scaled up the FFS approach that has been endorsed at the national level by various governments in the region. In Senegal, through this project the FFS approach was extended to include both irrigated and rainfed production systems, including agro-sylvo-pastoral contexts.

### Capacity Building through Farmer Field Schools; Hands-on Group Learning in Field

To mainstream CCA into local planning, the project took advantage of applying the successful FFS approach<sup>4</sup> in Senegal. The FFS is supported by a trained

facilitator who meets with farmers regularly during the growing season/productive cycle, often on a weekly basis, to carry out experiments in the field. Participants identify production problems, brainstorm potential solutions, then set up study plots to compare local practices and improved practices. In this way, farmers and agro-pastoralists could learn-by-doing the agroecological dynamics and the improvement of production, and try out innovative approaches to adopt CCA methods in their own fields. The project successfully integrated CCA and nutrition into the FFS curricula, which were adapted to the specificities of each ecological zone. Through FFS training sessions, field studies were carried out to assess with farmers the best options in term of cost reduction, yield, reduction of environmental pollution, enhancement of ecosystem services, and optimization of natural resources with the main objective of reducing climate change impact.

In collaboration with the Ecological Monitoring Center (CSE) and ANCAR, 52 best practices were developed and adapted to the different agroecological contexts, specifically in three key areas: natural resource management and biodiversity restoration; improvement of animal production and; improvement of agricultural production systems.<sup>5</sup> For instance, in the sylvo-pastoral zone, 840 livestock breeders increased their capacity to produce newly-introduced elephant grass to cope with the lack of forage. Elephant grass yields are around 20 tons per hectare of dry forage for one harvest, with a possibility to harvest five times per year. 350 breeders increased their capacity to improve straw through urea treatment, which increased nutritional value by 50 percent. 230 breeders have improved skills of the techniques for manufacturing multi-nutritional blocks. In the Groundnut Basin Area and Eastern Senegal zone, 8,376 farmers, of which 60 percent are women, trained through FFS adopted CCA practices such as early seed production, water management, and mulching, seedling, and organic products

manufacturing.<sup>6</sup> These best practices to cope with climate change are now integrated into the national action plans to support extension services and trainings to strengthen the technical and managerial capacity of small producers. In addition, FFS activities can lead to changes in gender dynamics and in decision-making within households. For example, community village chicken coops set up by 120 women saw death rates drop from 63.6 percent to 18.2 percent and egg laying increase from 79.4 percent to 169.7 percent compared to traditional chicken coops.

### Community engagement for empowerment and women's leadership through the Dimitra Clubs

The Dimitra Clubs gather informal groups of rural women and men of all ages voluntarily to discuss and find solutions to common problems, including climate change effects, using their own resources and collective efforts. By promoting a rural transformation led by rural communities themselves, the Dimitra Clubs empower communities and facilitate community ownership of actions, thereby enhancing sustainability. It is an excellent approach to boost leadership of women and youth in decision-making processes, improve social cohesion and gender equality, and facilitate access to information and knowledge to the most vulnerable. Fatou Ngom, a woman member of the Dimitra Clubs, village of Kouthia Farindella in Tambacounda region said: "I am truly grateful to the Dimitra Clubs. Before I did not use to attend the village meetings. Women were not informed on the issues and activities discussed and carried out by the community. We, the women, did not have the right to speak. Now, thanks to the clubs, we dare to speak in public and give our opinion."

Local leaders and governments valued and respected community led local activities of the Dimitra Clubs. For example, after one year of activities, the Dimitra Clubs in the village of Saré Boubou set up stone barriers to preserve arable land against erosion with the

<sup>3</sup> The Sylvo-Pastoral Zone of Ferlo is one of the largest areas of the country with an area of 55,561 km<sup>2</sup> but with only 4 percent of arable land. Due to the severe nature of the environment, the main production system is based on extensive livestock transhumance (22 to 30 percent of the national livestock). The Groundnut Basin Area covers an area of 46,367 km<sup>2</sup> (57 percent arable land). Two-thirds of the production of millet and groundnuts (main national cultures) is from this area. The Eastern Senegal Zone is 51,958 km<sup>2</sup> (10 percent arable land). Mining is the predominant activity in its northern part, while pastoralism is dominant in its southern area. It also provides nearly all of the fuel-wood consumed in large urban centers.

<sup>4</sup> The FFS approach enhances understanding of complex agro-ecosystems, co-produces innovation, empowers farmers and sharpen the farmers' ability to make critical and informed decisions on production. An FFS group comprises 20-30 farmers, livestock producers, or fisherfolk from the same locality who are interested in learning about improved practices. With this approach, the project supported a cascade of capacity building in rural areas through (re-)training master trainers, facilitators of FFS, and FFS participants in a village on CCA agriculture and pastoral practices.

<sup>5</sup> Exchanging FFS and APFS experiences on CCA practices, at least 11 good CCA practices for agro-pastoralists have been identified: (i) use of forage bean and elephant grass to cope with lack of forage; (ii) water management with mulching and zai practices; (iii) short cycle seed production; (iv) stone line to prevent soil degradation; (v) promoting organic fertilizers; (vi) crop association; (vii) manufacturing multi-nutritional blocks; (viii) urea treatment to improve nutritional value of straw; (ix) establishment of improved village chicken coops to diversify income; (x) establishment of small vegetable plots to improve nutrition; (xi) multi nutritional blocks to improve livestock feed in the dry season; and more.

<sup>6</sup> 112 ha of millet production are planned for this wintering 2020 Multiplication of short cycle seeds with high nutritional value: peanuts (7 ha), millet (5 ha), corn (3 ha), sorghum (3 ha), bio-fortified millet production (75 ha) and rain-fed rice (5 ha) in addition to marketing support with partner producer organizations.





**Figure 3:** Village Assembly where the ideas of Dimitra Clubs are shared and discussed in Tambacounda @De Mo/FAO

technical support of the FFS and the Institut National de Pédologie (National Institute of Soil Science). The Dimitra Clubs also helped resolve land-use conflict between farmers and herders through dialogue. For instance, farmers and herders agreed to create a space where animals can wait until farmers finish their harvest and before herders bring their animals back to their village before the dry season. As a result of FFS and the Dimitra Clubs, 150 women from five villages in Tambacounda region were encouraged to have collective fields to improve their nutrition and income, and access to water was greatly improved when the community was mobilized by the Dimitra Clubs to participate in cleaning the wells or making borings for water supply in ten other villages of the region.

#### **Setting up sustainable mechanisms in climate resilience fund**

The project set up a resilience fund for preparing, financing, and monitoring the implementation of

proposed sub-projects for producer organizations such as income-generating activities and strengthen the economic viability of households. To make the fund sustainable, the project collaborated with an existing national development fund, FNDASP, which provided multisectoral technical support to producer organizations, including implementation of CCA community-based plans. With contributions from the State via the Finance Law and from agro-pastoral production sector via levies, FNDASP's capital facilitates the pooling of partners' financial resources to double the initial allocation of the climate resilience fund. The FNDASP resilience fund is operational, and its revolving fund is accessible by producer organizations to support collective initiatives relating to adaptation to climate change. Ten producer organizations are funded through the resilience fund and their CCA projects are ongoing.

This innovative financing mechanism facilitates the scaling up of project achievements and promoting

## Lessons Learned

### **People centered approaches leading to inclusive local engagement and climate action**

The methodological alliance between FFS and Dimitra Clubs enabled the enhancement of technical skills, community empowerment and women's leadership for resilience and climate change adaptation. FFS and Dimitra Clubs are socially inclusive because of their focus on smallholders, who are often among those more vulnerable, and their methods contribute to improving livelihoods and reducing rural poverty. Both participatory approaches were complementary: while FFS is transferred through the Dimitra Clubs to non FFS members and the whole community, Dimitra Clubs disseminated newly introduced practices to other villagers, including women and youth. There is around one FFS active in a village during agricultural/pastoral seasons, while there are four to six Dimitra Clubs in a village, and they are active all year. Learning from FFS is transferred through the Dimitra Clubs to non FFS members and the whole community, amplifying the impact of FFS through members while strengthening women's role and knowledge exchange within a village.

FFS and Dimitra Clubs empowered local communities to strengthen their resilience against shocks like climate change and pandemics. Moussa Diop, Club Dimitra Leader at Koulor village said: "The project through the Dimitra Clubs did not come to solve our problems, but it shows us how to lift our constraints by our own means and our capabilities. With the Dimitra Clubs, transparency and communication are strengthened within the community and this is the way of our stability and development." These dynamic and community-driven platforms have proven to be successful approaches to encourage behavioral change and agile responses to threats. FFS and Dimitra Clubs were active and engaged on COVID-19 awareness through their engagement with the community and their connection on WhatsApp for information sharing. The project demonstrates how people in villages can become real agents of change through participatory approaches.

**Figure 4:** Village of Saré Gueda, woman leader of one of the Dimitra Clubs @De Mo/FAO

communities to be lead actors of CCA activities. For producer organizations to get the technical advice and support for their sub-projects in transparent manner, three supervision entities were installed: National Approval Committee to approve the sub-projects based on the technical advice; Regional Evaluation Committees to provide technical opinions on the sub-projects; and Local Animation Committees to support producer organizations in the identification, formulation, and advisory throughout implementation of their sub-projects.





### Strong partnership with government agencies enabling climate mainstreaming and sustainability of outcomes

The project was successful thanks to strong partnerships with relevant government agencies including ANACIM, ANCAR, CSE, Department of Environment and Classified Establishments and FNDASP. Harnessing the different technical expertise of these agencies was critical for: analyzing climate information; leading the multidisciplinary working group; broadcasting meteorological information to farmers and field school facilitators; strengthening farmer organizations; capacity building on adapted seed production; providing extension services with CCA; following up with farmers trained through field schools; climate vulnerability analysis; characterization of pastoral units; capitalization of CCA practices; mapping natural resources in sylvo-pastoral zones; mainstreaming CCA in national policies and local development plans; and operationalization of the resilient funds and capitalization of the project results.

While working with local farmers and herders on the ground, the project simultaneously mainstreamed these CCA good practices into local and national policies, strategies, and action plans to scale up tangible results at both field and policy levels. The project established a high-level intersectoral group in the National Climate Change Committee, which then defined and adopted the CCA strategies and resilience agenda to be mainstreamed into policies, programs, and projects based on experience on the ground. The Regional Climate Change Committee was revitalized through a capacity-building program based on: (i) the integration of the climate change dimension in planning and budgeting, (ii) the development of a feasible plan of action; and (iii) the preparation of financial resource mobilization strategies for a regional policy dialogue on climate change to monitor, evaluate and submit CCA projects.

As a result, the climate change dimension, together with gender, migration, and nutrition, was integrated into the National Guide for Local Planning for the communal development plans. A policy brief "Agro-sylvo-Pastoral sector & climate change in Senegal"

was prepared, eight action plans integrating CCA strategies were developed for producers organizations in the Sylvo-pastoral zone, and nine action plans were developed in the Groundnuts basin and Eastern Senegal, resulting in 27 Farmers Organizations integrating CCA strategies.

### Effective engagement with CSOs and community radio stations helping outreach to communities

Collaboration with a variety of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) was vital for successful implementation of the innovative approach such as the Dimitra Clubs. Trusted CSOs initiated dialogues with villagers and explained the Dimitra Clubs concept, and partnership with community radio stations in rural areas helped Dimitra Clubs mobilize local communities and amplify the voice to women, youth, and other vulnerable people. Local radio stations, which broadcast in local languages, play a pivotal role as a source of information in local communities and helped Dimitra Clubs members reach broader audiences by broadcasting their good practices and results obtained.



Figure 5: Sare Bouboub, Tambacounda Region ©De Mol/FAO



Figure 6: Welcoming Dimitra Clubs members in a village in Koussanar ©De Mol/FAO

## References and multimedia

- **Mid Term Review:** <https://www.thegef.org/project/mainstreaming-ecosystem-based-approaches-climate-resilient-rural-livelihoods-vulnerable>
- **Project Document:** [https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/project\\_documents/08-31-15\\_Project\\_Document\\_PAD\\_0.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/project_documents/08-31-15_Project_Document_PAD_0.pdf)
- FAO. 2019. **Farmers taking the lead—Thirty years of farmer field schools.** Rome, <http://www.fao.org/3/ca5131en/ca5131en.pdf>
- FAO. 2016. **Farmer Field School Guidance Document.** <http://www.fao.org/3/i5296e/i5296e.pdf>
- **Video: Dimitra Clubs, Stepping Stones towards Climate Change Resilient Communities in Rural Senegal** <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S7aWWtDb15Y>

## Contact

- Chizuru Aoki, Lead Environmental Specialist, GEF, [caoki@thegef.org](mailto:caoki@thegef.org)
- Stefano Mondovi, Agricultural Officer, Farmer Field Schools, Plant Production and Protection Division, FAO, [Stefano.Mondovi@fao.org](mailto:Stefano.Mondovi@fao.org)

- Christiane Monsieur, Dimitra Clubs' Programme Coordinator, Inclusive Rural Transformation and Gender Equality Division, FAO, [Christiane.Monsieur@fao.org](mailto:Christiane.Monsieur@fao.org)
- Mame Diene, Policy and Institutions Expert, FAO Representative in Senegal, FAO, [mame.diene@fao.org](mailto:mame.diene@fao.org)


*The GEF Good Practice Briefs showcase examples of GEF investments that align with GEF strategies and GEF-7 programing directions and policy recommendations. The GEF Secretariat selected featured projects from a pool of nominations by GEF agencies, taking into consideration approaches used to generate multiple global environmental benefits and co-benefits, and to achieve clear results and/or sustainability. Because the Good Practice Briefs include projects that are implemented under different contexts, the practices highlighted should not necessarily be considered universally applicable.*

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) was established on the eve of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit to help tackle our planet's most pressing environmental problems. Since then, the GEF has provided more than **\$21.1 billion** in grants and mobilized an additional **\$114 billion** in co-financing for more than **5,000 projects** in **170 countries**. Through its Small Grants Programme, the GEF has provided support to more than 25,000 civil society and community initiatives in 133 countries.



# Participatory Conservation and Peacebuilding in Dry Forest as Production Landscape

Nature-based Solutions for Local and Global Benefits in Colombia

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY	EXECUTING AGENCIES
Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in dry ecosystems to guarantee the flow of ecosystem services and to mitigate the processes of deforestation and desertification	 Colombia	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MADS); Autonomous Regional Corporation of the Upper Magdalena (CAM); Regional Autonomous Corporation of the Canal del Dique (CARDIQUE); Regional Autonomous Corporation of Cesar (CORPOCESAR); Regional Autonomous Corporation of La Guajira (CORPOGUAJIRA); Regional Autonomous Corporation of Tolima (CORTOLIMA); and Regional Autonomous Corporation of the Valle del Cauca (CVC)
		IMPACT AREAS	
GEF PROJECT ID: 4772	FOCAL AREAS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multi Focal Area</li> </ul>	
PROJECT TYPE: FSP	GEF Project Financing	Co-financing Total	
GEF PERIOD: GEF-5	\$ 8,787,819	\$ 26,934,999	

## Summary

The dry forest ecosystem is a high conservation priority in Colombia. This project seeks to promote the sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity in dry forests to ensure the flow of ecosystem services and to mitigate deforestation and desertification in the Caribbean region and the Inter-Andean Valley of the Magdalena River (VIRM) in Colombia. The project contributed to the flow of multiple global and local ecosystem services, including carbon storage, food production, water supply, fodder supply, and biodiversity habitat. The project also established protected areas, implemented Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) pilot projects, and promoted sustainable land management. At the same time, the project built trust with local communities, promoted participatory conservation in the tropical dry forest as a production landscape and ensured benefits for local communities from dry forest

ecosystem services, including reviving traditional agricultural products.

As a result, the project fostered strong ownership by local communities and contributed to peacebuilding in the post-conflict areas, since maintaining the good environmental condition of the dry forest and its ecosystem services provide for local livelihoods and food security, which were the basis for agreement between the government and local communities. Based on institutional capacity building of local governments and other organizations, the project contributed to develop a nationwide project to conserve dry forest in Colombia. Key lessons learned from this project are: importance of good marketing strategy to link small producers to entrepreneurs for valuing biodiversity, adaptive management to incorporate peacebuilding and socio-economic intervention, and participatory biodiversity monitoring that turned local communities into strategic partners.

## Results, Global Environmental Benefits and Other Benefits

The project's key results are:

- 15 protected areas with conservation agreements have been signed (exceeded the target indicator of 12 agreements): Dry Forest Conservation (1); Complementary Strategies for Dry Forest Conservation (2); dry forest conservation through Natural Reserves of the Civil Society (12), such as conservation corridors, regional protected areas, and buffer areas. 31,973 hectares of the dry forest and other dry ecosystems (exceeded the target indicator of 18,000 hectares) have been identified, delimited, and characterized as conservation areas.
- 3,176.6 hectares (exceeded the target indicator of 1,000 hectares) of dry forests are in restoration processes: 1,547.6 hectares were restored and maintained using landscape management tools; 1,629 hectares owned by families interested in increasing conservation areas are under restoration.
- 4,247,588 tCO2 (exceeded the target indicator of 2,838,588 tCO2) were not released as a global benefit at the end of the project due to the regeneration of 4,229 hectares of dry forest.
- 703 professionals and specialists of the national environmental institutions were trained in biodiversity conservation, sustainable forest management, and sustainable soil management. Of those, 170 officials received training to strengthen their capacities on environmental land use planning, integrated water resource management, comprehensive risk management, and adaptation to climate change.
- Capacity of 495 families (exceeded target indicator of 400 families) for sustainable use

Figure 1. Plant nursery practices led by women for the restoration of the dry forest. @ PNUD Colombia





and conservation of dry forest have been strengthened, 205 families in the Caribbean region and 290 families in the Andean region established fruit gardens, organic cocoa productions, and home gardens to recover native seeds, contributing to food security; installed eco-efficient stoves to reduce wood consumption; were trained to prevent forest fires; and are now developing further actions for the sustainable use and conservation of dry forests.

- Ten biodiversity value chains and environmentally sustainable production initiatives (exceeded target indicator of eight) have been strengthened; seven of them are in the Caribbean region (Bolívar and La Guajira) and the other three are in the Andean region (Huila and Tolima), including nature tourism and production of native beans, yams, and vegetables.

### Environmental Challenge

Dry forests, currently one of the most threatened ecosystems in the Neotropics, have long been centers of human population and are subject to intense transformation due to their fertile soils. Tropical dry forests show high levels of deforestation, with direct consequences of habitat loss and degradation, illegal logging of native species with a high market value, unplanned burns, and forest fires. These highly sensitive ecosystems are also affected by climate change. The main cause of these threats is the expansion of agriculture and extensive livestock farming, and industrial and urban areas. Moreover, dry forest areas are in demand for oil exploration, mining, and building infrastructure, including roads and dams.

Deforestation has multiple social and economic impacts. However, the impact is more immediate at a local level, particularly in communities that depend on the dry forest for their subsistence and economic activities. Deforestation leads to the loss of food options (hunting, fruit gathering), energy sources, building materials, and fodder for domestic animals, and alters ecosystem services such as water storage and regulation, erosion prevention, soil fertility maintenance, climate regulation (including shade and

humidity for people and animals), and rainy season flood and landslide control, among others. According to the Red Papers of Colombia (2002), 16 percent of the country's threatened species are found in the tropical dry forest, which plays an important role as a wildlife corridor and place for feeding and rest, because most wildlife migrates to wetlands or riparian forests in times of drought.

### Integrated Approach and Key Features

Dry forest restoration through landscape management is aimed at recovering the forest and its adjacent areas, as well as promoting the involvement of the community to improve the sustainability of the conservation actions. At the same time, conservation of production landscapes also supports the conservation of biodiversity and secures socio-economic benefits from the dry forests through an agroforestry system approach that promotes connectivity of agroforestry products and conservation/restoration of these ecosystems.

#### Building trust for participatory conservation in dry forest as production landscapes

Strong community engagement is one of the most important features of this tropical dry forest conservation project. The project showed high levels of sensitivity to connect with beneficiaries, generate trusting relationships and support capacity building and empowerment of local communities. With participation of 495 families living nearby and benefiting from ecosystem services provided by the critical dry forest, the project promoted conservation of dry forest to maintain the flow of global and local dry forest ecosystem services of such as carbon storage, food production, water supply, supply of fodder for livestock, provision of biodiversity habitat and ecotourism. Exploring sustainable livelihoods in the dry forests, local communities are actively engaged in conservation of tropical dry forest as production landscapes. For example, community members work as forest rangers (and children participate as little forest rangers), serve as community guardians for forest fire prevention, and promote nature tourism, hiking,

handicrafts, environmentally sustainable production, and home gardens.

For local livelihoods, out of 495 families that participated in capacity building for dry forest conservation, 60 established fruit gardens, 30 established native cocoa processing and production arrangements, and 150 families established home gardens to recover native seeds as a contribution to food security. In addition, 35 families led by women formed an association to develop community tourism (bird tourism, hiking, environmental interpretation, nursery practices, and traditional cuisine). Women-led groups also organized a group of craftswomen, produced and sold organic products and seeds from the dry forest, and strengthened the organic community garden. In order to reduce wood consumption, 110 families in the Caribbean region and 50 families in the Andean region installed eco-efficient stoves as well. In the Andean region, 230 individuals are guardians of the dry forest and 150 children served as little forest rangers. At the same time, 14 community brigades were trained to reduce the incidence of forest fires in the areas of the project. As a result, there was an 84 percent reduction of forest fires in the Garupal Basin, where forest fires have historically occurred; 950 hectares burned in 2015 and the figure decreased to 160 hectares in 2018.



**Figure 2.** Asomudepas, the San Jacinto farmers' association, is implementing novel in-vitro plant tissue culture techniques to ensure the reproduction of native species not only for the forest's survival but also for food security by ensuring a constant supply of heirloom varieties of beans, yuca, and yam. ©PNUD Colombia

### Ensuring livelihood and peacebuilding in post-conflict areas through nature-based solutions

In the post-conflict areas in Colombia, peacebuilding was vital for sustainable development and effective conservation in tropical dry forests. After the Peace Agreement of Colombia, local peoples came back to their land and needed to re-establish their livelihoods. Thus, nature-based solutions, sustainable provision of ecosystem services flows from dry forests, including agroforestry products, was more important than ever for local communities. The Peace Products of the Dry Forest campaign and the Responsible and Sustainable Supply Chain Program were designed and developed to promote forest products and establish connections between farmers and the private sector as a part of strategy to promote and consolidate value chains. With the campaign and program, local peoples were able to ensure their livelihoods and actively engage in dry forest conservation activities.

Under the initiative called *La paz se cocina en las ciudades y se cosecha en el bosque seco* (Peace is Cooked in the Cities and Harvested in the Dry Forest), gourmet restaurants in Cartagena are offering agrobiodiversity products in their menus, including 17 species of native beans, yams, and vegetables. Organic cocoa is being exported, honey from the dry forest is traded locally and regionally, and birdwatching has become a central component of nature tourism in Aipe and Dibulla. All these activities have contributed to livelihood diversification for local communities and the preservation of the dry forests. In collaboration with the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MADS), the post-conflict environmental zoning of 202 municipalities was carried out, of which 55 have dry forest in their jurisdiction. This task was carried out as a contribution to article 1.1.10 of the Final Peace Agreement of Colombia with the FARC guerrilla group on closing the agricultural frontier and protecting areas of special environmental importance.

#### From regional capacity building to nationwide project protecting dry forest

Capacity building of local environmental organizations and municipalities protecting the dry forest and its ecosystem services continues to deliver positive



results. These efforts helped develop a nationwide project to conserve dry forest in Colombia that will ensure long-term governmental investments in this ecosystem after project closure. The project has already trained 703 professionals and specialists from the Regional Autonomous Corporations, MADS, Institute of Hydrology, Meteorology, and Environmental Studies of Colombia, and land-use agencies to increase their capacities on sustainable land management, REDD+, and biodiversity conservation strategies. To date, 533 staff from these organizations have been trained in geographic information systems (GIS) and planning for conservation of biodiversity, sustainable forest management, and sustainable soil management. The organization and standardization of geographic information, Arc-GIS licenses, and installation have proved to be key in the local level planning processes at the six municipalities participating in the project and are relevant to be considered in the other municipalities.

Furthermore, the land-use planning methodology used to identify priority conservation and restoration areas of the dry forest allowed the project to enter into agreements with MADS to establish the technical basis of environmental zoning. This methodology applied for the post-conflict environmental zoning of 202 municipalities, and is currently implemented in 89 municipalities of the "Macizo Colombiano," a group of mountains within the Andes of south-central Colombia, known as the "Star of Rivers," because important rivers of Colombia originate in this region. In addition, collaborating between the MADS and Humboldt Institute, the results of the project were incorporated into national platforms such as the Environmental Information System for Colombia and the Colombian Biodiversity Information System to make data available to different users. This "National Program for Comprehensive Management of Dry Forests and their Ecosystem Services," which developed as a result of the project, will contribute to the sustainability of the project and will help disseminate the lessons learned.

## Lessons Learned

### Good marketing strategy to link small producers to entrepreneurs for valuing biodiversity

To achieve sustainable management of dry forest in Colombia, it was critical to develop a strong marketing strategy to strengthen biodiversity value chains and environmentally-sustainable production initiatives collaborating with the private sector, particularly the connection with the markets. A strategy, which was developed under a value chain approach, was aimed at linking small producers who live in the dry forest to entrepreneurs who value biodiversity, agrobiodiversity, and the cultural heritage of communities affected by the armed conflict. The strategy was tailored to support the region's capacity, the local community's interests, and the characteristic of local ecosystems. The consulting company developed not only a marketing strategy and slogan of agroforestry products, but also the package design and connections with high-end restaurants to facilitate peacebuilding with the conservation of dry forest.

Based on this strategy, ten value chains of biodiversity products, and initiatives of agrobiodiversity and environmentally-sustainable production were strengthened through a network of actions between producers, regional markets, and large retailers. For instance, these products and initiatives included native beans, native yams, and vegetables in San Juan Nepomuceno and San Jacinto (Bolívar), and nature tourism, native cocoa, panela (unrefined sugarcane) and vegetables (tomato) in Dibulla (Guajira), the Caribbean Region; and apiculture and nature tourism in Aipe (Huila), and calabash-made packaging (Crescentia Cujete) in Natagaima (Tolima), the Andean Region. At the national level, negotiations are in place with the Éxito Department Stores to purchase products, and with 27 restaurants of the Takami group. One of the value chains strengthened in the project was the value chain of local beans in Montes de María, Caribbean region, and this project was implemented with strong collaboration with the GEF's Small Grants Program.



**Figure 3.** Seventeen native varieties of beans, yams, colored corn, and vegetables comprise some of the seeds that have passed from generation to generation in the Montes de María @PNUD Colombia

### Adaptive management to incorporate peacebuilding and socio-economic intervention

The project's high capacity for adaptive management, flexibility to meet emerging demands and adapt the intervention to opportunities and challenges in the territory, was supported by the commitment, willingness, and ability to generate trust in partners and beneficiaries. During the project design stage, there was no clear socio-economic intervention linking the local communities to the objectives of the project. Adjustments were made along the way allowing local communities to be involved in dry forest conservation at the same time securing their livelihoods through management of production landscapes. Although the design of the project did not propose a raise of socio-economic baseline of communities, the socio-economic baselines were developed in 61 properties with Landscape Management Tools during the execution in order to identify the clear actions to be developed. Likewise,

the Peace Agreement could not be identified during the project design; however, its link to the project became a central element of the intervention through the post-conflict environmental zoning and production landscape management in the dry forests.

The project also had a good capacity to leverage support from other institutions and add other parties to the intervention in the territory, which in the future ensure continuity and sustainability of the project after its completion. These institutions include the World Food Programme, National Training Service (SENA), Chamber of Commerce, Sustainable Biocommerce, MADS Green Business Programme, Colombian Handicrafts, etc.

### Participatory biodiversity monitoring turned local communities into strategic partners

As a part of participatory monitoring, local people assisted the systematic and periodic recording of biodiversity information in the dry forest. To support



strengthening community's territorial governance and monitoring species of local community interest, the project monitoring has shifted the roles of rural communities from being mere logistical support to being strategic partners in species-monitoring. Based on the 52 platforms to monitor six basins and the results of laboratory analysis, 617 species of plants, 39 species of mammals, 443 species of birds, and 278 species of ants were identified and registered through the Biodiversity Information System. The most common species of the four biological groups were prioritized in the six basins and these species in the dry forest were included in the Guide for Dry Forest Species, which will help spread information about the biodiversity in this ecosystem.

Furthermore, the project has facilitated community involvement in monitoring through the participatory monitoring program, "State of Biodiversity." Three basins of the project located in dry forest fragments were selected for further engagement with local communities in the monitoring of the biological species: Aipe River (Huila), Cañas-Ancho River (Guajira), and Arroyo Grande (Bolívar). Fifty families became involved in the participatory monitoring, including children and youngsters, and 65 human-made trails to monitor mammals and birds were developed. Research and restoration activities as well as actions for the sustainable use of biodiversity and agrobiodiversity of the dry forest have been carried out in these three basins. Many peasant communities whose livelihoods depend on the forest have shown special interest in further understanding and studying their forests in a participatory manner. As a result of this activity, a participatory monitoring guide for each basin was published for communities from three basins, and the species of interest for the communities are being monitored to generate state-response indicators for the different drivers of transformation in the dry forest.



Planting in the dry forest@PNUD Colombia



Asomudepas, the San Jacinto farmers' association, is fostering innovation, gender equality, and income generation through the conservation of the dry forest. @PNUD Colombia

## References and multimedia

- Terminal Evaluation 2020. <https://www.thegef.org/project/conservation-and-sustainable-use-biodiversity-dry-ecosystems-guarantee-flow-ecosystem>
- Project Implementation Report 2019. <https://www.thegef.org/project/conservation-and-sustainable-use-biodiversity-dry-ecosystems-guarantee-flow-ecosystem>
- UNDP Ecosystems & Biodiversity (April 2020). *Planting for the Future—In Colombia's tropical dry forest these seeds are the oxygen that you will breathe in the future* <https://undp-biodiversity.exposure.co/planting-for-the-future>
- UNDP article (March 2020). *We are planning the oxygen you will breathe in the future.* <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/blog/2020/-we-are-planting-the-oxygen-you-will-breathe-in-the-future--.html>

## Contact

- Mark Zimsky, GEF, Biodiversity Focal Area Coordinator, Senior Biodiversity Specialist, [mzimsky@thegef.org](mailto:mzimsky@thegef.org)
- Santiago Carrizosa, UNDP-GEF Senior Technical Adviser Nature, Climate and Energy Team, UNDP, [santiago.carrizosa@undp.org](mailto:santiago.carrizosa@undp.org)

- Jimena Puyana, Country Office Focal Point, National Manager of Sustainable Development (Colombia), UNDP, [jimena.puyana@undp.org](mailto:jimena.puyana@undp.org)
- Zoraida Fajardo, Project Manager, UNDP, [zoraida.fajardo@undp.org](mailto:zoraida.fajardo@undp.org)

*The GEF Good Practice Briefs showcase examples of GEF investments that align with GEF strategies and GEF-7 programming directions and policy recommendations. The GEF Secretariat selected featured projects from a pool of nominations by GEF agencies, taking into consideration approaches used to generate multiple global environmental benefits and co-benefits, and to achieve clear results and/or sustainability. Because the Good Practice Briefs include projects that are implemented under different contexts, the practices highlighted should not necessarily be considered universally applicable.*

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) was established on the eve of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit to help tackle our planet's most pressing environmental problems. Since then, the GEF has provided more than **\$21.1 billion** in grants and mobilized an additional **\$114 billion** in co-financing for more than **5,000 projects** in **170 countries**. Through its Small Grants Programme, the GEF has provided support to more than 25,000 civil society and community initiatives in 133 countries.



MAY 2021  
978-1-948690-80-5

[www.thegef.org](http://www.thegef.org)



HOME

GEF Good Practice Briefs

Participatory Conservation and Peacebuilding in Dry Forest as Production Landscape / 4

PREVIOUS





# Building Capacity Towards Reducing GHG Emissions from Global Shipping

with Multi-Sectoral Collaboration and Private Sector Engagement

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY	EXECUTING AGENCIES
Transforming the Global Maritime Transport Industry towards a Low Carbon Future through Improved Energy Efficiency (GloMEEP)	Global 	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	International Maritime Organization (IMO)
		<b>FOCAL AREA</b>	<b>IMPACT AREAS</b>
GEF PROJECT ID: <b>5508</b>	GEF PERIOD: <b>GEF-5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multi Focal Area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate change mitigation</li> <li>International Waters</li> </ul>
PROJECT TYPE: <b>MEDIUM SIZE PROJECT</b>		GEF Project Grant <b>\$1,900,000</b>	Co-financing Total <b>\$17,154,000</b>

## Summary

International shipping contributes approximately 2 percent to global CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The need for shipping services is projected to increase over the coming decades, so emissions are expected to rise as well. To curb this development, the International Maritime Organization (IMO) agreed to include Annex VI to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL).<sup>1</sup> Annex VI requires signatory countries to develop and implement legal frameworks aimed at reducing emissions of harmful gases from ships, thereby reducing impacts on climate change, ocean acidification, and local air quality. The GEF, IMO, and UNDP launched Transforming the Global Maritime Transport Industry towards a Low Carbon Future through Improved Energy Efficiency (GloMEEP) to support 10 Lead Pilot Countries (LPCs)—Argentina, China, Georgia, India, Jamaica, Malaysia, Morocco, Panama, Philippines, and South Africa—in their efforts to implement MARPOL Annex VI with the necessary legal, policy, and institutional reforms.

The project focused on providing capacity building, enhancing inter-governmental coordination, promoting public private partnerships for innovation and technology deployment, including through high-quality training

in collaboration with international organizations and academic institutions.

