GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

GEF/ME/C.52/Inf. 05
May 2, 2017

52nd GEF Council Meeting
May 23-25, 2017
Washington, D.C.

IMPACT OF GEF SUPPORT ON NATIONAL ENVIRONMENT LAWS AND POLICIES

(Prepared by the GEF Independent Evaluation Office)

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AAO	Associations of Apartment Owners
AAP	Africa Adaptation Programme
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AfDB	African Development Bank
APR	Annual Progress Review
BMZ	German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
BOAD	West African Development Bank
CAF	Development Bank of Latin America
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CCP	Country Pilot Partnership
CFH	Committee on Forestry and Hunting
CI	Conservation International
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
CMS	Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals
COP	Conference of the Parties
CTF	Clean Technology Fund
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DBSA	Development Bank of Southern Africa
EA	Enabling Activity
EAPAN	Environmental Assessment Practioners Association of Namibia
ECB	Electricity Control Board
ERBD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ESCO	Energy Services Company
FECO	Environmental Protection of China
FFI	Fauna & Flora International
FHC	Forestry and Hunting Committee
FUNBIO	Brazilian Biodiversity Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IEO	Independent Evaluation Office
GRK	Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan
GRN	Government of the Republic of Namibia
IADB	Inter-American Development Bank
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
MARENA	Environment Ministry
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreements
MEMR	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism
MINT	Ministry of Industry and New Technology

MME	Ministry of Mines and Energy
MOA	Ministry of Agriculture
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSP	Medium-sized Project
MWT	Ministry of Works and Transport
NACOMA	Namibian Coast Conservation and Management
NAMREP	Namibia Renewable Energy Program
NCC	National Coordination Council
NCSA	National Capacity Self-Assessment
NDP	National Development Plan
NEEP	Namibia Energy Efficiency Programme
NHDP	National Human Development Plan
NIP	National Implementation Plan
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NSI	National Standards Institution
OGEMP	Off-Grid Energisation Master Plan
PA	Protected Area
PIC	Prior Informed Consent
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PMIS	Project Management Information System
POPS	Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants
PPA	Power purchase agreements
PRS	Poverty Reduction Strategy
REEE	Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency
SINAP	National System of Protected Areas
SLM	Sustainable land management
SRM	Sustainable rangeland management
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TER	Terminal Evaluation Review
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNCDD	UN Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
WBG	World Bank Group
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
WWF-US	World Wildlife Fund

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose, scope and methodology

1. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) was established in 1991 to address critical environmental issues. Since then, it has provided $14.5 billion in grants and mobilized $75.4 billion in additional financing for almost 4,000 projects undertaken by 18 partner agencies. GEF-funded projects fall within five principal focal areas: biodiversity, climate change, land degradation, persistent organic pollutants, and international waters. Projects span a wide range of objectives and activities. In keeping with GEF strategies over the past few decades, some projects have been directed specifically toward strengthening national environmental policy in member countries, including relevant environmental laws.

2. The GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) is undertaking a study on the role that GEF has played in strengthening policy and legal frameworks in different countries. Specifically, it examines how GEF-funded projects in Kazakhstan, Brazil, Vietnam, Philippines, Belarus and Namibia led to changes in legislative statutes and regulations issued by the national governments that have the effect of law. In aggregate, the projects cut across a wide spectrum of GEF focal areas: biodiversity (6), climate change (4), land degradation (1), and multifocal (2). The case studies examine the history and context of the laws that were addressed through the selected projects, the role that projects played in the legislative/rulemaking process, the purpose and content of the laws, the process and current status of implementation, and an assessment of results in terms of stated aims.

3. The results draw on multiple sources of information, including a review of project materials, key informant interviews, a meta-analysis of the Country Portfolio Evaluations (CPEs) and secondary research. Interviews were conducted with representatives of GEF agencies, officials from relevant ministries (including the GEF Focal Point), members of project management units, and other key stakeholders, as appropriate, during the course of in country visits. Interviews were supplemented with information obtained through written responses to questions sent to representatives of the implementing agency and government partners. Like all evaluations, this one was subject to certain constraints. The most challenging was dealing with the time that had elapsed since completion of some of the projects. While this allowed an opportunity to trace results over an extended period, some government officials and consultants who had been hired by agencies to work on particular projects were no longer in their positions and difficult to track down. In addition, project files were not always complete and data on impacts were generally unavailable.

Results

4. There is evidence from the case studies and the Country Portfolio evaluations that GEF-supported projects have specific components that directly or indirectly, influenced the legal and regulatory framework. Results are more notable in Biodiversity and Climate Change focal areas as compared to Chemicals and Land Degradation.

5. Table 1 below highlights some of the legal and regulatory reforms and their associated outcomes arising from GEF interventions in the six country case studies. The details are included in the case study discussion.

Table 1: Summary of outcomes of legal and regulatory reform in country case studies

Country	Law drafted or amended with GEF support	Results
Namibia	Development of a Regulatory Framework for Renewable Energy and Government Directive	Power purchase agreements signed with 13 solar PV projects and 1 wind project. 800mMW gas-fired power station will come online this year.
Kazakhstan	Law on Energy Saving and Energy Efficiency Improvements	Government allocated $62million to improve energy efficiency in residential buildings between 2011 and 2014. Heating systems were renovated in 1000 residential buildings.
Vietnam	National Strategy for Urban Lighting	25 provinces have developed regulations on public lighting, and electricity consumption for public lighting have declined from 6.71% per year in 2010 to 4.8% in 2014-2016 (estimated)
Philippines	Administrative reforms to promote energy efficiency lighting systems	Aggregate energy savings through the project is 7,684 Gwh and total GHG emission reduction is 3.4million tonnes CO2.
Belarus	National Strategy for Peatlands (NSP) and the Scheme for wise use of peat deposits and sustainable management of peatlands to 2030.	24 projects sites have been restored for a total area of more than 51K ha (10% of the area of degraded peatlands). A significant decrease in the square ha of fires with a high of 18500 Ha in the early 2000s to only 184 ha in 2015.
Brazil	National Systems of Conservation Units Law	43 new protected areas were created by legal decree totaling 24 million hectares

Biodiversity

6. GEF support provided through specific policy and legal formulation components of medium and full size projects in biodiversity has helped countries mainstream biodiversity conservation considerations in national policy and law making fora. The main contributions of GEF support are found in the formulation of new or strengthening of existing laws for establishment and consolidation of protected areas, wild life protection and protection of indigenous rights. These laws were typically passed during the project period. In some cases, provincial bans/laws drafted during the project, were extended to the national level after the project was completed.

7. In Morocco, the GEF helped establish the 2010 protected areas law (No. 22-07), which aimed at the conservation, development, and rehabilitation of the natural and cultural heritage and is fully functionally and being implemented. A GEF project (National Parks Conservation and Management Project - GEF 4075) in Benin supported the drafting and adoption of the law on wildlife management (loi sur le Régime de la Faune) promulgated in 2004, which also constitutes the reference framework for fauna management in Benin. The project resulted in an increase in elephant population from 900 in 2003 to more than 1,600 by 2006. A ban on commercial harvesting of sea turtles under the Marine Protected Areas (MPA) project

complemented the government's own efforts to protect migratory species and marine mammals in Samoan waters and led to a ban on the commercial harvesting of sea turtles at the national level.

Climate Change

8. GEF support in climate change was limited but critical in raising awareness about mitigation and adaptation issues. The development of energy policies and laws was mostly observed in the area of renewable energy and energy efficiency. The impact was most visible in countries with high ownership (Philippines, Egypt) or highly vulnerable to climate change (Latin America and Caribbean countries). In a limited number of cases there was a mismatch in priorities, where countries had climate change adaptation as the main priority, at a time when this was still peripheral to GEF funding. In other cases, a number of climate change projects were still enabling activities (i.e. Sierra Leone).

9. In Egypt, Vietnam and the Philippines, GEF has been the lead institution in introducing climate change issues and in building national capacities. A GEF project (Energy Efficiency Improvement and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Project - GEF ID 267) led to the development of energy efficiency standards and labels for electrical appliances (a ministerial decree issued in 2002–03), energy efficiency codes for new residential, commercial, and industrial buildings, and a draft energy efficiency law in Egypt. A significant achievement of this project is that the ministerial decree now obligates manufacturers and importers to abide by the specifications and label their products with energy consumption information. The projects in Vietnam and the Philippines have been documented in the case studies section.

POPs and Land Degradation

10. The evidence on GEF support to chemicals and land degradation in policy and regulatory reform is limited. Most of the projects under POPs were supported through enabling activities, and the same applies for land degradation. These have mainly served the purpose of problem identification and awareness generation on POPs, a necessary starting point towards future policy formulation. For example, GEF response in Belarus has been positive in the chemicals area. Despite being recognised as one of the national priorities in countries like Egypt, Syria and Turkey, GEF has so far been limited in its response to national priorities related to land degradation. Land degradation emerged as the main environmental concern in Eritrea, but the country has received relatively little support to address the challenge. In contrast, in Tajikistan, the GEF project (Tajikistan component of the Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in the High Pamir and Pamir-Alai Mountains (PALM) - Phase I - GEF ID 2377) was instrumental in the development of two important national laws, namely the Law "On Mountain Regions of the Republic of Tajikistan" and the Law "On Pastures", approved in 2013.

Conclusions

(a) **Conclusion 1: Strong environmental laws at the national level are essential to protect human health and the natural environment and are clearly recognized in the GEF Strategies.** The need for strong environmental laws is clearly recognized in

GEF strategies. In this regard, international conventions, including those for which the GEF serves as the financing mechanism—UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, UN Convention to Combat Desertification and the Convention on Biological Diversity—oblige parties to enact laws needed to accomplish stated objectives. All of the strategies developed over the last three cycles call for GEF to support efforts to strengthen legislative and/or regulatory frameworks.

(b) **Conclusion 2: GEF-funded projects include a wide range of activities to support governments in the lawmaking process.** The bulk of GEF-funded projects in the countries selected have included activities that aim at passage of laws at the national level. Generally, these activities were included as small components of much larger projects. The specific activities ranged from research on environmental conditions and reviews of existing laws, or technical drafting of laws to provide the justification for proposed legal reform as well as facilitation of a consultative process and political advocacy work. In addition, GEF enabling activities have functioned as an important catalyst, especially in the biodiversity and climate change focal areas, galvanizing expertise and resources for conducting the baseline studies, policy advocacy, and analyses needed to formulate and support strategy and policy formulation.

(c) **Conclusion 3: Legal reforms are often necessary, particularly in transforming markets, but not always sufficient to achieve aims, and require complementary efforts in institutional strengthening and enforcement.** In general, the laws established with the support of GEF-funded projects are intended to achieve environmental aims by regulating the behavior of individuals or institutions, allowing for the provision of public or private services, and establishing requisite conditions for legal arrangements among parties. Creating a level playing field for private investment is another important objective. However, the case studies demonstrate that effectiveness of the law is dependent on many factors, such as the strength of administrative or judicial enforcement and implementation capacity.

(d) **Conclusion 4: Several GEF-funded projects contributed to the enactment of environmental laws, and capacity building is important.** Stakeholder interviews and a review of key documents demonstrate that GEF-funded projects contributed to the enactment of statutes and implementing regulations across different focal areas and capacity building facilitated through GEF foundational support is likely to enhance progress in legislative action.

(e) **Conclusion 5: Many factors influence the implementation and success of reforms and should be considered in project design.** The case studies show that the ability to enact laws is affected by a number of factors, including the scope of the proposed law, political sensitivities, competing interests of different constituencies within government and the general population, government budgetary implications,

stability of government structures, continuity of key officials, and the technical capacity of government institutions.

(f) **Conclusion 6: Project designs are sometimes based on unrealistic expectations for change.** Project documents often conflate policy statements, legislative statutes, regulations issued by authorized bodies, and administrative directives. These are very different in terms of their legal authority and development process. With respect to statutes and regulations, the case studies reveal a tendency among stakeholders to misjudge the ability of governments to enact laws within the timeframe of the project. Specifically, GEF agencies and implementing partners are often overly optimistic about the likelihood and pace of legal reform

(g) **Conclusion 7: Limited follow-up and evaluation of impacts.** With respect to evaluations, documents generally do not describe the specific role of projects in advancing legal reforms, the content and wording of laws as proposed or enacted, or the extent to which laws, once enacted, achieved stated aims. In general, data needed to assess the effectiveness of legislation or regulations are not available.

Recommendations

(a) **Recommendation 1: Strengthen plans for legal and policy reforms presented in project documents.** GEF plays a very important role in the environmental policy and regulatory reform agenda in client countries. When reforms are contemplated, GEF should ensure that project documents clearly differentiate among policies, statutes, regulations, and administrative directives. If a specific environmental law is identified, the document should describe how it fits into the government's legislative/regulatory agenda with specific details on the extent of support from key stakeholders, including government officials, parties directly affected, and the general population.

(b) **Recommendation 2: Develop and implement projects or specific program components that focus solely on legal and/or policy reforms**. Rather than embedding work on legal reforms in a component of a project, GEF should consider structuring some entire projects around advancing a specific set of legal reforms, particularly in countries with limited institutional capacity. This should focus on putting laws in place that are needed to meet goals defined in international conventions for which GEF serves as the designated financing mechanism. As GEF seeks to achieve more transformational change through its programmatic approaches, and mainstream private sector engagement, the role of policy reform will become even more important.

