



Конференция Сторон
Двадцать шестая сессия
Глазго, 1–12 ноября 2021 года

Доклад Глобального экологического фонда для Конференции Сторон

Записка секретариата

1. Конференция Сторон (КС) в своем решении 12/CP.2 приняла и тем самым ввела в действие меморандум о взаимопонимании (МОВ) между КС и Советом Глобального экологического фонда (ГЭФ). В МОВ предусматривается, в частности, что ежегодные доклады ГЭФ будут представляться КС через секретариат РКИКООН.
2. В ответ на это положение секретариат ГЭФ представил 5 октября 2020 года доклад, содержащийся в приложении. Он воспроизводится здесь в том виде, в котором был представлен, с первоначальной нумерацией страниц.
3. В МОВ также предусматривается, что КС во исполнение пункта 1 статьи 11 Конвенции принимает решения в отношении политики, программных приоритетов и критериев отбора, связанных с Конвенцией, для Финансового механизма, который функционирует под руководством КС и подотчетен ей.
4. В МОВ далее предусматривается, что КС после каждой своей сессии будет сообщать Совету ГЭФ любые политические руководящие указания в отношении Финансового механизма, утвержденные КС.



Blank page

Annex

[English only]



**REPORT OF THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY TO THE
TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE
UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE**

September 30, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|------|
| LIST OF TABLES | iv |
| LIST OF FIGURES..... | v |
| ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS | vi |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | viii |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| PART I: GEF'S RESPONSE TO COP GUIDANCE | 1 |
| 1. <i>The Paris Agreement, COP 25 and CMA 2 Decisions, and Conclusions of SBI 51, SBI 50, SBSTA 51 and SBSTA 50</i> | 1 |
| 2. <i>Engagement with the UNFCCC</i> | 12 |
| PART II: GEF INITIATIVES | 15 |
| 1. <i>GEF-7 Impact Programs</i> | 15 |
| 2. <i>Private Sector Engagement</i> | 17 |
| 3. <i>Innovation</i> | 19 |
| 4. <i>Complementarity in Climate Finance</i> | 21 |
| 5. <i>Environmental and Social Safeguards</i> | 22 |
| 6. <i>Gender Equality</i> | 23 |
| PART III: GEF ACHIEVEMENTS..... | 25 |
| 1. <i>Climate Change Mitigation</i> | 25 |
| 2. <i>Climate Change Adaptation</i> | 36 |
| 3. <i>Capacity-Building Initiative for Transparency</i> | 51 |
| 4. <i>Technology Transfer</i> | 57 |
| 5. <i>Enabling Activities and Capacity-Building</i> | 63 |
| ANNEXES | 68 |
| ANNEX 1: GEF-7 FUNDING ENVELOPES AND ALLOCATIONS..... | 68 |
| ANNEX 2: LIST OF FY 2020 PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS UNDER THE GEF TRUST FUND | 74 |
| 1. List of FY 2020 Climate Change Mitigation Projects and Programs | 74 |
| 2. List of FY 2020 Enabling Activity Projects | 77 |
| 3. Summaries of Climate Change Mitigation Projects and Programs Approved in FY 2020 | 78 |
| 4. Summaries of Climate Change Mitigation Multi-Focal Area Projects Approved in FY 2020 | 84 |
| 5. Summaries of Enabling Activity Projects Approved in FY 2020 | 88 |
| ANNEX 3: LIST OF FY 2020 PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS UNDER THE LDCF AND THE SCCF..... | 91 |
| 1. List of LDCF Projects and Programs Approved in FY 2020 | 91 |
| 2. List of SCCF Projects Approved in FY 2020 | 93 |
| 3. Summaries of LDCF Projects and Programs Approved in FY 2020' | 94 |
| 4. Summaries of the SCCF Projects Approved in FY 2020 | 100 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 5. Summaries of the MTF Projects between LDCF and SCCF Approved in FY 2020 | 100 |
| ANNEX 4: REGIONAL AND GLOBAL CLIMATE TECHNOLOGY ACTIVITIES..... | 102 |
| ANNEX 5: NATIONAL CLIMATE TECHNOLOGY ACTIVITIES | 112 |
| ANNEX 6: STATUS REPORTS ON THE LDCF AND THE SCCF FOR FY 2020..... | 127 |
| ANNEX 7: STATUS REPORT ON THE CBIT TRUST FUND FOR FY 2020..... | 136 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Table 1: Decisions Adopted by UNFCCC COP 25 and CMA 2, Conclusions of SBI 51 and SBI 50 and SBSTA 51 and SBSTA 50, and GEF Responses | 2 |
| Table 2: GEF Projects on Climate Change Mitigation by Region | 26 |
| Table 3: GEF Projects on Climate Change Mitigation by Phase | 27 |
| Table 4: GEF Funding for Projects and Programs with Climate Change Mitigation Components | 30 |
| Table 5: Expected Results from Projects and Programs Approved during the Reporting Period | 31 |
| Table 6: Core Indicators for the LDCF and the SCCF (2018-2022)..... | 37 |
| Table 7: Regional Distribution of Adaptation Projects and Programs Approved under LDCF during the Reporting Period..... | 38 |
| Table 8: Agency Distribution of Projects and Programs Approved under LDCF during the Reporting Period..... | 38 |
| Table 9: Agency Distribution of Adaptation Projects and Programs Approved under SCCF during the Reporting Period | 44 |
| Table 10: Regional Distribution of Adaptation Projects and Programs Approved under SCCF during the Reporting Period..... | 45 |
| Table 11: Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation Project Concepts Selected | 49 |
| Table 12: GEF Projects for Climate Technology Transfer and Financing Centers and the CTCN..... | 59 |
| Table 13: GEF Trust Fund Enabling Activities Projects by Region (GEF Pilot Phase to end of reporting period)..... | 64 |
| Table 14: GEF Trust Fund Enabling Activities Projects by Phase | 64 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Figure 1: Annual and Cumulative Funding Approvals under the LDCF (as of June 30, 2020) | 38 |
| Figure 2: Cumulative Regional Distribution of Projects and Programs Approved under LDCF..... | 39 |
| Figure 3: Cumulative Agency Distribution of Projects and Programs Approved under LDCF | 41 |
| Figure 4: Cumulative Regional Distribution of Adaptation Projects Approved under SCCF-A (as of June 30, 2020)..... | 44 |
| Figure 5: Cumulative Regional Distribution of Adaptation Projects Approved under SCCF-B (as of June 30, 2020)..... | 45 |
| Figure 6: Cumulative Agency Distribution of Projects and Programs Approved under SCCF | 46 |
| Figure 7: Type of Transparency Activities Supported in CBIT Projects as of June 30, 2020 | 55 |