As a result of GloMEEP, LPCs developed not only the legal framework to fulfil the requirements of MARPOL Annex VI, but also the implementation capacity. Thus, emission reduction from ships in LPCs became more sustainable after the project. Furthermore, LPCs also actively contributed to discussions on the development and adoption of new international resolutions on greenhouse gases (GHG) such as the IMO Initial GHG Strategy that sets out emissions reduction targets for the maritime sector, stating a reduction of at least 50 percent of total annual GHG emissions by 2050 compared to 2008. The Global Industry Alliance to Support Low Carbon Shipping greatly contributed to the maritime sectors' efforts to reduce emissions through their work on the identification of barriers towards low-carbon shipping and the development of innovative solutions for their reduction. In addition, IMO scaled up the project in 12 countries with \$5.4 million in new funding from the Government of Norway, and the project provided a successful model of long-term emission reduction from ships and ports.

<sup>1</sup> Greenhouse gas emissions from international shipping are addressed at the global level, although they are not covered under the 1997 Kyoto Protocol to the Convention. Article 2.2 of the Protocol specifies that parties shall pursue the limitation or reduction of emissions of greenhouse gases from marine bunker fuels by working through IMO.



GloMEEP workshop on the IMO data collection system for fuel oil consumption (November 2018, Hangzhou, China)

## Results, Global Environmental Benefits, and Adaptation Benefits

The project's key results are:

- All 10 LPCs have further developed their legislative frameworks and drafted legislation for incorporating MARPOL Annex VI (Prevention of Air Pollution from Ships) into national law. Strategies for maritime energy efficiency and emission controls both for ships and port operations were also developed.
- Nearly 1,000 stakeholders across all the LPCs and other interested countries were trained to improve national capacities on shipping energy efficiency regulations, operation, and enforcement (through Port State Control) through more than 30 workshops and "train-the-trainer" training.
- A Ship and a Port Emissions Toolkit was developed to support LPCs and other countries in assessing ship and port emissions and to develop national emissions reduction strategies.
- The Global Industry Alliance to Support Low Carbon Shipping (Low Carbon GIA), an alliance of maritime industry leaders, was inaugurated on 29 June, 2017. With 14 active members across the shipping and linked sectors, GIA has raised \$640,000 from its members to support GIA activities. GIA developed, among other outputs, the "Just In Time Arrival Guide" to encourage voluntary cooperation between the port and shipping sectors to reduce GHG emissions from ships.
- The project significantly increased the uptake of MARPOL Annex VI. If efforts are further sustained, they are estimated to catalyze an additional reduction in the sector up to 71 million tonnes/year of CO<sub>2</sub> by 2050, compared to the baseline scenario.<sup>2</sup>

## Environmental Challenge

MARPOL Annex VI seeks to minimize airborne emissions from ships and their contribution to local and global air pollution and environmental problems. Shipping's greenhouse gas emissions have increased from 977 million tonnes in 2012 to 1,076 million tonnes in 2018—a 9.6 percent rise. Emissions are projected to increase by up to 50 percent over the next few decades to 2050, relative to 2018, despite further efficiency gains, as transport demands are expected to increase. In 2011, IMO expanded MARPOL Annex VI to include mandatory technical and

operational energy efficiency measures to reduce the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from international shipping. Flag States<sup>3</sup> or Port States are responsible for the effective implementation and enforcement of the regulatory framework. To achieve global scale compliance with MARPOL Annex VI and ensure significant GHG emissions reduction, it is important to address barriers to implementation and support countries, in particular developing countries that have special needs with regard to capacity building and technical cooperation, in their efforts to fully and effectively implement IMO's regulatory framework.

## Integrated Approach and Key Features

The project was built upon the implementation design experiences of the successful GEF-UNDP-IMO GloBallast Project,<sup>4</sup> which supported knowledge sharing, training, and capacity building for ballast water management of shipping through a network of government, industry, and academia. Via the creation of the first of several Global Industry Alliances, the GloBallast project promoted a strong public-private partnership for technical innovation and created transformational changes, including catalyzing the negotiation, adoption, and coming into force of the global convention on ship's ballast water and sediments.<sup>5</sup> Following this success, the GloMEEP project applied a similar project design: focusing on capacity building of the LPCs through networking, guidance, and training for developing the LPCs' legislative framework to enable compliance with MARPOL Annex VI; building public private partnerships; and developing supportive mechanisms at national, regional, and global levels to create transformational change.

### A catalyst for better collaboration and capacity building in countries

GloMEEP became a catalyst for stronger collaboration among different government units and other key stakeholders. The establishment of National Task Forces (NTF) across different government department, NTF also included private sector representation from shipping, ports and technology firms in each LPC, which is a good example of cross-sectoral collaboration to fast-track the drafting of the legislation needed to translate MARPOL's Annex VI into national law. It significantly supported fostering multi-agency support for the implementation of legislation as well as in the identification of resources to support the process (e.g. for monitoring and enforcement).

For example, Jamaica, one of the LPCs, noted that the project had helped them significantly in overcoming limited resources and realigning or expanding their legislative framework to ensure compliance with treaties. The project had broken through the common 'silo' approach of government departments working in isolation, with overlapping and often



GloMEEP National workshop in Johor, Malaysia (February 2017)

<sup>2</sup> This assumes nearly complete uptake and implementation of MARPOL Annex VI in the 10 LPCs, which alone represent 33 percent of global shipping tonnage.

<sup>3</sup> A flag state is the location of where a commercial ship is registered or licensed with (The Maritime Industry Knowledge Centre 2020).

<sup>4</sup> The GEF-UNDP-IMO GloBallast project closed in June 2017. Among its accomplishments, the project formed regional task forces in 12 developing sub-regions and developed regional strategies and action plans on ballast water management (BWM) involving more than 100 countries; assisted 80% of its lead partnering countries in drafting and adopting national legislation; and prepared countries and the shipping industry to implement the BWM Convention. GloBallast also pioneered a public-private sector partnership through its inclusion of shipping companies alongside IMO, GEF, UNDP and national governments.

<sup>5</sup> International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments (BWM) [http://www.imo.org/en/About/Conventions/ListOfConventions/Pages/International-Convention-for-the-Control-and-Management-of-Ships-Ballast-Water-and-Sediments-\(BWM\).aspx](http://www.imo.org/en/About/Conventions/ListOfConventions/Pages/International-Convention-for-the-Control-and-Management-of-Ships-Ballast-Water-and-Sediments-(BWM).aspx)



conflicting mandates. The project had brought them together through the NTF, which then acted as an excellent inter-agency body dealing with transport, environment, energy, and policy along with the private sector. Prior to establishment of the NTF, there was generally low awareness throughout the government departments even of the existence of MARPOL, let alone Annex VI. The establishment of NTF has sparked considerable interest from other government sectors as well as academia and NGOs. The capacity building, training, and awareness given by the project strengthened collaboration among the government departments to reduce emissions from shipping and ports together.

#### Innovative public private partnership to promote low carbon shipping

To reduce emissions from shipping and ports for the long term, the project also established an innovative public-private partnership, the Global Industry Alliance to Support Low Carbon Shipping (Low Carbon GIA), with the participation of 14 maritime industry leaders (including shipping companies, oil and gas providers, ports, energy efficiency-related technology developers, and data providers). The Low Carbon GIA played a critical role, providing technical expertise on tackling the challenges of decarbonizing the port and shipping sectors. The Low Carbon GIA has also raised \$640,000 from its members to fund GIA activities, including development of innovative solutions to support overcoming existing barriers to low-carbon shipping. The Low Carbon GIA engaged in the development of an E-Learning course on ship and port emission reduction and published the "Just In Time Arrival Guide" to encourage voluntary cooperation between the port and shipping sectors to reduce GHG emissions from ships and ports. The GIA's discussion towards "Just In Time Arrival" particularly provided important technical insights and inputs to the IMO's resolution, "Invitation to Member States to Encourage Voluntary Cooperation between the Port and Shipping Sectors to Contribute to Reducing GHG Emissions from Ships (MEPC.323(74), 17 May 2019)," and promoted stronger collaboration between the port and shipping sectors to reduce GHG emissions from the maritime sector.

Through the development of a protocol for the validation of performance of energy efficiency technologies, GloMEEP proactively addressed a significant problem for the industry. Current performance assessments and validations (such as propeller efficiency) do not present a level playing field. Due to different mechanism and protocols for assessing and calculating the efficiency of new technologies, ship owners were extremely cautious about investing in such technology and there has generally been mistrust in this respect. The Low Carbon GIA has made the Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC) in IMO aware of this problem and developed tools to facilitate verification of the impact of energy efficiency technologies and solutions that aim to improve the hydrodynamic performance of ships.

#### Collaboration with various stakeholders to find better solutions

The impact on climate change, ocean acidification, and port air quality from shipping energy use and fuel consumption necessarily spans the maritime transportation and environmental sectors. Thus, solutions require a coordinated effort between government, industry, and other stakeholders across these sectors. GloMEEP stakeholders included all relevant maritime sectors such as government agencies, international organizations, industry groups, training and R&D institutes, and environmental organizations. To facilitate this wider participation of stakeholders, the project management structure defined each party's role at national, regional, and global levels. Within this three-layer approach, LPCs were able to receive support through the project. For example, technical guidance and training was



Global Industry Alliance to Support Low Carbon Shipping, Task Force Meeting in London, United Kingdom (December 2017)

developed at a global level but adjusted and adapted to national circumstances. GloMEEP also organized, in collaboration with Singapore, the Future Ready Shipping Conference in 2017, in which all LPCs participated. A back-to-back, one-day GloMEEP workshop was also held to exchange experiences and lessons learned from developing a national strategy to address GHG emissions from shipping. Thus, national experiences were shared at regional and global levels.

To develop tools to reduce port emissions, GloMEEP developed a strategic partnership with the International Association of Ports and Harbours (IAPH), an industry-based organization, which is interested in the control of emissions in the context of the health hazards as well as climate change and energy efficiency. IAPH supported GloMEEP in the development of the Toolkit on Port Emissions and IAPH believes that this strategic partnership produced long-term value to both, ports and the shipping industry. The project also closely collaborated with the Institute of Marine Engineering (IMarEST) as a strategic partner. IMarEST has a Special Interest Group that aims to understand shipping's role in GHG emissions and air pollution, including black carbon. IMarEST has developed three guides (combined into a Ship Emissions Toolkit) in collaboration with GloMEEP.

### Lessons learned

#### Guidance, training, and knowledge sharing for capacity building and transformational change

The project's high-quality guidance materials, training, and capacity building throughout the LPCs and beyond made this project sustainable and created transformational change. The technical support and capacity building included provision of the Shipping Emission and Port Emission Toolkits and series of training, which assisted LPCs in developing the legislative framework for the effective implementation of MARPOL Annex VI as well as a National Maritime Emission Reduction Strategy and Roadmap. As a part of capacity building, the project has also created sustainable management structures of GHG emission reduction from shipping and ports within the LPCs including active NTFs and identification of responsible individuals within the Lead Agencies. Through capacity building and awareness raising at the national level, country ownership has been significantly expanded and enhanced, which has then strengthened national representation of countries at IMO and particularly at meetings of the MEPC. As a result, GloMEEP LPCs greatly contributed to discussions and negotiations that resulted in the adoption of the important IMO resolution, "Initial IMO Strategy on Reduction of GHG Emissions from Ships (MEPC.304(72), 13 April 2018)" that includes ambitious emissions reduction targets for the maritime sector "to reduce the total annual GHG emissions from international shipping by at least 50% by 2050 compared to 2008."

The project left a legacy of training and awareness materials which is of undoubted global value. In addition to in-country trainings, the project created the global GloMEEP 'train-the-trainer' course. Participants in the course delivered trainings in their own countries and regions as IMO consultants, and maritime energy efficiency experts in IMO's roster of consultants are increased. All training packages are with LPCs for wider dissemination and have been shared globally through IMO. The project also identified Maritime Training Centres in each LPC to focus on training-the-trainers. In order to further improve the quality of training, selection of candidates should be even more rigorous in the future, with clear criteria for selection and a follow-up online test or evaluation questionnaire leading to certification.

#### Scaling up and replication of successful project model

With remarkable capacity building of LPCs and a legacy of training and awareness materials, IMO succeeded in scaling up the GloMEEP project through the \$ 5.4 million IMO-Norway GreenVoyage2050 Project, funded by the Government of Norway. IMO fully utilized tools, training, and experience from GloMEEP for development of this new project which includes a broad range of coordinated actions by countries, industries, and strategic partners at national, regional, and global levels. Following the GloMEEP experience, pilot countries were strategically selected to achieve maximum global environment benefits to reduce GHG emissions from ships.

With twelve countries from six priority regions, the scaling-up project follows a similar project framework as GloMEEP and aims to expand government and port management capacities to undertake legal and policy reforms, develop National Action Plans to reduce GHG emissions, catalyze private sector partnerships, promote innovation, enable technology transfer, and deliver pilot demonstration projects to facilitate low carbon technology uptake. This successful project model has been applied to another GEF International Waters project titled 'Building Partnerships to Assist Developing Countries Minimize the Impacts from Aquatic Biofouling (GloFouling Partnerships, GEF ID 9605)' by UNDP and IMO. Applying a similar project model, UNDP is also in upstream discussions with IMO and GEF on 'GloNoise,' which would focus on the issue of ship-based ocean noise pollution and reducing its impact on ecosystems and species.

#### Adjusting scope of the project depending on countries' needs

It was critical to adjust the scope of GloMEEP in close consultation with the LPCs. Due to the LPC's legislation system and status of their regulatory frameworks, LPCs needed to address both, GHG emissions and air pollution from ships, which was not originally envisaged in the project design. The project was originally designed to only focus on providing support to countries on the domestication of Chapter 4 of Annex VI which sets out energy efficiency regulations for ships and hence addresses GHG emissions – rather than the entire Annex which includes, inter alia, regulations on Air Pollution (Chapter 3 of MARPOL Annex VII). As legally Chapter 4 cannot be implemented in isolation from the rest of Annex VI, during the project implementation and in consultation with LPCs, the project coordination unit identified the need to adjust the scope for all LPCs that had not yet domesticated Chapter 1 to 3 of MARPOL Annex VI. GloMEEP hence provided also support to those countries in developing the regulatory framework to implement the entire MARPOL Annex VI.

The adjustment of the scope of the project was also reflected in the project activities. In order to include air pollution in the scope of the project, GloMEEP also worked on Chapter 3 within

the workshops, while emphasizing the importance that effective implementation of MARPOL Annex requires implementation of all its chapters. The workshops made it clear that there were obvious synergies: improving the energy efficiency of ships reduces fuel consumption which not only reduces GHG emissions but also associated air pollutants (e.g. SOx, NOx). With regard to ports, while the Project Document focused on GHG / energy efficiency in ports, many LPCs had concerns about the health impacts of air pollutants in ports. This was the primary driver to adjust the scope of the project. Consequently, GloMEEP made sure that the Port Emission Toolkit provided guidance for ports to reduce both, air pollutants and GHG emissions.

### References and multimedia

- **TERMINAL EVALUATION**, <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/9744>
- **Project Document**, [https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/project\\_documents/2-23-2015\\_ID5508\\_ProDoc\\_IMO\\_Final.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/project_documents/2-23-2015_ID5508_ProDoc_IMO_Final.pdf)
- **GEF-UNDP-IMO GloMEEP Project publication** (including Ship and Port Emissions Toolkits), <https://glomeet.imo.org/resources/publications/>
- **GEF-UNDP-IMO GloMEEP Project and members of the GIA, 2020: Just In Time Arrival Guide – Barriers and Potential Solutions** <https://www.wcdn.imo.org/localresources/en/OurWork/PartnershipsProjects/Documents/GIA-just-in-time-hires.pdf>

### Contact

- Christian Severin, Sr. Environmental Specialist, GEF, [cseverin@thegef.org](mailto:cseverin@thegef.org)
- Filippo Berardi, Sr. Environmental Specialist, GEF, [fbearardi@thegef.org](mailto:fbearardi@thegef.org)
- Andrew Hudson, UNDP-GEF Principal Technical Adviser, International Waters, UNDP, [andrew.hudson@undp.org](mailto:andrew.hudson@undp.org)
- Astrid Dispert, Project Technical Manager, IMO, [adispert@imo.org](mailto:adispert@imo.org)

*The GEF Good Practice Briefs showcase examples of GEF investments that align with GEF 2020 Strategies and GEF-7 Programing Directions and Policy Recommendations. Featured projects were selected by the GEF Secretariat from a pool of nominations by GEF Agencies, taking into consideration approaches used to generate multiple global environmental benefits and co-benefits, and to achieve clear results and/or sustainability. Because the Briefs include projects that are implemented under different contexts, the practices highlighted should not necessarily be considered as universally applicable.*

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) was established on the eve of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit to help tackle our planet's most pressing environmental problems. Since then, the GEF has provided more than **\$21.1 billion** in grants and mobilized an additional **\$114 billion** in co-financing for more than **5,000 projects** in **170 countries**. Through its Small Grants Programme, the GEF has provided support to more than **25,000 civil society** and community initiatives in **133 countries**.



FEB 2021

[www.thegef.org](http://www.thegef.org)



HOME

GEF Good Practice Briefs

Building Capacity Towards Reducing GHG Emissions from Global Shipping / 2

PREVIOUS





# Sustainable Management of Bycatch in Bottom Trawl Fisheries

Improved institutional and regulatory frameworks through multi-stakeholder dialogue in Latin America and the Caribbean

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY	EXECUTING AGENCIES
Sustainable Management of Bycatch in Latin America and the Caribbean Trawl Fisheries (REBYC-II LAC)	Latin America & the Caribbean: Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	WECAFC Brazil, AUNAP Colombia, INVEMAR Colombia, INCOPESCA Costa Rica, INAPESEA/SAGARPA(SADER) Mexico, Ministry of Agriculture Animal Husbandry and Fisheries Suriname, Fisheries Division and Ministry of Agriculture, Land and Fisheries Trinidad and Tobago.
GEF PROJECT ID: 5304	<b>FOCAL AREAS</b> ▪ International Waters	03/04/2015 CEO Endorsement	07/22/2020 Project Closure
PROJECT TYPE: FSP	<b>IMPACT AREA</b> ▪ Biodiversity ▪ International Waters ▪ Food Security	04/23/2013 Project Approval	06/26/2019 Mid-Term Review
GEF PERIOD: GEF-5		GEF Project Grant <b>\$5,800,000</b>	Co-financing Total <b>\$17,198,491</b>

## Summary

The Sustainable Management of Bycatch in Latin America and the Caribbean Trawl Fisheries (REBYC-II LAC) project is a partnership between six countries and regional organizations to manage bycatch and to support sustainable development of bottom trawl fisheries and the people who depend on them. Over the last five years, it has sought to reduce food loss and to encourage sustainable livelihoods through improving collaborative institutional and regulatory arrangements for bycatch

management, strengthening management of bycatch through an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF), and enhancing information sharing in the region. The project has created an enabling environment that has increased trust and collaboration between government and stakeholders, leading to improved dialogue, updated rules and regulations, and reductions of over 30% in unsustainable bycatch in at least one pilot site per country.

## Results and Global Environmental Benefits

In the last four years, the project has achieved the following global environmental benefits as well as direct socioeconomic benefits for local communities:

- Over 30% reduction of bycatch (range 28-60%) in at least one pilot site per country over the previous four years. This included vessel-based reductions from Bycatch Reduction Devices, as well as reductions based on improved spatial and temporal measures.
- Five countries (Colombia, Trinidad and Tobago, Suriname, Costa Rica, and Brazil) drafted new laws that include bycatch management.
- Three countries (Brazil, Colombia, and Costa Rica) developed new management measures applying Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF)<sup>1</sup> framework (drafts developed in Suriname and Trinidad and Tobago).
- One Marine Area for Responsible Fisheries established (Barra del Colorado, Costa Rica).
- Five countries (Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico, and Suriname) established formal institutional co-management bodies (consultative processes/committees).
- One regional strategy on bycatch management drafted (awaiting final adoption at the next session of the Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission).
- Socioeconomic benefits to local fishers were improved or maintained through the creation or strengthening of more than twelve fisher organizations (e.g. Women's organizations in Costa Rica, local Surinamese fishing associations).
- Local capacities were improved through regional training workshops on Fishing Technology, Bycatch Utilization, EAF approach, and updated research on socio-economic and biological impacts of the fishery as well as value chain analysis in most countries.
- Regional coordinating working group on shrimp and groundfish in North-Brazil Guyana Shelf was re-established and strengthened.
- Trust between governments and stakeholders led to improved dialogue, and collaboration was significantly increased.

## Environmental Challenge

Industrial and semi-industrial bottom/shrimp trawling in tropical and sub-tropical areas tends to generate exceptionally large quantities of bycatch and low-value fish. In general, a significant part of this bycatch is discarded and unreported. In Latin America and the Caribbean, detailed information on the composition, volume, value, and potential utilization of bycatch—as well as on the impact of fishing on seabed habitats—had been inadequate until the REBYC-II LAC project. This may have led to significant impacts on



targeted and non-targeted fishery resources, marine ecosystems, and fishing communities. The root causes of impacts on fishery resources include local drivers such as unsustainable fishing practices and economic difficulties in the private fishing sector, and global drivers such as growing demand for fishery products. While the project cannot easily change the macroeconomic context, it does address barriers to better bycatch management, thus promoting sustainable development of bottom trawl fisheries and providing benefits to the people, communities, and other fisheries that the bottom trawl fishery sustains or influences.

## Integrated Approach and Key Features

### Integrated and science-based approach to the bottom trawl fishery

The project addressed the interface between biodiversity conservation and food security through sustainably managed international and national waters. In-depth analysis of national fisheries governance, legislation, and international instruments in all project countries led to this integrated approach. Project partners first evaluated the bycatch composition of its target fisheries by assessing the ecological and species-specific impacts of the catches. If these were determined to be unsustainable, partners sought technological and management solutions to reduce the amount of unsustainable bycatch and discards.

Additionally, improved on-board observation and data collection highlighted ecologically sensitive areas that require protection. The project supported dialogue to develop spatial or temporal measures that protect critical habitat. However, bycatch reduction may undermine short-term food security in many coastal communities. Thus, understanding the contribution of the trawl fisheries and different components

<sup>1</sup> The Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries has been adopted by the FAO Committee on Fisheries as the appropriate and practical way to fully implement the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries. EAF is a risk-based management planning process that covers the principles of Sustainable Development including the human and social elements of sustainability, not just the ecological and environmental components.



of trawl catches to livelihoods, nutrition, food security, and poverty alleviation was critically important for the development of sustainable bycatch management strategies. Using this approach, the project sought to protect biodiversity while preventing food-security impacts on vulnerable communities. The project sought consensus on a regional strategy to manage bycatch. This strategy improved practices across the region and will ensure regional collaboration.

#### Improved institutional and regulatory frameworks through multi-stakeholder dialogues

The project design ensured a multi-stakeholder, participatory process that supports everything from collecting baseline data, testing new technologies, forging agreement on management plans, developing regulations, and sharing information. This process included an early participatory approach to the design of the project itself through local and regional workshops. Thus, once the project began, a proper participatory framework already existed; in most of the countries these participatory committees continued to drive all the associated activities leading to positive outcomes for sustainable bycatch management in trawl fisheries.

While the effort to establish the multi-stakeholder committees was time consuming, it was critical for effective project delivery. These project committees were slowly becoming formalized management committees through government decrees. They are now formal institutional bodies that engage key stakeholders—including small- and large-scale fishing sectors, indigenous and non-indigenous fishers, various environmental organizations, and local communities and governments—in the management of these fisheries. As a example in Colombia and Costa Rica, this participatory approach has led fisher organizations to play a critical role in negotiating management measures (particularly spatial approaches such as fisheries zoning agreements) that clarify where artisanal and industrial fishing takes place and that reduce conflict amongst users. Multi-stakeholder committees are also the main vehicle to update fishery management plans and agree to new or improved regulations, such as those concerning the use of bycatch reduction devices.

Now, the project fosters a proactive and participatory co-management process where all the key stakeholders have participated in an integrated and adaptive fisheries management decision-making process. Strong ownership by government and other key stakeholders offers a foundation for sustainability of outcomes in the face of political instability. An example is Brazil, where the government office responsible for fisheries changed four times during REBYC-II LAC's lifetime. Despite these changes, the institutional arrangement facilitated by the project, which supported strong partnerships among different institutions (government, academia, fishers' associations), created an enabling environment for participatory, open, and transparent processes to develop a fisheries management plan. This included local consultations in almost 60 bottom-trawling communities that represent more than 90% of catches from bottom trawl fisheries.

#### Understanding impacts on vulnerable groups including gender

It is vital to understand the vulnerable groups that the project may affect, and address them directly via policy, capacity building, or project adjustments. Value chain and socio-economic analyses on the fisheries pilot sites improved



Fishers and researchers in Trinidad weigh the catch during comparative gear trials © FAO Trinidad

understanding of the role of women in the value chain. Partners then adjusted the project to make sure that women received socioeconomic benefits from bycatch and that local communities that relied on nutrition from bycatch could have alternative livelihoods. Thus, outputs address the needs of local communities and do not affect them disproportionately. These studies also identified other vulnerable groups, providing the basis for further intervention. In Costa Rica and Colombia, for example, these studies shed light on the role of women in the value chain, and the project is now working to create or strengthen women's organizations that may fight towards decent employment or seek alternative livelihoods. This is particularly crucial in Costa Rica, where trawling is currently banned.

## Lessons Learned

#### Engagement of private sector and fisher's traditional knowledge to develop appropriate techniques

The project collaborated with the private sector to develop new adaptable and implementable technologies and regulations as a part of multi-stakeholder research process. For example, fishers welcome bycatch reduction devices when such devices decrease fish sorting times on vessels that can lead to better rest or more fishing time, both highly appreciated during long and arduous fishing journeys. Compliance and uptake of new technologies also improved when private sector partners saw other benefits (such as lower fuel costs) in real time rather than just reading about them in reports. One of the other reasons for uptake of new technology by fishers is that scientists work together with fishers to develop the reduction devices. Fishers themselves came up with their own proposals based on tests that they conducted, inspired by discussions with researchers. They took ownership of the process and worked together with researchers in modifying and adapting the fishing nets.

The project has tested and introduced innovative fishing technologies in all project countries, including technologies adapted from other countries (such as square mesh panels



Women's organization seeking alternative livelihoods in Costa Rica © Coopesolidar for FAO

and flexible turtle excluding devices). In some cases, new technologies were also developed specifically by the country implementing the project (for example, updated grids and fisheyes—rigid metal frames that form an opening for fish to escape through—for small trawlers in Brazil).

#### Incorporated lessons learned from previous projects

The REBYC-II LAC project builds on two previous Sustainable Management of Bycatch projects. It incorporated lessons learned from these previous projects into its design. Key lessons learned from previous projects include strengthening of institutional arrangements to develop and implement management plans, increasing participation of fishers in planning and implementation of appropriate management measures, and creating incentives and capacity to reduce bycatch and discards. Another lesson learned was that focusing solely on improving fishing technology is not enough. It is also important to understand the bio-economic impacts on both the marine resources and those dependent on them as a source of livelihood and income, and improving knowledge management for enhanced dissemination of results and greater awareness. All these lessons learned were addressed in the project design.

#### Toward durability: Scaling up in country and region

To achieve sustainable management of bycatch in trawl fisheries, the project focused on processes that improved institutional and regulatory frameworks and ensure voluntary uptake of new fishing practices. The strengthening of bycatch management through multi-stakeholder participatory processes offered a strong potential for scaling up and replication; e.g. Brazil went from 4 local pilot sites to 14 coastal states without using project funds and regional EAF training led to local application in Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico, and Suriname. Fleet-wide behavioral changes are not yet fully sustainable, but the process is expected to continue a positive trajectory, given the benefits provided by the project, such as improved fishing technology, lower costs, new food products, and institutional structures for participation.

This participatory approach shows that focusing on how things are developed is as important as what is developed. REBYC-II LAC had to be implemented with a high degree of complexity: six countries; four languages; a wide geographic area with diverse national socio-economic and fishing characteristics; varying degrees of national capacities (at institutional and governmental levels as well as academic and fishery enterprise

capacities and abilities). By using a common participatory approach and sharing knowledge from other areas and countries, the project was able to address this complexity and develop tailored solutions that fit into local contexts.

## References and Multimedia

- For more information, videos and news, please visit the project website, <http://www.fao.org/in-action/rebyc-2/en/>
- Mid Term Evaluation of the Sustainable management of bycatch in Latin America and Caribbean trawl fisheries (REBYC-II LAC) Project (June 2019)
- Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries, <http://www.fao.org/fishery/eaf-net/about/what-is-eaf/en>

## Contact

- Christian Holde Severin, Senior Environmental Specialist, GEF, [cseverin@thegef.org](mailto:cseverin@thegef.org)
- Carlos Fuentevilla, Regional Project Coordinador, FAO, [Carlos.Fuentevilla@fao.org](mailto:Carlos.Fuentevilla@fao.org)
- Alejandro Flores, Lead Technical Officer, FAO, [Alejandro.Flores@fao.org](mailto:Alejandro.Flores@fao.org)
- Daniela Kalikoski, HQ Lead Technical Officer, FAO, [daniela.kalikoski@fao.org](mailto:daniela.kalikoski@fao.org)

Available at:  
<http://www.thegef.org/topics/knowledge-learning>

*The GEF Good Practice Briefs showcase examples of GEF investments that align with GEF 2020 Strategies and GEF-7 Programming Directions and Policy Recommendations. Featured projects were selected by the GEF Secretariat from a pool of nominations by GEF Agencies, taking into consideration approaches used to generate multiple global environmental benefits and co-benefits, and to achieve clear results and/or sustainability. Because the Briefs include projects that are implemented under different contexts, the practices highlighted should not necessarily be considered as universally applicable.*

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) was established on the eve of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit to help tackle our planet's most pressing environmental problems. Since then, the GEF has provided more than **\$21.1 billion** in grants and mobilized an additional **\$114 billion** in co-financing for more than **5,000 projects** in **170 countries**. Through its Small Grants Programme, the GEF has provided support to more than 25,000 civil society and community initiatives in 133 countries.



# Green Infrastructure for a Climate Resilient Society

## Nature-Based Solutions for Erosion Control in Vietnam

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY	EXECUTING AGENCIES
Climate Resilient Rural Infrastructure in Northern Mountain Province of Vietnam	Vietnam, East Asia	Asian Development Bank, United Nations Development Programme	Agriculture Projects Management Board (APMB), Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD)
GEF PROJECT ID: 3103		04/23/2012 CEO Endorsement	05/31/2017 Project Closure
PROJECT TYPE: FSP	IMPACT AREAS	06/30/2009 Project Approval	05/05/2015 Mid-Term Review
GEF PERIOD: GEF-4 SPECIAL CLIMATE CHANGE FUND	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate Change Adaptation</li> <li>Climate Change Mitigation</li> <li>Biodiversity</li> <li>Food Security</li> <li>Poverty Reduction</li> <li>Strengthen Resilience</li> </ul>	GEF Project Grant <b>\$3,400,000</b>	Co-financing Total <b>\$96,150,000</b>
FOCAL AREA			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate Change Adaptation</li> </ul>			

### Summary

This project aimed to demonstrate and promote the application of bioengineering<sup>1</sup> measures in road and riverbank slope protection and stabilization to build the resilience of local communities to the impacts of climate change and extreme weather events. The project also sought to familiarize local experts with bioengineering techniques and to initiate mainstreaming of climate resilient green infrastructure development in Vietnam through pilot projects and targeted capacity building. Pilot demonstration sites were used to test a range of bioengineering techniques and formed the physical basis of knowledge transfer to relevant line ministry staff through training and site visits. The project illustrated that nature-based solutions can be applied to prevent serious erosion and can increase the resilience of local communities. It also demonstrated

successful bioengineering solutions at four riverbank and roadside slope sites, and prepared landslide and flash flood risk maps for Son La and Bac Kan provinces. To promote sustainability and replication across the region, the project built the capacity of technical personnel to employ bioengineering techniques and developed knowledge products, risk assessments, and guidance documents. With funding from the Special Climate Change Fund of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the project was implemented jointly by the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and executed by the Agriculture Projects Management Board, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Vietnam, with technical backing of the International Centre for Environmental Management (ICEM).

<sup>1</sup> Bioengineering is the use of vegetation to serve an engineering function, forming a practical subset of green infrastructure. In many parts of the world, the use of plants to control slope erosion is a well-developed, low-cost technique. Plants have been used to stabilise slopes for centuries, but the expansion of civil engineering in the 20th century involved a reliance on man-made materials with precisely predictable properties, and the use of vegetation was neglected. The modern practice of bioengineering has emerged over the last 40 years in response to the high costs and sometimes low performance of the conventional approaches used by civil engineers for slope stabilization and erosion control.

### Results, Global Environmental Benefits and Adaptation Benefits

The project has achieved the following global environmental benefits as well as direct adaptation benefits for local communities:


- Resilience of local landscapes and communities was strengthened, and socioeconomic benefits were provided to local people through bioengineering methodologies.
- Four riverbank and roadside bioengineering demonstration sites were completed. After several years, the pilot sites proved that the slope and embankment protection has increased the resilience of local communities to natural events such as extreme flooding.
- Overall construction cost of riverbank and roadside protection were reduced due to the cost effectiveness of bioengineering techniques, which were 10-23% of conventional techniques.
- Bioengineering methodologies created local employment and provided other local benefits such as fodder, building materials, and medicinal plants.
- Aquatic and terrestrial habitats were established for plants and animals. Such habitats had been lost in nearby areas treated by conventional engineering.
- The capacity and technical skills of 179 Vietnamese government personnel, drawn from the national, provincial, district, and commune levels, were improved along with university staff and students and local communities, as well as visiting delegations from Lao PDR and Timor Leste.
- Technical guidelines were developed, providing detailed technical designs and construction methods for selected bioengineering and associated engineering options.
- More than 20 knowledge products were completed and put into use by local and national governments and universities, including videos and a website covering: (i) climate change vulnerability assessment; (ii) design, construction, and monitoring of the demonstrations and their effectiveness; (iii) workshops and training materials; and (iv) technical recommendations on design and use of bioengineering for rural infrastructure in Northern Vietnam.