(c) **Recommendation 3: Improve M&E and learning from the reform process.** GEF should consider modifying the PMIS to enable projects components that deal with legal reforms to be identified and tracked in the system. Evaluations should be more rigorous, including an assessment of project activities undertaken to advance legal

reforms, resulting changes in the content and wording of laws, and the extent to which laws achieved stated aims. Thus, follow up on implementation should be carried out two to three years after project closure to assess the impacts and document lessons learned.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES AND FIGURES

I. INTRODUCTION

Purpose and scope

1. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) was established in 1991 to address critical environmental issues. Since then, it has provided $14.5 billion in grants and mobilized $75.4 billion in additional financing for almost 4,000 projects undertaken by 18 partner agencies. GEF-funded projects fall within five focal areas: biodiversity, climate change, land degradation, persistent organic pollutants, and international waters. Projects span a wide range of objectives and activities. In keeping with GEF strategies over the past few decades, some projects have been directed specifically toward strengthening national environmental policy in member countries, including relevant environmental laws.

2. The GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) is undertaking a study on the role that GEF has played in strengthening environmental policies and laws in different countries. The main purpose of this study is to conduct an assessment of the effectiveness of GEF foundational support in helping member countries (1) develop their environmental policy and legal frameworks, and (2) achieve their national goals and strategies through different mechanisms including support to institutions.[1] It primarily revolves around case studies of selected countries, focusing on GEF-funded projects that were directed in whole or in part to strengthening national legal frameworks related to biodiversity, climate change, land degradation, and persistent organic pollutants. For purposes of the assessment, the legal framework includes statutory laws as well as regulations issued by national governments that have the effect of law.

3. The assessment examines how GEF-funded projects have led to changes in the legal framework in selected countries as well as the extent to which such legal reforms have been accompanied by the development of necessary institutions, including effective enforcement mechanisms. In so doing, the case studies provide an assessment of the specific activities in GEF-funded projects that led to observed legal reforms, the dynamics of the legislative and rule-making processes, and critical implementation issues. Where possible, the case studies document benefits arising from changes in the legal framework. In keeping with this approach, the case studies aim to determine the effect of GEF-funded projects within the particular context of different countries, providing insights into whether, how, and why projects work under different circumstances.

Methodology

4. The selection of countries began with an analysis of data compiled for the preparation of OPS5 Technical Document #12 *Progress Toward Impact.* The dataset contains information on 472 projects. The analysis conducted by IEO includes an assessment of the extent and scale of broader adoption at project completion. Of the 472 projects included in the dataset, 210 are coded as having resulted in legal/policy/regulatory changes at the national or sector-wide

[1] See Annex A.

level based on information contained in terminal evaluations (TE) and/or terminal evaluation reviews (TER), including 68 that were completed between 2010 and 2012 (the latest year in the dataset). The geographical distribution of the 68 completed projects is presented in Annex B. Using this as a starting point, six countries were chosen case studies based on the number of projects completed during this time frame, the magnitude of GEF funding, and focal area and regional representation.[2]

5. This report focuses on results from the six selected countries – Belarus, Brazil, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Philippines, and Vietnam. To ensure completeness, a full list of projects that had been undertaken in each of these countries was assembled based on data from the Project Management Information System (PMIS). The Projects Documents and Terminal Evaluations of projects that were completed since 2010 and not included in the OPS5 Review were examined to determine whether they dealt with national legal reforms. The final list of projects selected for assessment is shown in Annex C.[3]

6. Eight projects were identified in Kazakhstan and six in Namibia as having components that focused on helping national governments develop new laws. In aggregate, these projects cut across a wide spectrum of GEF focal areas: biodiversity (6), climate change (4), land degradation (1), and multifocal (2). Neither Kazakhstan, nor Namibia, has been the subject of a GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation.

7. The case studies examine the history and context of the laws that were addressed through the selected projects, the role that projects played in the legislative/rulemaking process, the purpose and content of the law, the process and current status of its implementation, and an assessment of results in terms of stated policy aims. The case studies draw on multiple sources of information, including a review of project materials, key informant interviews, and secondary research. The review of project materials focuses on *Project Documents* prepared as part of the approval process,[4] terminal evaluations prepared by the implementing agency, and terminal evaluation reviews prepared by the GEF IEO. Where available, work products such as studies prepared during the project as well as texts of the relevant legislation/regulations have also been reviewed. Interviews were conducted with representatives of GEF agencies, officials from relevant ministries (including the GEF Focal Point), members of project management units, and other key stakeholders, as appropriate, during the course of the country visits. Interviews were supplemented with information obtained through written responses to questions sent to representatives of the implementing agency and government partners.

8. The main limitation of this evaluation was dealing with the time that had elapsed since completion of some of the projects. While this allowed an opportunity to trace results over an

[2] The five selected countries are Belarus, Brazil, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Philippines, and Vietnam.
[3] Annex B includes brief summaries of reported results in the legislative/regulatory arena drawn from terminal evaluations and terminal evaluation reviews.
[4] A Project Document is the "applicable GEF Agency document containing final plans for a project, including rationale, budgets, and implementation arrangements submitted for CEO endorsement or approval." https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.C.50.08.Rev_.01_GEF_Project_and_Program_Cycle_Policy_0.pdf

extended period, some government officials and consultants who had been hired by agencies to work on particular projects were no longer in their positions and difficult to track down. In addition, project files were not always complete and data on impacts were generally unavailable.

Organization of the Report

9. Section II describes the overall context in which GEF-funded projects take place in terms of obligations under international conventions and existing national environmental law. The principal findings of the case studies are discussed in Section III, which describes the changes made in national environmental laws as a result of specific engagements and associated impacts. Section IV presents the primary conclusions of the study and offers several recommendations.

II. CONTEXT

GEF Strategies

10. The GEF provides financial support to developing countries and countries with economies in transition to help them address environmental issues and meet the objectives of the multilateral environmental conventions.[5] Every four years per the replenishment cycle, the GEF develops strategies to guide the allocation of funding within each focal area – biodiversity, land degradation, climate change, persistent organic pollutants, and international waters. As shown in Table 2, while the particular language varies, all of the strategies developed over the last three cycles call for GEF to support efforts to strengthen legislative and/or regulatory frameworks. In this regard, the strategies recognize that countries need strong rules founded in law to establish protected areas, prohibit trade in endangered species, control water use, reduce reliance on fossil fuels, ban or restrict the use of certain chemicals, and regulate other behavior that has a negative impact on the environment and the well-being of their citizens.

11. GEF support to countries is provided primarily through projects undertaken by GEF Agencies in concert with eligible government and non-governmental organizations.[6,] Projects can take the form of a Full-sized Project (FSP) with GEF funding of more than US$ 2 million, a Medium-sized Project (MSP) with GEF funding of US$ 2 million or less; or an Enabling Activity (EA) defined as a "project for the preparation of a plan, strategy or report to fulfill

[5] The GEF serves as a financing mechanism for the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, and the Minamata Convention on Mercury.

[6] Projects are implemented through 18 GEF Agencies: Asian Development Bank (ADB), African Development Bank (AfDB), Brazilian Biodiversity Fund (FUNBIO), Conservation International (CI), Development Bank of Latin America (CAF), Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA), European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), Food and Agriculture Organizaton of the United Nations (FAO), Foreign Economic Cooperation Office - Ministry of Environmental Protection of China (FECO), Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), West African Development Bank (BOAD), World Bank Group (WBG), and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF-US).

commitments under a Convention."[7] Efforts to strengthen legislation or regulations are typically a component of broader projects; these projects may also include demonstration initiatives, financing schemes, direct capital investment, capacity building and other activities.

12. While many projects include components that aim to put new laws into place, the actual number of projects and the magnitude of resources devoted to these efforts are unknown; projects in the GEF Project Management Information System (PMIS) are not coded in terms of whether project objectives or activities relate to national legal and regulatory reforms.

[7] GEF policy defines a project as "an activity or set of activities that promote the achievement of the purposes of the GEF for which resources from any of the Trust Funds operated by the GEF has been requested by the Agency on behalf of an eligible recipient and/or approved by the GEF Council or the CEO."

Table 2: Examples of References to Legal and Regulatory Reform in GEF Focal Strategies

Focal Area	GEF-4 (a) 2006-2010	GEF-5 (b) 2010-2014	GEF-6 (c) 2014-2018
Biodiversity	"Through [Strategic Program 1], GEF will support comprehensive, system-level financing solutions …This will require interventions that support the development of… appropriate **policies and laws** to allow protected areas to manage the entire revenue stream from generation of income to investment…" "Through [Strategic Program 4], GEF will support projects that … establish the policies and the **legislative and regulatory frameworks** required to integrate biodiversity conservation and sustainable use objectives into the actions…"	[The goal is to]: "Strengthen the **Policy and Regulatory Framework** for Mainstreaming Biodiversity." "In recognition of the importance that the COP places on the threat that invasive alien species pose to biodiversity…GEF will continue to support the development of **regulatory and management frameworks** to prevent, control and manage these species." "GEF will support the development and implementation of **policy and regulatory framework**s that provide incentives for private actors to align their practices and behavior with the principles of sustainable use and management." Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in **policy and regulatory** frameworks." "Outcome 4.1: **Legal and regulatory frameworks**, and administrative procedures established that enable access to genetic resources and benefit sharing in accordance with the CBD provisions."	"Efforts will include: (a) strengthening national **legislation**, institutions, and law enforcement to reduce poaching…" "GEF will support the development, adoption and enforcement of **policy and regulatory frameworks and legislation** to mitigate marine-based pollution and damage to coral reef ecosystems." "GEF will focus on innovations to current production systems and practices that…(c) Develop **policies, strategies, legislation, and regulations** that shift the balance in agricultural production in favor of diversity rich approaches." "Outcome 8.1: **Legal and regulatory frameworks**, and administrative procedures established that enable access to genetic resources and benefit sharing in accordance with the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol."
Land Degradation	"The scope of Strategic Objective 1 is to promote policy reform and build SLM competence and capacity in countries… Expected outcomes include… [the following] SLM is fully supported by **policy, regulatory and planning frameworks**… "	"The goal of the land degradation focal area is to contribute to arresting and reversing current global trends in land degradation, specifically desertification and deforestation. This will be accomplished by promoting and supporting effective **policies, legal and regulatory frameworks**…" "Improving rangeland management and sustainable pastoralism, including **regulating** livestock grazing pressure to carrying capacity (adaptation to climate change), sustainable intensification, rotational grazing systems, diversity in animal and grass species; [and] managing fire disturbance." Outcome 1.1: "An enhanced **policy environment** within the agricultural sector."	"GEF recognizes that successful SLM investment requires appropriate enabling environments, such as effective policies, **legal and regulatory frameworks**, capable institutions, and mechanisms for monitoring and knowledge sharing." "Three major outcomes are considered under this objective [LD2]: support mechanisms for forest landscape management and restoration (**institutional, legal and regulatory frameworks**), improved management of forest landscapes through innovative practices, and increased investment in SFM and/or forest landscape restoration."
Climate Change	"[With respect to Strategic Program 3] ... the emphasis will be upon developing **policies and regulatory frameworks** that provide limited incremental support to strategically important investments."	"GEF support will be directed toward developing and enforcing **strong policies, norms, and regulations** in order to achieve large-scale impact in terms of energy savings and GHG emissions reduction." Expected outcome for Objective 2: "Appropriate **policy, legal and regulatory frameworks** adopted and enforced." Expected outcome for Objective 3: "Favorable policy and	"Five key Programs of GEF-6 interventions support the three objectives… The programs…aim to achieve the following three outcomes …(b) **Policy, planning and regulatory frameworks** to foster accelerated low GHG development and emissions mitigation…"

Focal Area	GEF-4 (a) 2006-2010	GEF-5 (b) 2010-2014	GEF-6 (c) 2014-2018
		regulatory environment for renewable energy investment." "GEF intervention under [Objective 3] can be a combination of technical assistance for **policy and regulatory support**, building the technical and institutional capacity, and establishing financing mechanisms for investment in the deployment and diffusion of renewable energy technologies."	"The GEF will support the development, adoption, and implementation of policies, strategies, **regulations** and financial or organizational mechanisms that accelerate mitigation technology innovation and uptake."
Chemicals, Including Persistent Organic Pollutants	"Depending on NIP priorities, interventions can include strengthening **legislative and regulatory frameworks**..."	"…activities aimed at building institutional and **legislative frameworks** for chemicals management, including POPs, will be supported within each of the three objectives, most often in the context of a broader project or program of activities." "Indicator 1.5.1 Progress in developing and implementing a **legislative and regulatory framewor**k for environmentally sound management of POPs, and for the sound management of chemicals in general, as recorded in the POPs tracking tool."	"This objective [CW1] will develop **policy, legislative**, financial, economic, technical and technological tools that will remove barriers to scaling up interventions, including access to finance." "[Program 1] will support the development, testing and demonstration of technologies, alternatives, techniques, best practices, **legislative and policy tools**, finance models, private sector engagement models and economic tools." "Develop and demonstrate new tools and **regulatory** [sic] along with economic approaches for managing harmful chemicals and waste in a sound manner…"
International Waters	"Where capacity is built and action programs agreed, GEF will support **policy, legal, and institutional reforms** and multi-agency partnerships that contribute to WSSD [World Summit on Sustainable Development] targets for sustaining fish stocks…'"	"**Policy, legal, institutional reforms** and multi-agency strategic partnerships that contribute to WSSD targets for recovering and sustaining fish stocks [will] be a priority, including regional and national-level reforms in **legal frameworks** and governance, access rights, and enforcement in LMEs." "National and local **policy, legal, institutional reforms** to reduce land-based inputs of nitrogen and other pollutants will be pursued." [Outcomes under Objective 1]: "The enabling environment within the agricultural sector will be enhanced through targeting three core areas: **policy, legal and regulatory framework**, capable institutions, and knowledge transfer." "Enhanced enabling environments toward harmonization and coordination between sectors in support of SLM will be achieved by coordinating **policy, legal and regulatory frameworks** between sectors competing for land area and natural resources…"	"The development and reform of supportive policy and **legislative frameworks** and institutional capacity building is at the heart of the GEF's international waters portfolio approach for the improved management of transboundary waters."