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| ADB | Asian Development Bank |
| AfDB | African Development Bank |
| AFOLU | Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use |
| BUR | Biennial Update Report |
| CBA | Community-based adaptation |
| CBIT | Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency |
| CBIT TF | Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency Trust Fund |
| CCA | Climate Change Adaptation |
| CCM | Climate Change Mitigation |
| CEIT | Countries with Economy in Transition |
| CEO | Chief Executive Officer |
| CI | Conservation International |
| CMA | Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement |
| CO ₂ eq | Carbon Dioxide Equivalent |
| COP | Conference of the Parties |
| CSO | Civil Society Organization |
| CTCN | Climate Technology Centre and Network |
| EA | Enabling Activity |
| EBRD | European Bank for Reconstruction and Development |
| ECA | Eastern Europe and Central Asia |
| ECOWAS | Economic Community of Western African States |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations |
| FINTECC | Finance and Technology Transfer Centre for Climate Change |
| FOLUR | Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration |
| FSP | Full-sized Project |
| FY | Fiscal Year |
| GCA | Global Commission on Adaptation |
| GCF | Green Climate Fund |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| GEFTF | Global Environment Facility Trust Fund |
| GHG | Greenhouse Gas |
| GHGI | Greenhouse Gas Inventory |
| GSP | Global Support Program |
| HCFC | Hydro-chlorofluorocarbon |
| HFC | Hydrofluorocarbon |
| IAP | Integrated Approach Pilot |
| ICAT | Initiative for Climate Action Transparency |
| IDB | Inter-American Development Bank |
| IEO | GEF Independent Evaluation Office |
| IFAD | International Fund for Agricultural Development |
| IFC | International Finance Corporation |
| IP | Impact Program |
| IPCC | Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change |
| IUCN | International Union for Conservation of Nature |
| LAC | Latin America and the Caribbean |
| LCT | Low-carbon Technology |
| LDC | Least Developed Country |
| LDCF | Least Developed Countries Fund |
| LDN | Land Degradation Neutrality |
| MFA | Multi-focal Area |
| MRV | Measurement, Reporting and Verification |
| MSP | Medium-sized Project |
| Mt | Megatonne (10 ⁶ tonnes) |
| MTF | Multi-trust Fund |
| MTR | Mid-term Review |

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| NAP | National Adaptation Plan |
| NAPA | National Adaptation Program of Action |
| NBS | Nature-based Solutions |
| NC | National Communication |
| NDC | Nationally Determined Contribution |
| NGI | Non-grant Instrument |
| OFP | Operational Focal Point |
| POP | Persistent organic pollutant |
| PSP | Poznan strategic program on technology transfer |
| PPG | Project Preparation Grant |
| PIR | Project Implementation Report |
| PFD | Program Framework Document |
| SBI | Subsidiary Body for Implementation |
| SBSTA | Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice |
| SCCF | Special Climate Change Fund |
| SCCF-A | Special Climate Change Fund Adaptation Program |
| SCCF-B | Special Climate Change Fund Program for Technology Transfer |
| SCIP | Sustainable Cities Impact Program |
| SDGs | Sustainable Development Goals |
| SFM | Sustainable Forest Management |
| SGP | Small Grants Program |
| SIDS | Small Island Developing State |
| SME | Small and Medium Enterprise |
| SPA | Strategic Priority on Adaptation |
| STAR | System for Transparent Allocation of Resources |
| TAP | Technology Action Plan |
| Mt CO ₂ eq | Million Metric Tons of Carbon Dioxide Equivalent |
| TAP | Technology Action Plans |
| TEC | Technology Executive Committee |
| TNA | Technology Needs Assessment |
| UNCCD | United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNEP | United Nations Environment Programme |
| UNFCCC | United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change |
| UNIDO | United Nations Industrial Development Organization |
| WHO | World Health Organization |
| WWF | World Wildlife Fund |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The Global Environment Facility (GEF), as an operating entity of the Financial Mechanism of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC, or the Convention), provides financing to country-driven climate change mitigation (CCM) and climate change adaptation (CCA) projects. The Paris Agreement and related Conference of the Parties (COP) decisions affirmed the role and contributions of the GEF to address climate change as part of the Financial Mechanism of the Convention. In particular, the GEF, as well as the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), along with the Green Climate Fund (GCF), were designated to serve the Paris Agreement. The reporting period covered by this document is from July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020.

GEF-7 Programming Directions

2. The Programming Directions for the GEF-7 period (July 2018 to June 2022) were endorsed at the 54th GEF Council Meeting in June 2018. The GEF-7 Programming Directions build upon focal area investments and Impact Programs (IPs), aiming to transform urban, food, and land use systems to deliver lasting benefits across all multilateral environmental agreements that the GEF serves. The resource allocation framework, based on an updated system,¹ includes \$802 million for CCM, comprising \$511 million of country allocations under the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) and \$291 million from STAR set-asides. Annex 1 provides an overview of GEF-7 STAR country allocations.

3. The GEF-7 CCM Focal Area Strategy is focused on the following objectives:

- (a) Promoting innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs;
- (b) Demonstrating mitigation options with systemic impacts; and
- (c) Fostering enabling conditions for mainstreaming mitigation concerns into sustainable development strategies.