### Environmental Challenge

Vietnam is one of the most hazard-prone countries in the East Asia and Pacific region. The country's 3,260-km coastline is regularly exposed to typhoons, floods, drought, coastal erosion, and landslides, which pose significant threat to roads, embankments, and water supply infrastructure. Vietnam has extremely high exposure to flooding, ranked 1st with Bangladesh, including riverine, flash, and coastal flooding. Vietnam also has high exposure to tropical cyclones and their associated hazards.<sup>2</sup> Floods represent the largest risk by economic impact in Vietnam, accounting for an estimated 97% of average annual economic losses from natural hazards.<sup>2</sup> All 15 Northern provinces in Vietnam experience a large number of

<sup>2</sup> <https://climateknowledgeportal.worldbank.org/country/vietnam/vulnerability>

<sup>3</sup> For example, Sub-Project (SP) 4 was along 106 m of riverbank and approximately 800 m<sup>2</sup> of a slope area located in Thanh Mai Commune, Cho Moi District, Bac Kan Province. SP31 was approximately 102 m of the roadside cut slope and a slope area of around 1,700 m<sup>2</sup> located in Phong Lap Commune, Thuan Chau District, Son La Province. SP32 was along 111 m of riverbank and a slope area of around 1300 m<sup>2</sup> passing through Thom Mon and Chieng Ly Communes Thuan Chau District, Son La Province. SP35 was along 94 m of roadside cut slope and 87 m of fill slope and had a slope area of approximately 3763 m<sup>2</sup> located in Lien Minh Commune, Vo Nhai District, Thai Nguyen Province.



Project location map (ADB 2017: 6)

climate-related challenges. They have limited and poor quality infrastructure compared to the rest of Vietnam. Infrastructure loss and damage result in high maintenance and rehabilitation costs, and loss of benefits to local communities when structures remain un-repaired and nonfunctional. With poor and unstable infrastructure, local communities are also exposed to risk of land and property damage and loss. Therefore, increasing the resilience of infrastructure is important to improving the overall resilience of communities.

### Integrated Approach and Key Features

#### Innovative approach with integrated benefits

Bioengineering measures are low-cost options to supplement conventional infrastructure engineering designs and to strengthen the resilience of infrastructure through erosion control, water conservation, enhanced slope stability, and sustainability of water-crossing structures, and reduced maintenance and rehabilitation costs. In many cases, hard or mixed measures are necessary to stabilize and protect a slope or embankment. In these cases, a combination of low-cost conventional measures (gabions) and bioengineering was applied, with nearby sites treated with conventional hard engineering measures (reinforced concrete and hard revetments), allowing for comparative assessment. Two years after project completion, there were no signs of erosion at any of the demonstration sites despite several serious floods and intense rainfall events. The bioengineering measures have kept the slopes stable and safeguarded the riverbanks, road slopes and adjacent land from erosion. Sites subject to serious erosion prior to the project have been improved by the bioengineering work.

Aside from serving primary engineering purposes, bioengineering has also provided social, economic and ecosystem benefits. For example, the bioengineering measures used local cost-effective labor and materials. The approach engaged and empowered local communities for repairs and maintenance, utilized locally applicable techniques, and created ownership and local employment. Also, the demonstrations established aquatic and terrestrial habitats for plants and animals. As the project sites were small in scale<sup>3</sup>, the amount of greenhouse gas mitigation and other benefits from this project were limited. But application of



the same methodologies on a larger scale, such as riverbank protection at watershed level, can have more significant impacts on climate change mitigation and adaptation, biodiversity conservation and food security, for example. The demonstrations at the pilot sites have shown that using plants can also provide productive benefits, such as cardamom, fodder, firewood and others. In addition, the bioengineering approach used in this project was particularly inclusive, with a high proportion of women and a wide range of ethnic minorities included in the labor forces.

#### Producing knowledge products and capacity building

Bioengineering requires new design standards, skills and techniques, including plant and geotechnical knowledge, and effective engagement with local communities. The project supported knowledge and learning opportunities to share lessons learned from this project broadly with other provinces in Vietnam and other countries in the region and to facilitate scale up and replication. These knowledge and learning opportunities included workshops, technical guidelines, training materials, and a project website, as well as videos in English and Vietnamese. Local, national and regional government officials and other stakeholders are able to use these knowledge products. Consequently, with these learning materials and associated training, the project has helped raise awareness and build skills among government officials in bioengineering approaches to infrastructure resilience.

#### Knowledge sharing and mainstreaming bioengineering in infrastructure

The project involved relevant national, provincial, and district government officials in training, local consultations, field visits, and workshops. The project also conducted activities to scale up systematic application of bioengineering methods to national and regional level, including: (i) national level workshops and proposed policy and regulatory innovations, (ii) participation in the riverbank (2015) and roadside bioengineering (2016) workshops by delegates from the Lao PDR, (iii) a visit to the two riverbank demonstration by delegates from Timor Leste in September 2015, and (iv) a visit to the riverbank protection demonstration site in Bac Kan Province by UNDP delegates in November 2015. In September 2016, a group of engineering faculty and students from the University of Transport and Communications in Hanoi visited the roadside demonstration site in Thai Nguyen Province.

Based on the project experiences, ADB has extended its application of bioengineering in infrastructure to other countries in the region, such as Lao PDR and Timor Leste, ADB organized



Local community planting new Vetiver grass in Son La Province (June 2015) @ICEM

a regional workshop to share the experience of sustainable infrastructure in the Asian region on May 2017 in Hanoi, and introduced lessons learned from this project. To share the lessons learned of this project in the region and beyond, ADB is developing a publication titled "Awareness Raising Material on Bioengineering for Green Infrastructure."

## Lessons Learned

#### Nature-based solutions strengthen resilience of local landscapes and communities

The project demonstrated that nature-based solutions worked well to strengthen the resilience of local landscapes and infrastructure. Lessons learned included: (i) bioengineering should be considered at the earliest stage of project planning; (ii) high-risk locations need to be identified as early as possible using proven vulnerability assessment and slope condition criteria; (iii) specific slope problems need to be identified and assessed using low-cost geotechnical investigation procedures<sup>4</sup>; and (iv) integration of hard and soft measures needs to be considered to solve problems where bioengineering alone is insufficient.

It is also vital to achieve the active engagement of local contractors and communities to provide training in bioengineering methods, in designing the intervention, identifying suitable plant species, sources, replication methods and planting seasons, and to monitor the project for maintenance. Plant selection for the bioengineering project was based on the project's objectives, site analysis, project design, plant species' characteristics, planting material availability, and cost. In order to ensure maintenance during early stages, especially for watering trees and plants, management arrangements with local governments and local communities need to be formally established. Considering social aspects of bioengineering design was also critical for the project's success. The social aspects of the bioengineering design included: (i) identifying communities willing to host the demonstrations; (ii) identifying pilot demonstration sites with tangible community benefits – for example, at SP4 Bac Kan Province, protection of the community access track on the riverbank, agricultural land, and other assets; (iii) reviewing plant options for their engineering properties, potential economic uses and local availability; and (iv) continuing local consultation and capacity building as well as knowledge sharing.

Communities understood and appreciated the benefits of the bioengineering approach because they were closely involved in construction and maintenance. Subsequently, based on their experience in the project, some families have applied bioengineering methods to protect their own land. With bioengineering, local communities do not need to wait for government to fix infrastructure or protect their property. They can take preventative measures and maintain green infrastructure on their own initiative using local materials and labor, although follow-up training and awareness raising with local governments, contractors and communities are necessary. Communities also need to be involved in sharing experiences and management approaches with neighboring communities and with government at district, provincial and national levels.

#### Need for on-going investment in scaling up and

#### mainstreaming bioengineering in infrastructure

Bioengineering has been well received by the provinces, districts, and communes in Vietnam, particularly with respect to the low-cost and effectiveness of the measures which use local plants and community participation for roadside and embankment stabilization. The project's training and communications materials have had an influence on the tide of opinion within national government, with project products continuing to be used by government in training activities. Strong local government commitment and engagement also helped promote outcomes and advocate uptake with national government. However, bioengineering techniques are yet to be formally included in national design standards and specifications in Vietnam. This will require a sustained and longer commitment to mainstreaming and capacity building than can be covered in a single project.

In Vietnam, there are institutional barriers to the use of low-cost bioengineering solutions, not only in engineering codes but also in the contracting processes that currently provide little incentive for cost savings. Thus, a more extensive network of pilot demonstrations needs to be established, accompanied by development of technical standards and cost norms for bioengineering methods. Equally important in the medium term is modifying the curriculum for training of engineers, so they have the skills and commitment to integrating nature-based solutions into all aspects of their work. The University of Transport and Communications in Hanoi has already made use of the project's outputs in engineering instruction and has expressed interest in further bioengineering research.

#### Key role of development partners in promoting nature-based solutions

ADB followed a blended approach and bundled the GEF grant for this project with a large infrastructure loan to Vietnam, which enabled the Vietnamese government to try an innovative approach like bioengineering in infrastructure in Northern Vietnam. Thus, when the GEF Partner Agencies can work with government to combine pioneering GEF investments with large conventional loans, opportunities can emerge for effective demonstration of innovative solutions for scaling up and replication. This project provided good examples at the pilot demonstration sites and communicated the benefits from field experiences of the bioengineering approach at local, national and regional levels, paving the road for scaling up. Ideally, in a scaled-up demonstration, pilot sites should be in areas where they are easily accessible for decision makers, planners, and researchers. Also, locating demonstrations close to conventional engineering projects addressing the same issues would enable comparative monitoring of performance in years to come.

## References and Multimedia

- Final Report, Promoting Climate Resilient Rural Infrastructure in Northern Vietnam (International Centre for Environmental Management (ICEM) 2017), <http://icem.com.au/portfolio-items/promoting-climate-resilient-rural-infrastructure-in-northern-vietnam-report-series/>
- Natural Solutions to erosion control in Vietnam. Case studies from the Northern Mountainous Region <project



Overview of bioengineered riverbank protection in Bac Kan Province (September 2015) @ICEM

website for knowledge sharing>, <http://icem.com.au/series-of-publications-on-the-promotion-of-bioengineering-in-vietnam-now-available/climate-change-1/>

- Slope Protection Designs and Specifications: Guidelines from Thiays in Northern Vietnam*. ADB CDTA Project Promoting Climate Resilient Rural Infrastructure in Northern Vietnam (ICEM 2017), [https://www.vetiver.org/VNN\\_IJECM\\_SlopeProtectionDesign.pdf](https://www.vetiver.org/VNN_IJECM_SlopeProtectionDesign.pdf)
- Bringing Nature Back (ICEM), video about the project, <http://icem.com.au/portfolio-items/bringing-nature-back/>

## Contact

- Chizuru Aoki, Lead Environmental Specialist, GEF, [caoki@thegef.org](mailto:caoki@thegef.org)
- David Salter, Principal Natural Resources and Agriculture Specialist, Asian Development Bank, [dsalter@adb.org](mailto:dsalter@adb.org)
- Jeremy Carew-Reid, Director General, International Centre for Environmental Management (ICEM), [jecr@icem.com.au](mailto:jecr@icem.com.au)
- James Ramsay, Project Team Lead, ICEM, [jramsay@horizon.bc.ca](mailto:jramsay@horizon.bc.ca)

*The GEF Good Practice Briefs showcase examples of GEF investments that align with GEF 2020 Strategies and GEF-7 Programing Directions and Policy Recommendations. Featured projects were selected by the GEF Secretariat from a pool of nominations by GEF Agencies, taking into consideration approaches used to generate multiple global environmental benefits and co-benefits, and to achieve clear results and/or sustainability. Because the Briefs include projects that are implemented under different contexts, the practices highlighted should not necessarily be considered as universally applicable.*

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) was established on the eve of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit to help tackle our planet's most pressing environmental problems. Since then, the GEF has provided more than **\$21.1 billion** in grants and mobilized an additional **\$114 billion** in co-financing for more than **5,000 projects** in **170 countries**. Through its Small Grants Programme, the GEF has provided support to more than 25,000 civil society and community initiatives in 133 countries.

<sup>4</sup> Low-cost geotechnical investigation procedures include the Dynamic Cone Penetrometer, which is used to determine the strength of subgrade and base layers. It is used to conduct pavement research and other studies in the US because it is easy to transport and inexpensive to operate.



# Integrated Coastal Watershed Conservation

Cross-sectoral and participatory conservation, and monitoring in the context of climate change in Mexico

<b>PROJECT FULL NAME</b>	<b>COUNTRY &amp; REGION</b>	<b>IMPLEMENTING AGENCY</b>	World Bank
Conservation of Coastal Watersheds to Achieve Multiple Global Environmental Benefits in the Context of Changing Environments	Mexico, Latin America 	<b>EXECUTING AGENCIES</b>	National Commission for Protected Areas (CONANP), National Forestry Commission (CONAFOR), National Institute of Ecology and Climate Change (INECC), and a private institution, the Mexican Fund for the Conservation of Nature (FMCN).
<b>GEF PROJECT ID: 4792</b>	<b>FOCAL AREAS</b>	09/09/2013 CEO Endorsement	06/28/2019 Project Closure
<b>PROJECT TYPE: FSP</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity,</li> <li>Climate Change Mitigation</li> <li>Land Degradation</li> <li>Sustainable Forest Management</li> </ul>	06/01/2012 Project Approval	01/23/2017 Mid-Term Review
<b>GEF PERIOD: GEF-5</b>		<b>GEF Project Grant</b>	<b>Co-financing Total</b>
		<b>\$39,518,181</b>	<b>\$239,886,000</b>

## Summary

The project promotes integrated management of coastal watersheds to conserve biodiversity, contribute to climate change mitigation, and enhance sustainable land use in the Gulf of Mexico and Gulf of California, where impacts from climate change are significant and habitats of globally significant biodiversity are provided. Collaborating with three federal agencies and a private foundation, the project focused on improving sustainable management of protected areas and surrounding watersheds including the areas where local communities manage agroforestry systems. In addition, local communities were engaged through sub-projects that supported sustainable cattle ranching, honey production, adventure tourism and others. These

same stakeholders were involved in project monitoring and development of the Integrated Watershed Action Plans. The project achieved improvement of protected areas management covering 1,748,204.73 hectares, improved management of productive landscapes in the watersheds covering 35,784 hectares, and due to the emphasis on community participation, strengthened socio-ecological resilience of the watersheds to climate change and other potential future environmental and social perturbations. Community pride and ownership in the sustainable management of watersheds was a key outcome. Based on all these outcomes, an integrated watershed management approach is being scaled up at the local and national level.



Coffee cultivation in the coastal watershed © Santiago Gibert



Figure 1: Six project sites on conservation of coastal watersheds

## Global Environmental Benefits

Key global environmental benefits and direct benefits to local communities at the end of the project include following:

- 1,748,204.73 ha of protected area were consolidated<sup>1</sup>, surpassing the end-target projection (1,100,000.00 ha) and achieving 158% of results.
- 10 protected areas are in the process of showing an improvement in their management effectiveness according to the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool for protected areas (METT), Annual Operational Plans in line with Integrated Watershed Action Plans (IWAPs) and availability of sustainable finance.
- \$28.6 million have been raised for permanent endowment fund for protected areas (achieved 100% of the end-target)
- 35,784 ha of watersheds included Payment for Ecosystem Services as part of their management strategies, and agro-ecosystem and sustainable forest management sub-projects in accordance with Integrated Watershed Action Plans (IWAPs), surpassing the end-target of 18,696 ha and achieving 191% of results.
- 5.53 MtCO<sub>2</sub>e were avoided/sequestered across the relevant watersheds, surpassing the original end target 4,015 MtCO<sub>2</sub>e and achieving 137% of results.
- 6 Integrated Watershed Action Plans (IWAPs) were finalized achieving its outcome target.
- 6 local partners have incorporated better land management practices.

mountain ranges run parallel to the coast, and deep canyons and ravines connect the mountains with the ocean. They harbor important ecosystems, where globally significant biodiversity is at risk. The threat to the Gulf of Mexico and Gulf of California coastal watersheds is increasing due to poor land use planning and lack of enforcement of environmental regulations. If no action is taken, studies show a 35% additional loss of rain forests and 18% additional loss of temperate forests by 2050 in these two regions. Such forest losses would be accompanied by significant loss of biodiversity, increased GHGs emission, and a decrease in other sustaining ecosystems goods and services. To reverse these trends, a multi-institutional effort is required.

## Integrated Approach and Key Features

The project provided strong evidence of how Integrated Watershed Action Plans, paired with key activities, can reduce biodiversity loss, GHG emissions, and land degradation, through strengthening sustainable land use and socio-ecological resilience of watersheds.

### Cross-sectoral coordination for integrated approach

Inter-ministerial coordination starting from the project design stage was critical to achieve sustainable land management at the watershed level. The project was designed in collaboration with three federal agencies: the National Commission for Protected Areas (CONANP) strengthened the consolidation of protected areas, National Forestry Commission (CONAFOR) led watershed management through a Payment for Ecosystem Services scheme, and the National Institute of Ecology and Climate Change (INECC) facilitated participatory development of the Integrated Watershed Action Plans (IWAPs). A private institution, the Mexican Fund for the Conservation of Nature (FMCN) worked on agroforestry sub-projects with

## Environmental Challenge

Mexico will be disproportionately affected by climate change. The impacts of climate change, such as hurricanes, drought and forest fires, will be most evident in the coastal areas of the Gulf of Mexico and the Gulf of California, where

<sup>1</sup> The protected areas were considered to be consolidated if they have: (a) a published management program or a clear strategic plan (logical framework or similar) that defines results, activities, and indicators for decision making; (b) core and complementary personnel that can implement the main activities identified in the strategic plan; (c) a financial plan including financial gap analysis and implementation of strategies to reduce gaps (described below); (d) essential infrastructure, equipment, and recurrent funds for basic operation, including those to address natural contingencies; and (e) a diversified budget with investment from national and international sources.





Figure 2: Image of collaboration among different agencies in watersheds

local communities in the watersheds. With each agency's technical expertise, the project established the Technical Project Committee to coordinate actions with the aim of reducing negative externalities (e.g., inappropriate land use practices that lead to deforestation and unwarranted GHGs emissions) while maximizing synergies and multiple benefits from the same landscape. The implementation success of the project hinged on its cross-sectoral and inter-ministerial coordination from the beginning to the development and uptake of the landscape-oriented integrated approach which was made manifest in the agreed IWAPs.

#### Extensive community involvement in project design, implementation and monitoring

Local communities were actively engaged in the project through sub-projects, which were designed, organized and supervised by local organizations which helped to build trust and ownership of the project. The project identified and approved 32 sub-projects for sustainable land management and improvement of local livelihoods proposed by local organizations, such as honey production, sustainable cattle ranching, pepper production, adventure tourism. Throughout implementation of the sub-projects, interests and commitments of local communities to conserve their natural resources were strengthened. Furthermore, the local residents started recognizing the value of ecosystem services provided by the basins, and the importance of conserving riparian areas and maintaining the connectivity of well-preserved natural areas. As a result, local communities were actively engaged in not only the sub-projects, but also project monitoring activities. This monitoring data will feed into development of the IWAPs.

The regional coordination unit also invested significant effort in selecting, training, and accompanying the community organizations to implement the sub-projects

with local communities, and this investment was considered instrumental in the project's success. In total, 1,669 workshops, which were participated by 16,173 people (6,585 women and 9,588 men) including 20 % of indigenous, were held in four years to strengthen local capacities.

#### Sustainable financing mechanisms

The project included a component to increase financing and secure permanent funding for the targeted protected areas. The project partners have raised \$28.6 million, 100% of the project's original end-target, which is a significant achievement given that recently many potential funders have become disinterested in funding protected area trust funds. For capitalization of the Coastal Watersheds Fund, the project managed to get contribution from private companies including \$189,000 from Braskem-Idesa and \$346,000 from Materias Primas de Monterrey (presently COVIA). The other funding sources include: \$4.71 million from Packard Foundation, \$486,000 from Hydraulic Infrastructure Fund of Sinaloa (FIHSIN), \$100,000 from Resources Legacy Fund (RLF), \$1.086 million from Helmsley Foundation, and \$12.601 million from KfW (German Development Bank).

#### Innovative monitoring tools both at national and local levels

INECC has developed IWAPs in six watersheds with comprehensive technical data that identify priority sites to invest in defined activities that will maintain ecosystem services. Biodiversity, deforestation and community water monitoring systems [utilizing the Global Water Watch methodology<sup>2</sup>] are in place in the following watersheds: Tuxpan, Antigua, Jamapa, Huazuntlán, Temoloapa and Usumacinta basins, and this decision-making support tool with comprehensive technical data will be applicable to other areas.

Civil society organizations together with community members across the six watersheds monitored water quality and quantity following the Global Water Watch methodology. The civil society organizations adopted the monitoring methodologies into their core practice. The information generated and analyzed through the monitoring systems has informed the IWAPs for each watershed to strengthen local institutions and promote adaptive management.

With strong contributions from community-based monitoring, the CONANP team, together with civil society organizations, periodically gathered biodiversity data. This data and information were incorporated into the database on the National System for Biodiversity Monitoring, which is a product of five-year collaboration between National Commission for Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO), CONANP, CONAFOR and FMCN.

## Lessons Learned

### Integrated approach

In the coastal watershed in Mexico, landscape level planning and management, including protected areas and productive landscapes, was key to address drivers of environmental degradation. This integrated landscape approach became possible through effective inter-governmental collaboration across territorial areas from the design to implementation of the project. Agencies involved in the project are responsible for protected area management, mitigation of climate change through reduction of deforestation, monitoring of land use change, reduction of biodiversity degradation and associated carbon stocks, and improving socio-economic factors in local communities. This effective cross-agency collaboration also produced innovative community-based monitoring tools on integrated watershed management.

### Stakeholder engagement

Successful implementation of this project is strongly associated with active engagement of local organizations and communities, and building trust with them, which has been achieved through the tangible benefits that local communities realized during the project. Since local organizations were heavily involved in design and implementation of sub-projects to improve sustainable watershed management and community livelihoods. The sub-projects directly provided socio-economic benefits to local communities and the community members recognized the value of ecosystem services provided by the watersheds. They were actively involved in not only the sub-projects, but also more broadly in project monitoring activities. The community-based monitoring information was highly valuable data for the development of appropriate integrated watershed action plans.

### Scaling up the project

With clear benefits for both the environment and human wellbeing, this new integrated approach caught the attention of the national government and other municipalities. The Mexican government has now widely disseminated lessons learned from this innovative watershed level approach to other local governments. This model of landscape conservation will be shared nationally with the aim of scaling up the experience and approach in other watersheds.

## References and Multimedia

- Project website (only in Spanish): <http://www.c6.org.mx/cuencas-costeras/manejo-integral-de-cuencas/>

- PAMIC (Planes de Acción para el Manejo Integral de Cuencas Hídricas, or Action Plans for the Integrated Management of Water Basins) website (only in Spanish): <http://cuencas.cms.matrushka.com.mx/>
- FMCN's Annual Report 2017, available at <https://www.fmcn.org/uploads/infos/file/pdf/QqUS5jNYxaXZWEJCCDLt6Ry4crMg33Hgd62Kq9g.pdf>

## Contact

- Mark Zimsky, GEF, Biodiversity Focal Area Coordinator, Senior Biodiversity Specialist, [mzimsky@thegef.org](mailto:mzimsky@thegef.org)
- Adriana Moreira, Senior Environmental Specialist, World Bank, [amoreira@worldbank.org](mailto:amoreira@worldbank.org)
- Sylvia Diez, Senior Environmental Specialist, World Bank, [sdiez@worldbank.org](mailto:sdiez@worldbank.org)
- Renée González, Conservation Director, the Mexican Fund for the Conservation of Nature (FMCN), [renee.gonzalez@fmcn.org](mailto:renee.gonzalez@fmcn.org)

Available at:  
<http://www.thegef.org/topics/knowledge-learning>

*The GEF Good Practice Briefs showcase examples of GEF investments that align with GEF 2020 Strategies and GEF-7 Programming Directions and Policy Recommendations. Featured projects were selected by the GEF Secretariat from a pool of nominations by GEF Agencies, taking into consideration approaches used to generate multiple global environmental benefits and co-benefits, and to achieve clear results and/or sustainability. Because the Briefs include projects that are implemented under different contexts, the practices highlighted should not necessarily be considered as universally applicable.*

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) was established on the eve of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit to help tackle our planet's most pressing environmental problems. Since then, the GEF has provided more than **\$21.1 billion** in grants and mobilized an additional **\$114 billion** in co-financing for more than **5,000 projects** in **170 countries**. Through its Small Grants Programme, the GEF has provided support to more than 25,000 civil society and community initiatives in 133 countries.

<sup>2</sup> Global Water Watch (GWW) promotes citizen participation in water monitoring, bringing together community groups with adequate technology to obtain credible information that helps to encourage adequate care, or sustainable management, of the landscape. The monitoring of water quality and quantity parameters allows people to propose the use of practices that allow a sustainable use of land and water. The GWW-Mexico website is designed to maintain the biological and physical-chemical database of surface waters, collected by citizens certified by GWW.



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY  
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET



WORLD BANK GROUP

FEB 2021  
978-1-948690-73-7  
[www.thegef.org](http://www.thegef.org)



HOME

GEF Good Practice Briefs

Integrated Coastal Watershed Conservation / 2


PREVIOUS





# Data Driven Integrated Forest Management

Establishing a new system to identify multiple forest ecosystem services in Turkey

PROJECT FULL NAME	COUNTRY & REGION	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY	EXECUTING AGENCIES
Integrated approach to management of forests in Turkey, with demonstration in high conservation value forests in the Mediterranean region	Turkey, Europe 	UNDP	General Directorate of Forestry, Government of Turkey
GEF PROJECT ID: 4469	<b>FOCAL AREAS</b>	12/28/2012 CEO Endorsement	01/22/2020 Project Closure
PROJECT TYPE: FSP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity</li> <li>Climate Change Mitigation</li> <li>Sustainable Forest</li> </ul>	05/26/2011 Project Approval	02/28/2018 Mid-Term Review
GEF PERIOD: GEF-5		GEF Project Grant <b>\$7,120,000</b>	Co-financing Total <b>\$21,430,000</b>

## Summary

The project promoted integrated forest management in Turkey, demonstrating multiple environmental benefits in high conservation value forests in the Mediterranean forest region.

The project delivered 638,923 ha (142% of end of project target) of forest area with integrated management plans identifying multiple environmental benefits at landscape level, and provided training to strengthen implementation capacity. Twenty-eight forest management plans (FMPs) for the target forest units in five pilot sites included biodiversity zoning, forest fire planning,

pest management, carbon focused reforestation, non-timber forest products and eco-tourism plans, and protected forest areas management. Beyond five district level, the project also established and operationalized a forest fire early warning system at national scale. Furthermore, the project created and operationalized the first ever open access computer platform to project, quantify and optimize forest ecosystem services at landscape level, called "Forest and Ecosystem Management Systems." This computer platform enables reporting on Sustainable Development Goals from the benefits of integrated forest management.

## Global Environmental Benefits

The project delivered 638,923 ha (142% of end of project target) of forest area with integrated management plans with multiple environmental benefits at landscape level, and provided training to strengthen implementation capacity. Twenty-eight forest management plans (FMPs) for the target forest units in five pilot Forest Enterprise Directorates (FEDs) (Köyceğiz, Gazipasa, Gülnar, Pos and Andırın) now include biodiversity zoning, ecosystem services maps, forest fire planning, pest management, carbon focused silviculture and reforestation, non-timber forest products and eco-tourism plans and protected area management, which will be replicable at national level through Forest and Ecosystem Management Systems (FEMS).

### Policy and institutional Framework for integrated forest management

- Created and operationalized the first ever open access computer platform to project, quantify and optimize forest ecosystems at landscape level for forest planners called "Forest and Ecosystem Management Systems", and trained the General Directorate of Forestry (GDF) staff on how to use the decision support system, collect and input data that is compatible with the system.
- Established a Sustainability Working Group (SWG) composed of seven different departments of GDF to integrate not only protected area management, but also forest fire planning, pest control, carbon focused reforestation, and non-timber forest products and eco-tourism plans into existing legal framework.

### Implementation of forest-based GHG mitigation and carbon sequestration

- Established and operationalized forest fire early warning software at national scale based on temperature, humidity and wind values, and established 120 forest fire observation towers with 240 cameras throughout the country. With the new software system, fire fighters are able to reach fire locations in only 14 minutes instead of 40.
- 9,339 ha of forest covered by carbon-focused reforestation activities, such as regeneration thinning, industrial plantation and rehabilitation, to generate

carbon benefits as of June 2019 (the end of project target of 9,200 ha), which are expected to mitigate 11,572 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq/y.

- 1,301 micro-credits (the end of project target of 1,100) were disbursed to villagers for solar-heating in five pilot sites. Carbon benefits generated by the micro-credit program will be calculated during the project's final evaluation and are expected to mitigate in the range of 13,200 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq/y.

### Strengthen protection of high conservation Mediterranean forests

- 130,346 ha (or 163% of end of project target) of forest for nature conservation were identified, zoned and integrated into forest management plans of five pilot sites
- 207,315 tCO<sub>2</sub> equivalent are estimated as cumulative net carbon benefit associated with the conservation areas in five pilot sites.
- Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool for protected areas (METT) scores have improved from baselines measures

## Environmental Challenge

Turkey's Mediterranean forests cover an area of approximately 7 million hectares in total. The Mediterranean forests are moderately fragmented due to past logging activities, yet in some parts (especially in the southernmost regions) relatively large continuous forest tracts remain. Mediterranean forests are listed as a WWF Global 200 Ecoregion due to their exceptional biodiversity richness. These forests constitute the largest forest carbon repository in West Asia and the second largest in Southern Europe: the total carbon pool in Turkey's Mediterranean forests is currently assessed to be over 2 billion tCO<sub>2</sub>. Despite their global environmental importance, the Mediterranean forests presently face several threats from anthropogenic wildfires, pest and land use change due to development projects such as mining and large hydropower projects. These threaten biodiversity, at the same time, contribute to the release of carbon into atmosphere, thus also contributing to climate change. The project tackled these direct drivers of Mediterranean forest destruction.

## Integrated Approach and Key Features

Turkey's Mediterranean forests provide multiple environmental and socio-economic benefits at the local, country and global levels. The project adopted integrated forest use, planning and management systems to generate multiple benefits including biodiversity conservation, carbon sequestration, timbers, non-timber forest products, eco-tourism and others. This forest use, planning and management system required strict protection of biodiversity in significant and ecological important areas, while permitting sustainable use elsewhere consistent with sound carbon stock management.



Integrated forest management in Mediterranean Forest, Turkey © UNDP Turkey / Esat Sungur






Figure 1. Map of the project and pilot sites (from west to east Köyceğiz, Gazipaşa, Gülnar, Pos and Aındırın) @ UNDP Turkey

### Innovative online decision support system through multi-stakeholder engagement

One of the significant outputs of the project is the development and operationalization of an innovative open access computer platform for forest planners and decision makers, called "Forest and Ecosystem Management Systems (FEMS)". FEMS helps to project, quantify and optimize forest ecosystem services, including biodiversity, carbon sequestration, timber, non-timber forest products and eco-tourism at landscape level. Building on the existing forest management database, the new online software allows different key actors to understand consequences of different needs of forests, and to choose the best options to visualize these needs in the system. Key actors of the forest include the GDF for forest use planning, protected area management, forest fire control, pest management, carbon sequestration, non-timber forest products and eco-tourism plans, and timber companies. This comprehensive decision-support system has been established and operationalized through strong collaboration with different units within the GDF and across different stakeholders including Yale University, UNDP and University of Washington, and tested in forests in Turkey and the USA.

### Establishment of Institutional and Policy framework

To strengthen implementation of twenty-eight integrated forest management plans and their dissemination at national level, the project updated sustainable forest criteria

and indicators in Turkey and linked them with Sustainable Development Goals through discussion with the private sector, NGOs, academia and other governmental organizations. For forest fire fighters, a training at the national level was conducted to build capacity in the utilization of the new online platform and early warning system. This training is integrated into the existing training program for GDF staff at national scale.

Through a Sustainability Working Group (SWG) composed from 7 different departments of GDF, the project ensured that the policy framework at the national level integrates multiple functions of forests into existing legal frameworks covering not only protected areas, but also forest fire planning, pest control, carbon focused reforestation, and non-timber forest products and eco-tourism plans. SWG works in collaboration with NGOs and other key stakeholders.

### Lessons Learned

#### Scaling up through collaboration with wide-range of organizations

Collaboration with a wide-range of organizations both nationally and internationally (i.e., Nature Conservation Center, Gold Standard, Silvia Terra, University of Washington, Silva Mediterranean of FAO, and Yale University) has increased the innovative and scaling-up potential of the project. An innovative online, data driven,

decision support system for the forestry sector, "Forest and Ecosystem Management Systems (FEMS)", is applicable not only in the pilot areas, but also at the national scale and globally to other countries. Particularly, the fire management components have been already upscaled at the national level and can serve as regional and global model. Staff rotation between departments of the GDF headquarters and Forest Enterprise Directorates (FEDs) remain a major challenge for transferring the knowledge and institutional memory required for integrated forest management applying FEMS. Thus, continuous training for local and national staff is critical, and the promotion of strong project results could potentially attract additional investment to scale up the initiative in the future.

### Introducing concept of an integrated approach to forest management

By introducing the concept of an integrated approach to forest management, the project has provided strong value-added in Turkey to improve forest management. The project also highlighted the importance of creating a synergy between and among three components: biodiversity, climate and sustainable forest management. In addition, a major contribution of the GEF support was to help build an interdisciplinary collaboration platform among the different sub-units of the GDF, breaking silo thinking and hierarchy between central headquarters and regional implementation units.

### Adaptive management to further integration

Due to Turkey's status under the UNFCCC, the project needed to adjust activities and shifted its focus from developing action plans and a calculation system on forest based GHG mitigation and carbon sequestration to a more comprehensive integrated forest management system including biodiversity, forest fire planning, pest management, carbon focused reforestation, non-timber forest products, eco-tourism, and protected forest areas. This adjustment caused the existing forest database to become a more comprehensive and open computer system introducing new methods of inventory using remote sensing. The system also allows the assessment of the overall impact of forestry sector on Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which were not originally envisaged in the project. This adaptive approach improved the outcomes of the project. With continuous discussions/communication among different stakeholders including government officials, scientists, NGOs and local communities, and strong trust building and ownership between project management unit and government, flexible management of the project became possible.