Notes: (a) *Focal Area Strategies and Strategic Programming for GEF-4*, GEF Policy Paper, October 2007 (b) *GEF-5 Focal Area Strategies* (c) *GEF-6 Programming Directions*, GEF Assembly Document GEF/A.5/07/Rev.01, 22 May 2014.

International Conventions and National Laws

International conventions

13. Efforts to work with countries on the establishment of laws takes place within the context of international conventions, particularly those classified as Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs). These agreements include, but are not limited to, those that the GEF serves as a "financing mechanism" – the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, and the Minamata Convention on Mercury. Table 3 notes the dates when the countries became party to major international conventions. [8]

Table 3: International Conventions

Convention / Protocol	Entered into Force	Belarus	Brazil	Kazakhstan	Namibia	Philippines	Vietnam
The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention)	21-12-1975	25-08-1991	24-09-1993	02-05-2007	23-12-1995	08-11-1994	20-01-1989
Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)	01-07-1975	08-10-1995	08-06-1975	19-04-2000	18-03-1991	18-08-1981	20-01-1994
Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS or Bonn Convention)	NA	01-09-2003	01-10-2015	01-05-2006	Non-party	01-02-1994	Non-Party
UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) (a)	21-03-1994	09-08-2000	29-05-1994	15-08-1995	14-08-1995	31-08-1994	14-02-1995
UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) (a)	26-12-1996	27-11-2001	23-09-1997	07-10-1997	14-08-1997	10-05-2000	23-11-1998
Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (a)	29-12-2003	29-12-1993	29-05-1994	05-12-1994	14-08-1997	06-01-1994	14-02-1995
Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPS) (a)	17-05-2004	03-02-2004	16-06-2004	07-02-2008	22-09-2005	27-02-2004	22-07-2002
Minamata Convention on Mercury (a)	10-10-2013	23-09-2014	10-10-2013	Non-party	Non-party	10-10-2013	11-10-2013

Notes: (a) GEF serves as the financing mechanism.
Source: Convention websites

14. Each convention obliges parties to put needed legal frameworks in place. However, the conventions are generally silent on the specific content of such legislation and, with some exception, there are no procedures in place to assess whether the legal framework is sufficient to meet the aims of the conventions. For example:

[8] Annex E includes the stated objectives of these and other Multilateral Environmental Agreements.

(a) **Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat** (Ramsar Convention). The Convention does not reference any explicit requirement for national legislation or regulation. However, under Resolution VII.7 (1999) parties are encouraged to make use of the *Guidelines for reviewing laws and institutions to promote the conservation and wise use of wetlands;* and under Resolution VIII.9 (2002) are urged to make use of the *Guidelines for incorporating biodiversity-related issues into environmental impact assessment legislation and/or processes and in strategic environmental assessment.*

(b) Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of **Wild Fauna and Flora** (CITES). The convention provides guidance on what to include in legislation: Articles III to V specify the conditions under which trade should take place; Article VII requires that parties prohibit trade in specimens in violation of the convention, confiscate illegally traded specimens, and penalize violators; and Article IX requires parties to designate management and scientific authorities. The secretariat has prepared a model law, but it is the prerogative of each party to decide how to incorporate obligations stipulated under the convention into national law. That said, under Resolution Conf. 8.4, the secretariat is directed to identify those parties whose national laws are not sufficient to meet their obligations. National legislation is analyzed by the Secretariat classified in three categories: Category 1: legislation that is believed generally to meet the requirements for implementation of CITES; Category 2: legislation that is believed generally not to meet all of the requirements for the implementation of CITES; and Category 3: legislation that is believed generally not to meet the requirements for the implementation of CITES. As of 8 January 2016, Namibia, Brazil and Vietnam were classified as Category 1 and Kazakhstan, Belarus and Philippines were classified as Category 2.[9]

(c) **Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals** (CMS or Bonn Convention). The Convention does not reference any explicit requirement for national legislation or regulation. It requires parties to provide immediate protection for migratory species included in Appendix I of the Convention and to conclude agreements covering the conservation and management of specific migratory species included in Appendix II. Guidelines relating to the content of such agreements have been developed.

(d) **UN Framework Convention on Climate Change** (UNFCCC). The preamble to the Convention recognizes that "states should enact effective environmental legislation…" However, the Convention does not require parties to adopt specific legal provisions.

(e) **UN Convention to Combat Desertification** (UNCCD). Article 5.e of the Convention requires countries to undertake to "provide an enabling environment by strengthening, as appropriate relevant existing legislation and, when they do not exist, enacting new laws and establishing long-term policies as action programmes." However, it is silent on the content of such legislation; legislative guidelines have not yet been developed.

(f) **Convention on Biological Diversity** (CBD). Article 8 lays out the primary obligations under the Convention with respect to in situ conservation of biological diversity. Article 8 (k) states that parties should "develop or maintain necessary legislation and/or other regulatory provisions for the protection of threatened species and populations." The convention does not prescribe specific laws. Guidance has, however, been provided through other documents. For example, COP 6 Decision VI/24 invites parties to use the *Bonn Guidelines on Access to Genetic Resources and Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of their Utilization* "when developing and drafting legislative,

[9] https://cites.org/legislation.

administrative or policy measures on access and benefit-sharing, and contracts and other arrangements under mutually agreed terms for access and benefit-sharing."

(g) **Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants** (POPS). Article 3 requires parties to "prohibit and/or take the legal and administrative measures necessary to eliminate" the production and use of chemicals listed in Annexes A, B and C of the Convention. The Convention does not reference specific legislation or regulatory measures that parties should adopt. However, guidelines for *Developing National Legal Frameworks to Implement the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants* have been developed.

National Laws

15. GEF-funded projects build on the existing body of law in participating countries.[10] At the national level, the environmental legal framework covers constitutional provisions, legislative statutes, and legally binding rules issued by authorized bodies, which address pollution, natural resource management, land use, and other environmental matters. The three primary sources of national law are discussed below:[11]

(a) **Constitutional provisions**. Some countries have adopted written constitutions that contain reference to environmental interests, rights or duties. As shown in Table 4, the constitutions of Kazakhstan, Namibia, Belarus, Brazil, Philippines, and Vietnam recognize the obligations of the State to protect the environment in order to ensure the well-being of their citizens.

(b) **Statutory laws created though legislation**. Statutes are laws that are approved by a legislature and signed into law per constitutional procedures. Statutes are included in the body of law and are generally intended to be permanent.

(c) **Regulations established by authorized bodies**. Regulations are rules issued by the head of state, government department or an independent regulatory agency pursuant to statutory authority, which implement the relevant statute. These rules have the force and effect of law. They are legally binding on the public and the regulatory body.[12]

Table 4: Environmental Interests, Rights and Duties as Stipulated in Constitutions

Country	Provisions
Kazakhstan (1995)	Article 31 – 1. The state shall set an objective to protect the environment favorable for the life and health of the person. 2. Officials shall be held accountable for the concealment of facts and circumstances endangering the life and health of the people in accordance with law.
Namibia (1990)	Article 95 – The State shall actively promote and maintain the welfare of the people by adopting, inter alia, policies aimed at the following: maintenance of ecosystems, essential ecological processes and biological diversity of Namibia and utilization of living natural resources on a sustainable basis for the benefit of all Namibians, both present and future; in particular, the

[10] National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) undertaken in countries with GEF support often call attention to the need to strengthen the legal framework. See Annex F for a discussion of the NCSA in Belarus, Brazil, Kazakhstan, Namibia, Philippines, and Vietnam.

[11] In common law countries, the legal framework include laws created by judges through rulings and as they determine the precise meaning of a law or regulation.

[12] Administrative agencies routinely issue statements or documents, including directives, guidelines and manuals for use by government employees, which provide information on how programs are intended to be administered. These may or not be legally binding depending on the precise nature of the wording and interpretation of the courts.

	Government shall provide measures against the dumping or recycling of foreign nuclear and toxic waste on Namibian territory.
Belarus (1994)	Article 34. Citizens of the Republic of Belarus shall be guaranteed the right to receive, store and disseminate complete, reliable and timely information of the activities of state bodies and public associations, on political, economic, cultural and international life, and on the state of the environment. Article 55. It shall be the duty of everyone to protect the environment.
Brazil (1988)	No overarching article on rights to environmental rights, however the constitution includes multiple articles on the use of natural resources and on forest preservation.
Philippines (1987)	Sec.16: The State shall protect and advance the right of the people to a balanced and healthful ecology in accord with the rhythm and harmony of nature.
Vietnam (2013)	Article 43: Everyone has the right to live in clean environment and has the duty to protect the environment.

Source: Faolex

16. In the environmental arena, relevant statutes and regulations may stipulate a broad range of rules that, *inter alia*, do the following: prohibit or limit the extent of activities deemed detrimental to the environment; provide incentives for activities considered beneficial; create regulatory bodies; establish standards for air and water quality; define procedures for making environmental decision; require certain proposed activities to be assessed and reviewed by regulators prior to approval; and define offenses and establish administrative, civil, and criminal penalties for breaches of the law. Statutory laws and regulations are enacted through a process set by law, which typically requires public input.

17. As discussed below, GEF-funded projects often aim to help countries develop statutes or regulations. They also may deal with helping countries develop national policy statements or strategies and action plans. Much of this work is related to requirements set forth in particular conventions. In general, these policy documents describe the aims, principles and course of action that the government intends to pursue to address a particular issue. While some form of government resolution may accompany the publication of these documents, they typically are not legally binding on the government or the public. They may be used to inform the development of law, but are not part of the codified body of law.

III. Case Study Summaries

18. This section presents the summaries of the findings from the case studies. Details on each country are provided in the Annex.

Case Study: Kazakhstan

Wind Power Market Development Initiative

19. The project (GEF#783) was undertaken by the UNDP in concert with the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources (MEMR). The project started in July 2004 and ended in June 2011. The *Project Document* laid out four "immediate objectives" for the project: (a) assisting the Government to formulate a National Program on Wind Energy Development; (b) providing information for and building the local capacity to develop wind energy projects in Kazakhstan and to organize financing for them (including site "mapping" and expansion of the wind speed measurement program); (c) facilitating the construction of the first 5MW wind farm to prepare ground for and reduce the risks of

further investments; and (d) monitoring, analyzing and disseminating the experiences and lessons learned during the implementation of the project. The project design was modified in 2007 after the mid-term evaluation with greater emphasis placed on establishing a sound legal framework. The revised outcomes included: "Outcome 1. Foundation of an efficient regulatory framework for the development of the wind energy sector and relevant institutional capacity for efficient local implementation."

20. To this end, the project commissioned several reports dealing with legislation/regulation, including the following: *Legislation Report, Electricity Sector in Kazakhstan and Renewables* (2005); *Compiling RES Legislation for Kazakhstan, Report on the Benefits of RES to the Energy Sector, Task 2, Kyoto Protocol* (2007); and *Effective Legal and Regulatory Framework for the Support of Wind Energy in Kazakhstan* (2010).

21. This work contributed to the following law pertaining to renewable energy:

(a) **Law on Support of the Use of Renewable Energy Sources (2009)**.

Results: 12 renewable energy projects were completed by November 2016 with a combined nominal capacity of roughly 76 MW. Another 42 projects are planned or under construction which, if completed, would increase capacity by 1,570 MW. The 19 wind projects, if completed, would have a total nominal capacity of 686 MW. The fixed feed-in tariff for wind was set at 22.68 tenge per kWh (US$ 0.066 at current exchange rates).

Removing Barriers to Energy Efficiency in Municipal Heat and Hot Water Supply

22. The approved *Project Document* defined the development goal as follows: "to improve energy efficiency and reduce the GHG emissions originating from heating and hot water supply in Kazakhstan." To this end, the first of three project components was intended to deal with "strengthening the legal, regulatory and institutional framework to promote energy efficiency of the heat and hot water supply services in Kazakhstan." As stated in the *Project Document*, expected results included: "adoption and enforcement of new legislation and regulations, including improved tariff and billing policies, […] related social support scheme, heat sector planning, revised technical standards, strengthening of AAOs [Associations of Apartment Owners]." Much of the work centered on conducting pilot programs in selected heating districts. These were intended to demonstrate the feasibility of particular approaches and provide the foundation for proposed changes in the legal framework.