4. Eligible focal area investments include de-centralized renewable energy with energy storage, electric drive technologies and electric mobility, accelerating energy efficiency adoption, and cleantech innovation.

5. The GEF-7 IPs support countries to pursue approaches that are holistic and integrated for greater transformational change in key economic systems, and are aligned with their national development priorities. With a focus on addressing major drivers of environmental degradation, three IPs were included in the GEF-7 strategy, covering (i) sustainable cities, (ii) food systems, land use, and restoration, and (iii) sustainable forest management (SFM). These three IPs contribute significantly to the CCM focal area while also delivering other global environmental benefits. The *Sustainable Cities Impact Program* (SCIP) provides support for integrated low-carbon solutions for urban sustainability, such as energy efficiency in buildings, renewable energy development, and solid waste and wastewater management. The *Food Systems, Land Use, and Restoration Impact Program* (FOLUR IP) promotes landscapes approaches for sustainable land management and climate-smart agriculture solutions that reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by enhancing

¹ GEF, 2018, [Updating the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources \(STAR\)](#), Council Document GEF/C.54/03/Rev.01

agricultural productivity. The *Sustainable Forest Management Impact Program* (SFM IP) focuses on maintaining and restoring carbon stocks in the Amazon, the Congo Basin, and within dryland forests.

Climate Change Mitigation

6. Since its establishment in 1991, the GEF has been funding projects with CCM objectives in developing countries and countries with economies in transition (CEIT). As of June 30, 2020, the GEF has supported 1,008 projects on CCM with more than \$6,689.7 million GEF funding, including Project Preparation Grants (PPGs) and Agency Fees, in over 166 countries. The GEF funding leveraged \$57,193.7 million from a variety of sources, including GEF Agencies, national and local governments, multilateral and bilateral agencies, the private sector, and civil society organizations (CSOs).

7. In addition, since its inception the GEF has supported 396 Enabling Activities (EAs), including National Communications (NCs) and Biennial Update Reports (BURs), with \$505.8 million, including PPGs and Agency Fees. These EAs have leveraged \$259.4 million in co-financing, although it is not required. Combined with the 1,008 CCM projects above and these EAs, an average co-financing ratio as of June 30, 2020 is 1 (GEF) to 8.8 (co-financing).²

8. In the reporting period, the GEF programmed \$491.6 million, including PPGs and Agency Fees, from the GEF Trust Fund (GEFTF) for activities expected to generate CCM benefits, of which \$250.9 million were drawn from the CCM focal area and the rest from other GEF focal areas and incentive set-asides. These resources supported six investments in GEF programs, including three new programs and three additional investment tranches in existing programs, as well as 32 CCM projects and 12 EAs. These 50 programs and projects are expected to leverage approximately \$5.2 billion in co-financing, resulting in a co-financing ratio of 1 (GEF) to 11.5 (co-financing).³ They are expected to avoid or sequester over 431.4 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (Mt CO₂ eq) in total over their lifetime.

9. Through CCM programs and projects, the GEF and its partners are supporting GEF recipient countries in key CCM sectors. These sectors include: energy efficiency, renewable energy, sustainable transport and urban systems, and agriculture, forestry and other land use (AFOLU), as well as technology transfer/innovative low-carbon technologies (LCTs). Programs and projects that were approved in this reporting period include the following:

- (a) In energy efficiency, the GEF has supported four projects with energy efficiency components, with funding totaling \$32.4 million, including PPG and Agency Fees. Co-financing leveraged for these five projects amounted to \$379.9 million. Together, the four projects are expected to mitigate an estimated 45.4 Mt CO₂ eq.
- (b) In the renewable energy sector, the GEF has supported two projects, facilitating the transfer of renewable energy technologies, including waste-to-energy and biomass-to-energy generation. The GEF funding for these two projects amounted to \$36.4 million

² The co-financing ratio is calculated in accordance with the GEF Updated Co-financing Policy, including EAs but excluding PPGs and Agency Fees (GEF, 2018, [Updated Co-financing Policy](#), Council Document GEF/C.54/10/Rev.01).

³ GEF, 2018, [Updated Co-financing Policy](#).

including PPGs and Agency Fees, leveraging \$433.9 million in co-financing. Expected GHG emission reductions amount to 26.2 Mt CO₂ eq.

- (c) In sustainable transport and urban systems, in the reporting period, ten additional country projects were approved in the *Global Programme to Support Countries with the Shift to Electric Mobility*, with \$21.9 million in GEF funding, including PPGs and Agency Fees, leveraging \$218.8 million in co-financing. The total targeted emission reductions are estimated to be 29.7 Mt CO₂ eq. The SCIP was approved with GEF funding amounting to \$159.9 million including PPGs and Agency Fees. This IP includes nine countries and is expected to leverage close to \$1.7 billion in co-financing and lead to GHG emissions reductions of 184.5 Mt CO₂ eq.
- (d) In the AFOLU sector, GEF CCM resources have been used to support the Food, Land Use, and Restoration (FOLUR) IP and the Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) IP. In the reporting period, nine country projects were added to the FOLUR IP with a GEF funding of \$102.6 million, including PPGs and Agency Fees, and co-financing of \$982.6 million, which is estimated to reduce GHG emissions by 94.9 Mt CO₂ eq. In addition, two projects under the Non-Grant Instrument (NGI) Program in GEF-7 with \$30.0 million GEF funding including PPGs and Agency Fees were approved, which will avoid or mitigate in total 19.4 Mt CO₂ eq, and leverage \$919.3 million in co-financing.

10. As highlighted above, significant contributions to GHG emission reductions are expected from the GEF-7 IPs. The IPs are a key part of the GEF-7 Programming Directions and represent an integrated and drivers-based approach to reversing the course of environmental degradation. The IPs bring together countries to collectively and cooperatively work on common environmental challenges with direct mitigation, ecological, economic, and social consequences at the regional and global scales.