### References and Multimedia

- UNDP, "Mid-term evaluation of UNDP-supported GEF Financed Project: Integrated Forest Management, February 2018", Available at <https://undpgefirms.org/attachments/4434/213302/1715560/1720468/Final%20Report-MTE-Turkey-Forestry.pdf>
- UNDP, "Working for the Common Good: Integrated Forest Management", Available at <https://undpturkiye.exposure.co/working-for-the-common-good>
- Forest Ecosystem Management System, available at <https://fems.nrsig.org> <Sign up required>

### Contact

- Ulrich Apel, GEF, Sr. Environmental Specialist  
uapel@thegef.org
- Bahtiyar Kurt, UNDP, Project Manager  
bahtiyar.kurt@undp.org
- Nuri Ozbagdatli, UNDP, Country Office Focal Point, nuri.ozbagdatli@undp.org

Available at:  
<http://www.thegef.org/topics/knowledge-learning>

*The GEF Good Practice Briefs showcase examples of GEF investments that align with GEF 2020 Strategies and GEF-7 Programing Directions and Policy Recommendations. Featured projects were selected by the GEF Secretariat from a pool of nominations by GEF Agencies, taking into consideration approaches used to generate multiple global environmental benefits and co-benefits, and to achieve clear results and/or sustainability. Because the Briefs include projects that are implemented under different contexts, the practices highlighted should not necessarily be considered as universally applicable.*

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) was established on the eve of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit to help tackle our planet's most pressing environmental problems. Since then, the GEF has provided more than **\$21.1 billion** in grants and mobilized an additional **\$114 billion** in co-financing for more than **5,000 projects** in **170 countries**. Through its Small Grants Programme, the GEF has provided support to more than 25,000 civil society and community initiatives in 133 countries.





# GEF FACTSHEETS

## AGENCY FACTSHEETS

[Explore](#)

## COUNTRY FACTSHEETS

[Explore](#)



[HOME](#)

[Factsheets](#)



# GEF FACTSHEETS

## • AGENCY FACTSHEETS

**ADB**

*Explore*

**CONSERVATION  
INTERNATIONAL**

*Explore*

**FAO**

*Explore*

**IFAD**

*Explore*

**IUCN**

*Explore*

**UNDP**

*Explore*

**UNEP**

*Explore*

**UNIDO**

*Explore*

**WORLD  
BANK**

*Explore*

**WWF**

*Explore*



**HOME**

**GEF Factsheets**





# GEF FACTSHEETS

## • COUNTRY FACTSHEETS (1/9)

AFGHANISTAN

[Explore](#)

ALBANIA

[Explore](#)

ALGERIA

[Explore](#)

ANGOLA

[Explore](#)

ANTIGUA AND  
BARBUDA

[Explore](#)

ARGENTINA

[Explore](#)

ARMENIA

[Explore](#)

AZERBAIJAN

[Explore](#)

BAHAMAS

[Explore](#)

BAHRAIN

[Explore](#)

BANGLADESH

[Explore](#)

BARBADOS

[Explore](#)

BELARUS

[Explore](#)

BELIZE

[Explore](#)

BENIN

[Explore](#)

BHUTAN

[Explore](#)

BOLIVIA

[Explore](#)

BOSNIA-  
HERZEGOVINA

[Explore](#)

BOTSWANA

[Explore](#)

BRAZIL

[Explore](#)



HOME

GEF Factsheets



NEXT



# GEF FACTSHEETS

## • COUNTRY FACTSHEETS (2/9)

BRUNEI

[Explore](#)

BULGARIA

[Explore](#)

BURKINA  
FASO

[Explore](#)

BURUNDI

[Explore](#)

CABO VERDE

[Explore](#)

CAMBODIA

[Explore](#)

CAMEROON

[Explore](#)

CENTRAL  
AFRICAN  
REPUBLIC

[Explore](#)

CHAD

[Explore](#)

CHILE

[Explore](#)

CHINA

[Explore](#)

COLOMBIA

[Explore](#)

COMOROS

[Explore](#)

CONGO DPR

[Explore](#)

CONGO

[Explore](#)

COOK  
ISLANDS

[Explore](#)

COSTA RICA

[Explore](#)

COTE  
D'IVOIRE

[Explore](#)

CROATIA

[Explore](#)

CUBA

[Explore](#)



HOME

GEF Factsheets

PREVIOUS



NEXT





# GEF FACTSHEETS

## • COUNTRY FACTSHEETS (3/9)

CZECH  
REPUBLIC

[Explore](#)

DJIBOUTI

[Explore](#)

DOMINICA

[Explore](#)

DOMINICAN  
REPUBLIC

[Explore](#)

ECUADOR

[Explore](#)

EGYPT

[Explore](#)

EL SALVADOR

[Explore](#)

EQUATORIAL  
GUINEA

[Explore](#)

ERITREA

[Explore](#)

ESTONIA

[Explore](#)

ESWATINI

[Explore](#)

ETHIOPIA

[Explore](#)

FIJI

[Explore](#)

GABON

[Explore](#)

GAMBIA

[Explore](#)

GEORGIA

[Explore](#)

GHANA

[Explore](#)

GRENADA

[Explore](#)

GUATEMALA

[Explore](#)

GUINEA-  
BISSAU

[Explore](#)



HOME

GEF Factsheets

PREVIOUS



NEXT



# GEF FACTSHEETS

## • COUNTRY FACTSHEETS (4/9)

GUINEA

[Explore](#)

GUYANA

[Explore](#)

HAITI

[Explore](#)

HONDURAS

[Explore](#)

HUNGARY

[Explore](#)

INDIA

[Explore](#)

INDONESIA

[Explore](#)

IRAN

[Explore](#)

IRAQ

[Explore](#)

JAMAICA

[Explore](#)

JORDAN

[Explore](#)

KAZAKHSTAN

[Explore](#)

KENYA

[Explore](#)

KIRIBATI

[Explore](#)

KOREA DPR

[Explore](#)

KOSOVO

[Explore](#)

KUWAIT

[Explore](#)

KYRGYZ  
REPUBLIC

[Explore](#)

LAO PDR

[Explore](#)

LATVIA

[Explore](#)



HOME

GEF Factsheets

PREVIOUS



NEXT





# GEF FACTSHEETS

## • COUNTRY FACTSHEETS (5/9)

LEBANON

[Explore](#)

LESOTHO

[Explore](#)

LIBERIA

[Explore](#)

LIBYA

[Explore](#)

LITHUANIA

[Explore](#)

MADAGASCAR

[Explore](#)

MALAWI

[Explore](#)

MALAYSIA

[Explore](#)

MALDIVES

[Explore](#)

MALI

[Explore](#)

MALTA

[Explore](#)

MARSHALL  
ISLANDS

[Explore](#)

MAURITANIA

[Explore](#)

MAURITIUS

[Explore](#)

MEXICO

[Explore](#)

MICRONESIA

[Explore](#)

MOLDOVA

[Explore](#)

MONGOLIA

[Explore](#)

MONTENEGRO

[Explore](#)

MOROCCO

[Explore](#)



HOME

GEF Factsheets

PREVIOUS



NEXT



# GEF FACTSHEETS

## • COUNTRY FACTSHEETS (6/9)

MOZAMBIQUE

[Explore](#)

MYANMAR

[Explore](#)

NAMIBIA

[Explore](#)

NAURU

[Explore](#)

NEPAL

[Explore](#)

NICARAGUA

[Explore](#)

NIGER

[Explore](#)

NIGERIA

[Explore](#)

NIUE

[Explore](#)

NORTH  
MACEDONIA

[Explore](#)

OMAN

[Explore](#)

PAKISTAN

[Explore](#)

PALAU

[Explore](#)

PALESTINIAN  
AUTHORITY

[Explore](#)

PANAMA

[Explore](#)

PAPUA NEW  
GUINEA

[Explore](#)

PARAGUAY

[Explore](#)

PERU

[Explore](#)

PHILIPPINES

[Explore](#)

POLAND

[Explore](#)



HOME

GEF Factsheets

PREVIOUS



NEXT





# GEF FACTSHEETS

## • COUNTRY FACTSHEETS (7/9)

QATAR

[Explore](#)

REPUBLIC  
OF KOREA

[Explore](#)

ROMANIA

[Explore](#)

RUSSIAN  
FEDERATION

[Explore](#)

RWANDA

[Explore](#)

SAMOA

[Explore](#)

SAO TOME  
AND PRINCIPE

[Explore](#)

SAUDI ARABIA

[Explore](#)

SENEGAL

[Explore](#)

SERBIA

[Explore](#)

SEYCHELLES

[Explore](#)

SIERRA LEONE

[Explore](#)

SLOVAK  
REPUBLIC

[Explore](#)

SLOVENIA

[Explore](#)

SOLOMON  
ISLANDS

[Explore](#)

SOMALIA

[Explore](#)

SOUTH AFRICA

[Explore](#)

SOUTH SUDAN

[Explore](#)

SRI LANKA

[Explore](#)

ST. KITTS  
AND NEVIS

[Explore](#)



HOME

GEF Factsheets

PREVIOUS



NEXT



# GEF FACTSHEETS

## • COUNTRY FACTSHEETS (8/9)

ST. LUCIA

[Explore](#)

ST. VINCENT  
AND  
GRENADINES

[Explore](#)

SUDAN

[Explore](#)

SURINAME

[Explore](#)

SYRIA

[Explore](#)

TAJIKISTAN

[Explore](#)

TANZANIA

[Explore](#)

THAILAND

[Explore](#)

TIMOR LESTE

[Explore](#)

TOGO

[Explore](#)

TONGA

[Explore](#)

TRINIDAD  
AND TOBAGO

[Explore](#)

TUNISIA

[Explore](#)

TÜRKIYE

[Explore](#)

TURK-  
MENISTAN

[Explore](#)

TUVALU

[Explore](#)

UGANDA

[Explore](#)

UKRAINE

[Explore](#)

UNITED ARAB  
EMIRATES

[Explore](#)

URUGUAY

[Explore](#)



HOME

GEF Factsheets

PREVIOUS



NEXT





# GEF FACTSHEETS

## • COUNTRY FACTSHEETS (9/9)

UZBEKISTAN

*Explore*

VANUATU

*Explore*

VENEZUELA

*Explore*

VIET NAM

*Explore*

YEMEN

*Explore*

ZAMBIA

*Explore*

ZIMBABWE

*Explore*



HOME

GEF Factsheets

PREVIOUS 

AGENCY FACTSHEET

ADB

Share of Agency use of GEF resources by GEF phase



	Pilot Phase	GEF - 1	GEF - 2	GEF - 3	GEF - 4	GEF - 5	GEF - 6	GEF - 7	GEF - 8	Total
total financing (\$m)	..	..	7.1	47.0	83.4	48.9	52.1	27.5	..	265.9
Agency share of overall approved financing (%)	..	..	0.4%	1.7%	3.2%	1.3%	1.6%	0.9%	..	1.4%
# of MSPs	..	..	1	10	34	17	14	9	..	85
# of FSPs	..	..	1	7	33	15	12	7	..	75
# of EA	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
# of PFD	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
LDCF financing (\$m)	..	..	..	..	..	14.7	..	28.0	..	42.7
SCCF financing (\$m)	..	..	..	..	3.9	4.5	5.2	..	..	13.5

Parent and Child Projects in GEF 6, GEF 7, and GEF 8

Parent Project	Child Project	Child Project Name
9071	9658	Combating Environmental Organized Crime in the Philippines
9077	9484	Integrated Approaches for Sustainable Cities in Vietnam
9909	10064	Demonstration Investments in Eco-Waste Infrastructure Solutions: Thanlyin and Ayeyarwady Watersheds (which cover Mandalay, Hpa-An and Mawlaymine)

Program led by the Agency in GEF 6, GEF 7, and GEF 8: currently no data are available.

Resources by Focal Area, Region, and Country Group across GEF trust funds





## AGENCY PROFILE—ADB

- Above 80% of the project portfolio
  - From 60% to 80% of the project portfolio
  - Below 60% of the project portfolio
  - Data not available
- NB: No data is included in cells where an agency did not contribute to indicators during the period under review

	GEF Average	ADB				
	FY22	FY19 Reference	FY20 Reference	FY21 Reference	FY22 Average	FY22 Number of Projects
<b>ENHANCE THE SPEED OF OPERATIONS</b>						
Time from CEO endorsement (FSP) / CEO approval (MSP) to first disbursement below 18 months	85 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	75 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	0 <span style="color: red;">●</span>			
- MSPs only (%)	76 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>				
- FSPs only (%)	90 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	67 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	0 <span style="color: red;">●</span>			
Time from CEO endorsement to mid-term review submission below 4 years	50 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	40 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>		
MSP age below 4 years (%)	61 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	50 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	50 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	0 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	1
FSP age below 6 years (%)	81 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	79 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	75 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	70 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	67 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	6
Completed projects with a timely Terminal Evaluation (%)	87 <span style="color: green;">●</span>					
<b>ENSURE STRONG PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT</b>						
Disbursement ratio of ongoing portfolio (%)	19 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	15 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	24 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	12 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	26 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	10
Projects rated in the satisfactory range for both Implementation Progress and Development Outcome (%)	80 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	87 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	93 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	91 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	11
Projects rated in the satisfactorily range for Implementation Progress (%)	83 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	87 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	93 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	91 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	11
Projects rated in the satisfactorily range for Development Outcome (%)	86 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	96 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	93 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	11
Proactivity index (%)	77 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>					1
Projects with disbursement in the past year (%)	89 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	<span style="color: grey;">●</span>	83 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	75 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	50 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	10
Over 50% disbursed balance 3+ years into MSP implementation (%)	75 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	0 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	0 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	0 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	1
Over 50% disbursed balance 5+ years FSP implementation (%)	91 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	60 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	20 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	60 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	86 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	7
Projects with financial closure after Terminal Evaluation submission (%)	85 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	92 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	96 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	97 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	31
Projects financially closed on time in the last year (%)	64 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>		90 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>		
<b>INCREASE CO-FINANCING ACROSS THE PORTFOLIO</b>						
Projects with co-financing materialized higher than 35% at MTR (%)	51 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	<span style="color: grey;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>		
Co-financing materialized higher than 80% at Terminal Evaluation (%)	50 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	<span style="color: grey;">●</span>	74 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	69 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>		

AGENCY FACTSHEET

Conservation International (CI)

Share of Agency use of GEF resources by GEF phase

	Pilot Phase	GEF - 1	GEF - 2	GEF - 3	GEF - 4	GEF - 5	GEF - 6	GEF - 7	GEF - 8	Total
total financing (\$m)		..	..	..	..	22.4	47.4	167.8	..	237.7
Agency share of overall approved financing (%)		..	..	..	..	0.6%	1.4%	5.3%	..	1.2%
# of MSPs		..	..	..	..	4	3	14	..	21
# of FSPs		..	..	..	..	3	12	34	..	49
# of EA		..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	1
# of PFD		..	..	..	..	..	..	19	..	19
LDCF financing (\$m)		..	..	..	..	..	..	11.2	..	11.2
SCCF financing (\$m)		..	..	..	..	..	1.2	3.2	..	4.4


Parent and Child Projects in GEF 6, GEF 7, and GEF 8

Parent Project	Child Project	Child Project Name
9602	9713	A GEF GOLD/ Supply Chain Approach to Eliminating Mercury in Guyana’s ASGM Sector: El Dorado Gold Jewelry Made in Guyana
10200	10505	Strengthen Management and Climate Change Resilience in Angola's Conservation Areas for Sustainable Development
10201	10232	Reducing deforestation from palm oil and cocoa value chains
10569	10606	GEF GOLD+: Global coordination, knowledge management and outreach
10569	10836	GEF GOLD +: Global coordination, knowledge management and outreach
10569	10837	Global Opportunities for Long-term Development of ASGM in Zambia
10569	10838	Global Opportunities for Long-term Development of ASGM in Sierra Leone

Program led by the Agency in GEF 6, GEF 7, and GEF 8:

GEF Project ID	Project Title
10569	Global Opportunities for Long-term Development of artisanal and small-scale gold mining ASGM

Resources by Focal Area, Region, and Country Group across GEF trust funds





## AGENCY PROFILE—CI

- Above 80% of the project portfolio
  - From 60% to 80% of the project portfolio
  - Below 60% of the project portfolio
  - Data not available
- NB: No data is included in cells where an agency did not contribute to indicators during the period under review

	GEF Average	CI					FY22 Number of Projects
	FY22	FY19 Reference	FY20 Reference	FY21 Reference	FY22 Average		
<b>ENHANCE THE SPEED OF OPERATIONS</b>							
Time from CEO endorsement (FSP) / CEO approval (MSP) to first disbursement below 18 months	85 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>			100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	1	
- MSPs only (%)	76 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>			100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	1	
- FSPs only (%)	90 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>					
Time from CEO endorsement to mid-term review submission below 4 years	50 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>		100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	2	
MSP age below 4 years (%)	61 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	2	
FSP age below 6 years (%)	81 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	89 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	9	
Completed projects with a timely Terminal Evaluation (%)	87 <span style="color: green;">●</span>						
<b>ENSURE STRONG PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT</b>							
Disbursement ratio of ongoing portfolio (%)	19 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	11 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	31 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	40 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	33 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	10	
Projects rated in the satisfactory range for both Implementation Progress and Development Outcome (%)	80 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	92 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	82 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	83 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	92 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	13	
Projects rated in the satisfactory range for Implementation Progress (%)	83 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	92 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	91 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	83 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	92 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	13	
Projects rated in the satisfactory range for Development Outcome (%)	86 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	92 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	82 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	92 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	92 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	13	
Proactivity index (%)	77 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>				100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>		
Projects with disbursement in the past year (%)	89 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	<span style="color: grey;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	92 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	10	
Over 50% disbursed balance 3+ years into MSP implementation (%)	75 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>			
Over 50% disbursed balance 5+ years FSP implementation (%)	91 <span style="color: green;">●</span>			100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	67 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	3	
Projects with financial closure after Terminal Evaluation submission (%)	85 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	86 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	67 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	12	
Projects financially closed on time in the last year (%)	64 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	83 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>			
<b>INCREASE CO-FINANCING ACROSS THE PORTFOLIO</b>							
Projects with co-financing materialized higher than 35% at MTR (%)	51 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	<span style="color: grey;">●</span>			100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	2	
Co-financing materialized higher than 80% at Terminal Evaluation (%)	50 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	<span style="color: grey;">●</span>	105 <span style="color: green;">●</span>				

## AGENCY FACTSHEET

## FAO

Share of Agency use of GEF resources by GEF phase

	Pilot Phase	GEF - 1	GEF - 2	GEF - 3	GEF - 4	GEF - 5	GEF - 6	GEF - 7	GEF - 8	Total
total financing (\$m)	..	..	13.9	76.7	282.1	234.6	552.4	5.5	1165.1	
Agency share of overall approved financing (%)	..	..	0.5%	0.0	0.1	7.1%	17.3%	6.9%	6.1%	
# of MSPs	..	..	..	8	12	12	29	..	61	
# of FSPs	..	..	2	43	118	94	166	2	425	
# of EA	..	..	..	..	6	..	3	..	9	
# of PFD	..	..	..	..	..	12	44	..	58	
LDCF financing (\$m)	..	..	..	2.4	90.6	23.9	120.3	..	237.2	
SCCF financing (\$m)	..	..	..	..	20.2	2.8	..	..	23.1	

Parent and Child Projects in GEF 6, GEF 7, and GEF 8

Parent Project	Child Project	Child Project Name
9060	9126	Delivering Sustainable Environmental, Social and Economic Benefits in West Africa through Good Governance, Correct Incentives and Innovation
9060	9128	The Coastal Fisheries Initiatives Global Partnership
9070	9178	Food-IAP: Support for Sustainable Food Production and Enhancement of Food Security and Climate Resilience in Burundi's Highlands
9264	9514	Forest and Landscape Restoration supporting Landscape and Livelihoods Resilience in the Central African Republic (CAR)
9264	9515	The Restoration Initiative, DRC child project: Improved Management and Restoration of Agro-sylvo-pastoral Resources in the Pilot Province of South-Kivu
9264	9516	Reversing Deforestation and Degradation in High Conservation Value Chilgoza Pine Forests in Pakistan
9264	9517	Landscape Restoration for Ecosystem Functionality and Climate Change Mitigation in the Republic of Sao Tome e Principe
9264	9556	Restoration of Arid and Semi-arid lands (ASAL) of Kenya through Bio-enterprise Development and other Incentives under The Restoration Initiative
9768	9876	On-farm Conservation and Sustainable Use of Genetic Diversity of Crops Originated in China
9909	10069	Sustainable management of fisheries, marine living resources and their habitats in the Bay of Bengal region for the benefit of coastal states and communities

9909	10451	TO BE DELETED - WORNG GEF ID - The Project was already CEO endorsed with GEF ID 10069- Sustainable management of fisheries, marine living resources and their habitats in the Bay of Bengal region for the benefit of coastal states and communities.
10198	10248	Building human well-being and resilience in Amazonian forests by enhancing the value of biodiversity for food security and bio-businesses, in a context of climate change
10201	10245	Integrated Sustainable Landscape Management in the Mekong Delta of Vietnam
10201	10246	Innovative transformation of China's food production systems and agroecological landscapes
10201	10247	Scaling up Cocoa-based Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration / Transformative Innovations in Côte d'Ivoire (SCOLUR-CI)
10201	10480	Promotion of Sustainable Food Systems in India through Transforming Rice-Wheat Systems in Punjab, Haryana, Odisha and Chhattisgarh
10201	10481	Promoting Integrated Landscape Management and Sustainable Food Systems in the Niger Delta Region in Nigeria
10201	10598	Integrated Landscape Management for conservation and restoration of the Mt. Elgon Ecosystem in Western Kenya
10201	10599	Transforming Food Systems and Reducing Deforestation in the Protected Areas and Biological Corridors landscapes from the Southern Caribbean Coast and San Juan River autonomous region
10201	10600	Integrated management of degraded landscapes for sustainable food systems and livelihoods in Guinea Forest Region and Upper Guinea
10201	10601	Food System, Land Use and Restoration Impact Program in Uzbekistan
10201	10750	Integrated Landscape Management for a zero-deforestation coffee and rice value chains in the Central South and Eastern coast of Madagascar
10206	10249	Promoting Dryland Sustainable Landscapes and Biodiversity Conservation in the Eastern Steppe of Mongolia
10206	10250	Integrated Landscape Management in Dry Miombo Woodlands of Tanzania
10206	10251	Integrated landscape management to reverse degradation and support the sustainable use of natural resources in the Mopane-Miombo belt of Northern Namibia
10206	10253	Global coordination project for the SFM Drylands Impact Program
10206	10254	Transforming landscapes and livelihoods: A cross-sector approach to accelerate restoration of Malawi's Miombo and Mopane woodlands for sustainable forest and biodiversity management
10206	10255	Integrated sustainable and adaptive management of natural resources to support land degradation neutrality and livelihoods in the Miombo-Mopane landscapes of North-east Botswana
10206	10256	Land and natural resource degradation neutrality and community vulnerability reduction in selected Miombo and Mopane Ecoregions of Angola (Okavango and Cunene river basin)
10206	10257	A cross-sector approach supporting the mainstreaming of sustainable forest and land management to enhance ecosystem resilience for improved livelihoods in the Save and Runde Catchments of Zimbabwe
10548	10622	Sustainable management of tuna fisheries and biodiversity conservation in the areas beyond national jurisdiction.
10548	10623	Deep-sea Fisheries under the Ecosystem Approach (DSF project)
10548	10626	Global Coordination Project for the Common Oceans ABNJ Program


Program led by the Agency in GEF 6, GEF 7, and GEF 8.





GEF Project ID	Project Title
9060	CFI: Coastal Fisheries Initiative (PROGRAM)
9909	Sustainable Management of the Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem Programme
10206	Sustainable Forest Management Impact Program on Dryland Sustainable Landscapes
10548	Common Oceans - Sustainable utilization and conservation of biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction

Resources by Focal Area, Region, and Country Group across GEF trust funds



AGENCY PROFILE—FAO

● Above 80% of the project portfolio ● From 60% to 80% of the project portfolio  
 ● Below 60% of the project portfolio ● Data not available  
 NB: No data is included in cells where an agency did not contribute to indicators during the period under review

	GEF Average	FAO					FY22 Number of Projects
	FY22	FY19 Reference	FY20 Reference	FY21 Reference	FY22 Average		
<b>ENHANCE THE SPEED OF OPERATIONS</b>							
Time from CEO endorsement (FSP) / CEO approval (MSP) to first disbursement below 18 months	85 ●	86 ●	50 ●	100 ●	56 ●	9	
- MSPs only (%)	76 ●	100 ●		100 ●	40 ●	5	
- FSPs only (%)	90 ●	83 ●	50 ●		75 ●	4	
Time from CEO endorsement to mid-term review submission below 4 years	50 ●	63 ●	71 ●	41 ●	62 ●	13	
MSP age below 4 years (%)	61 ●	90 ●	57 ●	80 ●	89 ●	9	
FSP age below 6 years (%)	81 ●	93 ●	96 ●	86 ●	90 ●	49	
Completed projects with a timely Terminal Evaluation (%)	87 ●				85 ●	13	
<b>ENSURE STRONG PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT</b>							
Disbursement ratio of ongoing portfolio (%)	19 ●	13 ●	26 ●	19 ●	24 ●	62	
Projects rated in the satisfactory range for both Implementation Progress and Development Outcome (%)	80 ●	90 ●	92 ●	90 ●	96 ●	74	
Projects rated in the satisfactorily range for Implementation Progress (%)	83 ●	90 ●	95 ●	90 ●	97 ●	74	
Projects rated in the satisfactorily range for Development Outcome (%)	86 ●	92 ●	95 ●	93 ●	99 ●	74	
Proactivity index (%)	77 ●				100 ●	7	
Projects with disbursement in the past year (%)	89 ●	●	99 ●	97 ●	100 ●	62	
Over 50% disbursed balance 3+ years into MSP implementation (%)	75 ●	100 ●	75 ●	100 ●	100 ●	7	
Over 50% disbursed balance 5+ years FSP implementation (%)	91 ●	89 ●	87 ●	94 ●	92 ●	38	
Projects with financial closure after Terminal Evaluation submission (%)	85 ●	62 ●	56 ●	65 ●	60 ●	63	
Projects financially closed on time in the last year (%)	64 ●	80 ●	0 ●	25 ●	0 ●	7	
<b>INCREASE CO-FINANCING ACROSS THE PORTFOLIO</b>							
Projects with co-financing materialized higher than 35% at MTR (%)	51 ●	●	50 ●	73 ●	57 ●	14	
Co-financing materialized higher than 80% at Terminal Evaluation (%)	50 ●	●	65 ●	138 ●	62 ●	13	

AGENCY FACTSHEET

IFAD

Share of Agency use of GEF resources by GEF phase

	Pilot Phase	GEF - 1	GEF - 2	GEF - 3	GEF - 4	GEF - 5	GEF - 6	GEF - 7	GEF - 8	Total
total financing (\$m)	..	..	30.1	75.6	14.1	88.8	49.4	..	258.1	
Agency share of overall approved financing (%)	..	..	1.1%	2.9%	0.4%	2.7%	1.6%	..	1.3%	
# of MSPs	..	..	1	6	..	..	1	..	8	
# of FSPs	..	..	8	35	5	39	13	..	100	
# of EA	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	
# of PFD	..	..	..	..	..	56	..	..	56	
LDCF financing (\$m)	..	..	..	7.0	45.0	..	25.9	5.5	83.4	
SCCF financing (\$m)	..	..	..	4.2	24.2	13.8	..	..	42.2	


Parent and Child Projects in GEF 6, GEF 7, and GEF 8

Parent Project	Child Project	Child Project Name
9070	9132	Food-IAP: Reversing Land Degradation Trends and Increasing Food Security in Degraded Ecosystems of Semi-arid Areas of Central Tanzania
9070	9133	Food-IAP: Climate-Smart Agriculture for Climate-Resilient Livelihoods (CSARL)
9070	9134	Food-IAP: Agricultural Value Chains Resilience Support Project (PARFA)
9070	9136	Niger: Food-IAP: Family Farming Development Programme (ProDAF)
9070	9138	Food-IAP: Enhancing the Resilience of Agro-Ecological Systems (ERASP)
9070	9139	Food-IAP: Establishment of the Upper Tana Nairobi Water Fund (UTNWF)
9070	9140	Food-IAP: Cross Cutting Capacity Building, Knowledge Services and Coordination Project for the Food Security Integrated Approach Pilot Program
9070	9141	GEF-IAP: Participatory Natural Resource Management and Rural Development Project in the North, Centre-North and East Regions (Neer Tamba project)

Program led by the Agency in GEF 6, GEF 7, and GEF 8:

GEF Project ID	Project Title
9070	Food-IAP: Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Sub-Saharan Africa - An Integrated Approach (IAP-PROGRAM)

Resources by Focal Area, Region, and Country Group across GEF trust funds





## AGENCY PROFILE—IFAD

- Above 80% of the project portfolio
  - From 60% to 80% of the project portfolio
  - Below 60% of the project portfolio
  - Data not available
- NB: No data is included in cells where an agency did not contribute to indicators during the period under review

	GEF Average	IFAD				FY22 Number of Projects
	FY22	FY19 Reference	FY20 Reference	FY21 Reference	FY22 Average	
<b>ENHANCE THE SPEED OF OPERATIONS</b>						
Time from CEO endorsement (FSP) / CEO approval (MSP) to first disbursement below 18 months	85 <span style="color: green;">●</span>			0 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	0 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	1
- MSPs only (%)	76 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>					
- FSPs only (%)	90 <span style="color: green;">●</span>			0 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	0 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	1
Time from CEO endorsement to mid-term review submission below 4 years	50 <span style="color: red;">●</span>			0 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	0 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	1
MSP age below 4 years (%)	61 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>					
FSP age below 6 years (%)	81 <span style="color: green;">●</span>		100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	86 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	7
Completed projects with a timely Terminal Evaluation (%)	87 <span style="color: green;">●</span>					
<b>ENSURE STRONG PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT</b>						
Disbursement ratio of ongoing portfolio (%)	19 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>		20	23	28	10
Projects rated in the satisfactory range for both Implementation Progress and Development Outcome (%)	80 <span style="color: green;">●</span>		83 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	91 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	92 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	13
Projects rated in the satisfactory range for Implementation Progress (%)	83 <span style="color: green;">●</span>		83 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	91 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	92 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	13
Projects rated in the satisfactory range for Development Outcome (%)	86 <span style="color: green;">●</span>		100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	13
Proactivity index (%)	77 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>				100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	
Projects with disbursement in the past year (%)	89 <span style="color: green;">●</span>		92 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	92 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	90 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	10
Over 50% disbursed balance 3+ years into MSP implementation (%)	75 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>					
Over 50% disbursed balance 5+ years FSP implementation (%)	91 <span style="color: green;">●</span>		100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	10
Projects with financial closure after Terminal Evaluation submission (%)	85 <span style="color: green;">●</span>		93 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	97 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	32
Projects financially closed on time in the last year (%)	64 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>		50 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	75 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	3
<b>INCREASE CO-FINANCING ACROSS THE PORTFOLIO</b>						
Projects with co-financing materialized higher than 35% at MTR (%)	51 <span style="color: red;">●</span>			50 <span style="color: red;">●</span>	100 <span style="color: green;">●</span>	1
Co-financing materialized higher than 80% at Terminal Evaluation (%)	50 <span style="color: red;">●</span>		78 <span style="color: orange;">●</span>	16 <span style="color: red;">●</span>		

AGENCY FACTSHEET

IUCN

Share of Agency use of GEF resources by GEF phase

	Pilot Phase	GEF - 1	GEF - 2	GEF - 3	GEF - 4	GEF - 5	GEF - 6	GEF - 7	GEF - 8	Total
total financing (\$m)	..	..	..	..	..	7.2	63.9	77.3	..	148.4
Agency share of overall approved financing (%)	..	..	..	..	..	0.2%	1.9%	2.4%	..	0.8%
# of MSPs	..	..	..	..	..	..	10	6	..	16
# of FSPs	..	..	..	..	..	12	35	28	..	75
# of EA	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1	..	2
# of PFD	..	..	..	..	..	..	40	1	..	41
LDCF financing (\$m)	..	..	..	..	..	..	5	6.3	..	11.3
SCCF financing (\$m)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..