23. In this regard, the project contributed to the following laws dealing with energy efficiency:

(a) **Law on Energy Saving and Energy Efficiency Improvement (2012**)

(b) **Amendment to the Law on Housing Relations (2012/2014).**

24. ***Results*.** UNDP estimates that the government allocated roughly US$62 million to improve the energy efficiency of residential buildings between 2011 and 2014. By the end of the project in early 2013, heating and related systems had been renovated in 1,000 residential buildings. In 2014, 746 buildings were renovated; the number dropped to 150 in the following year. Data on the number and amount of loans made under the modernization program and grants provided under the low-income housing aid program are unavailable. Similarly, there are no data on the amount of funds that have

been collected by the managing authorities of condominiums, nor on how these monies have been used. According to UNDP, experts suggest that "about 40% of AAO in the country have such funds.

25. With respect to energy service companies, while government statistics are unavailable, according to UNDP, experts estimate that "not more than 100 buildings … have entered into contracts [with an] ESCO" since the enabling legislation was put into effect. The limited number is attributed to "the risk of no return on investment, due to tariffs and non-payment for energy renovation."

Integrated Conservation of Priority Globally Significant Migratory Bird Wetland Habitat

26. The approved *Project Document* defined the goal of the project as follows: "To protect globally significant wetland biodiversity in Kazakhstan." dealt, in part, with instituting needed changes in the legal framework The document noted, "At the center of this national structure will be a 'National Wetlands Conservation Law.'" However, plans to establish a National Wetland Conservation Law were dropped soon after the project started: government officials decided that it would be preferable to address issues related to the management and use of wetlands through amendments to existing laws and the introduction of new regulations.

27. The project contributed to the development of number of other statutes and regulations as described below:

(a) Law on Specially Protected Natural Areas (2006)

(b) Amendment to the Water Code (2009)

(c) Amendment to the Law on Protection, Reproduction and Use of Wildlife (2010).

(d) Rules pursuant to the Law on Protection, Reproduction and Use of Wildlife.

(e) Rules on Subsidizing the Cost of Water Supply Services for Agricultural Producers (2006/2010).

28. ***Results.*** According to stakeholders, the project helped the government prepare necessary documentation for ascension to the Ramsar Convention, which was entered into force on 2 May 2007. The first wetland site was proclaimed as a condition for joining the convention. In a related vein, the project also helped the develop rules for classifying and registering wetland of national and international importance, which were issued by the Ministry of Agriculture (Order No. 576 dated 14 June 2010 and Order No. 292 dated 26 April 2010).

29. Kazakhstan currently has 10 sites designated as Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Sites), with a total surface area of roughly 3.3 million hectares. All of these sites are located in specially protected areas and are subject to applicable laws and regulations. Interviews with government officials suggested that the designation of areas as Ramsar Sites, coupled with the aforementioned statutes and regulations, has helped to strengthen conservation of these wetlands. By way of illustration, officials mentioned a decision taken with respect to channeling rivers and other tributaries flowing into the Korgalzhyn State Nature Reserve near Astana to ensure an adequate supply of water to the wetland. The government has extended the number and size of protected areas.

In-Situ Conservation of Kazakhstan's Mountain Agrobiodiversity

30. The project (GEF #1148) was undertaken by UNDP in concert with the Committee on Forestry and Hunting (CFH) under the Ministry of Agriculture. The *Project Document* was signed on 22 December 2005 and implementation began on 1 March 2006. The project ended roughly six years later on 31 March 2012. The development objective focuses on the "conservation of key habitats and ecosystems of globally significant mountain agro-biodiversity in Kazakhstan." Five outcomes were specified in the *Project Document* including the establishment of an "effective legislative framework for the conservation and rational use of agrobiodiversity resources."

31. Much of the work undertaken under the project centered on the establishment of the Zhongar-Alatau State National Park (356,022 hectares), and the management of the Ile-Alatau State National Park and the Almaty State Natural Reserve to improve management of the protected area and strengthen the conservation of wild fruit trees.

32. In this regard, the project contributed to the development of the following legislation and regulations:

(a) Law on Specially Protected Natural Areas (2006).

(b) Amendments to Law on Specially Protected Natural Area (2012).

(c) Amendments to Forestry Code (2012).

(d) Amendments to Land Code.

33. In addition to the above, significant effort was devoted under the project to the development of a proposed Law on Flora in concert with CFH, including assistance with developing the concept for the law and drafting legislation in 2011. The proposed bill has been circulated for comment within the government. It has been rejected twice by Government due to concerns expressed by the Ministry of Justice, which felt that issues could be better addressed through amendments to existing legislation and regulations. Four years after the close of the GEF-funded project, the bill has not yet been tabled for consideration by Parliament.

Sustainable Rangeland Management for Rural Livelihood and Environmental Integrity

34. The project (GEF #3235) was undertaken by the UNDP in concert with the Ministry of Agriculture. It started in early 2009 and ended in March 2012. As stated in the approved *Project Document*, the objective of the project is the "demonstration of good practice in rangeland management that promotes both the ecological integrity of natural grasslands and rural livelihood." The agreed logframe specifically calls for "regulations which support the use of distant pastures and grazing rotation.

35. The project undertook various studies on international experience in pasture development, organized study tours, and provided technical input to proposed legislation and regulations. In so doing, the project contributed to the following changes in the legal framework:

(a) **Amendments to the Land Code (2011** to allow the state to seize land intended for agricultural production that was not being used for this purpose.

(b) **Rules on the Rational Use of Agricultural Land (2011).** It defines rationale use to include, *inter alia*, the following: rotating crops, maintaining and improving crop yields; maintaining and improving soil fertility; and preventing the loss of agricultural land. The

project also contributed to the development of proposed legislation to provide a comprehensive legal framework for the planning, organization and management of the 187 million hectares of land in the country that are suitable for grazing.

(c) The **proposed Pasture Law** is intended to address problems related to governance, land access, overgrazing and infrastructure, in part, through the establishment of pasture users' associations and community-based management arrangements. A bill was introduced to Parliament in September 2016 – roughly four years after the project came to a close. It is currently pending decision.

Steppe Conservation and Management

36. The project (GEF #3293) was undertaken by the UNDP in concert with the Committee on Forestry and Hunting (CFH) under the Ministry of Agriculture. Implementation started in May 2009 and ended in June 2013. According to the approved *Project Document*, the objective is to expand the protected areas system of Kazakhstan to ensure an improved coverage of steppe ecosystems."

37. The project aimed at developing a "set of reforms" to the Law on Specially Protected Natural Areas, "aimed at streamlining the PA establishment process and eliminating barriers to co-management and other alternative PA models".

38. The project contributed to the following legislative and regulatory reforms:

(a) **Amendment to Law on Specially Protected Natural Areas (2012).** With the active support of the project, the 'Irgyz-Torgai-Zhylanshyk' ecological corridor was officially established by the GRK in July 2014. Representing an area of roughly 2 million hectares, the corridor was established under the legal framework discussed above to protect the migration routes of Saiga Antelope between the Irgyz-Torgai State National Reserve and the Altyn Dala State Nature Reserve. [13] It is the first ecological corridor created in Kazakhstan; a second is currently under consideration. While the corridor is a major achievement, after a period of steady growth between 2009 and 2014, the Saiga population suffered a massive die-off from natural causes in 2015, falling from a total of 260,000 to 50,000.

Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Khazakhstani Sector of the Altai-Sayan Mountain Ecoregion.

39. The *Project Document* (GEF #2836) was approved on 10 January 2007 and ended on 31 March 2012. As stated in the approved *Project Document*, the immediate objective was defined as "to enhance the sustainability and conservation effectiveness of Kazakhstan's National PA system through demonstrating sustainable and replicable approaches to conservation management in the protected areas in the Kazakhstani sector of Altai-Sayan ecoregion." A key expected output was formulated as: "Essential enabling legislative and regulatory reforms are facilitated".

40. Several reports were prepared as part of the project, including i) Analysis of the Current Legislation and Proposals to Improve Legislation in the Field of Environmental Protection (2008); ii) Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Kazakhstan Part of Altai-Sayan Ecoregion for Proposing Amendments and Supplements to the Regulatory and Legal Framework to Ensure Efficient

[13] In this regard, Kazakhstan was one of five countries that entered into an MOU in 2006 under the CMS to protect the Saiga Antelope. The other signatories are Mongolia, Russian Federation, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan.

Management and Conservation of Biodiversity (2008); iii) Developing Draft Agreement on Establishment of Altai Transboundary Protected Area (2008).

41. The project team suggested language that was included in amendments to the Forest Code, Administrative Offenses Code, and the Law on Specially Protected Areas.

Summary of project outcomes

Table 5 Summary of project outcomes of legal and regulatory reform in Kazakhstan

GEF-ID	Project Title	Focal Area	Start Date	End Date	GEF Agency	Implementing Agency	Outcome and Impact Reforms Reported in Terminal Evaluation, Terminal Evaluation Review and/or OPS5 Review
783	Wind Power Market Development Initiative	C	Jul-04	Jun-11	UNDP	Ministry of Industry and New Technologies (MINT)	Law on Support of the Use of Renewable Energy Sources (2009).
838	Integrated Conservation of Priority Globally Significant Migratory Bird Wetland Habitat	B	Aug-03	Aug-11	UNDP	Forestry and Hunting Committee (FHC), Ministry of Agriculture	Law on Specially Protected Natural Areas (2006). Amendment to the Water Code (2009). Amendment to the Law on Protection, Reproduction and Use of Wildlife (2010).
3235	Sustainable Rangeland Management for Rural Livelihood and Environmental Integrity	L	Nov-08	Aug-11	UNDP / GTZ	Ministry of Agriculture	Amendments to the Land Code (2011). Rules on the Rational Use of Agricultural Land (2011).
1149	Removing Barriers to Energy Efficiency in Municipal Heat and Hot Water Supply	C	April-07	Dec-11	UNDP	Agency of the Republic of Kazakhstan on Construction and Housing and Municipal Infrastructure	Law on Energy Saving and Energy Efficiency Improvement (2012). Amendment to the Law on Housing Relations (2012/2014).
1148	In-Situ Conservation of Kazakhstan's Mountain Agrobiodiversity	B	Dec-05	Jun-12	UNDP	Forestry and Hunting Committee (FHC), Ministry of Agriculture	Law on Specially Protected Natural Areas (2006). Amendments to Law on Specially Protected Natural Area (2012). Development of a proposed Law on Flora in concert with CFH, including assistance with developing the concept for the law and drafting legislation in 2011.
2836	Conservation and Sustainable use of Biodiversity in the Kazakhstani Sector of the Altai-Sayan Mountain Ecoregion	B	Jan-07	Jun-12	UNDP	Forestry and Hunting Committee (FHC), Ministry of Agriculture	Amendments to Forest Code (2009/2011) Amendment to Administrative Offenses Code (2010) Amendments to Law on Specially Protected Areas (2011) (c)

GEF-ID	Project Title	Focal Area	Start Date	End Date	GEF Agency	Implementing Agency	Outcome and Impact Reforms Reported in Terminal Evaluation, Terminal Evaluation Review and/or OPS5 Review
3293	Steppe Conservation and Management	B	Dec-08	Mar-14	UNDP	Forestry and Hunting Committee on (FHC), which was moved from Ministry of Agriculture to the Ministry of Environmental Protection.	Amendment to Law on Specially Protected Natural Areas (2012). Amendment to Rules on Reserving Land for Protected Areas.

Case Study: Namibia

Namibian Coast Conservation and Management (NACOMA)

42. As noted in the *Project Document*, the project (GEF# 1505) was undertaken by the World Bank with GEF-support to "promote sustainable economic development on the coast and address …environmental priorities." The *Project Document* defined four components, including "Component 1: Policy, Legal, Institutional and Planning Framework for Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) conducive to Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use.

43. Based on an extensive stakeholder consultative process, the project produced a Green Paper (2009) and a White Paper (2010), which subsequently served as the basis for the *National Policy on Coastal Management in Namibia* approved by the Cabinet in September 2012. Proposed legislation – the Integrated Coastal Zone Management Bill – was drafted soon thereafter with the assistance of the project.

44. In parallel with the development of the policy, three new national parks were created by the Government: Tsau Khaeb National Park (gazetted in 2008), Namibian Islands Marine Protected Area (gazetted 2009), and Dorob National Park (gazetted in 2010). With these additions, the entire Namibian coastal area – almost 11 million hectares – is now protected in some way. According to government officials, this has helped to reduce commercial and recreational activities not allowed under the law.

45. Important elements of the legal framework are in place, particularly with respect to regulations under the purview of local authorities; however, the principle piece of legislation called for in the 2012 policy – Integrated Coastal Zone Management Bill – is still under cabinet review. Discussions with government officials suggest that various issues remain unresolved, particularly with respect to clarification of the respective roles and responsibilities of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources, and the proposed Coastal Management Authority.