11. Through the programming strategy and investments outlined above, the GEF expects to deliver 1.5 billion tCO₂ eq in GHG emission reductions during GEF-7. As of June 30, 2020, at the halfway mark of the GEF-7 programming cycle, and having committed \$470.1 million or 58.6 percent of the GEF-7 CCM resources, the total expected emission reductions from GEF-7 approved projects were approximately 1.2 billion (1,152.5 million) tCO₂ eq, corresponding to 77.2 percent of the overall GEF-7 GHG emission reduction target. This indicates that the GEF is on track to deliver on the overall GEF-7 climate mitigation targets and to support countries in mitigating climate change.

Capacity-building Initiative on Transparency

12. In response to the COP 21 decision adopting the Paris Agreement, the GEF supported the establishment and operationalization of Capacity-building Initiative on Transparency (CBIT) as a priority reporting-related need, through voluntary contributions during GEF-6. The GEF Council, at its 50th meeting in June 2016, established the CBIT Trust Fund (CBIT TF) and approved associated programming directions. The Council, at its 54th meeting in June 2018, agreed to extend the CBIT TF to accept remaining contributions and enable programming until October 2018. As of June 30, 2020, fourteen donors had signed their respective contribution agreements, and the Trustee had received the full pledged amount. The total donor contributions to the CBIT TF were \$61.6 million.

13. The support for the CBIT is an important theme addressed in the CCM Strategy within the GEF-7 Programming Directions. According to the agreed GEF-7 Resource Allocation Framework, \$55.0 million have been notionally allocated to the CBIT.

14. In the reporting period, the GEF approved one global CBIT project and twelve national projects in Benin, Fiji, Guatemala, Haiti, Indonesia, Malawi, Maldives, Mauritius, Namibia, Paraguay, Thailand, and Viet Nam. Of the GEF-7 indicative resources set aside for CBIT from the GEFTF, \$41.0 million (or 74.5 percent) have been programmed as of June 30, 2020.

Adaptation to Climate Change

15. The GEF provides support to climate-vulnerable countries, especially Least Developed Countries (LDCs), for adaptation to climate change. The GEF support for climate change adaptation is provided through the LDCF and the SCCF. In June 2018, the 24th LDCF/SCCF Council approved a new GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the LDCF and SCCF and Operational Improvements for the period 2018-2022.⁴ The 2018-2022 Adaptation Strategy is aligned with the Paris Agreement's global goal on adaptation and anchors the contributions of the LDCF and SCCF, which Parties decided "shall serve the [Paris] Agreement."⁵ To achieve this goal, the Strategy emphasizes three strategic objectives:

- (a) Reducing vulnerability and increasing resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation;
- (b) Mainstreaming climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact; and
- (c) Fostering enabling conditions for effective and integrated climate change adaptation.

16. The Strategy also seeks to enhance gender equality and mainstreaming, as well as private sector engagement while striving to enhance coordinated and synergistic programming with other GEF focal areas and other major climate funds.

17. The LDCF was designed to address the special needs of LDCs under the UNFCCC. From its inception to June 30, 2020, \$1,505.9 million has been approved for 305 projects, programs, and EAs, including PPGs and Agency Fees, to meet this mandate, mobilizing an additional \$6,529.4 million in co-financing, which is not required. This includes financing the preparation of 51 National Adaptation Programs of Action (NAPAs) and two global NAPA projects, all of which have been completed.

18. The LDCF received \$192.3 million in new pledges in the reporting period, including a pledge by a sub-national government. As of June 30, 2020, cumulative pledges to the LDCF amounted to \$1,593.7 million, of which \$1,495.0 million have been received (see Annex 6). As of June 30, 2020, funds available for new LDCF approvals amounted to \$58.6 million.⁶

19. The LDCF has been delivering strategic and more timely support in the GEF-7 period. Within two years of the new LDCF/SCCF strategy roll-out, 32 LDCs, or 68 percent of the LDCs, have

⁴ GEF, 2018, [GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the LDCF and the SCCF and Operational Improvements](#), Council Document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.24/03.

⁵ Decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 58.

⁶ This figure provided by the GEF Trustee factors in interest gained on the Trust Fund.

successfully accessed LDCF resources through 35 projects totaling \$275.1 million to address their national adaptation priorities.

20. As outlined in the 2018-2022 Adaptation Strategy, LDCF/SCCF project selection and approval transitioned in GEF-7 to a Work Program model, under which projects selected based on strategic prioritization factors are presented for approval by the LDCF/SCCF Council. The LDCF/SCCF Council has approved two Work Programs in the reporting period.

21. During this reporting period, the LDCF and SCCF have supported 26 projects and programs, of which 17 are Full-Sized Projects (FSPs) and nine are Medium-Sized Projects (MSPs). These projects and programs address national adaptation priorities, including: climate-smart agriculture and forestry; urban and rural climate resilience enhancement; water resource management; climate-resilient livelihood support; climate-proofing of infrastructure; sub-national and coastal zone planning for climate resilience; climate information services; and adaptive capacity enhancement of communities through integrated approaches.

22. In terms of impacts and outcomes, the 26 LDCF and SCCF projects and programs supported during this reporting period are anticipated to provide the following contributions⁷ to the core indicators for the GEF-7 Results Architecture:

- (a) 9,773,667 direct beneficiaries, of whom 4,996,941 are female;
- (b) 810,493 hectares of land under climate-resilient management;
- (c) 297 policies, plans, or development frameworks that mainstream climate resilience; and
- (d) 260,221 persons with enhanced capacity to identify climate risks and/or engage in adaptation measures, of whom 132,890 are female.

23. During this reporting period, the LDCF supported 17 FSPs and programs with \$122.6 million, including PPGs and Agency Fees. The LDCF has supported an additional six MSPs with \$6.9 million during this reporting period, of which three are exclusively supported by the LDCF and three are Multi-trust Fund (MTF) projects with the SCCF. The number of approved FSPs and MSPs combined supported by the LDCF during this reporting period total 23, with \$129.5 million.