Parent and Child Projects in GEF 6, GEF 7, and GEF 8


Parent Project	Child Project	Child Project Name
9264	9518	Building Climate Resilient Green Infrastructure: Enhancing Ecosystem Services of Planted Forests in China through Forest Landscape Restoration and Governance Innovation
9264	9519	Supporting Landscapes Restoration and Sustainable Use of Local Plant Species and Tree Products (Bambusa ssp, Irvingia spp, etc) for Biodiversity Conservation, Sustainable Livelihoods and Emissions Reduction in Cameroon
9264	9520	The Restoration Initiative (TRI) Myanmar, Reversing Forest Degradation and Deforestation and Restoring Forested Landscape through Local Multi-stakeholder Management
9264	9521	Managing Mangroves and Production Landscapes for Climate Change Mitigation
9264	9522	Global Learning, Finance, and Partnerships Project under TRI
10200	10613	Strengthening Governance and Capacity for Combatting Illegal Wildlife Trade in Pakistan
10206	10291	Sustainable management of dryland landscapes in Burkina Faso
10206	10292	Strengthening forest management for improved biodiversity conservation and climate resilience in the Southern rangelands of Kenya

10208	10293	Transforming and scaling up results and lessons learned in the Monte Alen and Rio Campo Landscapes through an inclusive Landscape-scale approach, effective land use planning and promotion of local governance
10710	10753	Mainstreaming biodiversity in the development of the Yangtze River Economic Belt
10710	10754	Strengthening in-situ Biodiversity Conservation in the Yangtze River Economic Belt

Program led by the Agency in GEF 6, GEF 7, and GEF 8:

GEF Project ID	Project Title
9264	TRI The Restoration Initiative - Fostering Innovation and Integration in Support of the Bonn Challenge
10710	Yangtze River Basin Biodiversity Conservation Programme

Resources by Focal Area, Region, and Country Group across GEF trust funds





## AGENCY PROFILE—IUCN

- Above 80% of the project portfolio
- From 60% to 80% of the project portfolio
- Below 60% of the project portfolio
- Data not available

NB: No data is included in cells where an agency did not contribute to indicators during the period under review

	GEF Average	IUCN				
	FY22	FY19 Reference	FY20 Reference	FY21 Reference	FY22 Average	FY22 Number of Projects
<b>ENHANCE THE SPEED OF OPERATIONS</b>						
Time from CEO endorsement (FSP) / CEO approval (MSP) to first disbursement below 18 months	85 ●	63 ●	0 ●			
- MSPs only (%)	76 ●		0 ●			
- FSPs only (%)	90 ●	71 ●				
Time from CEO endorsement to mid-term review submission below 4 years	50 ●					
MSP age below 4 years (%)	61 ●	67 ●	100 ●	50 ●	50 ●	2
FSP age below 6 years (%)	81 ●	33 ●	100 ●	100 ●	100 ●	9
Completed projects with a timely Terminal Evaluation (%)	87 ●					
<b>ENSURE STRONG PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT</b>						
Disbursement ratio of ongoing portfolio (%)	19 ●	5 ●	20 ●	15 ●	30 ●	9
Projects rated in the satisfactory range for both Implementation Progress and Development Outcome (%)	80 ●	83 ●	70 ●	56 ●	92 ●	12
Projects rated in the satisfactory range for Implementation Progress (%)	83 ●	82 ●	70 ●	56 ●	92 ●	12
Projects rated in the satisfactory range for Development Outcome (%)	86 ●	91 ●	90 ●	78 ●	92 ●	12
Proactivity index (%)	77 ●				75 ●	3
Projects with disbursement in the past year (%)	89 ●	●	100 ●	78 ●	89 ●	9
Over 50% disbursed balance 3+ years into MSP implementation (%)	75 ●	100 ●	100 ●	100 ●	100 ●	3
Over 50% disbursed balance 5+ years FSP implementation (%)	91 ●					
Projects with financial closure after Terminal Evaluation submission (%)	85 ●			0 ●	0 ●	1
Projects financially closed on time in the last year (%)	64 ●					
<b>INCREASE CO-FINANCING ACROSS THE PORTFOLIO</b>						
Projects with co-financing materialized higher than 35% at MTR (%)	51 ●	●				
Co-financing materialized higher than 80% at Terminal Evaluation (%)	50 ●	●				

AGENCY FACTSHEET

UNDP

Share of Agency use of GEF resources by GEF phase

	Pilot Phase	GEF - 1	GEF - 2	GEF - 3	GEF - 4	GEF - 5	GEF - 6	GEF - 7	GEF - 8	Total
total financing (\$m)	258.6	369.4	641.1	1021.4	1011.7	1479.1	1271.8	1134.0	0.0	7187.0
Agency share of overall approved financing (%)	37.1%	32.5%	35.0%	36.4%	38.5%	40.7%	38.6%	35.6%	0.0%	37.40%
# of MSPs	..	3	67	119	134	101	56	51	..	531
# of FSPs	56	72	81	145	385	549	394	371	..	2053
# of EA	5	157	177	170	16	123	77	115	27	867
# of PFD	..	..	..	10	2	..	9	16	..	37
LDCF financing (\$m)	..	..	..	0.9	90.7	376.2	189.8	160.8	..	818.3
SCCF financing (\$m)	..	..	..	4.3	40.4	30.1	9.1	..	..	84.0

Parent and Child Projects in GEF 6, GEF 7, and GEF 8

Parent Project	Child Project	Child Project Name
9060	9124	Coastal Fisheries Initiative- Latin America
9070	9135	Food-IAP: Integrated Landscape Management to Enhance Food Security and Ecosystem Resilience
9070	9137	Food-IAP: Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Karamoja Sub Region
9070	9143	Food-IAP: Integrated Landscape Management to Enhance Food Security and Ecosystem Resilience in Nigeria
9071	9148	Securing Livelihoods, Conservation, Sustainable Use and Restoration of High Range Himalayan Ecosystems (SECURE)Himalayas
9071	9150	Combating Illegal and Unsustainable Trade in Endangered Species in Indonesia
9071	9154	Managing the Human-wildlife Interface to Sustain the Flow of Agro-ecosystem Services and Prevent Illegal Wildlife Trafficking in the Kgalagadi and Ghanzi Drylands
9071	9155	Integrated and Transboundary Conservation of Biodiversity in the Basins of the Republic of Cameroon
9071	9156	Combating poaching and the illegal wildlife trade in Tanzania through an integrated approach
9071	9157	Enhanced Management and Enforcement of Ethiopia's Protected Areas Estate
9071	9158	Strengthening the Conservation of Globally Threatened Species in Mozambique through Improving Biodiversity Enforcement and Expanding Community Conservancies around Protected Areas
9071	9527	Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade, Focusing on Ivory, Rhino Horn, Tiger and Pangolins in Thailand

9071	9531	Conservation of Snow Leopards and their Critical Ecosystem in Afghanistan
9071	9659	Kenya- Combating Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trafficking in Kenya through an Integrated Approach
9071	9660	Strengthening Biodiversity and Ecosystems Management and Climate-Smart Landscapes in the Mid to Lower Zambezi Region of Zimbabwe
9071	9661	Mali- Community-based Natural Resource Management that Resolves Conflict, Improves Livelihoods and Restores Ecosystems throughout the Elephant Range
9072	9179	Adaptive Management and Learning for the Commodities IAP
9072	9180	Reducing Deforestation from Commodity Production
9072	9617	Taking Deforestation Out of the Soy Supply Chain
9077	9127	Cities-IAP: Asuncion Green City of the Americas – Pathways to Sustainability
9083	9328	Leapfrogging Sudan's Markets to More Efficient Lighting and Air Conditioners
9083	9332	Energy Efficient Standards, Certification, and Labeling for Appliances and Equipment
9083	9492	Leapfrogging South Africa's Markets to High Efficiency LED Lighting and High Efficiency Distribution Transformers
9083	9493	Advancing Indonesia's Lighting Market to High Efficient Technologies (ADLIGHT)
9272	9387	Sustainable Productive Landscapes in the Peruvian Amazon
9403	9462	Expanding the Coverage and Strengthening the Management of Wetland Protected Areas in Sichuan Province, China
9403	9463	Strengthening Marine Protected Areas in SE China to conserve globally significant coastal biodiversity
9403	9464	Strengthening the PA System in the Qilian Mountains-Qinghai Lake landscape
9403	9465	Enhancing conservation of globally significant biodiversity through protected area system strengthening in Gansu
9403	9679	China's Protected Area Reform (C-PAR) for Conserving Globally Significant Biodiversity
9602	9707	Integrated Sound Management of Mercury in Indonesia's Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining (ISMIA)
9602	9708	Integrated Sound Management of Mercury in Kenya's Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining (ASGM) or IMKA
9602	9709	GEF GOLD Colombia: Integrated Sound Management of Mercury in Colombia's ASGM sector
9602	9710	GEF GOLD Peru - Integrated Sound Management of Mercury in Peru's Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining (ASGM)
9768	9873	Enhancing sustainable Use of Indigenous Agricultural Genetic Diversity in Hubei
9768	9874	Strengthening Coordinated Approaches to Reduce Invasive Alien Species (IAS) Threats to Globally Significant Agrobiodiversity and Agroecosystems in China (R-IAS)
9768	9875	Participatory in situ Conservation and Sustainable Use of Agrobiodiversity in Hainan
10114	10282	Tashkent - Accelerating Investments in Low Emission Vehicles (TAILEV)
10114	10286	Enhancing sustainability in e-mobility for low carbon urban transport and an Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) approach in batteries and vehicle components
10114	10289	Supporting Sustainable Transportation through the Shift to Electric Mobility in Jamaica
10114	10640	Enabling Electric Vehicles (EVs) Adoption in the framework of Sustainable energy based Transportation in Bangladesh






10114	10641	Enhancing Readiness for the Transition to Electric Vehicles in Indonesia (ENTREV)
10185	10261	ISLANDS - Indian Ocean Child Project
10198	10252	Strengthening management of protected and productive landscapes in the Surinamese Amazon
10200	10234	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into the Tourism Sector in Bhutan
10200	10235	Strengthening Conservation and Resilience of Globally-significant Wild Cat Landscapes through a Focus on Small Cat and Leopard Conservation
10200	10236	Catalyzing Optimum Management of Nature Heritage for Sustainability of Ecosystem, Resources and Viability of Endangered Wildlife Species (CONSERVE)
10200	10241	Enhancing jaguar corridors and strongholds through improved management and threat reduction
10200	10242	Kabobo-Luama Protected Area Landscape Management
10200	10244	Integrated approach to proactive management of human-wildlife conflict and wildlife crime in hotspot landscapes in Namibia
10200	10304	Integrating Landscape Considerations in Wildlife Conservation, with Emphasis on Jaguars
10200	10597	Building institutional and local capacities to reduce wildlife crime and to enhance protection of iconic wildlife in Malaysia
10201	10237	Integrated Landscape Management of Heart of Borneo Landscapes in Sabah and Sarawak
10201	10238	Strengthening Sustainability in Commodity and Food-Crop Value Chains, Land Restoration and Land Use Governance through Integrated Landscape Management for Multiple Benefits in Indonesia
10201	10239	Establishing System for Sustainable Integrated Land-use Planning Across New Britain Island in Papua New Guinea
10201	10243	Preventing forest loss, promoting restoration and integrating sustainability into Ethiopia's coffee supply chains and food systems
10201	10263	Promoting sustainable landscapes in the Motagua River watershed
10201	10264	Promoting sustainable livestock management and ecosystem conservation in Northern Ukraine
10201	10265	Promotion of sustainable food systems and improved ecosystems services in Northern Kazakhstan Landscape
10201	10307	Deforestation Free Commodity Supply Chains in the Peruvian Amazon
10208	10729	Transforming Forest Landscape Governance in the Lower Ogooué - Lower Nyanga Landscape Corridor
10391	10467	Transitioning to an urban green economy and delivering global environmental benefits
10391	10486	Child Project Title: Strengthening Marrakech's sustainable development through innovative planning and financing
10413	10470	National child project under the GEF Africa Mini-grids Program Somalia
10413	10471	National child project under the GEF Africa Mini-grids Program Djibouti
10413	10473	National child project under the GEF Africa Mini-grids Program Comoros
10413	10474	National child project under the GEF Africa Mini-grids Program Burkina Faso
10413	10475	National child project under the GEF Africa Mini-grids Program Malawi
10413	10476	National child project under the GEF Africa Mini-grids Program Eswatini
10413	10477	National child project under the GEF Africa Mini-grids Program Nigeria

10413	10478	National child project under the GEF Africa Mini-grids Program Ethiopia
10413	10827	Sudan, National Child Project under the GEF Africa Mini-grid Programme
10413	10831	Benin National Child Project under the GEF Africa Minigrids Program
10413	10832	São Tomé and Príncipe national child project under the Africa Minigrids Program
10413	10833	Niger National Child Project under the GEF Africa Minigrids Program
10413	10834	Mali national child project under the Africa Minigrids Program
10413	10841	Zambia National Child Project under the GEF Africa Minigrids Program
10413	10843	Regional Child Project under the GEF Africa Mini-grids Program
10548	10620	Strengthening the stewardship of an economically and biologically significant high seas area – the Sargasso Sea
10569	10614	GEF GOLD+: Advancing formalization and mercury-free gold in Honduras
10569	10615	GEF GOLD+: Advancing formalization and mercury-free gold in Suriname
10569	10616	GEF GOLD+ in Ghana: Advancing formalization and mercury-free gold in Ghana
10569	10835	GEF GOLD+: Advancing formalization and mercury-free gold in Ecuador

Program led by the Agency in GEF 6, GEF 7, and GEF 8:

GEF Project ID	Project Title
9072	Comm-IAP: Taking Deforestation Out of Commodity Supply Chains (IAP-PROGRAM)
9403	China's Protected Area System Reform (C-PAR)
9768	PRC-GEF Partnership Program for Sustainable Agricultural Development
10413	GEF-7 Africa Minigrids Program

Resources by Focal Area, Region, and Country Group across GEF trust funds



## AGENCY PROFILE—UNDP

- Above 80% of the project portfolio   
 ● From 60% to 80% of the project portfolio  
● Below 60% of the project portfolio   
 ● Data not available  
 NB: No data is included in cells where an agency did not contribute to indicators during the period under review

	GEF Average	UNDP					FY22 Number of Projects
	FY22	FY19 Reference	FY20 Reference	FY21 Reference	FY22 Average		
<b>ENHANCE THE SPEED OF OPERATIONS</b>							
Time from CEO endorsement (FSP) / CEO approval (MSP) to first disbursement below 18 months	85 ●	79 ●	40 ●	56 ●	88 ●	26	
- MSPs only (%)	76 ●	57 ●		67 ●	78 ●	9	
- FSPs only (%)	90 ●	87 ●	40 ●	50 ●	94 ●	17	
Time from CEO endorsement to mid-term review submission below 4 years	50 ●	57 ●	66 ●	50 ●	67 ●	3	
MSP age below 4 years (%)	61 ●	80 ●	80 ●	67 ●	79 ●	28	
FSP age below 6 years (%)	81 ●	93 ●	93 ●	88 ●	93 ●	153	
Completed projects with a timely Terminal Evaluation (%)	87 ●				95 ●	20	
<b>ENSURE STRONG PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT</b>							
Disbursement ratio of ongoing portfolio (%)	19	22	27	22	23	181	
Projects rated in the satisfactory range for both Implementation Progress and Development Outcome (%)	80 ●	71 ●	68 ●	64 ●	57 ●	181	
Projects rated in the satisfactorily range for Implementation Progress (%)	83 ●	73 ●	71 ●	68 ●	62 ●	181	
Projects rated in the satisfactorily range for Development Outcome (%)	86 ●	80 ●	76 ●	71 ●	70 ●	181	
Proactivity index (%)	77 ●				77 ●	23	
Projects with disbursement in the past year (%)	89 ●	●	100 ●	99 ●	98 ●	181	
Over 50% disbursed balance 3+ years into MSP implementation (%)	75 ●	89 ●	79 ●	79 ●	65 ●	23	
Over 50% disbursed balance 5+ years FSP implementation (%)	91 ●	94 ●	88 ●	88 ●	96 ●	55	
Projects with financial closure after Terminal Evaluation submission (%)	85 ●	90 ●	84 ●	85 ●	85 ●	1097	
Projects financially closed on time in the last year (%)	64 ●	54 ●	70 ●	72 ●	62 ●	63	
<b>INCREASE CO-FINANCING ACROSS THE PORTFOLIO</b>							
Projects with co-financing materialized higher than 35% at MTR (%)	51 ●	●	57 ●	57 ●	0 ●	3	
Co-financing materialized higher than 80% at Terminal Evaluation (%)	50 ●	●	131 ●	560 ●	50 ●	20	



AGENCY FACTSHEET

UNEP

Share of Agency use of GEF resources by GEF phase

	Pilot Phase	GEF - 1	GEF - 2	GEF - 3	GEF - 4	GEF - 5	GEF - 6	GEF - 7	GEF - 8	Total
total financing (\$m)	19.0	38.6	188.1	299.7	322.4	449.7	466.9	677.0	30.5	2491.1
Agency share of overall approved financing (%)	2.7%	3.4%	10.3%	10.7%	12.3%	12.4%	14.2%	21.3%	38.5%	13.0%
# of MSPs	..	4	33	51	79	68	102	97	..	434
# of FSPs	1	5	21	39	189	140	97	155	14	661
# of EA	4	60	42	94	15	87	71	307	..	680
# of PFD	..	..	2	2	2	28	190	..	..	224
LDCF financing (\$m)	..	..	..	0.2	15.2	97.5	52.0	42.1	..	207.1
SCCF financing (\$m)	..	..	..	..	10.1	25.1	1.1	1.2	..	37.6

Parent and Child Projects in GEF 6, GEF 7, and GEF 8

Parent Project	Child Project	Child Project Name
9071	9525	Strengthening Institutions, Information Management and Monitoring to Reduce the Rate of Illegal Wildlife Trade in South Africa
9077	9142	Cities-IAP: Promoting Sustainable Cities in Brazil through Integrated Urban Planning and Innovative Technologies Investment
9083	9283	Development of a Market for Energy Efficient Lighting, Air Conditioners and Refrigerators in Costa Rica
9083	9337	Global Project to Leapfrog Markets to Energy Efficient Lighting, Appliances and Equipment
9083	9496	Leapfrogging Chilean's Markets to More Efficient Refrigerator and Freezers
9083	9498	Leapfrogging Tunisia's Lighting Market to High Efficiency Technologies
9083	9499	Leapfrogging Myanmar's Market to High Efficiency Lighting and Appliances
9264	9524	Supporting the implementation of integrated ecosystem management approach for landscape restoration and biodiversity conservation in Tanzania
9264	9526	Enhancing Integrated Natural Resource Management to Arrest and Reverse Current Trends in Biodiversity Loss and Land Degradation for Increased Ecosystem Services in the Tana Delta, Kenya
9295	9298	Promoting access to sustainable off-grid lighting in West Africa to achieve SE4ALL goals (Child project Nigeria)

9295	9299	Promoting access to sustainable off-grid lighting in West Africa to achieve SE4ALL goals (Child project Niger)
9602	9695	GEF GOLD Mongolia-Philippines: Contribution Towards the Elimination of Mercury in the ASGM sector From Miners to Refiners
9602	9697	Global Knowledge Management and Exchange of Child Project Results Through Networking and Outreach Activities for the GEF GOLD Program
9607	9684	Reducing Pollution from Harmful Chemicals and Wastes in Mediterranean Hot Spots and Measuring Progress to Impacts
9607	9685	Mediterranean Coastal Zones: Managing the Water-Food-Energy and Ecosystems NEXUS
9607	9686	Mediterranean Sea Basin Environment and Climate Regional Support Project
9607	9687	Mediterranean Coastal Zones Climate Resilience Water Security and Habitat Protection
9607	9717	Mediterranean Pollution Hot Spots Investment Project
9607	10158	Management Support and Expansion of Marine Protected Areas in Libya.
10114	10270	Global project to support countries with the shift to electric mobility
10114	10271	Transition Towards Low and No-Emission Electric Mobility in the Ukraine: Strengthening Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure and Incentives
10114	10272	Support the Shift to Electric Mobility in Togo
10114	10273	Supporting Sierra Leone with the Shift to Electric Mobility
10114	10274	Support the Shift to Electric Mobility in the Seychelles
10114	10275	Support the Shift to Electric Mobility in Madagascar
10114	10276	Electrifying Mobility in Cities: Investing in the Transformation to Electric Mobility in India
10114	10277	Accelerating the Adoption of Electric Mobility in Chile
10114	10278	Support the Shift to Electric Mobility in Burundi
10114	10280	Transition Towards Electric Mobility in Armenia
10114	10281	Antigua and Barbuda Sustainable Low-Emission Island Mobility Project
10114	10283	Support the Shift to Electric Mobility in Saint Lucia
10114	10284	Accelerating the transition to electric public transport in the Greater Metropolitan Area of Costa Rica
10114	10301	Integrated, Sustainable and Low Emissions Transport in the Maldives
10114	10302	Integrated, Sustainable and Low Emissions Transport in Côte d'Ivoire
10114	10629	Accelerating the introduction of low-emission and climate-resilient electric mobility in Grenada
10114	10630	Support the shift towards low-carbon electric mobility in Ecuador
10114	10651	Sustainable and Efficient Electric Mobility System in Sri Lanka
10185	10266	Communications, Coordination and Knowledge Management Project




10185	10267	ISLANDS - Pacific Child Project
10185	10279	ISLANDS - Caribbean Child Project
10185	10472	Additional Caribbean Regional Project
10185	10848	ISLANDS - Atlantic Regional Project
10200	10233	Sustainable Management of Conservation Areas and Improved Livelihoods to Combat Wildlife Trafficking in Madagascar
10200	10285	Conservation of wildcats and prey species through public-private partnerships and human-jaguar conflict management in Panama
10200	10612	Reducing Human Wildlife Conflict through an Evidence-based and Integrated Approach in Southern Africa
10201	10268	Inclusive Sustainable Rice Landscapes in Thailand
10201	10463	Promoting integrated landscape management approach for conservation of the Mount Elgon ecosystem in Eastern Uganda
10201	10464	Paraguay FOLUR
10208	10269	Transformational Change in Sustainable Forest Management in Transboundary Landscapes of the Congo Basin
10208	10298	Integrated Community - Based Conservation of Peatlands Ecosystems and Promotion of Ecotourism in Lac Télé Landscape of Republic of Congo – ICOBACPE /PELATEL
10208	10314	Community-based forested landscape management in the Grand Kivu and Lake Tele-Tumba
10391	10452	Sustainable Cities Impact Program Global Platform (SCIP-GP)
10391	10465	Promoting integrated metropolitan planning and innovative urban technology investments in Brazil
10391	10466	Integrated low-carbon and conservation investments in Argentinian cities
10391	10484	Livable Cities in India: Demonstrating Sustainable Urban Planning and Development through Integrated Approaches
10548	10697	Building and Enhancing Sectoral and Cross-sectoral capacity to support sustainable resource use and biodiversity conservation in marine areas beyond national jurisdiction
10569	10618	Global Opportunities for the Long-term Development of ASGM (GOLD+) in Uganda
10569	10619	Global Opportunities for the Long-term Development of ASGM (GOLD+) in the Republic of the Congo
10569	10844	Global Opportunities for Long-term Development of ASGM in Guinea

Program led by the Agency in GEF 6, GEF 7, and GEF 8:

GEF Project ID	Project Title
9083	Leapfrogging Markets to High Efficiency Products (Appliances, including Lighting, and Electrical Equipment) (PROGRAM)
9602	Global Opportunities for Long-term Development of ASGM Sector - GEF GOLD

9607	Mediterranean Sea Programme (MedProgramme): Enhancing Environmental Security
10114	Global Programme to Support Countries with the Shift to Electric Mobility.
10185	Implementing Sustainable Low and Non-Chemical Development in SIDS (ISLANDS)
10208	The Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program (CBSL IP)
10391	Sustainable Cities Impact Program
10872	Financing Agrochemical Reduction and Management (FARM)

Resources by Focal Area, Region, and Country Group across GEF trust funds





## AGENCY PROFILE—UNEP

- Above 80% of the project portfolio    ● From 60% to 80% of the project portfolio  
● Below 60% of the project portfolio    ● Data not available  
 NB: No data is included in cells where an agency did not contribute to indicators during the period under review

	GEF Average	UNEP				
	FY22	FY19 Reference	FY20 Reference	FY21 Reference	FY22 Average	FY22 Number of Projects
<b>ENHANCE THE SPEED OF OPERATIONS</b>						
Time from CEO endorsement (FSP) / CEO approval (MSP) to first disbursement below 18 months	85 ●	82 ●	83 ●	71 ●	96 ●	27
- MSPs only (%)	76 ●	76 ●	100 ●	0 ●	92 ●	13
- FSPs only (%)	90 ●	91 ●	71 ●	100 ●	100 ●	14
Time from CEO endorsement to mid-term review submission below 4 years	50 ●	61 ●	63 ●	13 ●	17 ●	6
MSP age below 4 years (%)	61 ●	67 ●	62 ●	61 ●	56 ●	57
FSP age below 6 years (%)	81 ●	74 ●	86 ●	85 ●	73 ●	78
Completed projects with a timely Terminal Evaluation (%)	87 ●					
<b>ENSURE STRONG PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT</b>						
Disbursement ratio of ongoing portfolio (%)	19 ●	21 ●	33 ●	19 ●	16 ●	141
Projects rated in the satisfactory range for both Implementation Progress and Development Outcome (%)	80 ●	88 ●	91 ●	88 ●	87 ●	152
Projects rated in the satisfactory range for Implementation Progress (%)	83 ●	91 ●	95 ●	92 ●	89 ●	154
Projects rated in the satisfactory range for Development Outcome (%)	86 ●	91 ●	94 ●	91 ●	89 ●	152
Proactivity index (%)	77 ●				72 ●	44
Projects with disbursement in the past year (%)	89 ●	●	82 ●	72 ●	77 ●	141
Over 50% disbursed balance 3+ years into MSP implementation (%)	75 ●	74 ●	80 ●	82 ●	80 ●	44
Over 50% disbursed balance 5+ years FSP implementation (%)	91 ●	66 ●	90 ●	91 ●	90 ●	41
Projects with financial closure after Terminal Evaluation submission (%)	85 ●	76 ●	72 ●	67 ●	75 ●	296
Projects financially closed on time in the last year (%)	64 ●	33 ●	67 ●	82 ●	44 ●	27
<b>INCREASE CO-FINANCING ACROSS THE PORTFOLIO</b>						
Projects with co-financing materialized higher than 35% at MTR (%)	51 ●	●	63 ●	33 ●	50 ●	6
Co-financing materialized higher than 80% at Terminal Evaluation (%)	50 ●	●	170 ●	132 ●		

AGENCY FACTSHEET

UNIDO

Share of Agency use of GEF resources by GEF phase

	Pilot Phase	GEF - 1	GEF - 2	GEF - 3	GEF - 4	GEF - 5	GEF - 6	GEF - 7	GEF - 8	Total
total financing (\$m)		..	0.6	12.2	186.8	302.0	181.3	143.3	..	826.1
Agency share of overall approved financing (%)		..	0.0%	0.4%	7.1%	8.3%	5.5%	4.5%	..	4.3%
# of MSPs		..	..	..	19	46	22	26	..	113
# of FSPs		..	..	2	42	101	27	30	..	202
# of EA		..	22	18	3	57	26	11	..	137
# of PFD		..	..	..	..	..	..	11	..	..
LDCF financing (\$m)		..	..	..	..	3.2	2.5	26.1	5.0	36.7
SCCF financing (\$m)		..	..	..	..	3.7	..	2.2	..	6.0

Parent and Child Projects in GEF 6, GEF 7, and GEF 8


Parent Project	Child Project	Child Project Name
9077	9147	Sustainable-City Development in Malaysia
9077	9323	Cities-IAP: Sustainable Cities, Integrated Approach Pilot in India
9602	9718	GEF GOLD: Contribution Towards the Elimination of Mercury and Improvement of the Gold Value Chain in the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining Sector
10114	10605	Integrated adoption of electric mobility in Jordan
10114	10607	Scaling-up the adoption of electric mobility in Tunisia
10114	10609	Accelerating the adoption and scale-up of electric mobility for low-carbon city development in the Philippines
10114	10610	Electric mobility for sustainable tourism in Albania
10408	10453	Promoting the transition to a circular economy in Uruguay through cleantech innovations
10408	10454	Low-carbon economy of Ukraine for climate change prevention: Facilitating investment to scale-up innovative cleantech solutions for low-carbon economy and climate action
10408	10455	Innovative clean technology enterprise development – Institutionalisation and expansion of the Global Cleantech Innovation Programme for SMEs in Turkey
10408	10456	Accelerating cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship in SMEs to support the transition towards circular economy and create green jobs

10408	10457	Clean technology innovation programme for SMEs and start-ups in the Republic of Moldova
10408	10458	Global Cleantech Innovation Programme in Kazakhstan - Promoting cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship in SMEs for green jobs in Kazakhstan
10408	10459	Accelerating cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship in start-ups and SMEs in Indonesia
10408	10460	Global Cleantech Innovation Programme: Accelerating cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship in start-ups and SMEs in Cambodia
10408	10461	Global Cleantech Innovation Programme (GCIP) to support countries to accelerate the uptake and investment in cleantech innovations
10408	10825	Promoting clean energy technologies for sustainable start-ups and small medium enterprises development in Nigeria
10408	10826	Programme for cleantech innovation and green jobs - Phase 2
10569	10602	GEF GOLD+ Bolivia: Enhancing the formalization and mercury reduction in artisanal and small-scale gold mining in the Plurinational State of Bolivia
10569	10603	GEF GOLD+ in Nigeria: Enhancing the formalization and mercury-free gold in Nigeria
10569	10604	GEF GOLD+ in Madagascar: Enhancing the formalization and mercury reduction in artisanal and small-scale gold mining in Madagascar
10569	10846	GEF GOLD+ Mali: Enhancing the formalization and mercury reduction in the artisanal and small-scale gold mining in Mali
10569	10847	GEF GOLD+ Nicaragua: Enhancing the formalization and mercury reduction in the artisanal and small-scale gold mining in Nicaragua

Program led by the Agency in GEF 6, GEF 7, and GEF 8:

GEF Project ID	Project Title
10408	Global Cleantech Innovation Programme (GCIP) to accelerate the uptake and investments in innovative cleantech solutions

Resources by Focal Area, Region, and Country Group across GEF trust funds





AGENCY PROFILE — UNIDO

- Above 80% of the project portfolio
- From 60% to 80% of the project portfolio
- Below 60% of the project portfolio
- Data not available

NB: No data is included in cells where an agency did not contribute to indicators during the period under review

	GEF Average	UNIDO					FY22 Number of Projects
	FY22	FY19 Reference	FY20 Reference	FY21 Reference	FY22 Average		
<b>ENHANCE THE SPEED OF OPERATIONS</b>							
Time from CEO endorsement (FSP) / CEO approval (MSP) to first disbursement below 18 months	85 ●	88 ●	50 ●	100 ●	100 ●	2	
- MSPs only (%)	76 ●	80 ●	100		100 ●	2	
- FSPs only (%)	90 ●	93 ●	0 ●	100 ●			
Time from CEO endorsement to mid-term review submission below 4 years	50 ●	18 ●	14 ●	0 ●	57 ●	7	
MSP age below 4 years (%)	61 ●	62 ●	47 ●	59 ●	43 ●	21	
FSP age below 6 years (%)	81 ●	85 ●	73 ●	52 ●	48 ●	46	
Completed projects with a timely Terminal Evaluation (%)	87 ●						
<b>ENSURE STRONG PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT</b>							
Disbursement ratio of ongoing portfolio (%)	19	14	26	29	26	69	
Projects rated in the satisfactory range for both Implementation Progress and Development Outcome (%)	80 ●	89 ●	90 ●	89 ●	97 ●	70	
Projects rated in the satisfactory range for Implementation Progress (%)	83 ●	90 ●	91 ●	91 ●	97 ●	70	
Projects rated in the satisfactory range for Development Outcome (%)	86 ●	93 ●	96 ●	93 ●	100 ●	71	
Proactivity index (%)	77 ●				80 ●	22	
Projects with disbursement in the past year (%)	89 ●	●	100 ●	96 ●	96 ●	69	
Over 50% disbursed balance 3+ years into MSP implementation (%)	75 ●	67 ●	83 ●	63 ●	86 ●	22	
Over 50% disbursed balance 5+ years FSP implementation (%)	91 ●	63 ●	85 ●	86 ●	95 ●	39	
Projects with financial closure after Terminal Evaluation submission (%)	85 ●	81 ●	75 ●	87 ●	92 ●	78	
Projects financially closed on time in the last year (%)	64 ●	88 ●	86 ●	59 ●	69 ●	16	
<b>INCREASE CO-FINANCING ACROSS THE PORTFOLIO</b>							
Projects with co-financing materialized higher than 35% at MTR (%)	51 ●	●	43 ●	100 ●	67 ●	9	
Co-financing materialized higher than 80% at Terminal Evaluation (%)	50 ●	●	361 ●				

AGENCY FACTSHEET

World Bank

Share of Agency use of GEF resources by GEF phase

	Pilot Phase	GEF - 1	GEF - 2	GEF - 3	GEF - 4	GEF - 5	GEF - 6	GEF - 7	GEF - 8	Total
total financing (\$m)	422.8	725.3	1009.1	1387.3	708.7	709.1	537.8	510.5	6.1	6016.7
Agency share of overall approved financing (%)	60.7%	63.8%	55.1%	49.5%	27.0%	19.5%	16.3%	16.0%	7.7%	31.3%
# of MSPs	..	3	66	42	39	11	6	3	..	170
# of FSPs	49	62	103	162	148	154	108	85	3	874
# of EA	..	18	16	5	2	1	..	..	..	42
# of PFD	..	..	3	5	5	114	164	..	..	291
LDCF financing (\$m)	..	..	..	0.4	14.5	56.7	13.6	21.0	..	106.2
SCCF financing (\$m)	..	..	..	11.5	31.2	49.2	5.5	..	..	97.4

Parent and Child Projects in GEF 6, GEF 7, and GEF 8

Parent Project	Child Project	Child Project Name
4487	9160	Regional Partnership for African Fisheries Policy Reform (RAFIP)
9060	9125	The Coastal Fisheries Initiative Challenge Fund: Enabling Sustainable Private Sector Investment in Fisheries (CFI-CF)
9070	9340	Food-IAP: Sustainable Land and Water Management Project, Second Additional Financing
9071	9211	Coordinate Action and Learning to Combat Wildlife Crime
9071	9212	Wildlife and Human-Elephant Conflicts Management
9071	9213	Zambia Integrated Forest Land Project (ZIFLP)
9071	9529	Strengthening Partnerships to Protect Endangered Wildlife in Vietnam
9071	9700	Strengthening the Management of Wildlife and Improving Livelihoods in Northern Republic of Congo
9071	9842	Shire Valley Transformation Program - I
9072	9696	Enabling Transactions - Market Shift to Deforestation Free Beef, Palm Oil and Soy
9077	9123	Cities-IAP: Sustainable Cities Initiative
9077	9162	Sustainable Cities IAP - Global Platform for Sustainable Cities
9077	9223	GEF China Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot
9272	9339	AMAZON Coordination Technical Assistance