Strengthening the Protected Area Network (SPAN)

46. The project (GEF #2492) was undertaken by the UNDP in concert with the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET). It started in early 2006 and ended in September 2012. As stated in

the approved *Project Document*, the objective of the project was "increased management effectiveness of the national PA [protected area] network for biodiversity conservation." The existing law governing protected areas was felt to be inadequate and there was general agreement among stakeholders that a new law was needed to address a wide range of issues, including the establishment and management of parks, commercial concessions, relationships with adjoining communities, and fines and penalties. As such, one of the aims of the SPAN project was to work with the MET to "finalise" the legislation and develop a set of implementing regulations.

47. Four years after the end of the project the law still has not been enacted. There appear to be several reasons for the delay, including unresolved institutional issues related to the role of different ministries and sensitivities with respect to the disposition of private land holdings.

48. While new legislation is still under consideration, the Cabinet has approved several policies dealing with protected areas, including the *Policy on Tourism and Wildlife Concessions on State Land* (2007), *National Policy on Human-Wildlife Conflict Management* (2009) and *National Policy on Protected Areas' Neighbours and Resident Communities* (2013). The three policy documents provide a statement of the aims, objectives, and principles of the policy as well as implementation strategies. The most prescriptive is the concession policy adopted in 2007, which provides a "regulatory framework and focuses on tourism, trophy hunting, and other concessions in proclaimed protected areas.

49. To date, 22 community concessions have been awarded, of which 19 are operational. An additional five trophy hunting concessions have been awarded to private entities through a tender process. Preliminary data provided by the Concession Unit suggests that the concessions currently employ a total of 318 people, including foreign managers and staff from areas outside of participating communities. Government officials note that fees and other financial benefits accruing to communities have been limited.

Adapting to Climate Change through the Improvement of Traditional Crops and Livestock Farming

50. The project (GEF #2915) was undertaken by UNDP in concert with Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry. It ran from mid-2007 through the end of 2011. The project was one of four conducted as part of the Country Pilot Partnership (CPP). The overall goal of the CPP was to "combat land degradation using integrated cross-sectoral approaches … to assure the integrity of dryland ecosystems..." The stated objective of the climate change adaptation project was "to develop and pilot a range of effective coping mechanisms that assist subsistence farmers in Namibia's North-Central regions to better manage and cope with climate change, including variability such as droughts. and included a small component to review and update the National Drought Policy formulated in 1997.

51. A review of project documents and discussions with project stakeholders suggest that no work was done on the development of a new drought policy during the project.

Strengthening Capacity to Implement the Global Environmental Conventions in Namibia

52. The project (GEF# 3163) was undertaken by UNDP in concert with Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET). It began in late 2009 and ended in July 2012. As stated in the *Project Document*, the objective of the project was to "increase institutional and human capacities to meet Namibia's commitments to global environmental Conventions on climate change, biodiversity and land

degradation in context with national development." It included the preparation of regulations in line with the legal act provisions.

53. The Environmental Management Act of 2007 was promulgated roughly two years *before* the project started, but did not come into force until 6 February 2012 with the enactment of regulations pertaining to environmental impact assessments. The terminal evaluation does not describe the contribution of the project to the development of these regulations, merely noting that they were pending at the time of the evaluation in November 2011.

54. A number of challenges have been identified with respect to implementation of the regulations, including vague wording of certain provisions, lack of clarity regarding time frames, contradictory procedures, and lack of explicit criteria to grant or refuse issuance of a certificate. Roughly 300 certificates applications are being processed per year and the DEA has begun to increase inspection activities. According to the Environmental Commissioner, fines have been issued and action has been taken to stop companies that are operating without an environmental clearance certificate. One challenge is the ongoing practice of other ministries to issue permits or licenses to companies that do not have a certificate from the DEA.

Barrier Removal to Namibian Renewable Energy Program (I and II)

55. The project (GEF# 2256) was undertaken by UNDP in concert with the Ministry of Mines and Energy (MME). The project was implemented in two phases. Implementation of NAMREP I ran from 2004 to 2006. NAMREP II ran from June 2007 through May 2011. The approved *Project Document* for NAMREP II identified five expected outcomes, one of which called for "new policies, laws, regulations and actions in support of renewable energy and off-grid electrification" to be put in place.

56. Several reports were prepared under NAMREP and submitted to the MME, including *Development of a Regulatory Framework for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency within the Electricity Sector*. Issued in early 2007, the report called for the development and introduction of three new Acts to promote renewable energy: i) Renewable Energy Act to "establish the legal basis for Government-subsidization of RE-based electricity generation" including feed-in tariffs and net metering ii) Off-Grid Energization Act to establish a levy on the sale of electricity to be used to subsidize long-term off-grid energy programs; and iii) Energy and Conservation Act to establish energy efficiency mandates. In the nine years since publication of the report, none of these laws has been drafted, let alone passed. According to government officials interviewed during this study, a process is currently underway to develop a Renewable Energy Policy under the MME as a precondition for development of a Renewable Energy Act.

57. That said, the project did contribute to the promulgation of a government directive and regulations as describe below:

(a) **Cabinet Directive on Solar Water Heaters**. This led to a Cabinet Directive issued in August 2007, which required the installation of solar water heaters in all new governmental and parastatal and four major building projects that had been completed with a total of capacity of 50,400 liters (collectors – 840 sq. meters). No further data are available.

(b) **Rules for net metering and feed-in tariffs**. Namibia Power has signed power purchase agreements (PPA) with developers of 13 solar PV projects and one wind project with a total capacity of 70 MW (nominal). Rules on net metering have been developed, but these rules have not yet been put into force.

Namibia Energy Efficiency Programme in Buildings (NEEP)

58. The project (GEF #3793) was undertaken by UNDP in concert with the Ministry of Mines and Energy (MME). The project had four components.[14] As stated in the *Project Document*, the aim of Component 1 "is to set and formulate appropriate regulations, standards and building codes to guide [energy efficiency] activities in the building sector." Project activities began in October 2010 and ended in March 2014. The project was not able to effect any changes in existing building codes or any other energy efficiency regulations.

Summary of project outcomes

Table 6: Summary of project outcomes of legal and regulatory reform in Namibia

GEF-ID	Project Title	Focal Area	Start Date	End Date	GEF Agency	Implementing Agency	Reforms Reported in Terminal Evaluation, Terminal Evaluation Review and/or OPS5 Review
2256	Barrier Removal to Namibian Renewable Energy Programme (NAMREP), Phase II	C	Jun-07	Feb-11	UNDP	Ministry of Mines and Energy	The project produced a Cabinet Directive on Solar Water Heaters and the Rules for net metering and feed-in tariffs.
1590	Integrated Ecosystem Management in Namibia through the National Conservancy Network	M	Nov-04	Mar-11	WB	Ministry of Environment and Tourism	Environmental Management Bill enacted in 2007… Parks and Wildlife Bill and Access to Biological Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge Bill had not been enacted.
2915	CPP Namibia: Adapting to Climate Change through the Improvement of Traditional Crops and Livestock Farming (SPA)	C	Oct-07	Dec-11	UNDP	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry	The CCA project was instrumental to the formation of Namibia's Policy on Climate Change [approved by Cabinet in May 2011]. The strategy and action plan took into account some of the adaptation measures that were piloted and tested.
3163	Strengthening Capacity to Implement the Global Environmental Conventions in Namibia	M	Feb-09	Jul-12	UNDP	Ministry of Environment and Tourism	Presentation of the Draft ABS Bill, to stakeholders and particularly Traditional Authorities who were able to give their inputs into the draft bill. The project supported the development of an Environmental Education Policy / Strategy
2492	Strengthening the Protected Area Network (SPAN)	B	Mar-06	Sep-12	UNDP	Ministry of Environment and Tourism	new legislation is still under consideration, the Cabinet has approved several policies dealing with protected areas, including the ***Policy on Tourism and Wildlife Concessions on State Land (2007),***

[14] The other three project components are as follows: Component 2: Organized provision of auditing and energy marketing services; Component 3: Increased institutional capacity and awareness; and Component 4: Structured monitoring, feedback and evaluation.

							National Policy on Human-Wildlife Conflict Management (2009) and National Policy on Protected Areas' Neighbours and Resident Communities (2013).
1505	Namibia Coast Biodiversity Conservation and Management (NACOMA)	B	Oct-05	Dec-12	WB	Ministry of Environment and Tourism	NACOMA produced a Green Paper (2009) and a White Paper (2010), which subsequently served as the basis for the ***National Policy on Coastal Management in Namibia*** approved by the Cabinet in September 2012 Three new national parks were created by the Government: Tsau Khaeb National Park (gazetted in 2008), Namibian Islands Marine Protected Area (gazetted 2009), and Dorob National Park (gazetted in 2010).
3793	Namibia Energy Efficiency Programme (NEEP) In Buildings	C	Aug-10	Mar-14	UNDP	Ministry of Mines and Energy, which delegated responsibility for project management to the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Institute	With respect to Output 1.1, the TE found that the "Strategic Action Plan [was] not adopted," adding, "No evidence of the action plan included in the scope of implementation." Further, "Building codes were not revised." It concluded, "The revision of the building codes was unrealistic, but made good progress towards a revised building standard which will lay the foundation for improved efficiency in buildings."

Case Study: Brazil

Espírito Santo Biodiversity and Watershed Conservation and Restoration Project

59. The project "Florestas para Vida" (GEF#2765) was undertaken by the World Bank in concert with one committee composed of the heads of the State Secretariat of Development (SEDES), the State Secretariat for the Environment and Hydrological Resources (SEAMA), the State Secretariat for Agriculture, Food, Aquaculture and Fisheries (SEAG), the State Finance Secretariat (SEFAZ), the State Secretariat for Urban Development (SEDURB), and the State's Water Supply and Sewerage Company (CESAN). The project started in August 2008 and the original close date was June 30, 2012.

60. As stated in the Project Document approved in 2005, "The development objective of the project is to restore and improve ecosystem functions vital for global biodiversity and for quality and quantity of water supply in two key Atlantic Forest watersheds in Espírito Santo, the watersheds of the Jucu and the Santa Maria da Vitória rivers."

61. Expected results included: a functioning Payment for Ecosystem Services program targeted toward protection of critical areas for water service supplies in the *Jucu* and *Santa Maria da Vitória* watersheds" and "short-term PES plan established for sustainable land use practices".

62. The project contributed to the following laws dealing with payment for environmental services:

(a) Law on Payment for Environmental Services Program (2008). T
(b) Reformulation on Payment for Environmental Services Program (2012).
(c) Reformulation on Payment for Environmental Services Program (2016). T.
(d) Reformulation of the State Water Resources Fund of Espírito Santo – FUNDÁGUA (2012).
(e) Rules on Payment for Environmental Services Program (2012).
(f) Rules on Modalities of land use eligible for financial support (2013).

63. ***Results.*** The State Water Fund FUNDÁGUA created a sub account (Forest Cover) to finance biodiversity conservation activities, setting aside 2.5% of the state oil and gas royalties to fund conservation and biodiversity protection activities. About 1,939 farms involved in project activities could receive financial resources from this source.

64. Reformulation on Payment for Environmental Services Program. Until 2016, the program served about 1,939 farms and this allowed the restoration of at least 6,492.29ha in different modalities. It restored 1,807.37ha with planting of seedlings; 2,434.63ha in natural regeneration; 1,186.22ha in agroforestry systems; 573.05ha in silvopastoral systems and 491,02ha in managed forests.

65. This State Law amending the State Fund for Pollution Control – FECOP, created in 2002 included Payment for Environmental Services (PES) as an eligible activity to receive non-refundable resources related to initiatives included in the Forest Remnants Program

Ecosystem Restoration of Riparian Forests in São Paulo Project

66. The project "Ecosystem Restoration of Riparian Forests", commonly known as PRMC - Projeto de Recuperação de Matas Ciliares, (GEF#2356) was undertaken by the World Bank in concert with São Paulo State Government and its Secretariats: The State Secretariat of Environment (SMA) and the State Secretariat of Agriculture and Supply (SAA). The project started in May 2005 and closed in April 27, 2011. The project development objective was "to support long-term and large-scale restoration of riparian forests of the Cerrado and Atlantic Forest biomes through development and harmonization of policy, regulatory, economic and technological tools and mechanisms, while providing opportunities for improved livelihoods and economic wellbeing of rural communities."

67. In order to put in place an appropriate legal and technical framework to restore of about 1.0 million ha of degraded riparian forests, it sought to strengthen the policy, regulatory, economic and institutional basis for a statewide sustainable land management. The important achievements related to policy development were for example, the establishment of the State Program for Native Species, and the creation of the Mata Ciliar PES project with the main objective to protect, restore and increase riparian areas and native forest fragments.

68. In 2015, the *Nascentes* Program was instituted by the State to scaling up the activities carried out by *Mata Ciliar* Program. Until June 2016, *Nascentes* Program restored 1,084.00ha with planting of 1,8million seedlings in priority areas of 24 Municipalities. Besides, the Program has 8 projects already done and 71,000ha available to receive restoration projects. Almost 80 Municipalities have projects

under implementation. The goal of the first phase of this program is to restore 4,464 hectares of riparian forest, using 6.3 million seedlings of native species.