24. From its inception to June 30, 2020, the SCCF has supported a total of 86 projects with \$349.8 million in GEF funding and approximately \$2,660.5 million in co-financing, which is not required.

25. As of June 30, 2020, \$356.1 million have been pledged to the SCCF, of which \$349.4 million were received. As of this same date, funds available for Council/Chief Executive Officer (CEO) approval amounted to \$7.5 million and \$7.1 million for the SCCF-A and SCCF-B, respectively (see Annex 6 for further detail).

26. During the reporting period, the SCCF has supported six MSPs totaling \$6.7 million, inclusive of GEF project financing, PPGs, and Agency Fees. Of these, three are exclusively supported by the

⁷ The contributions on the core indicators include the LDCF and SCCF share of relevant MTF projects and programs.

SCCF and three are MTF projects with the LDCF. Five of these MSPs are through the Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation.

27. The LDCF and SCCF have supported a combined total of nine MSPs for \$13.8 million during the reporting period. Among these MSPs, the LDCF supported three MSPs totaling \$5.9 million, the SCCF supported three MSPs totaling \$4.4 million, and three were MTF projects from the LDCF and SCCF totaling \$3.5 million.

28. Responding to the mandate of the LDCF and the SCCF, total funding in support of the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process amounts to \$80.3 million as of June 30, 2020. Of this, \$75.2 million has been provided by the LDCF, and \$5.1 million by the SCCF.

29. Concerted efforts have been made to support innovative climate adaptation approaches by the LDCF and SCCF, in line with the 2018-2022 Adaptation Strategy and utilizing operational improvements. For example, programming of resources by the LDCF with the GEFTF was facilitated as three MTF projects to enable integration and synergistic approaches to address multiple global environmental concerns.

30. With further regards to innovation, the Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation was launched with \$10 million, financed equally from LDCF and SCCF, to catalyze innovation to harness the potential of private sector actors for achieving adaptation results.

Technology Transfer

31. The GEF, in response to decision 2/CP.17, continues to support pilots and innovative projects for technology transfer and financing, including the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) and four Regional Climate Technology Transfer and Financing Centers. In the reporting period, under CCM three Program Framework Documents (PFDs) and ten projects with technology transfer objectives were approved totaling \$119.5 million in GEF funding, including project financing, PPGs and Agency Fees, and leverage \$1,236.5 million in co-financing. In the reporting period, under CCA Objective 1 to reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation, 24 projects and programs were approved totaling \$86.6 million, inclusive of GEF project financing and Agency Fees, and leverage \$445.9 million in co-financing financing. Of the 24 technology transfer projects supported under CCA, 19 are financed by the LDCF, two are financed by the SCCF, and three are financed by a combination of both Funds.

Enabling Activities

32. Since its inception, the GEF has funded 447 EAs with \$518.0 million from the GEFTF and the LDCF. Of this amount, 396 EAs have been supported with \$505.8 million in funding from the GEFTF, in support of NCs, BURs, and Technology Needs Assessments (TNAs). In the reporting period, the GEF financed, through the GEFTF, 12 EAs, in the amount of \$15.3 million.

Private Sector Engagement

33. COP23 guided the GEF to further enhance engagement with the private sector for the development of climate technology projects and to further expand the use of non-grant instruments. The Seventh Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund included a two-pillar strategy to

engage with the private sector. The first pillar is focused on blended finance through the Non-Grant Instrument Program (NGI) Program while the second pillar focuses on working with the private sector as an agent for market transformation.

34. The NGI Program, which builds on the lessons learned in blended finance during the GEF-6 Non-Grant Instrument Pilot, expanded the financing envelope from \$110 million in GEF-6 to \$136 million in GEF-7. The selection of NGI projects follows a competitive process in which the GEF launches calls for proposals inviting Partner Agencies to submit innovative projects with a focus on scalability, innovation, and digital and technological solutions that have potential to generate global environmental benefits.⁸ The GEF has launched two calls for proposals (August 2019 and February 2020), and has received 25 proposals requesting \$381.7 million in financing. The process resulted in the selection of seven projects totaling \$94.5 million including PPGs and Agency Fees, which accounts for 69.5 percent of the total NGI resources. Four of the seven projects generate climate change mitigation benefits totaling 61.7 Mt CO₂ eq in GHG emission reductions towards the GEF-7 emission reduction target.

35. The second pillar consists of a strategy to mobilize the private sector as an agent of market transformation. This pillar is focussed on strengthening private sector engagement—at all scales and across all GEF programs—to transform the markets and economic systems required to tackle key drivers of environmental degradation, reverse unsustainable global trends, and extend the delivery of global environmental benefits.

GEF Small Grants Programme

36. Since its inception in 1992, the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP)⁹ has supported more than 24,200 grants¹⁰ executed by civil society, indigenous peoples and community-based groups. Among those, 5,391 grants (or 22.3 percent) corresponded to community-based CCM actions, totaling more than \$159 million in GEF funding, which have leveraged over \$208 million in in-kind and cash co-financing.

37. According to the latest SGP Annual Report, during the period from July 2018 to June 2019, 326 CCM grants were under implementation, with GEF's contribution including PPGs and Agency Fees amounting to \$10.9 million and co-financing of \$13.9 million. An additional 239 SGP projects were completed during the same period.

38. For the current reporting period, a second global project of \$64.0 million of GEF funding was approved by the GEF Council in its June 2020 Work Program. Of this amount, a total of \$10.3 million, along with \$10.8 million in expected co-financing, will support community-based grants targeting CCM objectives.

39. In addition, a total of \$17.2 million in GEF funding, including PPGs and Agency Fees, were approved for five SGP Upgraded Country Programmes (Egypt, Indonesia, Kenya, Malaysia, and Mexico), of which \$4.3 million will focus on financing grant activities in the area of climate change mitigation.

⁸ GEF, 2019, [Call for Proposals GEF-7 Non-Grant Instrument Program](#).

⁹ The SGP is currently active in 125 countries.