1

9272	9663	Colombia: Connectivity and Biodiversity Conservation in the Colombian Amazon
9272	9664	Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Project
9433	9692	Second South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Governance and Shared Growth Project (SWIOFish2)
9444	9850	Africa Environmental Health and Pollution Management Project – Tanzania
9444	9851	Africa Environmental Health and Pollution Management Project - Ghana
9444	9852	Africa Environmental Health and Pollution Management Project – Zambia
9444	9853	Africa Environmental Health and Pollution Management Project – Kenya
9444	9854	Africa Environmental Health and Pollution Management Project – Senegal
9444	9855	KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE AND INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERSHIPS TO REDUCE ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH RISKS FROM EXPOSURE TO HARMFUL CHEMICALS AND WASTE
9768	10006	Climate Smart Management of Grassland Ecosystems
10198	10300	Forest Conservation and Sustainability in the Heart of the Colombian Amazon (AF2)
10198	10737	Amazon Regional Technical Assistance
10198	10749	BRAZIL AMAZON SUSTAINABLE LANDSCAPES PROJECT – PHASE 2
10200	10315	Chad ALBIA – Local Development and Adaptation Project
10200	10341	Catalyzing Financing and Capacity for the Biodiversity Economy around Protected Areas
10200	10483	Additional Financing for the Cambodia Sustainable Landscape and Ecotourism Project
10200	10647	GEF-7 GWP Global Coordination Project
10201	10306	FOLUR Global Knowledge to Action Platform to Support Transformational Shifts In Food and Land Use Systems
10201	10348	Landscape Restoration and Ecosystem Management for Sustainable Food Systems
10201	10468	Sustainable Multiple Use Landscape Consortia - Vertentes Project
10201	10594	Burundi Landscape Restoration and Resilience Project
10201	10735	Connecting Watershed Health with Sustainable Livestock and Agroforestry Production
10206	10299	Kazakhstan Resilient Agroforestry and Rangeland Management Project
10206	10583	Conservation Areas for Biodiversity Conservation and Development II-Additional Financing
10208	10347	Scaling up ecological corridors and transboundary connectivity through integrated natural resources management in the Ngotto Forest landscape and Mbaéré-Bodingué National Park
10391	10494	Indonesia Sustainable Cities Impact Program
10391	10530	Rwanda Urban Development Project II
10391	10768	Resilient Urban Sierra Leone Project
10391	10822	GEF-7: Green and Carbon Neutral Cities


Program led by the Agency in GEF 6, GEF 7, and GEF 8:

2



GEF Project ID	Project Title
9071	Global Partnership on Wildlife Conservation and Crime Prevention for Sustainable Development (PROGRAM)
9077	Cities-IAP: Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP-PROGRAM)
9272	Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program
9444	EHPMP - Environmental Health and Pollution Management Program in Africa
10198	Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program - Phase II
10200	Global Wildlife Program
10201	Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration (FOLUR) Impact Program

Resources by Focal Area, Region, and Country Group across GEF trust funds



AGENCY PROFILE — WORLD BANK

● Above 80% of the project portfolio ● From 60% to 80% of the project portfolio  
 ● Below 60% of the project portfolio ● Data not available  
 NB: No data is included in cells where an agency did not contribute to indicators during the period under review

	GEF Average	WORLD BANK				
	FY22	FY19 Reference	FY20 Reference	FY21 Reference	FY22 Average	FY22 Number of Projects
<b>ENHANCE THE SPEED OF OPERATIONS</b>						
Time from CEO endorsement (FSP) / CEO approval (MSP) to first disbursement below 18 months	85	67	0	83	87	23
- MSPs only (%)	76	50	0			
- FSPs only (%)	90	68	0	83	87	23
Time from CEO endorsement to mid-term review submission below 4 years	50	68	67	44		
MSP age below 4 years (%)	61	60	67	75	25	4
FSP age below 6 years (%)	81	90	78	77	82	60
Completed projects with a timely Terminal Evaluation (%)	87				50	4
<b>ENSURE STRONG PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT</b>						
Disbursement ratio of ongoing portfolio (%)	19	23	22	19	10	54
Projects rated in the satisfactory range for both Implementation Progress and Development Outcome (%)	80	90	83	91	81	64
Projects rated in the satisfactorily range for Implementation Progress (%)	83	86	86	92	84	64
Projects rated in the satisfactorily range for Development Outcome (%)	86	90	92	96	88	69
Proactivity index (%)	77				63	6
Projects with disbursement in the past year (%)	89		96	80	74	54
Over 50% disbursed balance 3+ years into MSP implementation (%)	75	75	67	0	50	6
Over 50% disbursed balance 5+ years FSP implementation (%)	91	88	87	91	88	34
Projects with financial closure after Terminal Evaluation submission (%)	85	95	92	88	90	630
Projects financially closed on time in the last year (%)	64	100	100	98	92	25
<b>INCREASE CO-FINANCING ACROSS THE PORTFOLIO</b>						
Projects with co-financing materialized higher than 35% at MTR (%)	51		67	57		
Co-financing materialized higher than 80% at Terminal Evaluation (%)	50		78	90	0	4

AGENCY FACTSHEET  
WWF

Share of Agency use of GEF resources by GEF phase

	Pilot Phase	GEF - 1	GEF - 2	GEF - 3	GEF - 4	GEF - 5	GEF - 6	GEF - 7	GEF - 8	Total
total financing (\$m)	..	..	..	..	27.2	52.9	92.4	..	..	172.6
Agency share of overall approved financing (%)	..	..	..	..	0.7%	1.6%	2.9%	..	..	0.9%
# of MSPs	..	..	..	..	2	1	8	..	..	11
# of FSPs	..	..	..	..	2	13	16	..	..	31
# of EA	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
# of PFD	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	2
LDCF financing (\$m)	..	..	..	..	..	..	10.7	..	..	10.7
SCCF financing (\$m)	..	..	..	..	..	..	1.2	..	..	1.2


Parent and Child Projects in GEF 6, GEF 7, and GEF 8

Parent Project	Child Project	Child Project Name
9060	9129	Eco-system Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) in Eastern Indonesia (Fisheries Management Area (FMA)- 715, 717 & 718)
9072	9182	Commodities-IAP: Generating Responsible Demand for Reduced-Deforestation Commodities
9272	9374	Securing the Future of Peru's Natural Protected Areas
9433	9546	Expanding and Consolidating Madagascar's Marine Protected Areas Network
10198	10259	Connectivity corridors in two priority landscapes of the Ecuadorian Amazon Region
10198	10288	Securing a Living Amazon through Landscape Connectivity in Southern Guyana.
10201	10262	Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration in Tanzania's Forest Landscapes
10208	10287	Integrated management of Cameroon's forest landscapes in the Congo Basin

Program led by the Agency in GEF 6, GEF 7, and GEF 8:

GEF Project ID	Project Title
9433	S3MR Sustainable Management of Madagascar's Marine Resources

Resources by Focal Area, Region, and Country Group across GEF trust funds





## AGENCY PROFILE—WWF

- Above 80% of the project portfolio    ● From 60% to 80% of the project portfolio  
● Below 60% of the project portfolio    ● Data not available  
 NB: No data is included in cells where an agency did not contribute to indicators during the period under review

	GEF Average	WWF				
	FY22	FY19 Reference	FY20 Reference	FY21 Reference	FY22 Average	FY22 Number of Projects
<b>ENHANCE THE SPEED OF OPERATIONS</b>						
Time from CEO endorsement (FSP) / CEO approval (MSP) to first disbursement below 18 months	85 ●	100 ●			100 ●	1
- MSPs only (%)	76 ●				100 ●	1
- FSPs only (%)	90 ●	100 ●				
Time from CEO endorsement to mid-term review submission below 4 years	50 ●		100 ●		0 ●	1
MSP age below 4 years (%)	61 ●		100 ●	100 ●	100 ●	2
FSP age below 6 years (%)	81 ●	100 ●	100 ●	100 ●	100 ●	5
Completed projects with a timely Terminal Evaluation (%)	87 ●					
<b>ENSURE STRONG PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT</b>						
Disbursement ratio of ongoing portfolio (%)	19	12	32	12	19	7
Projects rated in the satisfactory range for both Implementation Progress and Development Outcome (%)	80 ●	100 ●	75 ●	100 ●	75 ●	8
Projects rated in the satisfactorily range for Implementation Progress (%)	83 ●	100 ●	80 ●	100 ●	75 ●	8
Projects rated in the satisfactorily range for Development Outcome (%)	86 ●	100 ●	100 ●	100 ●	88 ●	8
Proactivity index (%)	77 ●					1
Projects with disbursement in the past year (%)	89 ●	●	100 ●	100 ●	100 ●	7
Over 50% disbursed balance 3+ years into MSP implementation (%)	75 ●				0 ●	1
Over 50% disbursed balance 5+ years FSP implementation (%)	91 ●				100 ●	1
Projects with financial closure after Terminal Evaluation submission (%)	85 ●	95 ●	100 ●	100 ●	67 ●	3
Projects financially closed on time in the last year (%)	64 ●	100 ●				
<b>INCREASE CO-FINANCING ACROSS THE PORTFOLIO</b>						
Projects with co-financing materialized higher than 35% at MTR (%)	51 ●	●	100 ●		0 ●	1
Co-financing materialized higher than 80% at Terminal Evaluation (%)	50 ●	●	121 ●			

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Dr. Zainul Abedin Abid</b> Acting Director General National Environmental Protection Agency of Afghanistan Islamic Emirate	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Afghanistan has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$11 million available for use** out of its \$11 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Afghanistan has disbursed 13.6 percent or \$1.3 million out of its \$9.3 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	5	19.8	4.8
Regional projects	9	157.9	0.8
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	29	3	100	50
Regional projects	18	8	100	50



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Sofjan Jaupaj</b> Director of Procurement and Partnerships Ministry of Tourism and Environment	<b>Ms. Mirela Kumbaro Furxhi</b> Minister Ministry of Tourism and Environment

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Albania has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.2 million available for use** out of its \$8.2 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Albania has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$2.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	6	4.3	6.4
Regional projects	20	234.8	6.7
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	2	2.9	5.7

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	17	4	100	100
Regional projects	1	4	83	67



# COUNTRY FACTSHEET ALGERIA

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Karim Baba</b> Director of Urban Environment Policy Ministry of Environment	<b>Mr. Nacim Gaouaoui</b> Director General ad interim of Multilateral Relations Ministry of Foreign Affairs

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Algeria has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$12.2 million available for use** out of its \$12.2 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	1.7			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Algeria has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$3.3 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	4	9.5	6.5
Regional projects	12	57.9	33.5
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	1.0	4.9

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	0	4	..	..
Regional projects	9	5	80	60





# COUNTRY FACTSHEET ANGOLA

Up to date as of March 13, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Julio Ingles Joao Ferreira</b> Advisor to the Minister Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Environment	<b>Mr. Julio Ingles Joao Ferreira</b> Minister Advisor Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Environment

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Angola has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has \$18.5 million available for use out of its \$18.5 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.4 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Angola has disbursed 2 percent or \$0.4 million out of its \$20.7 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (X:1)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	8	28.3	4.5
Regional projects	14	97.4	10.4
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	5	25.7	3.5
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	24	5	43	57
Regional projects	48	6	100	57



# COUNTRY FACTSHEET ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Her Excellency Diann Black Layne</b> Ambassador and GEF NOFP Ministry of Foreign Affairs	<b>Her Excellency Diann Black Layne</b> Ambassador and GEF NOFP Ministry of Foreign Affairs

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Antigua and Barbuda has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$10.4 million available for use** out of its \$10.4 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Antigua and Barbuda has disbursed 6.2 percent or \$0.2 million out of its \$3.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	6	8.8	2.6
Regional projects	20	139.3	3.0
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	5.0	2.6

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	70	5	100	100
Regional projects	40	5	100	75





# COUNTRY FACTSHEET ARGENTINA

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Martin Manuel Illescas</b> General Director of Projects with External Financing and International Cooperation Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	<b>Mrs. Corina Lehmann</b> Minister, 1st Class Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Worship

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Argentina has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$26.8 million available for use** out of its \$26.8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Argentina has disbursed 3 percent or \$1.1 million out of its \$35.4 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	14	79.5	5.9
Regional projects	12	186.9	1.9
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	19	5	83	71
Regional projects	20	5	67	50

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
H.E. Mr. Hakob Simidyan Minister Ministry of Environment	H.E. Mr. Hakob Simidyan Minister Ministry of Environment

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Armenia has utilized 72.7 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$2.3 million available for use** out of its \$8.3 million allocation. This utilization rate is higher than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	1.7

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Armenia has disbursed 14.5 percent or \$0.6 million out of its \$4.1 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	9	9.5	5.5
Regional projects	12	185.1	2.1
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	32	4	100	100
Regional projects	11	6	100	67



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Emin Garabaghli</b> Head of Division of International Cooperation Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources	<b>Mr. Mukhtar Babayev</b> Minister Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Azerbaijan has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$9.2 million available for use** out of its \$9.2 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Azerbaijan has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$9.3 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	4	13.4	5.7
Regional projects	7	39.7	5.0
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	29	2	100	100
Regional projects	11	6	100	100

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Dr. Rhianna Neely-Murphy</b> Director Department of Environmental Planning and Protection	<b>Mr. David L. Cates</b> Permanent Secretary Ministry of the Environment and Housing

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Bahamas has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$9.6 million available for use** out of its \$9.6 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Bahamas has disbursed 1.7 percent or \$0.1 million out of its \$7.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	7	19.1	2.0
Regional projects	13	168.4	2.1
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	22	4	100	100
Regional projects	0	1	..	..



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Dr. Mohamed Bin Daina</b> Chief Executive Supreme Council for Environment	<b>Mr. Talal Alabsi</b> First Secretary Embassy of the Kingdom of Bahrain

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Bahrain has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.

#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	1.7			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Bahrain has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds


	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	2	0.4	0.5
Regional projects	4	23.9	0.1
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area

Regional



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	62	9	..	0

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Dr. Farhina Ahmed</b> Secretary Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change	<b>Ms. Sharifa Khan</b> Secretary Economic Relations Division (ERD), Ministry of Finance

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Bangladesh has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$10.6 million available for use** out of its \$10.6 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Bangladesh has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$14.8 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	11	30.1	14.3
Regional projects	6	25.6	4.1
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	5	34.3	4.7
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	19	4	100	100
Regional projects	13	5	100	100



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Charley Browne</b> Permanent Secretary Ministry of Environment and National Beautification	<b>Ms. N. Simone Rudder</b> Permanent Secretary Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Barbados has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$9.2 million available for use** out of its \$9.2 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Barbados has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$1.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	4	3.4	3.9
Regional projects	14	165.4	3.1
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	44	3	100	100
Regional projects	20	5	100	100

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points


Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Larissa Lukina</b> Deputy Head of the General Directorate for Environmental Policy, International Cooperation and Science Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection, Head of the International Cooperation Department	<b>Mr. Aliaksandr Haroshka</b> Deputy Minister Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of the Republic of Belarus

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Belarus has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$7 million available for use** out of its \$7 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Belarus has disbursed 100 percent or \$3.7 million out of its \$3.7 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	7	18.5	14.8
Regional projects	7	171.8	2.2
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	53	5	100	75
Regional projects	18	8	100	50



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Dr. Kenrick Williams</b> Chief Executive Officer Ministry of Sustainable Development, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management	<b>Ms. Sharman Hyde</b> Chief Executive Officer Ministry of Economic Development, Petroleum, Investment, Trade and Commerce

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Belize has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8 million available for use** out of its \$8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Belize has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$2.7 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	4	7.9	4.1
Regional projects	11	125.2	4.5
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	8.0	0.5

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	22	2	0	0
Regional projects	15	2	100	100

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
..	..
..	..
..	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Benin has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$12.6 million available for use** out of its \$12.6 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Benin has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$17.5 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	4	9.0	3.9
Regional projects	13	100.8	15.2
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	3	19.6	6.6
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	38	4	100	100
Regional projects	25	6	75	60

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Wangchuk Namgay</b> Officiating Secretary/ Chief Program Coordinator Gross National Happiness Commission Secretariat	<b>Mr. Ugyen Dorji</b> Officiating Director Department of Multilateral Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Bhutan has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8 million available for use** out of its \$8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Bhutan has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$6.6 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	4	9.4	2.3
Regional projects	10	168.8	0.9
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	1	6.0	14.7
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	62	3	100	100
Regional projects	24	7	100	40



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Carlos David Guachalla Terrazas</b> Viceministro de Planificación y Coordinación Ministerio de Planificación del Desarrollo	<b>Mr. Carlos David Guachalla Terrazas</b> Viceministro de Planificación y Coordinación Ministerio de Planificación del Desarrollo

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Bolivia has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$20.6 million available for use** out of its \$20.6 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	0.5
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Bolivia has disbursed 0.8 percent or \$0.2 million out of its \$24.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	10	38.0	4.5
Regional projects	11	104.8	4.6
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	23	4	100	100
Regional projects	27	5	100	100

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Assistant Professor, Mr. Senad Oprasic</b> Head of Environment Protection Department Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economical Relations	<b>Mr. Stasa Kosarac</b> Minister Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations of Bosnia and Herzegovina

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Bosnia-Herzegovina has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$5.5 million available for use** out of its \$5.5 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Bosnia-Herzegovina has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$3.5 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	7	9.8	8.5
Regional projects	15	96.8	14.0
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	31	4	100	100
Regional projects	1	4	80	60



# COUNTRY FACTSHEET BOTSWANA

Up to date as of March 13, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Khulekani Mpofo</b> Chief Natural Resources Officer Department of Environmental Affairs	<b>Ms. Abigail Lillian Engleton</b> Deputy Permanent Secretary Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources Conservation and Tourism

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Botswana has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$7.9 million available for use** out of its \$7.9 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.4 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Botswana has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$5.4 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (X:1)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	8	28.3	4.5
Regional projects	14	97.4	10.4
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	5	25.7	3.5
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	24	5	43	57
Regional projects	48	6	100	57



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Marcus Cesar Ribeiro Barretto</b> General Coordination of External Financing of the Secretariat for International Economic Affairs Ministry of Economy	<b>Mr. Vitor Bahia Diniz</b> Head of the Division for Environmental Policy and Sustainability Ministry of Foreign Affairs

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Brazil has utilized 6.7 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$74.5 million available for use** out of its \$79.8 million allocation. This utilization rate is higher than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Brazil has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$96.9 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	22	294.6	6.5
Regional projects	19	138.7	5.5
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	34	4	82	83
Regional projects	9	6	75	83

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points


Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
..	..
..	..
..	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Brunei has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.

#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Brunei has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status

### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	0	0.0	..
Regional projects	0	0.0	..
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area

#### Distribution by Agency

#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	..	..	..	..

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Emiliya Kraeva</b> Director for Strategies Ministry of Environment and Water	.. .. ..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Bulgaria has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.

#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Bulgaria has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.


#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status

### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	0	0.0	..
Regional projects	2	46.1	1.9
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	0	14	..	..



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Somanegre Nana</b> Coordonnateur Technique Secretariat Permanent du Conseil National pour l'Environnement et le developpement durable	<b>Mr. Ambroise Kafando</b> Directeur General de la Cooperation Ministere de l'Economie, des Finances et du Developpement

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Burkina Faso has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$13.7 million available for use** out of its \$13.7 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Burkina Faso has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$16.5 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	6	22.3	9.2
Regional projects	21	288.2	6.1
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	3	17.8	4.9
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	21	2	75	100
Regional projects	20	5	86	60

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Emmanuel Ndorimana</b> Permanent Secretary Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock	<b>Dr. Deo-Guide Rurema</b> Minister Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Burundi has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$10.9 million available for use** out of its \$10.9 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Burundi has disbursed 13.2 percent or \$1 million out of its \$7.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	6	16.4	5.0
Regional projects	15	176.7	0.7
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	1	5.9	3
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	34	4	75	100
Regional projects	21	9	67	60

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Alexandre Nevsky Medina Rodrigues</b> National Director of Environment Ministry of Agriculture and Environment	<b>Mr. Alexandre Nevsky Medina Rodrigues</b> National Director of Environment Ministry of Agriculture and Environment

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Cabo Verde has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$14.2 million available for use** out of its \$14.2 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	1.7

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Cabo Verde has disbursed 12.3 percent or \$0.1 million out of its \$0.9 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	4	10.1	4.8
Regional projects	13	217.9	1.4
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	45	5	100	100
Regional projects	15	6	100	80



Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>H.E. Mr. Tin Ponlok</b> Secretary General Ministry of Environment, National Council for Sustainable Development (NCSD)	<b>H.E. Mr. Sao Sopheap</b> Secretary of State Ministry of Environment

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Cambodia has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$9.8 million available for use** out of its \$9.8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	5.5	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Cambodia has disbursed 30.1 percent or \$4.6 million out of its \$15.3 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	9	18.6	6.0
Regional projects	18	111.2	3.5
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	4	28.3	7.3
SCCF projects	1	4.6	4.6

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	48	4	75	78
Regional projects	46	6	100	82

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Dr. Unusa Haman</b> Sub-Director for Environmental Planning Ministry of Environment, Protection of Nature and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED)	<b>H.E. Pierre Hele</b> Minister Ministry of Environment and Protection of Nature

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Cameroon has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$20.4 million available for use** out of its \$20.4 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	1.7

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Cameroon has disbursed 1.4 percent or \$0.2 million out of its \$13.7 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	17	46.3	7.7
Regional projects	20	294.9	5.7
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	4.0	38.8

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	24	7	89	89
Regional projects	6	7	60	33

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Lambert Gnapelet</b> Meteorological Engineer and Environment Manager Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	<b>Mr. Thierry Kamach</b> Ministre Ministere de l'Environnement et du Developpement Durable

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Central African Republic has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.9 million available for use** out of its \$8.9 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Central African Republic has disbursed 8.5 percent or \$0.6 million out of its \$7.6 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	6	19.0	2.8
Regional projects	14	140.7	2.5
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	2	9.9	6.4
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	11	6	33	100
Regional projects	27	7	80	50



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points


Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Oumar Gadji Soumaila</b> Director of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, Studies and IT Ministry of Environment and Fisheries	<b>Mr. Brahim Mahamat Djmaladine</b> Ministre Ministere de l'Environnement, de l'Eau et de la Peche

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Chad has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$11.4 million available for use** out of its \$11.4 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Chad has disbursed 35.7 percent or \$4.9 million out of its \$13.7 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	5	15.7	5.5
Regional projects	15	93.7	15.5
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	4	27.0	3
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	44	4	100	80
Regional projects	45	7	75	56

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
Mr. Miguel Stutzin	Ms. Constance Nalegach
..	Head International Affairs Office
Ministerio del Medio Ambiente	Ministry of the Environment

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Chile has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$25.6 million available for use** out of its \$25.6 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Chile has disbursed 2.4 percent or \$0.4 million out of its \$16.3 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	15	34.6	6.5
Regional projects	13	105.2	3.5
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	34	4	88	100
Regional projects	17	5	80	80

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Xiang Peng</b> Deputy Director  Ministry of Finance	<b>Mr. Zhijun Cheng</b> Deputy Director General - International and Economic and Financial Cooperation Department Ministry of Finance, People's Republic of China

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

China has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$93.7 million available for use** out of its \$93.7 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

China has disbursed 4.7 percent or \$7.3 million out of its \$154.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	48	392.0	15.2
Regional projects	8	203.9	1.6
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	45	4	94	94
Regional projects	1	6	100	100



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Andrés Felipe Marmolejo Egred</b> Head of the International Affairs Office  Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	<b>Ms. Faryde Carlier Gonzalez</b> Directora de Asuntos Económicos, Sociales y Ambientales Multilaterales Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores de la República de Colombia

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Colombia has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$64.4 million available for use** out of its \$64.4 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.




#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	0.5	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	16	121.4	5.6
Regional projects	22	243.6	3.7
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	0.5	5.3

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	32	4	90	90
Regional projects	20	5	88	82

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Youssouf Elamine Youssouf Mbechezi</b> Director General for Environment and Forests Ministry of Agriculture, Fishing, Environment and City Planning	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Comoros has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.1 million available for use** out of its \$8.1 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	1.7

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Comoros has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$5.3 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	4	11.4	10.2
Regional projects	14	118.7	5.8
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	2	14.1	3.9
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	66	4	67	67
Regional projects	50	6	100	60

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mrs. Arlette Soudan-Nonault</b> Minister of Tourism and Environment Ministry of Tourism and Environment	<b>Mrs. Arlette Soudan-Nonault</b> Minister of Tourism and Environment Ministry of Tourism and Environment

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Congo has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$5.9 million available for use** out of its \$5.9 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Congo has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$8.8 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	11	22.6	9.2
Regional projects	9	44.0	0.8
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	45	5	75	60
Regional projects	43	8	100	50



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points


Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Godefroid Ndaukila Muhinya</b>	..
Directeur-Chef de Service de la Direction de Développement Durable	..
Ministère de l'Environnement et Développement Durable	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Congo DR has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$29.4 million available for use** out of its \$29.4 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Congo DR has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$28.4 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	12	45.1	4.2
Regional projects	21	309.7	1.4
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	5	25.5	3.8
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	43	5	67	78
Regional projects	18	6	100	62

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Halatua Fua</b> Director National Environment Service	<b>Ms. Tapaeru HERRMANN</b> Secretary Ministry of Foreign Affairs

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Cook Islands has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8 million available for use** out of its \$8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Cook Islands has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$4 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	3	8.3	6.4
Regional projects	8	48.6	3.9
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	48	3	100	100
Regional projects	21	5	100	67

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Enid Chaverri-Tapia</b> Director of International Cooperation Ministry of Environment and Energy of Costa Rica	<b>Mr. Franz Tattenbach Capra</b> Minister Ministry of Environment and Energy of Costa Rica

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Costa Rica has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$16.2 million available for use** out of its \$16.2 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Costa Rica has disbursed 12 percent or \$1.8 million out of its \$14.8 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	10	27.9	5.9
Regional projects	12	110.6	4.8
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	39	3	100	83
Regional projects	16	7	100	100



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points


Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mrs. Alimata Kone</b> Permanent Secretary CNFEM (GEF NATIONAL COMMISSION)	<b>HE Minister Jean Luc Assi</b> Minister Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Cote d'Ivoire has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$12.9 million available for use** out of its \$12.9 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Cote d'Ivoire has disbursed 2.7 percent or \$0.3 million out of its \$10.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	12	31.5	9.0
Regional projects	18	264.8	5.6
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	27	4	83	86
Regional projects	7	7	75	75

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Gordana Ruklic</b> Head of International Relations Service Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development	<b>Mr. Mario Siljeg</b> State Secretary Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Croatia has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.

### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Croatia has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status

## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	0	0.0	..
Regional projects	2	6.0	9.9
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area

Regional



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	0	9	..	..

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Ulises Fernandez Gomez</b> Director Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnologia y Medio Ambiente	<b>Mr. Ulises Fernandez Gomez</b> Director Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnologia y Medio Ambiente

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Cuba has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$16.1 million available for use** out of its \$16.1 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Cuba has disbursed 0.3 percent or \$0 million out of its \$10.7 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	15	40.5	6.1
Regional projects	12	180.7	2.7
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	43	4	88	100
Regional projects	8	4	100	100



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Premysl Stepanek</b> Head of Multilateral Relations Unit Ministry of the Environment of the Czech Republic	<b>Mr. Michal Pastvinsky</b> Director, Department of International Relations Ministry of Environment

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Czech Republic has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Czech Republic has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status

## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	0	0.0	..
Regional projects	0	0.0	..
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area

### Distribution by Agency

### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	..	..	..	..

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Dini Abdallah Omar</b> Secretary General Ministry of Habitat and Environment	<b>His Excellency Moussa Mohamed Ahmed</b> Minister Ministry of Housing, Urban Planning and Environment

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Djibouti has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$9.9 million available for use** out of its \$9.9 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Djibouti has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$12 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	5	11.0	4.4
Regional projects	9	78.9	0.3
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	3	21.4	3.1
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	46	4	40	67
Regional projects	78	8	100	75

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Kimisha Thomas</b> Senior Policy Advisor Ministry of Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment	<b>Ms. Mandra Fagan</b> Permanent Secretary Ministry of Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Dominica has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.8 million available for use** out of its \$8.8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Dominica has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$3.5 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	4	7.0	4.6
Regional projects	13	67.2	0.9
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	13	3	50	50
Regional projects	51	6	100	67





# COUNTRY FACTSHEET DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Milagros De Camps</b> Viceministra de Cooperación Internacional Ministro de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales	<b>Mr. Jorge Mera Orlando</b> .. Ministro de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Dominican Republic has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$11.8 million available for use** out of its \$11.8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	1.7

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Dominican Republic has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$4.1 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	4	15.1	5.7
Regional projects	17	304.9	2.3
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	32	4	100	60
Regional projects	14	5	100	80

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. José Luis Naula</b> Coordinador - Dirección de Cooperación Internacional Ministerio del Ambiente y Agua del Ecuador	<b>Mr. Walter Schuldt</b> Director of Environment and Sustainable Development Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Human Mobility

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Ecuador has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$39.1 million available for use** out of its \$39.1 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	0.5
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Ecuador has disbursed 11.9 percent or \$4.1 million out of its \$34.6 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	18	62.5	5.5
Regional projects	15	150.8	4.2
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	39	3	100	100
Regional projects	26	7	100	100

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
Eng. Ali Abo Sena	..
Chief Executive Officer	..
Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Egypt has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$14.3 million available for use** out of its \$14.3 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Egypt has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$12.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	12	39.5	6.5
Regional projects	17	137.5	9.4
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	7.8	4.9

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	34	5	100	88
Regional projects	9	6	89	78



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Mayra Lourdes Argueta Vda. de Ardon</b> Manager of International Cooperation and Monitoring Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	<b>Mr. Fernando Andres Lopez Larreynaga</b> Minister of Environment and Natural Resources Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

El Salvador has utilized 43.6 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$2.9 million available for use** out of its \$5.1 million allocation. This utilization rate is higher than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

El Salvador has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$3.6 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	4	6.5	8.1
Regional projects	8	101.8	2.6
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	2	7.1	5.9

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	2	2	0	50
Regional projects	13	4	100	100



# COUNTRY FACTSHEET EQUATORIAL GUINEA

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Antonio Micha Ondo Angue</b> Director Nacional Instituto Nacional para la Conservacion de Medio Ambiente	<b>H.E. Francisca Eneme Efua</b> Ministra Titular Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería, Bosques y Medio Ambiente

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Equatorial Guinea has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$5 million available for use** out of its \$5 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Equatorial Guinea has disbursed 6.8 percent or \$0.4 million out of its \$6.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	4	15.1	5.7
Regional projects	6	35.2	1.0
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	20	3	100	100
Regional projects	51	9	100	67

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Kibrom Asmerom Weldegebriel</b> Acting DG- Dept of Environment Ministry of Land, Water and Environment	<b>Mr. Tesfai G. Selassie Sebhatu</b> The Minister Ministry of Land, Water and Environment

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Eritrea has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$9.9 million available for use** out of its \$9.9 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Eritrea has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$15.7 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




1

## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	2	6.1	1.7
Regional projects	12	104.7	0.8
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	8	5	0	0
Regional projects	37	5	100	40

2



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Kerli Killi</b> Director General, International Affairs Department Ministry of the Environment	<b>Mr. Meelis Munt</b> Secretary General Ministry of the Environment

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Estonia has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.

### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Estonia has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status

## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	0	0.0	..
Regional projects	0	0.0	..
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area

### Distribution by Agency

### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	..	..	..	..



# COUNTRY FACTSHEET ESWATINI

Up to date as of March 13, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Khangezine Glory Mabuza</b> Principal Secretary Ministry of Tourism and Environmental Affairs	<b>Ms. Khangezine Glory Mabuza</b> Principal Secretary Ministry of Tourism and Environmental Affairs

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Eswatini has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$7.5 million available for use** out of its \$7.5 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.4 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Eswatini has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$0.9 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (X:1)
National projects	2	8.1	8.4
Regional projects	14	134.4	3.2
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	43	4	100	100
Regional projects	27	6	100	75

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Kasahun Wakoya Nikusa</b> Acting Director General, Resource Mobilization and Project Administration Environment, Forest and Climate Change Commission	<b>H.E. Dr. Getahun Garedeu</b> Director General Ethiopian Environmental Protection Authority

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Ethiopia has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$23.8 million available for use** out of its \$23.8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Ethiopia has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$35.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	10	53.3	10.1
Regional projects	20	198.2	3.9
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	3	21.0	4.4
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	41	4	88	88
Regional projects	15	5	75	88



Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Joshua WYCLIFFE</b> Permanent Secretary Ministry of Waterways & Environment	<b>H.E. Ratu Naivakarurubalavu SOLO MARA</b> Fiji's Ambassador to the United States of America Fiji Embassy, DC

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Fiji has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$12 million available for use** out of its \$12 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Fiji has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$8.7 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	7	21.8	5.6
Regional projects	14	198.7	2.0
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	1.0	7.3

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	41	3	0	0
Regional projects	12	6	100	67

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Monsieur Stanislas Stephen Mouba Olouna</b>	..
Directeur General	..
Direction General de l'Environnement et de la Protection de la Nature	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Gabon has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$7.2 million available for use** out of its \$7.2 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Gabon has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$6.6 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	6	16.5	5.4
Regional projects	12	107.6	1.0
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	55	5	50	50
Regional projects	10	6	100	50

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Dr. Badgie Dawda</b>	..
Executive Director	..
National Environment Agency	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Gambia has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$12.1 million available for use** out of its \$12.1 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Gambia has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$17.8 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	9	22.8	4.1
Regional projects	15	242.3	2.7
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	4	25.4	3.1
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	35	4	100	75
Regional projects	22	6	75	67



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Nino Tkhlava</b> Head of Department Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia	<b>His Excellency Levan Davitashvili</b> Minister Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Georgia has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$7 million available for use** out of its \$7 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Georgia has disbursed 13.6 percent or \$1 million out of its \$7.6 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	9	15.6	7.9
Regional projects	10	65.4	5.8
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	33	3	100	100
Regional projects	1	4	100	100

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Isaac Charles Acquah Jnr.</b> Chief Programme Officer Environmental Protection Agency	<b>Dr. Kwaku Afriyie</b> Hon. Minister Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Ghana has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$11.7 million available for use** out of its \$11.7 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Ghana has disbursed 50.5 percent or \$13.6 million out of its \$27 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	7	36.7	8.4
Regional projects	13	160.3	1.7
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	64	2	100	75
Regional projects	9	8	100	50

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Dr. Kelvin Michael George</b> Director	<b>Hon. Simon Stiell</b> Minister for Climate Resilience, the Environment, Forestry, Fisheries, Disaster Management and Information
Ministry of Finance, Planning, Economic Development and Physical Development	Ministry for Climate Resilience

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Grenada has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8 million available for use** out of its \$8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Grenada has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$1.1 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	3	4.9	4.1
Regional projects	14	188.4	2.4
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	13	2	0	0
Regional projects	15	5	100	86



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Jenifer Andrea Calderón Cintora</b> Chief International Cooperation Unit Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources of Guatemala	<b>Mr. Fredy Antonio Chiroy Barreno</b> Vice Minister of Natural Resources and Climate Change Ministry of Environment of Natural Resources of Guatemala

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Guatemala has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$11.3 million available for use** out of its \$11.3 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Guatemala has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$13.7 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	8	29.4	4.4
Regional projects	16	149.7	5.0
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	23	4	67	100
Regional projects	15	4	60	60

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Lourenco Antonio Vaz</b> General Director of Environment Ministry of Natural Resources	<b>Mr. Viriato Luis Soares Cassama</b> Minister Ministry of Environment and Biodiversity

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Guinea-Bissau has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.2 million available for use** out of its \$8.2 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Guinea-Bissau has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$4.8 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	6	13.5	5.9
Regional projects	15	149.8	0.9
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	1	12.0	4.9
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	14	4	33	33
Regional projects	30	6	100	60

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Fodé Toure</b> General Director of Environment and Natural Capital Fund Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	<b>Ms. Louopou Lamah</b> Minister Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Guinea has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$11.2 million available for use** out of its \$11.2 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Guinea has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$23.7 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	7	23.3	4.9
Regional projects	14	174.8	8.7
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	3	21.9	8
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	35	4	100	75
Regional projects	26	6	83	62



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Kemraj Parsram</b> Executive Director Environmental Protection Agency	<b>Hon. Dr. Bharrat Jagdeo</b> Vice President Office of the President

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Guyana has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.1 million available for use** out of its \$8.1 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Guyana has disbursed 2.6 percent or \$0.2 million out of its \$5.9 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	8	20.9	3.3
Regional projects	15	125.4	5.3
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	40	5	40	40
Regional projects	28	4	100	75

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Joseph Astrel</b> General Director Ministry of Environment	<b>Mr. James Cadet</b> Minister Ministry of Environment

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Haiti has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$11.7 million available for use** out of its \$11.7 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	1.7			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Haiti has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$15.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	4	14.4	7.9
Regional projects	9	104.6	1.7
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	3	15.0	4.9
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	22	3	67	67
Regional projects	25	7	100	50

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Malcolm Stufkens</b> Subsecretario de Estado Secretaría de Energía, Recursos Naturales, Ambiente y Minas	<b>Mr. Lucky Halach Medina Estrada</b> Minister Secretaría de Energía, Recursos Naturales, Ambiente y Minas

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Honduras has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$15.9 million available for use** out of its \$15.9 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	0.5
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	1.7

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Honduras has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$13.9 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	4	30.6	6.4
Regional projects	15	198.5	3.6
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	3.0	8.3

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	24	4	100	100
Regional projects	12	5	80	80



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Adam Kirchknopf</b> Deputy Head of Department Ministry of Foreign Affairs	<b>Mr. Adam Kirchknopf</b> Deputy Head of Department Ministry of Foreign Affairs

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Hungary has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.

### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Hungary has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status

## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	0	0.0	..
Regional projects	0	0.0	..
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area

### Distribution by Agency

### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	..	..	..	..

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Neelesh Kumar Sah</b> Joint Secretary Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India	<b>Mr. Avanish Kumar Mishra</b> Deputy Director General Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance, Government of India

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

India has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$89.3 million available for use** out of its \$89.3 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

India has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$76.9 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	34	305.6	14.0
Regional projects	11	84.5	3.2
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	1.8	29.9

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	56	6	95	95
Regional projects	1	9	100	100

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Ibu Laksmi DHEWANTHI</b> Senior Advisor to the Minister on Industry and International Trade Ministry of Environment and Forestry	<b>Mr. Raden Wira Kartono</b> Counsellor-Economic Affairs The Embassy of Republic of Indonesia

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Indonesia has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$103.6 million available for use** out of its \$103.6 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Indonesia has disbursed 0.9 percent or \$0.7 million out of its \$76.1 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	29	182.3	7.4
Regional projects	18	153.9	5.2
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	30	4	71	73
Regional projects	19	5	88	89



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Seyyed Hossein Mousavifar</b> Head of International Affairs & Convention Center Department of Environment	<b>Mrs. Hosna Khalvandi</b> Second Secretary, Department of Environment and Energy Ministry of Foreign Affairs

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Iran has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.3 million available for use** out of its \$8.3 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Iran has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.


### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status

## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	3	7.0	5.3
Regional projects	2	49.2	0.9
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	33	11	100	100
Regional projects	0	14	..	..

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Dr. Jasim Abdulazeez Humadi ALMOHAMADI</b> Deputy Minister for Environmental Affairs Ministry of Health and Environment	<b>H.E. Dr. Aladin Abdul Sahib Alwan</b> The Minister Ministry of Health and Environment

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Iraq has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$6.4 million available for use** out of its \$6.4 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Iraq has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$7.6 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	7	14.7	5.3
Regional projects	6	53.2	0.1
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	17	4	100	100
Regional projects	..	..	..	..

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Gillian Guthrie</b>	..
Senior Director	..
Ministry of Water, Land, Environment and Climate Change	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Jamaica has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$11.5 million available for use** out of its \$11.5 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Jamaica has disbursed 4.4 percent or \$0.2 million out of its \$5.4 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	7	11.8	5.5
Regional projects	17	267.2	2.4
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	6.0	5

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	2	2	50	50
Regional projects	15	4	100	83



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
Mr. Marwan Al-Refai	..
Acting Secretary General	..
Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Jordan has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.8 million available for use** out of its \$8.8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	1.7

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Jordan has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$5.1 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	7	14.1	8.8
Regional projects	12	148.1	3.7
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	39	5	100	100
Regional projects	5	6	100	75

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Zulfiya Suleimenova</b> Vice-Minister Ministry of Ecology, Geology and Natural Resources	<b>Ms. Zulfiya Suleimenova</b> Vice-Minister Ministry of Ecology, Geology and Natural Resources

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Kazakhstan has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$17.6 million available for use** out of its \$17.6 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Kazakhstan has disbursed 7.4 percent or \$1.6 million out of its \$21.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	11	50.4	12.2
Regional projects	10	98.2	2.8
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	31	4	50	71
Regional projects	28	6	100	100

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Dr. Christopher Kiptoo</b> Principle Secretary Ministry of Environment and Forestry	<b>Mr. Keriako Tobiko</b> Cabinet Secretary Ministry of Environment and Forestry

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Kenya has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$21.3 million available for use** out of its \$21.3 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	2.5
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Kenya has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$16 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	14	55.4	5.5
Regional projects	24	214.0	4.7
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	2.6	22.9

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	52	5	91	82
Regional projects	24	6	78	89



Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mrs. Nenenteiti Teariki Ruatu</b> Director Environment and Conservation Division, Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agricultural Development (MELAD)	<b>Mrs. Taare Aukitino</b> Secretary Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agricultural Development (MELAD)

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Kiribati has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.6 million available for use** out of its \$8.6 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Kiribati has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$4.6 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	3	10.3	3.9
Regional projects	13	122.9	1.6
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	4	35.8	5
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	16	4	25	25
Regional projects	16	6	100	80

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
Mr. Hung Sik Ri Secretary General	Mr. Su Hon Choe Chairman
..	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Korea DPR has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.

#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Korea DPR has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status

### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	0	0.0	..
Regional projects	0	0.0	..
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area

#### Distribution by Agency

#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	..	..	..	..

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
Mr. Baton Begolli	..
..	..
Ministry of the Environment	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Kosovo has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.

#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Kosovo has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status

### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	0	0.0	..
Regional projects	0	0.0	..
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area

#### Distribution by Agency

#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	..	..	..	..



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
Sheikh Abdullah Ahmad Alhumoud ALSABAH	..
Chairman of the Board and Director General	..
Environmental Public Authority (EPA)	..

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Kuwait has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.

### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Kuwait has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status

## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	1	0.9	0.8
Regional projects	1	10.1	0.1
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area

### Distribution by Agency

### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	..	..	..	..

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points


Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mrs. Dinara Kutmanova</b> Director The State Agency on Environment Protection and Forestry of the Kyrgyz Republic	<b>Mr. Eldiar Sheripov</b> Deputy Director The State Agency on Environment Protection and Forestry

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Kyrgyz Republic has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.7 million available for use** out of its \$8.7 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Kyrgyz Republic has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$4.1 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	5	12.4	4.8
Regional projects	12	102.1	1.7
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	5.0	7

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	58	5	67	100
Regional projects	32	5	67	50

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Virana Sonnasinh</b> Director General Department of Planning and Finance	<b>Mr. Phouvong Luangxaysana</b> Vice Minister Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Lao PDR has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$10.9 million available for use** out of its \$10.9 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	1.7

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Lao PDR has disbursed 3.6 percent or \$0.6 million out of its \$16.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	5	18.7	8.9
Regional projects	16	205.5	1.7
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	7	37.6	5.6
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	47	5	100	100
Regional projects	19	6	100	67



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Evita STANGA</b> Head of Division, International Cooperation and EU Coordination Division Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development	<b>Ms. Evita STANGA</b> Head of Division, International Cooperation and EU Coordination Division Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Latvia has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Latvia has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	0	0.0	..
Regional projects	0	0.0	..
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area

### Distribution by Agency

### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	..	..	..	..

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Dr. Yassin Naser</b> Minister Ministry of Environment	<b>Dr. Yassin Naser</b> Minister Ministry of Environment

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Lebanon has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$7.9 million available for use** out of its \$7.9 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Lebanon has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$12.6 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	6	18.3	6.8
Regional projects	14	132.4	8.0
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	7.1	3.8

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	27	3	100	100
Regional projects	3	5	83	67



# COUNTRY FACTSHEET LESOTHO

Up to date as of March 13, 2023

## Country Focal Points


Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Qongqong Hoohlo</b> Acting Director - Department of Environment Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture	<b>Mrs. Mabataung Khalane</b> Acting Principal Secretary Ministry of Defense and National Security and Environment

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Lesotho has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$9.9 million available for use** out of its \$9.9 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.4 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Lesotho has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$13.6 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (X:1)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	4	10.3	6.2
Regional projects	17	155.0	3.9
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	4	22.7	5
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	36	3	75	75
Regional projects	31	6	100	67



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Prof. Wilson K. Tarpheh</b> Executive Director/CEO Environmental Protection Agency of Liberia	<b>Prof. Wilson K. Tarpheh</b> Executive Director/CEO Environmental Protection Agency of Liberia

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Liberia has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.6 million available for use** out of its \$8.6 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Liberia has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$16.8 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	6	14.4	8.2
Regional projects	13	201.9	3.3
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	1	8.9	1.3
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	6	3	100	100
Regional projects	21	6	75	67

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Omar Ahmed M. Sharif</b> University of Sabha Staff Sabha University	<b>Dr. Ibrahim Alarabi Munir</b> Minister of Environment Ministry of Environment

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Libya has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$5.8 million available for use** out of its \$5.8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Libya has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	2	1.7	3.7
Regional projects	10	48.4	18.5
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	1.0	4.9

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	1	2	100	100
Regional projects	4	4	80	60

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Jolita Meilune</b>	..
Chief Desk Officer of Strategic Planning Division	..
Ministry of Environment	..

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Lithuania has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.

### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Lithuania has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status

## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	0	0.0	..
Regional projects	0	0.0	..
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area

### Distribution by Agency

### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	..	..	..	..



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
Monsieur Hery Andriamirado Rakotondravony	Madame Baomiatotse Vahinala Raharinarina
..	Ministre
Ministere de l'Environnement et du Developpement Durable	Ministere de l'Environnement et du Developpement Durable

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Madagascar has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$56.7 million available for use** out of its \$56.7 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Madagascar has disbursed 0.5 percent or \$0.2 million out of its \$38.7 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	19	97.6	5.8
Regional projects	26	267.6	4.1
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	2	5.5	2.2
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	33	4	93	93
Regional projects	30	5	88	70

Up to date as of March 13, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Shamiso NAJIRA</b> Chief Environmental Officer, Environmental Affairs Department Ministry of Natural Resources	<b>Mr. Davie Wirima</b> .. Ministry of Finance

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Malawi has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$11.9 million available for use** out of its \$11.9 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.4 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Malawi has disbursed 2.5 percent or \$0.3 million out of its \$12.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (X:1)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	7	24.6	7.9
Regional projects	18	127.2	2.1
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	3	12.5	5.3
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	51	4	86	100
Regional projects	28	7	100	67

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Noor Afifah Abdul Razak</b> Deputy Secretary General (Environment) Ministry of Environment and Water	<b>Mr. Che Kodir Baharum</b> Director Economic Planning Unit, Prime Minister's Department

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Malaysia has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$26.3 million available for use** out of its \$26.3 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Malaysia has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$14.9 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	12	43.3	6.4
Regional projects	8	89.1	2.8
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	30	4	80	100
Regional projects	22	7	100	50



Up to date as of December 02, 2022

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Miruza Mohamed</b> Director Ministry of Environment and Energy	<b>Dr. Abdulla Naseer</b> Minister of State for Environment Ministry of Environment

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Maldives has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8 million available for use** out of its \$8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	1.7			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Maldives has disbursed 10.7 percent or \$0.4 million out of its \$3.3 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	7	14.6	8.3
Regional projects	13	81.0	3.2
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	34	3	75	75
Regional projects	39	6	100	33

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Amidou Goïta</b> Chef Section Données sur l'Environnement Agence de l'Environnement et du Développement Durable	<b>Mr. Bamoussa Kone</b> National Director of Development Planning Ministry of Economy and Finance

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Mali has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$11.7 million available for use** out of its \$11.7 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Mali has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$16.6 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




1

## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	5	6.6	3.4
Regional projects	19	296.7	5.6
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	1	1.8	17.5
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	10	2	0	0
Regional projects	23	6	86	56

2

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
..	..
..	..
..	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Malta has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.

#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Malta has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status

### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	0	0.0	..
Regional projects	0	0.0	..
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area

#### Distribution by Agency

#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	..	..	..	..



Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Clarence Samuel</b> Director Office of the Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination (OEPPC)	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Marshall Islands has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.4 million available for use** out of its \$8.4 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Marshall Islands has disbursed 2.7 percent or \$0 million out of its \$0.9 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	4	5.1	0.8
Regional projects	14	178.3	1.7
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	64	5	0	0
Regional projects	9	5	83	100

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
Madame Aissata Daouda Diallo	Madame Aissata Daouda Diallo
..	..
Ministre de l'Environnement et du Developpement Durable de la Maurinaie	Ministre de l'Environnement et du Developpement Durable de la Maurinaie

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Mauritania has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$10.5 million available for use** out of its \$10.5 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Mauritania has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$13.8 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	5	15.1	2.1
Regional projects	14	162.0	8.8
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	5	24.6	2.4
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	31	4	83	83
Regional projects	20	7	100	100

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Dharam Dev Manraj</b> Financial Secretary Ministry of Finance and Economic Development	<b>Dr. Renganaden Padayachy</b> Minister Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Mauritius has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$9.8 million available for use** out of its \$9.8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Mauritius has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$7.1 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	7	18.8	6.5
Regional projects	15	239.8	3.8
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	24	4	50	50
Regional projects	15	6	100	60



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mrs. Noemí Hernández Rodríguez Borjas</b> Director Ministry of Finance and Public Credit	<b>Mrs. Laura Elisa Aguirre Tellez</b> Director General Ministry of Finance and Public Credit

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Mexico has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$71.9 million available for use** out of its \$71.9 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	0.5
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Mexico has disbursed 6.8 percent or \$3.4 million out of its \$50.1 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	16	129.0	7.7
Regional projects	12	96.2	3.6
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	6.0	5

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	18	3	64	64
Regional projects	24	8	100	100

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Honorable Mr. Andrew Yatilman</b> Secretary/Minister Department of Environment, Climate Change and Emergency Management	<b>H.E. Mrs. Jane Chigiya</b> Ambassador, Permanent Representative Permanent Mission of Micronesia to the United Nations

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Micronesia has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$9.1 million available for use** out of its \$9.1 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Micronesia has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	8	12.1	2.5
Regional projects	8	138.1	1.6
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	37	4	33	0
Regional projects	4	4	100	100

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Petru Tataru</b> Head of Policy Analysis, Monitoring and Evaluation Department Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Moldova	<b>Ms. Iordanca-Rodica Iordanov</b> State Secretary Ministry of Environment

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Moldova has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.8 million available for use** out of its \$8.8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Moldova has disbursed 15.5 percent or \$1.2 million out of its \$7.6 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	8	10.2	9.6
Regional projects	11	144.4	2.6
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	29	3	100	50
Regional projects	2	6	100	100



Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Tserendulam Shagdarsuren</b> Director General of Climate Change Department Ministry of Environment and Tourism of Mongolia	<b>Mr. Odonbaatar SHIJEKHUU</b> Director, Department of Policy and Planning Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Mongolia

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Mongolia has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$10.1 million available for use** out of its \$10.1 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Mongolia has disbursed 18.9 percent or \$1.3 million out of its \$7.1 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	5	15.5	6.4
Regional projects	15	220.3	1.4
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	1.5	7.7

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	33	4	100	100
Regional projects	13	6	75	60

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Milica Sarancic</b> Head of Division for EU Integration and International Cooperation Ministry of Ecology, Spatial Planning and Urbanism of Montenegro	<b>Mr. Ratko Mitrovic</b> Minister Ministry of Ecology, Spatial Planning and Urbanism of Montenegro

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Montenegro has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$6.3 million available for use** out of its \$6.3 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Montenegro has disbursed 8.5 percent or \$0.4 million out of its \$4.1 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	5	9.3	7.0
Regional projects	18	114.5	13.3
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	1.0	4.9

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	42	4	100	100
Regional projects	2	3	83	67

## Country Focal Points

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Rachid Firadi</b> Director of Partnership, Communication and Cooperation Secretariat of State in Charge of Sustainable Development	<b>Mr. Mohamed Benyahia</b> Secrétaire Général Secrétariat d'Etat charge du Développement Durable

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Morocco has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$11.5 million available for use** out of its \$11.5 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	1.7			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Morocco has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$12.6 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	11	31.2	14.4
Regional projects	20	184.0	7.6
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	3	13.7	6

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	42	5	86	67
Regional projects	5	5	90	80





# COUNTRY FACTSHEET MOZAMBIQUE

Up to date as of March 13, 2023

## Country Focal Points


Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Eduardo Baixo</b> Head of Department of Mitigation and Low Carbon Development Ministry of Land and Environment	<b>Mrs. Ivete Maibaze</b> Minister Ministry of Land and Environment

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Mozambique has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has \$25.4 million available for use out of its \$25.4 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.4 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Mozambique has disbursed 71.3 percent or \$16.5 million out of its \$23.1 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (X:1)
National projects	8	46.8	4.9
Regional projects	22	238.0	4.4
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	1	6.0	3.8
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	71	6	83	83
Regional projects	29	7	100	73

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Hla Maung THEIN</b> Director General, Environmental Conservation Department Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Myanmar has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$19.3 million available for use** out of its \$19.3 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Myanmar has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	2	9.4	13.4
Regional projects	8	43.7	0.9
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	2	15.0	7.7
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	38	4	100	100
Regional projects	62	7	100	75

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Teofilus Nghitila</b>	..
Director of Environmental Affairs	..
Ministry of Environment and Tourism	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Namibia has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$16.5 million available for use** out of its \$16.5 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Namibia has disbursed 5.4 percent or \$0.8 million out of its \$14.3 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	7	25.4	7.2
Regional projects	15	183.8	8.2
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key Indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	22	2	50	50
Regional projects	17	6	80	80



Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mrs. Berilyn Jeremiah</b> Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Environment Commerce, Industry and Environment	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Nauru has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8 million available for use** out of its \$8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Nauru has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$3.5 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	2	6.8	6.2
Regional projects	9	122.8	1.5
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	3	2	0	0
Regional projects	19	7	100	80

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Ishwori Prasad Aryal</b> Joint Secretary International Economic Cooperation Coordination Division (IECCD), Ministry of Finance	<b>Mr. Madhu Marasini</b> Secretary Ministry of Finance

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Nepal has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$9.3 million available for use** out of its \$9.3 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Nepal has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$16.4 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	7	17.9	4.9
Regional projects	10	200.4	1.3
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	5	36.5	3.6
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	9	4	40	80
Regional projects	18	7	100	50

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Javier Gutierrez Ramirez</b> Vice Ministro Ministerio del Ambiente y los Recursos Naturales	<b>Mrs. Fanny Sumaya Castillo Lara</b> Ministra Ministerio del Ambiente y los Recursos Naturales (MARENA)

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Nicaragua has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$9.8 million available for use** out of its \$9.8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Nicaragua has disbursed 9.7 percent or \$1.4 million out of its \$14.1 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	7	23.8	5.9
Regional projects	6	132.9	1.5
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	18	2	100	100
Regional projects	7	10	100	100



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Yakoubou Mahaman Sani</b> Directeur General	<b>Dr. Maazou Kamaye</b> Executive Secretary, National Council on Environment and Sustainable Development (CNEDD)
Direction General de la Programmation du Developpement	Prime Minister's Cabinet

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Niger has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$12.4 million available for use** out of its \$12.4 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Niger has disbursed 4.9 percent or \$0.3 million out of its \$6.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	7	22.2	8.0
Regional projects	21	278.3	6.5
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	1	8.9	3.6
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	31	3	75	75
Regional projects	11	5	75	62

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Stanley Jonah</b> Director Federal Ministry of Environment	<b>Ms. Sharon Ikeazor</b> Honourable Minister of State Federal Ministry of Environment

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Nigeria has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$21.4 million available for use** out of its \$21.4 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	2.5
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Nigeria has disbursed 11.7 percent or \$2.5 million out of its \$21.3 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	15	52.0	9.0
Regional projects	18	246.3	6.9
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	34	4	80	57
Regional projects	5	6	67	50

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Haden Talagi</b> Director - Department of Environment Department of Environment	<b>Ms. Peleni Talagi</b> Acting Secretary to Government Office of the Secretary to Government

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Niue has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8 million available for use** out of its \$8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Niue has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	4	3.6	4.9
Regional projects	12	53.9	2.6
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	25	3	0	0
Regional projects	51	6	100	83





# COUNTRY FACTSHEET NORTH MACEDONIA

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Vesna INDOVA</b> Head of Unit for Coordination and Technical Implementation of IPA Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning	<b>Mr. Naser Nuredini</b> Minister Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


North Macedonia has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$6.7 million available for use** out of its \$6.7 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

North Macedonia has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$3.7 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	7	16.3	7.7
Regional projects	7	114.4	3.7
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	52	5	100	75
Regional projects	0	8	..	..

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points


Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Dr. Juma Said Al-Maskari</b> Director General of Meteorology Directorate General of Meteorology, Civil Aviation Authority	<b>H.E. Dr. Muhammad Nasser Al-Zaabi</b> Chairman Civil Aviation Authority

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Oman has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.

### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Oman has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$0.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status



## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	2	1.1	0.6
Regional projects	0	0.0	..
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area

### Distribution by Agency

### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	..	..	..	..

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Syed Mujtaba Hussain</b> Senior Joint Secretary (International Cooperation) Ministry of Climate Change	<b>Mr. Syed Mujtaba Hussain</b> Senior Joint Secretary (International Cooperation) Ministry of Climate Change

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Pakistan has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$17.8 million available for use** out of its \$17.8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Pakistan has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$2.7 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	7	22.1	6.1
Regional projects	8	91.3	1.2
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	3.3	4.4

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	46	5	100	100
Regional projects	0	11	..	..



Up to date as of December 02, 2022

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Charlene Mersai</b> National Environment Coordinator National Environmental Protection Council	<b>The Honorable Jerrlyn Uduch Sengebau Senior</b> Vice President of the Republic of Palau and Minister of State Office of the Vice President/ Ministry of State

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Palau has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8 million available for use** out of its \$8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	1.7

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Palau has disbursed 9.6 percent or \$0.2 million out of its \$1.8 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	2	6.1	6.6
Regional projects	16	186.7	1.5
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	36	3	50	100
Regional projects	12	6	80	83

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points


Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Ahmed Abu Thaher</b> Director General for Projects and International Relations Environment Quality Authority (EQA)	<b>H.E. Mr. Jameel Mtour</b> .. Environment Quality Authority (EQA)

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Palestinian Authority has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.

### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Palestinian Authority has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status

## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	0	0.0	..
Regional projects	1	0.4	0.0
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area

### Distribution by Agency

### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	..	..	..	..

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Raul Pinedo</b> Planning Analyst Ministry of Environment of Panamá	<b>His Excellency Milciades Concepcion</b> Ministro Ministerio de Ambiente

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Panama has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$16.4 million available for use** out of its \$16.4 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	1.7			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Panama has disbursed 10.4 percent or \$1.3 million out of its \$12.1 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	11	18.4	6.7
Regional projects	15	250.9	2.7
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	37	3	67	83
Regional projects	12	4	100	67





# COUNTRY FACTSHEET PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Gunther Joku</b>	..
Director	..
Conservation and Environment Protection Agency (CEPA)	..

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Papua New Guinea has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$29 million available for use** out of its \$29 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Papua New Guinea has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$20.7 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	8	36.9	5.1
Regional projects	10	100.6	2.3
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	1.0	7.3

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	17	4	100	67
Regional projects	12	6	100	100

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mrs. Graciela Soledad Miret Martinez</b> Director of Strategic Planning Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	<b>Mr. Ariel Oviedo</b> Minister Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Paraguay has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.2 million available for use** out of its \$8.2 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Paraguay has disbursed 3.9 percent or \$0.6 million out of its \$14.9 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	7	28.5	13.5
Regional projects	8	93.5	2.8
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	27	3	100	100
Regional projects	0	4	..	..

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points


Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mrs. Martha Carolina Cuba Villafuerte de Cronkleton</b> Director of Cooperation and International Affairs Office  Ministry of Environment	<b>Ms. Fey Yamina Silva Vidal de Millones</b> Viceministra de Desarrollo Estratégico de los Recursos Naturales Ministerio del Ambiente

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Peru has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$50.3 million available for use** out of its \$50.3 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	0.5
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Peru has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$46.1 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	15	104.9	9.9
Regional projects	19	178.8	5.2
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	36	4	89	89
Regional projects	26	5	100	91



## Country Focal Points

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
Ms. Analiza Rebuelta - Teh Undersecretary Department of Environment and Natural Resources	Ms. Rosemarie G. Edillon OIC-Undersecretary National Economic and Development Authority

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Philippines has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$52.8 million available for use** out of its \$52.8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Philippines has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$41.7 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	20	82.1	16.8
Regional projects	15	127.7	4.2
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	20	3	67	83
Regional projects	26	6	86	86

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
..	..
..	..
..	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Poland has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Poland has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status

### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	0	0.0	..
Regional projects	0	0.0	..
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area

#### Distribution by Agency

#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	..	..	..	..

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Abdullah Al-Muraikhi</b>	..
Environmental Operations Department Director	..
Ministry of Municipality and Environment	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Qatar has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.

#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Qatar has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status



### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	0	0.0	..
Regional projects	2	9.3	0.1
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area

#### Distribution by Agency

#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	..	..	..	..



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points


Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Siyun Lee</b> Deputy Director Ministry of Environment	<b>Ms. Siyun Lee</b> Deputy Director Ministry of Environment

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Republic Of Korea has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.

### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Republic Of Korea has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status

## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	0	0.0	..
Regional projects	0	0.0	..
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area

### Distribution by Agency

### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	..	..	..	..

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
..	..
..	..
..	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Romania has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.

#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Romania has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.


#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status

### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	2	8.4	11.3
Regional projects	1	45.2	1.0
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	42	20	100	100
Regional projects	0	13	..	..

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
..	..
..	..
..	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Russian Federation has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$55.6 million available for use** out of its \$55.6 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Russian Federation has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.


#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status

### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	4	26.7	9.1
Regional projects	1	18.0	4.1
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	28	11	100	100
Regional projects	77	6	100	100



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Juliet Kabera</b> Director General Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA)	<b>Mr. Patrick Karera</b> Permanent Secretary Ministry of Environment

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Rwanda has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$9.6 million available for use** out of its \$9.6 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Rwanda has disbursed 9.7 percent or \$2.3 million out of its \$23.4 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	6	21.9	9.7
Regional projects	12	86.2	0.5
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	4	28.7	3
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	28	4	83	100
Regional projects	53	8	67	60

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Frances Reupena</b> Chief Executive Officer Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	<b>Ambassador Allioiga Feturi Elisaia</b> Samoa's High Commissioner to Fiji Independent State of Samoa

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Samoa has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8 million available for use** out of its \$8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	1.7			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Samoa has disbursed 2.8 percent or \$0.1 million out of its \$4.4 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	5	10.6	6.2
Regional projects	8	29.3	3.9
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	47	8	0	0
Regional projects	53	6	100	100



# COUNTRY FACTSHEET SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Lourenço Monteiro de Jesus</b> General Director of Environment Ministry of Public Works, Infrastructure, Natural Resources and Environment	..

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Sao Tome and Principe has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$10.4 million available for use** out of its \$10.4 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	1.7

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Sao Tome and Principe has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$3.5 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	5	14.0	4.1
Regional projects	11	79.9	3.0
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	3	11.5	2.6
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	22	6	100	100
Regional projects	47	7	100	67



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points


Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Khalid M. Abuleif</b> Chief Negotiator for the Climate Agreements Ministry of Petroleum and Mineral Resources	<b>His Royal Highness (HRH) Turki Al Saud</b> President of PME Presidency of Meteorology and Environment

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Saudi Arabia has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.

### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Saudi Arabia has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status

## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	0	0.0	..
Regional projects	2	21.3	0.1
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area

### Distribution by Agency

### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	..	..	..	..

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Baba Drame</b>	..
Directeur de l'Environnement et des Etablissements classes	..
Ministere de l'Environnement et du Developpement Durable	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Senegal has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$14.2 million available for use** out of its \$14.2 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Senegal has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$17.8 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	7	25.9	15.8
Regional projects	25	260.6	3.8
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	3	17.3	3.2
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	47	4	83	67
Regional projects	23	5	91	83

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Sandra Dokić</b> Assistant Minister Ministry of Environmental Protection	<b>Ms. Jelena Tanasković</b> State Secretary Ministry of Environmental Protection

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Serbia has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$5.9 million available for use** out of its \$5.9 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	1.7			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Serbia has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$3.9 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	6	10.0	10.5
Regional projects	8	55.8	11.0
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	47	3	100	100
Regional projects	0	5	..	0



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Will Agricole</b> Principal Secretary Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change	<b>Mr. Maurice Loustau-Lalanne</b> Principal Secretary Ministry of Foreign Affairs

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Seychelles has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$10.8 million available for use** out of its \$10.8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Seychelles has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$5.4 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	5	19.7	5.1
Regional projects	16	273.9	3.2
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	37	3	100	100
Regional projects	11	6	100	50

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Sheku Mark Kanneh</b> Assistant Director, National Climate Change Secretariat Environment Protection Agency Sierra Leone	<b>Dr. Gevaio Bondi</b> Executive Chairman Environment Protection Agency, Sierra Leone

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Sierra Leone has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.5 million available for use** out of its \$8.5 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Sierra Leone has disbursed 12.9 percent or \$0.9 million out of its \$7.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	3	12.4	5.6
Regional projects	14	256.5	2.1
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	2	14.0	4.3
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	29	3	67	100
Regional projects	13	6	100	50

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
Mrs. Miroslava Hruskova PHDR, CSC. Ministry of Environment of the Slovak Republic	His Excellency Peter Ziga Minister Ministry of Environment of the Slovak Republic

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Slovak Republic has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.

#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Slovak Republic has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status


### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds


GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	0	0.0	..
Regional projects	1	45.2	1.0
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area

Regional



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	0	13	..	..



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points


Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Barbara Knapič Navarrete</b> Secretary Ministry of Finance	<b>Ms. Barbara Knapič Navarrete</b> Secretary Ministry of Finance

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Slovenia has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.

### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Slovenia has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status

## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	0	0.0	..
Regional projects	0	0.0	..
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area

### Distribution by Agency

### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	..	..	..	..

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Chanel Iroi</b> Deputy Secretary Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology	<b>Mr. Noel Martin Matea</b> Deputy Permanent Representative/Minister Counsellor Solomon Islands Permanent Mission to the United Nations

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Solomon Islands has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$13.3 million available for use** out of its \$13.3 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	1.7			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Solomon Islands has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$19.5 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	6	24.5	3.5
Regional projects	12	127.4	2.1
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	3	27.0	6.4
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	15	3	100	33
Regional projects	13	6	100	80

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>H.E. Mahdi Mohammed Gulaid</b> Deputy Prime Minister The Federal Government of Somalia, Directorate of Environment	<b>H.E. Mahdi Mohammed Gulaid</b> Deputy Prime Minister The Federal Government of Somalia, Directorate of Environment

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Somalia has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$16 million available for use** out of its \$16 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Somalia has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$3.3 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	2	4.3	40.4
Regional projects	11	109.2	4.2
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	2	18.8	4.9
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	33	4	100	67
Regional projects	29	6	100	50

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Shakira Parker</b> Senior Policy Advisor: International Governance Management Ministry of Land and Environment	<b>Ms. Nomfundo Tshabalala</b> Director-General Department of Environment, Forestry and Fisheries

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


SOUTH AFRICA has utilized 2.2 percent of its STAR resources and has \$48 million available for use out of its \$49.1 million allocation. This utilization rate is higher than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.4 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	2.5	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

SOUTH AFRICA has disbursed 1 percent or \$0.5 million out of its \$47.7 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (X:1)
National projects	22	123.0	8.0
Regional projects	21	229.0	6.8
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	19	4	88	64
Regional projects	22	6	100	88



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. David Batali Oliver</b> Director for Pollution Control Ministry of Environment	<b>Amb. Charles Manyang D'Awol</b> Undersecretary Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

South Sudan has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.4 million available for use** out of its \$8.4 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

South Sudan has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$10.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	3	7.2	2.8
Regional projects	5	24.8	0.1
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	1	9.0	2.9
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	3	2	100	100
Regional projects	57	8	..	0

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mrs. Janaki Damayanthi Amaratunge</b> Director, International Relations Ministry of Environment	<b>Hon. Mahinda Amaraweera</b> Minister Ministry of Environment

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Sri Lanka has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$19 million available for use** out of its \$19 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Sri Lanka has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$6.9 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	11	23.4	6.6
Regional projects	9	138.6	1.4
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	27	5	75	50
Regional projects	0	8	..	..