69. Finally, the GEF's National Biodiversity Project (PROBIO) in Brazil was critical in promoting the creation of the Secretariat of Biodiversity and Forests and its Directorate for Biodiversity, which generated several of the most important publications on biodiversity produced by the national government that has been fundamental in structuring Brazil's biodiversity legal framework and in formulating a national biodiversity strategy.

Summary of project outcomes

Table 7: Summary of project outcomes of legal and regulatory reform in Brazil

GEF-ID	Project Title	Focal Area	Start Date	End Date	GEF Agency	Implementing Agency	Reforms Reported in Terminal Evaluation, Terminal Evaluation Review and/or OPS5 Review
2356	Ecosystem Restoration of Riparian Forests in Sao Paulo	LD	Sep-05	Apr-11	World Bank	State Secretary of Environment (SMA)	The Riparian Forest Restoration Program (PEMC) created in 2007 as one of SMA's strategic programs, instituted by Resolution SMA Nº 42/2007 which established the Riparian Forest Restoration Program - Projeto Estratégico Mata Ciliar (PEMC). A payment for environmental services (PES) system created through State Law Nº 13.798/2009 which establishes the State Climate Change Policy-PEMC.
2765	Espirito Santo Biodiversity and Watershed Conservation and Restoration Project	BD	Aug-05	Jun-12	World Bank	State Government of Espirito Santo	Law on Payment for Environmental Services Program (2008). Reformulation on Payment for Environmental Services Program (2012). Reformulation on Payment for Environmental Services Program (2016). Reformulation of the State Water Resources Fund of Espírito Santo – FUNDÁGUA (2012).

Case Study: Belarus

Re-naturalization and Sustainable Management of Peatlands to Combat Land Degradation, Ensure Conservation of Globally Valuable Biodiversity and Mitigate Climate Change

70. The project (GEF ID 2057) was implemented through UNDP alongside the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection aimed at developing at addressing peatland degradation through:

(a) a regulatory framework, which would specify the procedure and rules for re-naturalization of degraded peatlands;

(b) demonstration of sustainable peatland management by re-wetting in pilot settings; and

(c) capacity development to encourage peatland rehabilitation recommendation.

71. The project successfully researched and tested various practical approaches towards restoring hydrological regime at 12 disturbed peatlands on the overall area of 28,000 ha. The project's experience was applied for developing Belarus' first practical recommendations on the environmental rehabilitation of degraded peatlands. In addition to several technical codes, these included the following national programs:

(a) development of the sectoral peatland renaturalization programme of the Ministry of Forestry,

(b) contributions to the development of normative documents on EIA related to impact of peat extraction on biodiversity and hydrology, as well as

(c) contributions to the National Programme to Combat Land Degradation by inclusion of a section "Sustainable Use, Renaturalization, and Protection of Degraded Peatlands

72. Collectively these policies aim to ensure that environmental considerations are taken into account during rehabilitation of developed peat lands and other disturbed wetlands. Since 2010, repeated bogging has been carried out on an area of about 50,000 ha of the developed peat fields and other disturbed wetlands. 24 projects sites have been restored for a total area of more than 51K ha (10% of the area of degraded peatlands). Along with the restoration has come a significant decrease in the square ha of fires with a high of 18500 Ha in the early 2000s to only 184 ha in 2015.

73. There are also concomitant reductions in GHG emissions from peatlands (estimated at 8.2 million tons tCO2 equivalent over 20 years) with the rehabilitation of the land. There have also been substantial contributions to the promotion of sustainable peatland management and replication of the approach in and outside Belarus. As a result of re-wetted wetlands endemic species such as the Aquatic Warbler are returning as part of their migratory habitat.

74. In addition to restoring over 90,000 of additional ha and the expected GHG emission reductions (278,501.67 tCO2equivalent GHG reduction from reduced peat fires) the policy work constitutes one of the project's key achievement given that the approved strategy will serve as a map for guiding sustainable use of peatlands in Belarus in the long run.

75. In addition to the national legislation, local bodies also prepared local regulations concerning land management with improvement proposals for example, of forestry activities. To transform these local plans into practice natural resource management units were set up for several peatland reserves after which emerged frameworks for implementation of plans and guidelines for the establishment of protected reserves and associated local management plans for threatened species including the first Belarus-Ukraine transboundary Ramsar site.

Integrated Solid Waste Management Project (POPs)

76. The focus of the project was on packaging and loading PCB-containing transformers and pumping out liquid PCB transformer oil from a landfill. Concerning the PCB disposal, seventy-five percent of the cost was borne by the GEF grant and the remaining 25% by the private sector (PCB operation owners).

77. The following are the main regulations developed. A number of technical codes of common practice were also developed to monitor persistent organic pollutants.

(a) National Plan of Implementation (NIP) of the Obligations of the Republic of Belarus under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants in 2011-2015

(b) Regulation of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of the Republic of Belarus on the Procedure of Maintenance of the Uniform Database on Persistent Organic Pollutants

78. Overall, between 2010 and 2013, about 3,000 tons of POPs stockpiles and waste were recovered and packaged, about 1,800 tons have already been destroyed, and about 1000 tons of the remaining stockpiles have been stored at a secure location, eliminating POPs-associated health risks for 116,000 people and reducing PCBs by 17%. In addition to the tonnage of POPs removed, awareness for risks associated with POPs was increased among adjacent communities and a number of new legislative acts, strategies and programs in the area of POPs management were developed and approved.

Summary of project outcomes

Table 8: Summary of project outcomes of legal and regulatory reform in Belarus

GEF-ID	Project Title	Focal Area	Start Date	End Date	GEF Agency	Implementing Agency	Reforms Reported in Terminal Evaluation, Terminal Evaluation Review and/or OPS5 Review
2057	Renaturalization and Sustainable Management of Peatlands to Combat Land Degradation, Ensure Conservation of Globally Valuable Biodiversity, and Mitigate Climate Change	MFA	Dec-05	Dec-10	UNDP	Resources and Environmental Protection of Belarus	project successfully researched and tested various practical approaches towards restoring hydrological regime at 12 disturbed peatlands on the overall area of 28,000 ha. The project's experience was applied for developing Belarus' first practical recommendations on the environmental rehabilitation of degraded peatlands
3281	Integrated Solid Waste Management Project (POPs)	POPs	Oct-2010	Feb-2014	World Bank	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection	National Plan of Implementation (NIP) of the Obligations of the Republic of Belarus under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants in 2011-2015 Regulation of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of the Republic of Belarus on the Procedure of Maintenance of the Uniform Database on Persistent Organic Pollutants

Case Study: Philippines

Philippines Efficient Lighting Market Transformation Project (PELMATP)

79. PELMATP (GEF ID 1103) was implemented as a 5-year USD 15 million (GEF grant: USD 3.1 million and Philippine Co-financing USD 12 million) project with support from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) through the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). The Department of Energy

(DOE), through the Energy Research and Testing Laboratory Services (ERTLS), which also headed the Project Management Office (PMO), executed the PELMATP.

80. The purpose of the project is "the removal of barriers to widespread utilization of EEL systems. To address these barriers, the PELMATP design one component focused on strengthening the legal, regulatory and institutional framework to promote energy efficiency and transformation in the lighting market. It aimed to "enhance the existing EEL systems policies, standards and guidelines and establish new ones, involving the establishment of a functioning mechanism for sustained periodic review/updating and enforcement of policies, standards, guidelines and programs on EEL applications, and implementation of minimum energy performance standards (MEPS) for EEL products".

81. The project contributed, inter alia, to the following policy reforms: Issuance of **Administrative Order (AO) No. 183 Directing the Use of Energy Efficient Lighting/Lighting Systems (EELS) in Government Facilities** in 2007. A total of one hundred fifteen (115) government buildings nationwide implemented the EELs in 2008 alone. By the end of the project, 448 government buildings carried out the EELs.

82. Setting of **minimum energy performance standards (MEPs)**. The Department of Energy has issued a policy requiring compliance with the Philippine Energy Standards and Labeling Program (PESLP) as a policy of the government. The policy applies to all PESLP-covered housing appliances, *lighting products,* motor vehicles and other energy-consuming equipment.

83. The project has contributed to reducing GhG emissions. The gains achieved from PELMATP also helped catalyze further improvement and updating of these policies (e.g. energy performance standards and ecolabelling, energy conserving design, roadway lighting guidelines), institutionalized efficient lighting in government buildings, expanded coverage of efficient lighting markets, and influenced the design of future projects on energy efficiency and conservation. GEF support also helped improve the capacities of national and local governments, partner organizations, and beneficiaries to address climate change.

84. Similarly, GEF support on energy efficiency and renewable energy (Capacity Building to Remove Barriers to Renewable Energy Development- GEF ID- 1264) , both of which are high priorities and highly relevant for the Philippines, a country that strives to become a world leader in renewable energy, facilitated the passage of the Renewable Energy Law (Republic Act 9513, 2008). The availability of project resources, particularly the Renewable Energy Interagency Committee (REIAC) and the Project Management Office (PMO) support and policy studies, were critical to moving the bill into law and bringing the drafting of Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) to conclusion.

Samar Island Biodiversity Project: Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Biodiversity of a Forested Protected Area

85. The Samar Island Biodiversity Project (SIBP): Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Biodiversity of a Forested Protected Area SIBP (GEF ID 2), was executed by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) and implemented by DENR Region VIII with Samar Island Non-Government Organizations (NGOs).

86. It aims to "establish the Samar Island Natural Park (SINP), a new protected area zoned for multiple uses centering on protection, but providing for sustainable harvests of non-timber forest

products, and institute a comprehensive range of ancillary conservation measures to insulate the Park from human pressures. The SINP was established through Presidential Proclamation in 2003 which set aside 453,000 hectares of terrestrial protected area in the Philippines and is awaiting the approval of a Congressional Act. In the interim, there have been reforms at the local level to ensure the sustainability of activities, but continuing support from the national government through legislation of the SINP will be important.

Summary of project outcomes

Table 9: Summary of project outcomes of legal and regulatory reform in Philippines

GEF-ID	Project Title	Focal Area	Start Date	End Date	GEF Agency	Implementing Agency	Reforms Reported in Terminal Evaluation, Terminal Evaluation Review and/or OPS5 Review
2	Samar Island Biodiversity Project: Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Biodiversity of a Forested Protected Area	BD	Jul-00	Dec-11	UNDP	Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)	Samar Island Natural Park (SINP) was established through Presidential Proclamation in 2003 which set aside 453,000 hectares of terrestrial protected area in the Philippines and is awaiting the approval of a Congressional Act.
1103	Efficient Lighting Market Transformation Project	CC	Dec-04	Dec-10	UNDP	Department of Energy	Administrative Order (AO) No. 183 Directing the Use of Energy Efficient Lighting/Lighting Systems (EELS) in Government Facilities Setting of minimum energy performance standards (MEPs) Adoption of the (a) Guidelines for Energy Conserving Design of Buildings and (b) Roadway Lighting Guidelines through the tripartite Memorandum of Agreement signed among the DOE, Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH), and the DILG National Eco-Labeling Program Board (ELPB) of the Philippines of the Ecolabelling Guidelines for lighting products

Case Study: Vietnam

Systems Efficiency Improvement, Equalization and Renewables (SEIER)

87. The SEIER (GEF ID 965) project was implemented from 2003 to 2010 and had a total budget of US$ 351.7 million, of which US$ 225 million from the International Development Association (IDA) of the World Bank, US$ 122.9 million from Vietnam Government and US$ 4.5 million from GEF.

88. SEIER was designed to: (i) enhance electricity system efficiency in Vietnam; (ii) provide electric power in selected rural areas of Vietnam; and (iii) support the reform and institutional development of the country's energy sector.

89. The project supported the development and completion of the regulatory framework for the country's power sector, including: (i) cost-reflective tariff regulations for transmission, distribution and supply, and market-based mechanisms for retail electricity tariffs as per the Prime Minister's Decision 21; (ii) technical codes, load research, and related implementation procedures; (iii) design of the Vietnam Competitive Generation Market (VCGM), and related market surveillance and monitoring procedures.

90. Specifically, SEIER contributed to:

(a) Formulation of 13 procedures related to the Grid Code,

(b) Decision No. 26/2006/QĐ-TTg dated January 26, 2006 (now replaced by Decision No. 63/2013/QĐ-TTg dated November 08, 2013 by the Prime Minister) promulgating the roadmap and conditions for the planning of different stages in the development of Vietnam electricity market, which includes: (i) the competitive electricity production market (scheduled to run until 2014); (ii) the competitive electricity wholesale market (from 2015 to 2021); and (iii) the competitive electricity retail market (from 2021 onwards).

(c) Standard Power Purchase Agreement (PPA), Avoided Cost Tariff (ACT) regulations and Electricity Licensing Procedures by updating Impacts after project completion

91. PPA and ACT were both issued in compliance with Decision No. 18/2008/QĐ-BCT dated 18 July 2008 which was one of the most important legal documents that kicked off the competitive electricity market in Vietnam, contributing to the increase in the share of national power generation from renewable energy sources. Since the issuance of PPA and ACT, 70 small hydropower projects of less than 30 MW each were installed in Vietnam, with a total installed capacity of 806 MW power to the grid[j]. These small hydropower projects played a limited, yet important role in reducing GHGs in the country.