¹⁰ For the sections on the SGP, the term “grant” and “project” is used indistinctively to refer to the projects that civil society and community-based organizations execute with funding from the small grants.

40. In GEF-7, SGP's CCM strategy aims to demonstrate and scale up low-carbon, viable, and appropriate technologies implemented by local communities in partnership with the private sector and governments. These initiatives are aligned with larger frameworks such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and focus on supporting low-cost energy solutions that reduce carbon emissions, increase climate resilience, improve livelihoods of local communities while enhancing gender equality.

Environmental and Social Safeguards

41. The GEF's updated Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards (2019)¹¹ presents the GEF's approach to anticipating, and then avoiding, preventing, minimizing, mitigating, managing, offsetting, or compensating adverse impacts that GEF-financed projects and programs may have on people or the environment, thereby enhancing the environmental and social outcomes. The policy sets out mandatory requirements for identifying and addressing environmental and social risks and impacts in GEF-financed projects and programs, requiring that GEF projects are screened as early as possible to identify risks and potential impacts.

42. In addition, under the provisions of the Policy a compliance assessment of all GEF Agencies was initiated in 2019. In all cases where an Agency was found not to be fully compliant, they developed plans of actions to achieve compliance. Moreover, the policy requests that all GEF projects document and report on environmental and social risks and potential impacts, and their management, throughout the GEF project and program cycle. These requirements are intended to enhance the flow of information on safeguards implementation across GEF-financed projects. The GEF Secretariat issued guidelines in 2019 to support the effective implementation of the project and program level documentation and reporting requirements set out in the policy by GEF Agencies, the GEF Secretariat, as well as GEF Operational Focal Points in recipient countries, executing partners, and other stakeholders.

Gender Equality

43. An analysis of GEF-7 programs and projects in May 2020¹² continues to validate good compliance with the principles and requirements set out in the GEF Policy on Gender Equality,¹³ suggesting that the Secretariat's activities, guided by the GEF Gender Implementation Strategy,¹⁴ are translating into gender-responsive approaches across GEF projects. GEF-7 projects include plans to contribute to gender results in areas such as improving women's access and control over to natural resources, women's participation in natural resource decision-making at different levels, as well as supporting women's economic opportunities. The analysis also suggests a positive trend in terms of projects actively reaching out to women's organizations and gender focal points of relevant national ministries, nongovernment organizations, and civil society.

¹¹ GEF, 2019, [Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards](#), SD/PL/03.

¹² GEF, 2020, [Progress Report on the Gender Equality Implementation Strategy](#), Council Document GEF/C.58/Inf.05.

¹³ GEF, 2017, [Policy on Gender Equality](#), Council Document, GEF/C.53/04.

¹⁴ GEF, 2018, [GEF Gender Implementation Strategy](#), Council Document GEF/C.54/06.

INTRODUCTION

1. Each year, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), an operating entity of the Financial Mechanism of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), reports to the Conference of the Parties (COP). This report to COP 26 covers climate change mitigation (CCM), climate change adaptation (CCA), and capacity-building activities from July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020, which corresponds to fiscal year (FY) 2020. FY 2020 is the second fiscal year of the GEF-7 programming cycle. The GEF-7 programming cycle covers the period from July 2018 to June 2022. This report consists of three parts: (i) GEF's response to the COP 25 and second Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA) guidance, as well as the conclusions of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) 51 and 50 and Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) 51 and 50; (ii) GEF initiatives; and (iii) GEF achievements in the reporting period.

PART I: GEF'S RESPONSE TO COP GUIDANCE

1. *The Paris Agreement, COP 25 and CMA 2 Decisions, and Conclusions of SBI 51, SBI 50, SBSTA 51 and SBSTA 50*

2. The Paris Agreement and related COP decision affirmed the role of the GEF as part of the Financial Mechanism of the Convention. Article 9 of the Paris Agreement stated that the Financial Mechanism of the Convention, including its operating entities, shall serve as the financial mechanism of this Agreement including the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and the GEF, the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), and the Adaptation Fund. The GEF remains committed to serve the Paris Agreement as its financial mechanism.

3. Concrete steps taken by the GEF to serve the Paris Agreement in this reporting period include continued support for the implementation of nationally determined contributions (NDCs) through three new programs, three additional tranches to the existing programs, 30 national projects, and 12 Enabling Activities (EAs), totaling \$487.8 million, including Project Preparation Grants (PPGs) and Agency Fees, from the GEF Trust Fund (GEFTF) invested towards climate mitigation (CCM) objectives. With regards to climate change adaptation (CCA), the LDCF and SCCF approved 26 projects/programs with \$136.2 million in total, including PPGs and Agency Fees, to address urgent and immediate needs for CCA during the reporting period. The Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) continued its operations to program the available resources notionally allocated to the CBIT envelope with the GEF-7 replenishment. During the reporting period, the GEF approved twelve CBIT national projects and one global project with \$27.8 million, including PPGs and Agency Fees.

4. COP 25 and CMA 2 provided specific guidance to the GEF, while the conclusions of SBI 51 and 50, as well as SBSTA 51 and 50, also contain matters of relevance to the GEF. Key topics include: appreciation for new contributions to the LDCF and the SCCF; improvement of efficiency in the GEF project cycle; continued support for technology and capacity-building activities, including those related to the enhanced transparency requirements under the Paris Agreement (CBIT), biennial transparency reports (BTRs), and technology needs assessments; increased collaboration with support provided by the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) for technology transfer activities; and smooth transition of countries graduating from LDC status.

5. The GEF continues to be responsive to COP guidance by incorporating it into its CCM and CCA strategies, through approval of projects and programs, and by adapting its policies and procedures. Table 1 describes the GEF's response to the decisions by COP 25 and CMA 2 and SBI and SBSTA conclusions.