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Lavern Queeley</b> Senior Director Ministry of Finance	<b>Mrs. Hilary Hazel</b> Financial Secretary Ministry of Finance

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


St. Kitts and Nevis has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.1 million available for use** out of its \$8.1 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

St. Kitts and Nevis has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	1	3.0	7.5
Regional projects	17	218.2	2.6
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	15	3	100	100
Regional projects	22	5	100	86

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Samantha Justin</b> Chief Technical Officer Department of Sustainable Development	<b>Ms. Anita Montoute</b> Permanent Secretary Ministry of Education, Innovation, Gender Relations and Sustainable Development

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


St. Lucia has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.1 million available for use** out of its \$8.1 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

St. Lucia has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$0.8 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	5	7.7	3.1
Regional projects	23	315.3	2.3
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	32	5	100	100
Regional projects	18	5	100	80



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points


Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
Mrs. Janeel Miller-Findlay	Mr. Clayton Burgin
..	Minister
Ministry of Health, Wellness and the Environment	Ministry of Health, Wellness and the Environment

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

St. Vincent and Grenadines has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.4 million available for use** out of its \$8.4 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

St. Vincent and Grenadines has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$3.7 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	3	7.5	4.1
Regional projects	13	160.1	2.6
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	7	2	0	0
Regional projects	26	7	100	86

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Dr. Mona Ahmed</b> Secretary General Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources	<b>Mr. Galal Ahmed</b> .. Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Sudan has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$10.3 million available for use** out of its \$10.3 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	1.7

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Sudan has disbursed 3.6 percent or \$0.6 million out of its \$16.8 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	10	31.8	3.8
Regional projects	8	22.5	3.3
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	5	24.3	5.4
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	45	4	78	80
Regional projects	41	5	67	100

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Ivette Patterzon</b> Legal and Policy Advisor Ministry of Spatial Planning and Environment	<b>Mr. Silvano Tjong-Ahin</b> Minister Ministry of Spatial Planning and Environment

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Suriname has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8 million available for use** out of its \$8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	1.7			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Suriname has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$10.4 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	4	22.4	3.9
Regional projects	16	229.1	3.2
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	19	4	50	50
Regional projects	12	5	100	86

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Moutaz Douaji</b>	..
Deputy Minister	..
Ministry of Local Administration and Environment	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Syria has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$6.1 million available for use** out of its \$6.1 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Syria has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	1	0.9	1.1
Regional projects	4	120.9	1.4
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	0	12	..	0
Regional projects	0	13	..	..



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points


Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Sheralizoda Bahodur</b> Chairman Committee of Environmental Protection Under the Government of The Republic of Tajikistan	<b>Mr. Sheralizoda Bahodur</b> Chairman Committee of Environmental Protection Under the Government of The Republic of Tajikistan

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Tajikistan has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$9 million available for use** out of its \$9 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Tajikistan has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$4.4 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	7	13.0	6.8
Regional projects	8	47.6	3.4
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	2.9	8.2

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	36	6	67	100
Regional projects	24	4	67	67

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Dr. Andrew Komba</b> Director of Environment Vice President's Office	<b>Ms. Mary Maganga</b> Permanent Secretary Vice President's Office

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Tanzania has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$33.6 million available for use** out of its \$33.6 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Tanzania has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$30.3 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	12	61.3	7.9
Regional projects	25	302.5	4.2
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	2	12.0	5.8
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	33	3	100	100
Regional projects	24	6	80	82

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Jatuporn Buruspat</b> Permanent Secretary Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	<b>Mr. Nadhavathna Krishnamra</b> Director-General Department of International Organization, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Thailand has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$19.1 million available for use** out of its \$19.1 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Thailand has disbursed 2.7 percent or \$0.6 million out of its \$20.7 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	15	44.5	8.4
Regional projects	11	115.7	3.5
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	25	5	100	100
Regional projects	13	6	100	75

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Joao Carlos Soares</b> Director Secretariat of State for Environment	<b>Mr. Numinando Soares Martins</b> State Secretary State Secretariat for the Environment

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Timor Leste has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$9.6 million available for use** out of its \$9.6 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	1.7			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Timor Leste has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$4.4 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	3	6.1	2.9
Regional projects	6	99.2	1.7
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	3	16.6	12.1
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	35	5	80	80
Regional projects	15	7	75	100



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points


Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Comlan Awougnon</b>	..
Directeur des Affaires Administratives et Financiers	..
Ministere de l'Environnement et des Ressources Forestieres	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Togo has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$11.5 million available for use** out of its \$11.5 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Togo has disbursed 1.9 percent or \$0.3 million out of its \$15.3 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	5	9.8	3.4
Regional projects	13	200.1	3.8
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	2	17.9	7.3
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	17	3	100	67
Regional projects	8	5	100	100

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Paula MA'U</b> Chief Environment Officer Ministry of Meteorology, Energy, Information, Disaster Management, Environment, Climate Change and Communications	<b>Hon. Mr. Poasi Mataele Tei</b> Minister Ministry of Meteorology, Energy, Information, Disaster Management, Environment, Climate Change and Communications

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Tonga has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8 million available for use** out of its \$8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Tonga has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$0.5 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	3	5.5	5.9
Regional projects	11	153.9	1.6
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	5.5	7.3

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	99	6	100	100
Regional projects	10	6	100	100



# COUNTRY FACTSHEET TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Hayden ROMANO</b> Managing Director Environmental Management Authority	<b>Ms. Joanne DEORAJ</b> .. Ministry of Planning and Development

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Trinidad and Tobago has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.5 million available for use** out of its \$8.5 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Trinidad and Tobago has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$4.8 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	4	10.9	3.7
Regional projects	11	165.9	3.4
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	5	2	100	100
Regional projects	17	5	100	100

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mrs. Sabria Bnoui Ben Ammar</b> Director General for External Relations Ministry of Local Affairs and Environment	<b>Mr. Mohamed Maher Meddeb</b> Counselor of Foreign Affairs Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Migration and Tunisians Abroad

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Tunisia has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.7 million available for use** out of its \$8.7 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Tunisia has disbursed 1 percent or \$0.1 million out of its \$6.3 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	6	10.9	17.2
Regional projects	20	212.6	6.8
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	1.0	4.9

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key Indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	8	4	50	100
Regional projects	5	5	89	78



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Ebubekir Gizligider</b> Deputy Minister Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	<b>Mr. Mehmet Alper Batur</b> Director General of Foreign Economic Relations Republic of Türkiye Ministry of Treasury and Finance

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Türkiye has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$14.5 million available for use** out of its \$14.5 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Türkiye has disbursed 10.6 percent or \$1.6 million out of its \$15.3 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	15	43.9	15.6
Regional projects	17	205.4	4.6
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	46	4	88	70
Regional projects	5	5	75	75

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Berdi Berdiyev</b> Head of the Department of International Relations and Planning State Committee on Environment Protection and Land Resources of Turkmenistan	<b>Mr. Allanur Altyyev</b> Minister Ministry of Agriculture and Environment Protection

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Turkmenistan has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$9.5 million available for use** out of its \$9.5 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Turkmenistan has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$4.6 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	2	10.6	10.8
Regional projects	7	38.3	2.5
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	31	3	100	100
Regional projects	35	5	100	100

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mrs. Tilia Tima</b> Director of Environment (AG) Department of Environment	<b>Mr. Sumeo Silu</b> Deputy Secretary Ministry of Public Works, Infrastructure, Environment, Labour, Meteorology and Disaster (MPWIELMD)

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Tuvalu has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8 million available for use** out of its \$8 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Tuvalu has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$7.4 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	3	5.4	4.2
Regional projects	12	65.5	2.6
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	3	22.9	3.6
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	16	3	50	50
Regional projects	19	5	80	83

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Patrick Ocaïap</b> Acting Deputy Secretary to the Treasury Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development	<b>Mr. Patrick Ocaïap</b> Acting Deputy Secretary to the Treasury Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Uganda has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$11.5 million available for use** out of its \$11.5 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	2.5	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Uganda has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$23.9 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	7	35.1	9.8
Regional projects	22	323.2	3.3
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	6	32.5	5.6
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	21	4	50	67
Regional projects	11	5	60	71



Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Evgenii Fedorenko</b> Deputy Minister Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine	<b>Mr. Ruslan Strilets</b> Minister Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources of Ukraine

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Ukraine has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$13.4 million available for use** out of its \$13.4 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Ukraine has disbursed 4.8 percent or \$0.7 million out of its \$14.5 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	11	45.9	7.5
Regional projects	14	214.7	3.3
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	54	5	71	67
Regional projects	12	5	100	60

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points


Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
..	..
..	..
..	..

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

United Arab Emirates has utilized .. percent of its STAR resources and has \$.. million available for use out of its \$.. million allocation. This utilization rate is .. than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.

#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

United Arab Emirates has disbursed NaN percent or \$0 million out of its \$0 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status

### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	0	0.0	..
Regional projects	0	0.0	..
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area

#### Distribution by Agency

#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	..	..	..	..
Regional projects	..	..	..	..

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Adrián Peña</b> Minister Ministry of Environment	<b>Mr. Manuel Etchevarren</b> Ministry of Foreign Affairs Director of Environment

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Uruguay has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$5.7 million available for use** out of its \$5.7 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	1.7

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Uruguay has disbursed 5.7 percent or \$0.3 million out of its \$4.8 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	7	10.6	6.3
Regional projects	11	113.7	2.4
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	52	4	100	75
Regional projects	13	4	100	100

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Jakhongir Talipov</b> Chief Specialist, International Cooperation and Projects Department The State Committee for Ecology and Environmental Protection of the Republic of Uzbekistan	<b>Mr. Oblomuradov Narzullo Naimovich</b> Chairman The State Committee for Ecology and Environmental Protection of the Republic of Uzbekistan

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Uzbekistan has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$13.2 million available for use** out of its \$13.2 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Uzbekistan has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$18.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	10	36.8	10.4
Regional projects	11	232.4	1.1
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	37	3	80	100
Regional projects	4	6	100	100



Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Ms. Donna Kalfatak</b> Director Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation (DEPC)	<b>Mr. Yvon BASIL</b> Acting Director General Government of the Republic of Vanuatu

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments


Vanuatu has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$9.3 million available for use** out of its \$9.3 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	1.7

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Vanuatu has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$16 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	7	12.8	3.4
Regional projects	10	143.8	1.6
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	2	20.1	3.6
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	14	2	67	67
Regional projects	8	6	100	100

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Miguel Serrano</b> Director de Integración y Asuntos Internacionales Ministerio del Poder Popular para el Ecosocialismo	<b>Viceministro Ruben Darío Molina</b> Despacho del Viceministro para Temas Multilaterales Ministerio del Poder Popular para Relaciones Exteriores

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Venezuela has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$26.5 million available for use** out of its \$26.5 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	1.7			

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Venezuela has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$5.3 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	4	15.4	4.8
Regional projects	10	205.9	2.5
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	49	5	50	50
Regional projects	7	5	100	100

Up to date as of December 02, 2022

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Thuan Duc Nguyen</b> Director Viet Nam Environment Protection Fund, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment of Viet Nam	<b>Dr. Tran Hong Ha</b> Minister Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE)

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Viet Nam has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$34.4 million available for use** out of its \$34.4 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 0.8 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Viet Nam has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$14.6 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	9	38.6	18.3
Regional projects	18	219.4	3.0
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	1	4.6	17.1

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	28	3	80	80
Regional projects	11	6	100	80

Up to date as of January 19, 2023

### Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Faisal S. Obaid Al-thalabi</b> Acting EPA Chairman Ministry of Water and Environment	<b>Mr. Taofeq Al-Sharjbe</b> Acting Minister Ministry of Water and Environment

### GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

Yemen has utilized 36.6 percent of its STAR resources and has **\$8.7 million available for use** out of its \$13.7 million allocation. This utilization rate is higher than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.1 percent.

#### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



#### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.


Type (\$m)	Resources
Chemicals and Waste	..
International Waters	..
Impact Program Incentive	..
Enabling Activity	..

Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..

### GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

Yemen has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$16.1 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

#### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status



### Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


#### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (1:X)
National projects	4	5.2	2.9
Regional projects	6	134.8	0.9
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	1	10.0	1.1
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

#### Distribution by Focal Area



#### Distribution by Agency



#### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	11	3	100	100
Regional projects	0	5	..	..





# COUNTRY FACTSHEET ZAMBIA

Up to date as of March 13, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
<b>Mr. Godwin Fishani GONDWE</b> Director, Environment Management Department Ministry of Water Development, Sanitation and Environmental Protection	<b>Mr. Mabvuto Sakala</b> Permanent Secretary Ministry of Water Development, Sanitation & Environmental Protection

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

ZAMBIA has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has \$17.5 million available for use out of its \$17.5 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.4 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources

The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	..	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	20
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	..			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

ZAMBIA has disbursed 1.2 percent or \$0.2 million out of its \$17.2 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects


### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

GEF TRUST FUND	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (X:1)
National projects	6	32.0	5.6
Regional projects	19	121.4	6.1
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	2	15.1	3.2
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	42	3	100	100
Regional projects	39	6	100	57



# COUNTRY FACTSHEET ZIMBABWE

Up to date as of March 13, 2023

## Country Focal Points

Operational Focal Point	Political Focal Point
Mr. Tanyaradzwa Mundoga	Mr. Tanyaradzwa Mundoga
..	..
Ministry of Environment, Water and Climate	Ministry of Environment, Water and Climate

## GEF-8 Allocations and Commitments

ZIMBABWE has utilized 0 percent of its STAR resources and has \$13.2 million available for use out of its \$13.2 million allocation. This utilization rate is lower than the average of GEF countries standing at 1.4 percent.

### Utilization of STAR resources

Each dot represents the share of allocated STAR resources utilized by country.



Utilization of resources in \$m by focal area.



### Additional GEF resources


The following presents commitments made under additional focal areas, set asides and GEF-managed trust funds. Financing amounts represent the full project financing.

Type (\$m)	Resources	Type (\$m)	Approved	Allocation
Chemicals and Waste	8.1	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	..	..
International Waters	..	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	..	..
Impact Program Incentive	..			
Enabling Activity	1.7			

## GEF-7 Portfolio Progress

ZIMBABWE has disbursed 0 percent or \$0 million out of its \$11.6 million active GEF-7 commitments in national projects.

### Distribution of GEF-7 projects by status




## Portfolio of Ongoing Projects

### Portfolio of projects across GEF-managed Trust Funds

	Number	GEF financing (\$m)	Co-financing ratio (X:1)
<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>			
National projects	4	21.8	5.0
Regional projects	16	216.7	2.5
<b>GEF-MANAGED TRUST FUNDS</b>			
LDCF projects	0	0.0	..
SCCF projects	0	0.0	..

### Distribution by Focal Area



### Distribution by Agency



### Progress

	Key indicators		Projects rated Moderately Satisfactory or above	
	Disbursement rate (%)	Average age (year)	Implementation progress (%)	Development outcomes (%)
National projects	18	3	100	100
Regional projects	9	4	100	67



Scan for  
more details

# RESULTS AND MONITORING

## COUNTRY FACTSHEETS

[Explore](#)

## AGENCY FACTSHEETS

[Explore](#)

## MONITORING RESULTS

[Explore](#)

## CORPORATE SCORECARD

[Explore](#)

## GEOMAPPING DATA

[Explore](#)



# MONITORING RESULTS

FOCAL AREAS	BIODIVERSITY	CLIMATE CHANGE	LAND DEGRADATION	INTERNATIONAL WATERS	CHEMICALS AND WASTE
CROSS-CUTTING THEMES	<i>Circular Economy • Nature-based Solutions • Transboundary and Freshwater Environmental Security Gender Responsive Approaches • Behavior Change • Resilience • Private sector Engagement</i>				
TRANSFORMATION LEVERS	<i>Governance and Policies • Financial Leverage • Multi-stakeholder Dialogues • Innovation</i>				
<b>INTEGRATED PROGRAMMING</b>	<i>Tackling drivers and advancing the integrated approach to transform systems and generate global environmental benefits across multiple focal areas</i>				
BLUE AND GREEN ISLANDS					
AMAZON, CONGO, AND CRITICAL FOREST BIOMES					
GREENING TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT					
CIRCULAR SOLUTIONS TO PLASTIC POLLUTION					
FOOD SYSTEMS					
ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION					
CLEAN AND HEALTHY OCEAN					
NET-ZERO ACCELERATOR					
SUSTAINABLE CITIES					
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION FOR DEVELOPMENT					
<b>GEBs AND INDICATORS</b>	Biodiversity Conserved (Landscapes and Seascapes)	Greenhouse Gas Mitigation	Sustainable Land Management	Transboundary Water Management	Chemicals, POPs, and Mercury reduced

Color shading indicates degree of contribution of the IPs to Focal Areas

- Major
- Moderate
- Minor



## GEF-8 TARGETS &amp; EXPECTED CONTRIBUTION FROM INTEGRATED PROGRAMS

CORE INDICATOR	GEF-8 TARGETS	EXPECTED IP CONTRIBUTION (%)
<b>CONSERVING &amp; SUSTAINABLY USING BIODIVERSITY</b>		
1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management	150 million ha	49
2 Marine protected areas created or under improved management	100 million ha	48
4 Area of landscapes under improved practices	195 million ha*	51
5 Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity	70 million ha	69
<b>SUSTAINABLY MANAGING AND RESTORING LAND</b>		
3 Area of land and ecosystems under restoration	10 million ha	64
<b>REDUCING GHG EMISSIONS</b>		
6 Greenhouse Gas emissions mitigated	1850 million metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e	51
<b>STRENGTHENING TRANSBOUNDARY WATER MANAGEMENT</b>		
7 Shared water ecosystems under new or improved cooperative management	40	18
8 Globally over-exploited marine fisheries moved to more sustainable levels	2.1 million metric tons	1
<b>REDUCING CHEMICALS AND WASTE</b>		
9 Chemicals of global concern and their waste reduced	300 thousand metric tons	17
10 Persistent organic pollutants to air reduced	5900 grams of toxic equivalent	33

# GEF-8 SCORECARD November 2022



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY  
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

## ABOUT THE GEF-8 SCORECARD

The GEF-8 Corporate Scorecard is a comprehensive report on the performance of the Global Environment Facility during the GEF-8 period. In particular, the Scorecard reports on the progress made towards the achievement of the GEF-8 targets. It also looks at how the GEF is utilizing

resources made available for its eighth replenishment cycle and making progress in the implementation of key policies. The Scorecard is published twice a year and this issue includes all projects approved from June 2022 up to and including the November 2022 Work Program.

## HIGHLIGHTS

This first edition of the GEF-8 Corporate Scorecard provides an account of the utilization of GEF-8 resources, including in terms of generating Global Environmental Benefits and addressing the cross-cutting areas of gender equality, stakeholder engagement, knowledge management, and communications. Addressing commitments made during replenishment negotiations, this Scorecard expands reporting on Rio Markers and deepens analysis by covering private sector financing. It also provides an update on the Country Engagement Strategy implementation.

As the GEF-8 cycle only recently began on 1 July 2022, the November 2022 work program is a positive reflection of the ability of the GEF to facilitate access to finance across its thematic areas. It also indicates that planned investments cover nine out of the ten Core Indicator targets. The indicator on areas of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity has already reached 15.1% of its target through two contributing projects.

Countries utilized resources from the three STAR focal areas. This Scorecard tracks GEF investments for the first time along an expanded set of Rio Markers now covering the three focal areas of Biodiversity, Climate Change and Land Degradation. It also provides a progress update specific to Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation. The Corporate Scorecard will continue to monitor Rio Markers in forthcoming editions across GEF-8 investments.

Catalyzing co-financing from the private sector is instrumental to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits set in GEF investments. The Corporate Scorecard presents for the first time the volume of private sector co-financing, standing at \$35 million to date.

Early engagement with countries matters more than ever at the onset of this GEF-8 cycle to develop a robust pipeline of investments. Three Regional Workshops organized through the Country Engagement Strategy presented countries with Programming Priorities and Integrated Programs for the next four years. Through the regional workshops, a total of 76 countries have been consulted and briefed on programming directions and operational modalities to help shape country priorities in utilizing GEF-8 resources. A separate workshop targeted specifically Small Island Developing States (SIDS).

Achieving gender equality and engaging with stakeholders is key to enhancing the delivery of Global Environmental Benefits. Investments to date indicate the consideration of gender dimensions at concept design. Agencies also engaged with private sector and civil society organizations, with plans to further engage the private sector during project preparation.

Building on the record GEF-8 replenishment, the GEF continues to increase its media outreach and strategic communications with an emphasis on raising the GEF's profile and elevating a wider network of partners through story-telling, targeted publications, and strengthening its digital presence and participation in global events.



HOME

Corporate Scorecard

1


▶ NEXT

## CONTENTS

1. Contribution to the Generation of Global Environmental Benefits	2
2. Programming by Focal Area	5
3. Programming by GEF Agency	6
4. System for Transparent Allocation of Resources	7
5. Co-Financing	8
6. Biodiversity, Climate, and Land Degradation Financing	9
7. Climate Change Adaptation	10
8. Gender Equality	11
9. Stakeholder Engagement	11
10. Communications	12
11. Country Engagement Strategy	13
12. Knowledge and Learning	14

## 1. CONTRIBUTION TO THE GENERATION OF GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS






Projects in the Work Program delivered expected results against the GEF-8 Core Indicator targets, presented here along the results areas of the GEF-8 Results Measurement Framework.



\*This Core Indicator also includes a target of 85 million hectares for its sub-indicator 'Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems' shared with the grouping of indicators 'Sustainably Managing and Restoring Land' under the GEF-8 Results Measurement Framework. To date, 0.1 million hectares of this sub-indicator is from the November 2022 work program contribution.








The GEF-8 Results Measurement Framework is organized around five results areas, which group together Core Indicators on Global Environmental Benefits, associated sub-indicators and sex-disaggregated metrics on direct beneficiaries.




<b>CONSERVING AND SUSTAINABLY USING BIODIVERSITY</b>		<b>VALUE</b>
	<b>Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management (million hectares)</b>	<b>0.1</b>
	– of which newly created (million hectares)	0.0
	– of which under improved management effectiveness (million hectares)	0.1
	<b>Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (million hectares)</b>	<b>4.5</b>
	– of which newly created (million hectares)	0.0
	– of which under improved management effectiveness (million hectares)	4.5
	<b>Area of landscapes under improved practices* (million hectares)</b>	<b>0.1</b>
	– of which under improved management to benefit biodiversity (million hectares)	0.0
	– of which that meets third-party certification (million hectares)	0.0
	– of which of High Conservation Value or other forest loss avoided (million hectares)	0.0
	Terrestrial OECMs supported (million hectares)	0.0
	<b>Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity (million hectares)</b>	<b>10.1</b>
	Fisheries under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations (count)	0.0
	Marine OECMs supported (million hectares)	0.0
	<b>People benefiting from the conservation, sustainable use or restoration of biodiversity (million)</b>	<b>2.2</b>
	– of whom women	1.1

<b>SUSTAINABLY MANAGING AND RESTORING LAND</b>		<b>VALUE</b>
	<b>Area of land and ecosystems under restoration (million hectares)</b>	<b>0.02</b>
	– of which degraded agricultural lands under restoration (million hectares)	0.0
	– of which forest and forest land under restoration (million hectares)	0.01
	– of which natural grass and woodlands under restoration (million hectares)	0.01
	– of which wetlands (including estuaries and mangroves) under restoration (million hectares)	0.0
	Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems (million hectares)	0.1
	<b>People benefiting from sustainable land management and restoration investments (thousand)</b>	<b>44.0</b>
	– of whom women	22.2

\*The indicator 'Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems' contributes to the Core Indicator "Area of landscapes under improved practices" located under the 'Conserving and sustainably using biodiversity' results area.

<b>REDUCING GHG EMISSIONS</b>	<b>VALUE</b>	
	<b>Greenhouse gas emissions mitigated (million metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e)</b>	<b>5.3</b>
	– of which carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector (million metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e)	5.2
	– of which emissions avoided outside of the AFOLU sector (million metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e)	0.04
	– Energy saved (gigawatt hours)	0.0
	– Installed renewable energy capacity (mega watts)	0.0
	<b>People benefiting from climate change mitigation support (thousand)</b>	<b>42.5</b>
	– of whom women	21.4

<b>STRENGTHENING TRANSBOUNDARY WATER MANAGEMENT</b>		<b>VALUE</b>
	<b>Shared water ecosystems under new or improved cooperative management (count)</b>	<b>1.0</b>
	– Level of Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Program formulation and implementation (1 Low – 4 High)	4.0
	– Level of regional legal agreements and regional management institution(s) to support its implementation (1 Low – 4 High)	4.0
	– Level of national/local reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees (1 Low – 4 High)	4.0
	– Level of engagement in IW:LEARN through participation and delivery of key products (1 Low – 4 High)	0.0
	<b>Globally over-exploited fisheries moved to more sustainable levels (thousand metric tons)</b>	<b>0.0</b>
	– Large Marine Ecosystems with reduced pollution and hypoxia (number)	0.0
	<b>People benefiting from transboundary water management (thousand)</b>	<b>11.0</b>
	– of whom women	5.0

<b>REDUCING CHEMICALS AND WASTE</b>		<b>VALUE</b>
	<b>Chemicals of global concern and their waste reduced (thousand metric tons)</b>	<b>0.2</b>
	– of which persistent organic pollutants (POPs) removed or disposed (POPs type) (thousand metric tons)	0.03
	– of which mercury reduced (thousand metric tons)	0.2
	– of which hydrochlorofluorocarbons reduced/phased out (metric tons)	0.0
	– of which highly hazardous pesticides eliminated (metric tons)	0.0
	Countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste (number)	6.0
	Low-chemical/non-chemical systems implemented, particularly in food production, manufacturing, and cities (number)	0.0
	POPs/Mercury containing materials and products directly avoided (million metric tons)	0.0
	<b>Persistent organic pollutants to air reduced (grams of toxic equivalent)</b>	<b>29.5</b>
	Countries with legislation and policy implemented to control emissions of POPs to air (metric tons)	0.0
	Emission control technologies/practices implemented (number)	0.0
	Avoided residual plastic waste (thousand metric tons)	15.0
	<b>People benefiting from reduced exposure to hazardous chemicals (thousand)</b>	<b>15.0</b>
	– of whom women	5.2




## 2. PROGRAMMING BY FOCAL AREA

This section summarizes the progress made in programming GEF-8 resources to date. It provides a cumulative summary of GEF-8 utilization of funds against the programming envelopes established during the GEF-8 replenishment.

### GEF TRUST FUND

#### FOCAL AREAS



#### NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT PROGRAM



#### INNOVATIONS WINDOW




#### SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME



5

## 3. PROGRAMMING BY GEF AGENCY

GEF agencies submit new projects and programs in GEF-8 in response to country demand. The data shown here reflects the respective Agency share of cumulative programming in GEF-8.




6


## 4. SYSTEM FOR TRANSPARENT ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES

Utilization of resources allocated to countries under the System for the Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) has taken place across the three focal areas it covers—biodiversity, climate change, and land degradation. One percent of STAR resources has been utilized to date.

### GEF GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS



### LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs)




### SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES (SIDS)



## 5. CO-FINANCING

The Policy on Co-Financing sets out a goal for the overall GEF portfolio to reach a ratio of co-financing to GEF project financing of at least 7:1, and for the portfolio of projects and programs approved in Upper-Middle Income Countries and High-Income Countries that are not Small Island Developing States or Least Developed Countries to reach a ratio of investment mobilized to GEF project financing of at least 5:1. Co-Financing means financing that is additional to GEF Project Financing, and that supports the implementation of a GEF-financed project or program and the achievement of its objectives. Investment Mobilized means Co-Financing that excludes recurrent expenditures. Enabling Activities qualify for full agreed costs funding from the GEF; there is no co-finance requirement for Enabling Activities.

### GEF FINANCING VS. CO-FINANCING



### INDICATIVE CO-FINANCING IN GEF-8




### INDICATIVE INVESTMENT MOBILIZED IN GEF-8



## 6. BIODIVERSITY, CLIMATE, AND LAND DEGRADATION FINANCING

GEF-8 financing contributing toward Biodiversity, Climate Change Adaptation, Climate Change Mitigation, and Land Degradation as a principal or significant objective is tracked against indicative targets covering GEF-8 investments to date, consistent with the OECD DAC Rio Marker methodology. Climate-related financing refers to any GEF-8 investment marked as having a principal or significant objective for Climate Change Adaptation and/or Mitigation.




## 7. CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION

The GEF-8 Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) results framework is linked to the GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF). Core Indicators track the progress in Adaptation Benefits, including beneficiaries disaggregated by gender. This section depicts the expected results from approved projects and programs.

### USE OF LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES FUND

Resources approved to date in GEF-8 amount to \$10.13 million.

Out of 46 Least Developed Countries, one has used LDCF resources (Cambodia).



### USE OF LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES FUND

Resources approved to date in GEF-8 amount to \$0.50 million.

### CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION CORE INDICATORS

Core Indicator	Total
Direct beneficiaries (number)	94,000
- of whom women	47,000
Area of land managed for climate resilience (hectare)	20,000
Coastal or marine area managed for climate resilience (hectare)	-
Policies, plans, and frameworks that will mainstream climate resilience (number)	3
People trained or with awareness raised (number)	203,000
- of whom women	101,500
Private sector enterprises engaged in climate change adaptation and resilience action (number)	30


## 8. GENDER EQUALITY

Without greater equality between men and women, the world will not meet its environment objectives. That's why the GEF is making sure that projects are gender informed, giving women and men equal opportunities to contribute and benefit from them.

### QUALITY AT ENTRY OF GEF-8 PROJECT CONCEPTS

Percentage of projects that considered gender issues at the initial project design **86%**


### PERCENTAGE OF ANTICIPATED GEF BENEFICIARIES THAT ARE FEMALE AND MALE



## 9. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Including stakeholders—civil society organizations, Indigenous Peoples, local communities, and the private sector—when preparing projects is key in strengthening the overall impact of a project. The data shows that projects consulted and took into account the civil society and private sector in their design. As not all projects have Indigenous Peoples or private sector as stakeholders, the share is expected to be lower for this type of stakeholder as compared to those reported for civil society.

### CONSULTATION IN PROJECT IDENTIFICATION



### PLANNED PRIVATE SECTOR ENGAGEMENT DURING IMPLEMENTATION



11

## 10. COMMUNICATIONS

In November 2022, the GEF Secretariat produced several new and updated climate change publications for UNFCCC COP27. An additional publication on the 11 new GEF-8 integrated programs highlights the issue, integrated solutions, and expected outcomes for each initiative.

**2,401**  
MEDIA MENTIONS

Number of times GEF is mentioned in English, Spanish, and French language online media.

**52**  
CONTENT PRODUCED

Number of original news and feature stories, blogs, and partner stories about GEF projects posted on the GEF website. Also includes multimedia and publications.

**720,599**  
WEB/CONTENT ENGAGEMENT

Number of times visitors viewed pages on the GEF website and videos on the GEF YouTube channel.

**16,500+**  
NEWSLETTER SUBSCRIBERS

Number of subscribers to the GEF newsletter and announcements campaign list.



**SOCIAL MEDIA = 304,052**

Total number of followers of GEF social media accounts: Twitter, LinkedIn, Facebook, and Instagram.

### PUBLICATIONS

GEF-8: Moving Toward an Equitable, Nature-Positive, Carbon-Neutral, and Pollution-Free World



The Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT)



SCCF: Serving the Adaptation Needs of SIDS and Enhancing Technology Transfer, Private Sector Engagement, and Innovation



UNFCCC Guidance from the COPs and Responses by the GEF: COP1 - COP26



Funding Adaptation Action in Least Developed Countries with Support from the LDCF



The GEF and Climate Change: Catalyzing Transformation



Support for Innovation, Technology Transfer, and Private Sector Engagement by the LDCF and the SCCF



Advancing Urban Sustainability for a Green Recovery



12



HOME

Corporate Scorecard

7

PREVIOUS




NEXT



## 11. COUNTRY ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY


The Country Engagement Strategy (CES) empowers countries to improve portfolio progress and maximize the impact of GEF resources. It combines capacity strengthening activities from the Country Support Program with upstream country engagement and country-specific knowledge activities. Three Regional GEF-8 roll-out workshops already introduced a range of countries to the GEF-8 Programming Directions with an emphasis on Integrated Programs. The online GEF calendar provides information on CES events.




## 12. KNOWLEDGE AND LEARNING

The GEF promotes online learning to strengthen the quality and impact of its investments. It has further increased its reach by making classes available in different languages. Since 2022, the Introduction to the GEF has been taken by 108 participants and 126 participants registered for the GEF Results Framework e-courses.


**E-Course:**  
Introduction to the  
Global Environment Facility



**E-Course:**  
Gender and Environment



**E-Course:**  
GEF Results Framework



Now in **French** and **Spanish**

Developed with the Small Grants Programme

In addition, two new Good Practice Briefs—Strengthening Regional Cooperation to Mainstream Migratory Soaring Birds Safeguard, and Promoting Non-POP Alternatives to DDT and Environmental Health Through Engaging Key Local Partners—have been produced. Both briefs include good practice examples of South-South exchanges between Asian and African countries.

### PUBLICATIONS

Good Practice Brief: Strengthening Regional Cooperation to Mainstream Migratory Soaring Birds Safeguards




GEF Good Practice Brief: Promoting Non-POPs Alternatives to DDT and Environmental Health Through Engaging Key Local Partners



## CAPTURING THE GEOLOCATION OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES

- Easy search engine by Agency, Focal Area and Project Status





# PHOTOS CREDITS



Duc Nguyen



Magdalena Smolnicka



FluxFactory



Margaret Jaszowska




Arty



Chang Qing



K. P. D. Madhuka



Venti Views



Ryan Yao



Calin Tatu



Annie Spratt




Bankim Desai



Gustavo Zambelli




Appolinary  
Kalashnikova



Damian Patkowski



Milad Fakurian



Yulian Alexeyev



CHITTERSNAP



Alexey Malakhov




Philipp Tores




Markus Spiske



E. Diop



David Troeger



Roya Ann Miller



Chua Bing Quan



Richard Tao



Pop & Zebra



Zeynel Cebeci

Design and interactivity by Voilà:  
[chezVoila.com](http://chezVoila.com)