92. SAIER played an important role in providing Vietnam with a clear roadmap for power reform that moved from a power monopoly (in 2009) to a competitive wholesale market (by 2017), then finally toward a competitive retail market (by 2023). Implementation of the roadmap is delayed, with the pilot competitive generation market having started in July 2012. ACT regulations provided the legal foundation for developing regulations for wind power, waste-to-energy, biomass, and solar heating systems.

Demand-Side Management and Energy Efficiency Program (DSM/EE)

93. The DSM/EE project was implemented from 2003 to 2010 and had a total budget of US$ 13.15 million of which US$ 2.54 million from the International Development Association (IDA) of the World Bank, US$ 5.34 million from Vietnam Government and US$ 4.81 million from GEF. The project was implemented by the World Bank in concert with EVN and the Ministry of Industry and Trade (MoIT). The global environmental objective was "to contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the energy sector through the systematic removal of barriers to Demand Side Management (DSM) and Energy Efficiency (EE) investments".

94. During the implementation of this project, a number of important changes took place with respect to energy efficiency policies, regulations and programs. Recognizing the importance of energy efficiency, the Government of Vietnam launched a series of efforts to expand its energy-efficiency

initiatives. In 2010, a new Law on Energy Saving and Efficiency was passed. As these changes were taking place, the World Bank reprogrammed some of the funds and activities under DSM/EE project.

95. As a result of the project, according to manufacturers' statistics, the market went from over 20,000 Solar Water Heater units sold in 2008 to more than 30,000 units in 2009, and was expected to increase over 20% in 2010. Having reviewed the new regulations related to SWH, six provincial governments publicly declared that they will continue supporting the dissemination of SWHs.

96. One of the results of the project was the Law on economical and efficient use of energy, published by the National Assembly in 2010. Come into effect in January 2011, this law promoted energy conservation and energy efficiency in the whole society while ensuring sustainable economic and social development.

Vietnam Energy Efficient Public Lightning (VEEPL)

97. The total financing for the VEEPL project (GEF ID 1106) in 2006-2011 was US$15.3 million of which a GEF contribution of US$3.00 million. The project was implemented by the UNDP in concert with Vietnamese Academy of Science and Technology. The global environmental objective was "improvement of lighting energy utilization efficiency through the removal of barriers to the widespread application of energy efficient lighting systems in the public sector in Vietnam". The project was designed to stimulate and accelerate the transformation of the market for energy efficient public lighting in Vietnam by providing high quality technical information to relevant stakeholders, and by helping to build the capacity of Vietnamese institutions, organizations and businesses.

98. The VEEPL project supported the development of a regulatory framework for public lighting in Vietnam, specifically contributing to the law No. 50/2010/QH12 issued by the National Assembly dated June 17, 2010 on economical and efficient use of energy. Articles 17 and 18 of that law focus specifically on "Responsibilities for economical and efficient use of energy in public lighting" and "State management responsibilities for economical and efficient use of energy in public lighting."

99. As a result of the policies and regulations introduced, electricity consumption for public lighting in Vietnam will decrease from 6.71%/year (business as usual or base line as of 2010), to 5.8% (2010-2013) and 4.8% (2014) (Ministry of Industry forecast).

Summary of project outcomes

Table 10: Summary of project outcomes of legal and regulatory reform in Vietnam

GEF-ID	Project Title	Focal Area	Start Date	End Date	GEF Agency	Implementing Agency	Reforms Reported in Terminal Evaluation, Terminal Evaluation Review and/or OPS5 Review
965	Systems Efficiency Improvement, Equitization and Renewables (SEER) Project - Renewables Components	CC	Feb-03	Dec-10	World Bank	Ministry of Industry, and World Bank (Split Arrangement)	Development and completion of the regulatory framework for the country's power sector, including: (i) cost-reflective tariff regulations for transmission, distribution and supply, and market-based mechanisms for retail electricity tariffs as per the Prime Minister's Decision 21; (ii) technical codes, load research, and related implementation procedures; (iii) design of the Vietnam Competitive Generation Market (VCGM), and related

							market surveillance and monitoring procedures
1083	Demand-Side Management and Energy Efficiency Program	CC	Nov-03	Jun-10	World Bank	Ministry of Industry, Vietnam and Electricity of Vietnam (EVN, utility)	One of the results of the project was the Law on economical and efficient use of energy, published by the National Assembly in 2010. Come into effect in January 2011, this law promoted energy conservation and energy efficiency in the whole society while ensuring sustainable economic and social development
1106	Energy Efficiency Public Lighting (VEEPL) Project	CC	Dec-05	Jun-11	UNDP	Vietnamese Academy of Science and Technology	VEEPL project supported the development of law No. 50/2010/QH12 issued by the National Assembly dated June 17, 2010 on economical and efficient use of energy. Articles 17 and 18 of that law focus specifically on “Responsibilities for economical and efficient use of energy in public lighting” and “State management responsibilities for economical and efficient use of energy in public lighting.”

ANNEX A. GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS IN OPS5 REVIEW

Region/Country	# Projects (a)	GEF Grant Total (d)	Co-financing
AFR	***13***	***48.5***	***141.5***
Namibia	4	12.7	52.2
South Africa	2	5.5	32.1
Kenya	2	1.8	8.5
Tanzania	1	12.4	34.9
Rwanda	1	5.7	
Guinea-Bissau	1	5.1	
Regional (a)	1	4.5	12.2
Maldives	1	0.8	1.6
Asia	***15***	***86.9***	***1042.7***
China	3	26.7	123.2
Philippines	3	14.8	84.2
Vietnam	2	9.1	51.7
Vanuatu	2	1.5	1.4
Regional/Korea	1	14.7	525.0
Regional (b)	1	11.6	136.4
Bangladesh	1	5.8	0.3
Indonesia	1	2.1	120.0
Bhutan	1	0.5	0.5
ECA	***22***	***65.0***	***231.7***
Kazakhstan	5	18.2	84.9
Belarus	3	5.0	13.6
Croatia	2	10.4	43.8
Georgia	2	5.7	15.4
Turkmenistan	2	2.4	3.4
Bulgaria	1	10.3	30.5
Russia	1	5.5	9.9
Lithuania	1	3.4	18.1
Macedonia	1	1.0	9.2
Regional (c)	1	1.0	1.2
Uzbekistan	1	1.0	1.1
Armenia	1	0.5	0.4
Tajikistan	1	0.5	0.2
LAC	***12***	***92.7***	***478.4***
Nicaragua	3	12.4	45.6
Ecuador	1	18.7	32.9
Mexico	1	15.7	59.4
Caribbean	1	14.4	5.7
Paraguay	1	9.2	16.5
Peru	1	8.3	261.9
Chile	1	6.1	26.5
Brazil	1	4.1	22.2
Honduras	1	2.8	6.9
Costa Rica	1	1.1	1.0
MENA	***3***	***13.7***	***25.8***
Jordan	1	5.3	4.8

Iran	1	5.0	13.3
Lebanon	1	3.4	7.7
Global	***3***	***18.5***	***26.1***
Global	3	18.5	26.1
Grand Total	**68**	**325.3**	**1946.2**

(a) Projects completed between 2010 and 2012 that were reported as having led to the adoption of laws/policies/regulations at national or sector-wide level. (b) Comoros, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, South Africa, and Tanzania. (c) Cook Islands, Nauru, Solomon Islands, Fed. States of Micronesia, Niue, Tonga, Fiji, Palau, Tokelau, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Tuvalu, Marshall Islands, Samoa, and Vanuatu. (d) Hungary, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, and Ukraine.

ANNEX B. MULTILATERAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENTS

Convention / Protocol	Objectives	Entry into Force	Belarus	Brazil	Kazakhstan	Namibia	Philippines	Vietnam
Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)	Article 1. The objectives of this Convention, to be pursued in accordance with its relevant provisions, are the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources, including by appropriate access to genetic resources and by appropriate transfer of relevant technologies, taking into account all rights over those resources and to technologies, and by appropriate funding.	Dec-2003	Dec-1993	May-1994	Dec -1994	August-1997	Jan-1994	Feb-1995
Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity	Article 1. In accordance with the precautionary approach contained in Principle 15 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, the objective of this Protocol is to contribute to ensuring an adequate level of protection in the field of the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms resulting from modern biotechnology that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health, and specifically focusing on transboundary movements.	Sept-2003	Sep-2003	Feb-2004	Dec-2008	May-2005	Jan-2007	April-2004
The Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from	Article 1. The objective of this Protocol is the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources, including by appropriate access to genetic resources and by appropriate transfer of relevant technologies, taking into account all rights over those resources and to technologies, and by appropriate funding, thereby contributing to the conservation of	Nov-2014	2014-10-12	Non-party	Sept-2015	Oct-2014	Dec-2015	Oct-2014

their Utilization	biological diversity and the sustainable use of its components.							
UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)	Article 2. The ultimate objective of this Convention and any related legal instruments that the Conference of the Parties may adopt is to achieve, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Convention, stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system. Such a level should be achieved within a time frame sufficient to allow ecosystems to adapt naturally to climate change, to ensure that food production is not threatened and to enable economic development to proceed in a sustainable manner.	March-1994	August-2000	May-1994	August-1995	August-1995	August-1994	Feb-1995
Kyoto Protocol	Refers to UNFCC Article 2	Feb-2005	Nov-2005	Feb-2005	Sept-2009	Feb-2005	Feb-2005	Feb-2005
UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)	Article 2. 1. The objective of this Convention is to combat desertification and mitigate the effects of drought in countries experiencing serious drought and/or desertification, particularly in Africa, through effective action at all levels, supported by international cooperation and partnership arrangements, in the framework of an integrated approach which is consistent with Agenda 21, with a view to contributing to the achievement of sustainable development in affected areas. 2. Achieving this objective will involve long-term integrated strategies that focus simultaneously, in affected areas, on improved productivity of land, and the rehabilitation, conservation and sustainable management of land and water resources, leading to improved living conditions, in particular at the community level.	Dec-1996	Nov-2001	Sept-1997	Oct-1997	August-1997	May-2000	Nov-1998
The Convention on Wetlands of	"the conservation and wise use of all wetlands through local and national actions and international cooperation, as a	1975	August-1991	Sept-1993	May-2007	Dec-1995	Nov-1994	Jan-1989

International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention)	contribution towards achieving sustainable development throughout the world". Under the "three pillars" of the Convention, the Contracting Parties commit to work towards the wise use of all their wetlands; designate suitable wetlands for the list of Wetlands of International Importance (the "Ramsar List") and ensure their effective management; and cooperate internationally on transboundary wetlands, shared wetland systems and shared species.							
Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)	Its aim is to ensure that international trade in specimens of wild animals and plants does not threaten their survival.	July-1975	Oct-1995	June-1975	April-2000	March-1991	August-1981	Jan-1994
Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS or Bonn Convention)	(Article 2) 1. The Parties acknowledge the importance of migratory species being conserved and of Range States agreeing to take action to this end whenever possible and appropriate, paying special attention to migratory species the conservation status of which is unfavourable, and taking individually or in co-operation appropriate and necessary steps to conserve such species and their habitat. 2. The Parties acknowledge the need to take action to avoid any migratory species becoming endangered. 3. In particular, the Parties: a) should promote, co-operate in and support research relating to migratory species; b) shall endeavour to provide immediate protection for migratory species included in Appendix I; and c) shall endeavour to conclude Agreements covering the conservation and management of migratory species included in Appendix II.	NA	Sept-2003	Oct-2015	May-2006	Non-party	Feb-1994	Non-Party
Stockholm Convention on Persistent	Article 1. Mindful of the precautionary approach as set forth in Principle 15 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and	May-2004	Feb-2004	June-2004	Feb-2008	Sept-2005	Feb-2004	July-2002

Organic Pollutants (POPS)	Development, the objective of this Convention is to protect human health and the environment from persistent organic pollutants.							
Rotterdam Convention on Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade	Article 1. The objective of this Convention is to promote shared responsibility and cooperative efforts among Parties in the international trade of certain hazardous chemicals in order to protect human health and the environment from potential harm and to contribute to their environmentally sound use, by facilitating information exchange about their characteristics, by providing for a national decision-making process on their import and export and by disseminating these decisions to Parties.	Feb-2004	N/A	Sept-2004	Nov-2007	June-2005	Oct-2006	August-2007
Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer	Article 2. The Parties shall take appropriate measures in accordance with the provisions of this Convention and of those protocols in force to which they are party to protect human health and the environment against adverse effects resulting or likely to result from human activities, which modify or are likely to modify the ozone layer.	Sept-1988	June-1986	March-1990	August-1998	Sept-1993	July-1991	Jan-1994
Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer	The Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer was designed to reduce the production and consumption of ozone depleting substances in order to reduce their abundance in the atmosphere, and thereby protect the earth's fragile ozone Layer.	Jan-1989	Oct-1988	March-1990	August-1998	Sept-1993	July-1991	Jan-1994

Notes: Rio Convention relates to the following three conventions, which are results of the Earth Summit held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992: United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Convention on Biological Diversity, United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (b) other MEAs include the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal (Basel Convention).

Sources: Conventions.