Table 1: Decisions Adopted by UNFCCC COP 25 and CMA 2, Conclusions of SBI 51 and SBI 50 and SBSTA 51 and SBSTA 50, and GEF Responses

| UNFCCC COP 25 Decision ¹⁵ / CMA 2 Decision ¹⁶ / SBI 51 and 50 Conclusions/SBSTA 51 and 50 Conclusions | GEF's Response |
|---|---|
| COP 25 DECISIONS | |
| Decision 7/CP.25 National adaptation plans | |
| Paragraph 6: <i>Notes</i> that funding has been made available for developing country Parties under the Green Climate Fund, the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund for the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans, and that other channels of bilateral, multilateral and domestic support have also contributed to enabling developing countries to advance their work in the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans. | Support for the national adaptation plan (NAP) process has been made by the LDCF and SCCF. During the reporting period, the GEF also continued to support NAP processes through projects. |
| Decision 8/CP.25 Annual technical progress report of the Paris Committee on Capacity-building for 2019 | |
| Paragraph 2: <i>Invites</i> Parties, as appropriate, the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism, the constituted bodies under the Convention, United Nations organizations, observers and other stakeholders to consider the recommendations referred to in paragraph 1 above and to take any necessary action, as appropriate and in accordance with their mandates. | <p>The GEF continues to provide support to developing country Parties in assessing their needs and priorities, in a country-driven manner, including technology and capacity-building needs, and in translating climate finance needs into action. Among others, the GEF continues to provide resources for the CBIT, Technology Needs Assessments (TNAs), NDCs, and to engage with developing country Parties through initiatives such as National Dialogues and Expanded Constituency Workshops (ECWs), in an effort to enhance developing countries' abilities to assess their needs and priorities and to support developing countries to both develop and implement NDCs.</p> <p>In providing capacity-building support to developing countries, the GEF continues to collaborate with relevant initiatives and other capacity-building providers, including through fostering coordinated engagement with the GCF as part of the financial mechanism of the Convention, as well as through the NDC Partnership, to enhance synergies and coherence of the respective work programs.</p> |
| Decision 11/CP.25 Matters relating to the Standing Committee on Finance | |
| Paragraph 13: <i>Looks forward</i> to the inputs that may be provided by the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts to the work of the Standing Committee on Finance for its consideration in preparing elements of draft guidance for the operating entities. | Noted. |

¹⁵ COP 25 decisions are available at: <https://unfccc.int/event/cop-25>

¹⁶ CMA 2 decisions are available at: <https://unfccc.int/event/cma-2>

| UNFCCC COP 25 Decision ¹⁵ / CMA 2 Decision ¹⁶ / SBI 51 and 50 Conclusions/SBSTA 51 and 50 Conclusions | GEF's Response |
|---|--|
| Decision 13/CP.25, Report of the Global Environment Facility to the Conference of the Parties and guidance to the Global Environment Facility | |
| <p>Paragraph 1: <i>Welcomes</i> the report of the Global Environment Facility to the Conference of the Parties at its twenty-fifth session, including the responses of the Global Environment Facility to previous guidance from the Conference of the Parties.</p> | Noted with appreciation of recognition. |
| <p>Paragraph 2: <i>Also welcomes</i> the work undertaken by the Global Environment Facility during its reporting period (1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019), including:</p> <p>(a) The approval of climate change projects and programmes approved during the reporting period under the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund, the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund;</p> <p>(b) The approval of minimum requirements for Global Environment Facility Trust Fund agencies on anti-money-laundering and countering the financing of terrorism;</p> <p>(c) The composition of the Private Sector Advisory Group;</p> <p>(d) The implementation of the gender equality policy and the approval of the gender implementation strategy;</p> <p>(e) The approval of the policy on monitoring and the evaluation policy.</p> | Noted with appreciation of recognition of work undertaken. |
| <p>Paragraph 3: <i>Welcomes with appreciation</i> the contributions made by developed country Parties to the Least Developed Countries Fund during the reporting period, amounting to USD 184 million, and the contribution made by Switzerland to the Special Climate Change Fund during the reporting period amounting to USD 3.3 million, and <i>encourages</i> additional voluntary financial contributions to these funds to provide support for adaptation.</p> | The GEF appreciates the contributions made by donor countries and acknowledgement by the COP, and stands ready to continue to work with countries to support adaptation with additional contributions. |
| <p>Paragraph 4: <i>Invites</i> the Global Environment Facility to continue its efforts to minimize the time between the approval of project concepts, the development and approval of the related projects, and the disbursement of funds by its implementing/executing agencies to the recipient countries of those projects.</p> | <p>The GEF continues its efforts to strengthen efficiencies in the project cycle. As part of this effort, the GEF has instituted a maximum time period (12 months for Medium-sized Projects, and 18 months for Full-sized Projects) for the project to receive Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Endorsement after approval by the Council of the relevant Work Program, in line with the Project Cancellation Policy¹⁷ approved by the Council in December 2018.</p> <p>As detailed in the GEF Monitoring Report 2019, presented to the 57th GEF Council Meeting in December 2019, the percentage of Full-sized Projects that were CEO-endorsed within 18 months of Council approval of the Project Information Form (PIF) increased to 35 percent in GEF FY 2019, from 28 percent in GEF FY 2018.¹⁸ Additionally, the average time from CEO Endorsement to first disbursement</p> |

¹⁷ GEF, 2018, [Project Cancellation Policy](#), Council Document GEF/C.55/04/Rev.01.