ANNEX C. NATIONAL CAPACITY SELF-ASSESSMENTS

1. The GEF under the Global Support Programme (GSP) provided support to countries to enable them to analyze their own capabilities in meeting their commitments under the three Rio Conventions on Biodiversity Conservation, Desertification and Drought, and Climate Change focused on three conventions: CBD, UNFCCC, and the UNCCD. The GSP was operational between 2005 and 2010 to provide technical backstopping to countries undertaking National Capacity Self-Assessments (NCSA). The GSP produced a Resource Kit that set out the guidelines and methodologies for the undertaking the NCSAs.

2. UNDP supported 111 countries to undertake their NCSAs, while UNEP supported 34 countries. References to laws and regulations in the NCSA for Kazakhstan and Namibia are shown below:

- **Kazakhstan**. NCSA Kazakhstan took place in 2004. The project was funded by GEF and implemented in cooperation with the Ministry of Environmental Protection and the UNDP. It called for, among other things: "improvement of the legislative-regulating and economic mechanisms in the sphere of climate change… establishment of the legislative and normative bases for standardization of land use, development of economic mechanisms for the sparing nature use… improvement of the legislative basis in the sphere of preservation of the habitat and components of biodiversity." With respect to particular laws, the document highlighted the need to create or amend the Law on Protection, Recovery and Use of Flora; Law on Protection and Use of Fish Resources; and the Law on Genetically Modified Organisms. The agreed Action Plan included the following item: "Analyze legislation in order to agree it with the Conventions' requirements. Introduce necessary changes in the national legislation in accord with the Conventions' requirements." No specific laws were identified in the action plan.
- **Namibia.** The NCSA was carried out in early 2005 by UNDP in concert with the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. The only statement pertaining to legal reforms is as follows: "On a national level, the systemic capacity (the policy and legal framework) is inadequate. Policy gaps, conflicts, and barriers need to be addressed more systematically."
- **Belarus.** NCSA Belarus took place in 2003. The project was funded by the GEF and implemented by UNDP with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection. In addition to undertaking the NCSA for Belarus to meet its requirements under the global environmental conventions, the NCSA process was seen as an opportunity "to facilitate the development of concrete initiatives that will lead to synergistic approaches in addressing global environmental issues at the national and local level. At the same time, it will integrate global environmental management objectives to national environmental management and sustainable development frameworks."
- **Brazil.** NCSA Brazil took place in 2006. The project was funded by the GEF and implemented by UNDP with the Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Science and Technology. The NCSA aimed at identifying "priorities for the development of capacity and concrete actions that may optimize national efforts in the thematic areas of biodiversity, climate change and combat to desertification, maximizing advantages derived from the activities developed on each Convention, avoiding simultaneously, the duplication of efforts."
- **Philippines.** NCSA Philippines took place in 2003. The project was funded by the GEF and implemented by UNDP with the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. The primary objective of the Philippines NCSA was to identify priority capacity needs related to global environmental management in the Philippines and examine any barriers to effectively addressing these needs that exist.

- **Vietnam.** NCSA Vietnam took place in 2004. The project was funded by the GEF and implemented by UNDP with the National Environment Agency of the Ministry of Science, Technology and the Environment. The principal objective of the proposed Viet Nam NCSA project is "*to identify and determine the nature of critical capacity constraints and priority capacity needs faced by Viet Nam* as they relate to the global environment."

ANNEX D. LIST OF INTERVIEWS

Kazakhstan

Institution	Contact Person
Alakol State Nature Reserve	Maden Zhumankulov, Director
Association for Biodiversity Conversation of Kazakhstan	Sergey Sklyarenko, Deputy Director
Biodiversity Conservation Fund of Kazakhstan	Asylkhan Assylbekov, Superintendent (former UNDP Project Manager)
Institute of Ecology and Sustainable Development	Kuralay Karibaeva, Director (former UNDP Project Manager)
Ministry of Agriculture	Kairat Ustemirov, Deputy Chairperson, Committee of Forestry and Wildlife Bakytbek Duissekeev, Head of Department, Committee of Forestry and Wildlife Khairbek Mussabayev (former Deputy Chairperson, Committee of Forestry and Wildlife) Igor Koval, Director of Division Bakhyt Nasyrkhanova Erkebulan Akhmetov, Director, Department
Ministry of Education and Science	Lyazzat Kussainova, Deputy Chairperson, Committee for Science
Ministry of Energy	Ainur Sospanova, Head, Department of Renewable Energy (former UNDP Project Manager)
Ministry of Environmental Protection	Alexandr Bragin, former staff Rysty Tulebayeva, former staff
Kamkor Zhylu, LLP	Indira Chermanova, Director (former Deputy Director of Communal Utilities Department, Committee for Construction, Housing and Utilities
Korgalzhyn Nature Reserve	Murat Aitzhanov, Counselor
International Fund of Aral Sea	Bolat Bekniyaz, Director
United Nations Development Program	Rassul Rakhimov, Programme Officer, Sustainable Urbanization and Energy & Environment Portfolio Victoria Baigazina, Programme Associate, Department of Energy Talgat Kerteshev, Manager, Biodiversity Program Yerlan Zumabayev, Manager, Sustainable Land Management Alexandr Belyi, Project Manager Firuz Ibraginov, Chief Technical Advisor, SLM Projects Gennady Doroshin, former UNDP Chief Technical Advisor Bakhtiyar Sadyk, former UNDP Project Manager Dr. Vladimir Mamaev, former Regional Technical Advisor Maxim Vergeichik, Regional Technical Advisor

Namibia

Institution	Contact Person
Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry	Bertram Swartz, Deputy Director, Directorate of Water Resource Management
Ministry of Environment and Tourism	Teofilus Nghitila, Environmental Commissioner, Department of Environmental Affairs Petrus Muteyauli, Head, Multilateral Environmental Agreements, Department of Environmental Affairs

	Johnson Ndokosho Deputy Director, Wildlife and National Parks Vatalis Mushongo, Chief Warden, Concession Unit
Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources	Rudi Cloete, Director, Aquaculture
Ministry of Justice, Office of the Attorney General	Veronika Halwoodi, Chief Legal Officer Charmaine Toati Van der Smit
Ministry of Mines and Energy	Vilyo Kuwtondokwa, Chief Energy Researcher
NAFOLA	Viviane Kinyanga, former UNDP Project Manager
Namibia Energy Institute	Zivayi Chiguvare, Director Helvi Ileka, Projects Officer
United Nations Development Program	Nelson R. Zakaapi, Programme Associate Shimweefeleni, F. Hamutwe, former UNDP Project Manager Michael Sibalatani, former UNDP Project Manager Erling Kavita, former UNDP Project Manager Martha Naanda , former UNDP Portfolio Manager Midori Paxton, former Project Manager and RTA Lucas Black, former RTA Phemo Karen Kgmotso Robert Kelly
World Bank	Claudia Sobrevila, Global Wildlife Program Manager Timoteus Mufeti, former WB Project Manager

Belarus

Institution	Contact Person
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection	Iya Malkina – GEF Operational/Political Focal Point. First Deputy Minister.
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection	Marina Philipuk – Head of International Cooperation Department
N/A	Yury Solovev – Project Manager for “Integrated Solid Waste Management”
National Academy of Science	Alexandr Kozulin – Head of International Cooperation and Scientific Support of the Environmental Convention
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection	Tatsyana Evdaseva – Head of Information and Public Relations
United Nations Development Program, Belarus	Ivan BelAlexandre Grebenkov, Project Manager
United Nations Development Program, Belarus	Ekaterina Paniklova, UNDP Deputy Resident Representative in Belarus
World Bank	Elena Klochan, World Bank Senior Country Program Officer

Brazil

Institution	Contact Person
AGERH - Agência Estadual de Recursos Hídricos	Paulo Renato Paim, Diretor Presidente
Associação Plantas do Nordeste - APNE	Frans Pareyn , Coordenador Geral
Banco Mundial	Maria Isabel Braga, Project Manager

CESAN -Companhia Espírito Santense de Saneamento	Celso Caus
CESAN -Companhia Espírito Santense de Saneamento	Paulo Ruy Valim Carnelli, Diretor Presidente
DFI/SFB/MMA	Graciema R. Pinage, Analista Ambiental
Environmental Agency of Sergipe State (SEMARH)	Valdineide Barbosa de Santana, Coordinator of the Biodiversity and Protected Areas Department
Fundação Cearense de metereologia e recursos hídricos - FUNCEME	Ana Maria Lebre Soares, Geógrafa
Fundação Cearense de metereologia e recursos hídricos - FUNCEME	Margareth Silvia B. Carvalho, Engenheira Agrônoma
Fundação florestal - FF	Oswaldo Bruno, Beneficiary
Fundação Luís Eduardo Magalhães/BA	Nádia Holtz da Nova Moreira , Superintendente da SUDES
Instituto do Meio Ambiente e Recursos Hídricos – INEMA/BA	Márcia Cristina Telles de Araújo Lima, Diretoria-Geral – DIREG
Ministério de Ciencia e Tecnologia - MCTI	Andrea Portela, Coordenadora de Gestão em Ecossistemas
Ministry of Environment	João Arthur Seyffarth , Overall Coordinator of the GEF Caatinga Project
MMA - Secretaria de Biodiversidade e Florestas	Carlos Alberto Scaramuzza, Diretor
MMA - Secretaria de Biodiversidade e Florestas	Ugo Vercillo, Secretário
RPPN Amadeu Botelho	Toni Carioba, Beneficiary
SEAMA -Secretaria de Estado do Meio Ambiente e Recursos Hídricos	Aladim Fernando Cerqueira, Secretário De Estado
Secretaria de Estado de Governo - SEG	Regina Curitiba da Silva , Subsecretária de Estado de Captação de Recursos
Secretaria de Meio Ambiente - SP	Helena Carrascosa von Glehn, Assessora Técnica do Gabinete
Secretaria de Meio Ambiente do Estado - SEAMA	Maria da Glória Abaure, Secretária do Meio Ambiente
Secretaria do Meio Ambiente – Sema/CE	Lucia Maria Bezerra da Silva, Coordenadoria de Desenvolvimento Sustentável - Codes
Secretaria do Meio Ambiente – Sema/CE	Maria Dias Cavalcante, Secretária Executiva
Secretaria do Meio Ambiente – Sema/CE	Maria Jovelina G.Silva,
Secretaria do Meio Ambiente – Sema/CE	Renata Aline Bezerra Pinheiro, Bióloga - Gestora Ambiental
Secretaria do Meio Ambiente – Sema/CE -Coordenação de Desenvolvimento Sustentável - CODES/SEMA	Monica Carvalho Freitas, Bióloga - Gestora Ambiental
Secretaria Estadual de Meio Ambiente e Recursos Hídricos	Marcos Sossai, Project Manager - Reflorestar
SEMAR/PI	Carlos Antonio Moura Fe, Superintendente de Meio Ambiente/SEMAR/PI
SFB/Ministry of Environment	Francisco Campello, Project Manager -Regional Coordinator of the GEF Caatinga Project
SMA - Coordenadoria de Biodiversidade e Recursos Naturais	Araci Kamiyama, Diretora do Departamento

SMA - Coordenadoria de Biodiversidade e Recursos Naturais	Dylan Rocha, Environment Analyst
SMA - Coordenadoria de Biodiversidade e Recursos Naturais	Rafael Barreiro Chaves, Environment Analyst
sma/Programa Desenvolvimento Sustentável Rural	Neide Araujo, Diretora do Programa
sma/Programa nascentes	Carolina Kois Tiberio, Environment Analyst
Superintendência Estadual do Meio Ambiente (Semace)/CE	Doris Day S. da Silva, Coordenadoria de Biodiversidade - Cobio
Superintendência Estadual do Meio Ambiente (Semace)/CE	Maria Tereza Bezerra Farias Sales, Núcleo de Análise de Projetos Estratégicos – NAPES
UNDP	Rosenely Diegues Peixoto, GEF advisor
Universidade Federal do Estado - Labgest	Edmilson Costa Teixeira, Professor
UR Nordeste	Alencar Garlet, Serviço Florestal Brasileiro - SFB
World Bank	Bernadete Lange, Especialista em desenvolvimento sustentável
World Bank	Erik Fernandes, Project Manager
World Bank	Gunars H. Platais, Sr. Environmental Economist

Philippines

Institution	Contact Person
United Nations Development Program-Philippines	Floradema Eleazar, former SIBP Project Development Specialist and current Lead of the Energy and Environment Unit
United Nations Development Program-Philippines	Imee Manal, Program Analyst Energy and Environment Unit
Department of Energy	Artemio Habitan, Officer-in-Charge, Division Chief Energy Efficiency and Conservation Division Energy Utilization and Management Division

Vietnam

Institution	Contact Person
The World Bank - Hanoi	Mr. Tran Hong Ky,Senior Energy Specialist
Viet Nam Energy Efficiency Public Lighting (VEEPL)	Mrs. Nguyen Thi Bac Kinh, Original Senior Technical Advisor of VEEPL project
Project “Promoting Energy Conservation in Small and Medium Scale Enterprises”	Mrs. Nguyen Thi Nga, Original Senior Technical Advisor of PECSME project