¹⁸ GEF, 2019, [The GEF Monitoring Report 2019](#), Council Document GEF/C.57/03, page 14.

| UNFCCC COP 25 Decision ¹⁵ / CMA 2 Decision ¹⁶ / SBI 51 and 50 Conclusions/SBSTA 51 and 50 Conclusions | GEF's Response |
|--|--|
| | <p>decreased from 11.2 months in GEF-5 to 7.7 months in GEF-6. The GEF Monitoring Report 2019 provides further detailed explanation of additional measures for increasing the pace of preparation and implementation of GEF projects.¹⁹</p> <p>Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the GEF provided an initial automatic extension of three months in March 2020²⁰ and subsequently additional extension of a further three months in April 2020²¹ (six months in total) to the business standard deadlines applicable to the submission of CEO Endorsements or Approvals, as well as the actual CEO Endorsements or Approvals, in line with the Cancellation Policy approved by the Council in December 2018. The six-month extension applies to all projects and child projects under Programs approved after March 1, 2019 to address challenges and mitigate risks of the preparation of such projects.</p> |
| <p>Paragraph 5: <i>Urges</i> the Global Environment Facility to continue to report to the Conference of the Parties any change or update to the eligibility criteria for accessing the Global Environment Facility resources, including the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources country allocation, in its future reports to the Conference of the Parties.</p> | <p>The GEF will continue to report to the Conference of Parties should such change or update occur in the future.</p> |
| <p>Paragraph 6: <i>Encourages</i> the Global Environment Facility, as part of the overall performance study of its seventh replenishment, to analyse any challenges faced and lessons learned by the Global Environment Facility and its implementing agencies in applying the updated policy on co-financing of the Global Environment Facility and to report back to the Conference of the Parties on the outcomes of the study.</p> | <p>The GEF plans to have a review of experiences of the implementation of the updated Policy on Co-financing as described in the GEF-7 Policy Recommendations at the 59th GEF Council meeting in December 2020. Furthermore, the Seventh Comprehensive Evaluation (OPS7) is expected to be completed in FY 2022.²² Relevant findings will be reported to the Conference of the Parties once they become available.</p> |
| <p>Paragraph 7: <i>Also encourages</i> the Global Environment Facility, in collaboration with the Global Environment Facility country focal points, to promote the use of technology needs assessments to facilitate the financing and implementation of technology actions prioritized by countries in their technology needs assessments, within the scope of its mandate and operational modalities.</p> | <p>The GEF continues to work with the respective focal points of GEF recipient countries to ensure that requests for GEF funding are in line with national priorities identified as part of UNFCCC processes, including technology needs assessments (TNAs), in line with the scope of its mandate and operational modalities. The GEF continues to stand ready to receive country-driven, technology-related project proposals, addressing priorities as identified in the TNAs.</p> |
| <p>Paragraph 8: <i>Invites</i> the Global Environment Facility to consider:</p> | <p>(a) The GEF has continued to work closely with partners to support the development of technology needs assessments for all developing countries,</p> |

¹⁹ GEF, 2019, [The GEF Monitoring Report 2019](#), Council Document GEF/C.57/03, paragraph 34.

²⁰ The information is available at: <https://www.thegef.org/documents/extension-deadlines-under-gef-policy-project-cancellation-march-23-2020>

²¹ The information is available at: <https://www.thegef.org/documents/extension-deadlines-under-gef-policy-project-cancellation-april-23-2020>

²² GEF, 2019, [Four-Year Work Program and Budget of The GEF Independent Evaluation Office – GEF-7](#), Council Document GEF/C.56/03/Rev.01.

| UNFCCC COP 25 Decision ¹⁵ / CMA 2 Decision ¹⁶ / SBI 51 and 50 Conclusions/SBSTA 51 and 50 Conclusions | GEF's Response |
|---|---|
| <p>(a) Exploring ways to include in the fourth phase of the global project on technology needs assessments the least developed countries and small island developing States that have never undertaken a technology needs assessment and have not been included in the fourth phase;</p> <p>(b) Relevant recommendations contained in the report prepared by the Technology Executive Committee on the updated evaluation of the Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer, within the scope of its mandate and its operational modalities.</p> | <p>including least developed countries (LDCs) and small island developing States (SIDS), which choose to undertake them. In GEF-7, set aside resources continue to be available to LDCs and SIDS to support the development of TNAs. The GEF has worked in collaboration with the implementing agency of the fourth phase of the global TNA project to endeavor to include all LDCs and SIDS that wish to participate but: (i) have not yet undertaken a TNA and/or (ii) have not been included in the fourth phase.²³ As a result, two additional countries, Lesotho and Barbados, were included in the fourth phase of the TNA project, which includes the participation of 17 LDCs and SIDS.</p> <p>(b) The GEF has and will continue to work with the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and other partners to consider relevant recommendations contained in the TEC's updated evaluation of the Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer (PSP), as appropriate, consistent with the GEF's mandate and operational modalities.</p> |
| <p>Paragraph 9: <i>Also invites</i> the Global Environment Facility, in accordance with its existing mandates and in collaboration with the Green Climate Fund, to report on lessons learned in supporting developing countries in collecting and managing information and data on adaptation.</p> | <p>The GEF continues to provide support through the LDCF and SCCF to developing countries in collecting and managing information and data on adaptation, including by strengthening their systems and capacities for generating and using climate information services, in collaboration with the GCF. The GEF's and GCF's coordinated support for formulation of national adaptation plans and other adaptation planning processes continues to be an important source of support to developing countries for collecting and managing information and data on adaptation. Reporting on lessons learned in collaboration with the GCF has included Progress Reports submitted to the LDCF/SCCF Council; Expanded Constituency Workshops throughout the year; and events at COP 25.</p> |
| <p>Paragraph 10: <i>Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility, in administering the Least Developed Countries Fund, to continue facilitating the smooth transition of countries graduating from least developed country status by continuing to provide approved funding through the Least Developed Countries Fund until the completion of projects approved by the Least Developed Countries Fund Council prior to those countries' graduation from least developed country status.</p> | <p>The GEF continues to facilitate the smooth transition of countries graduating from LDC status, by engaging in active dialogue to facilitate timely programming and prioritizing funding to projects approved prior to those countries' graduation from LDC status. Funds approved through the LDCF for graduating LDCs are secured until project completion.</p> |
| <p>Paragraph 11: <i>Takes note</i> of decision 7/CMA.2 and <i>decides</i> to transmit to the Global Environment Facility the guidance from the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement contained in paragraphs</p> | <p>Please see the responses to the guidance transmitted from CMA to COP as included in related paragraphs 12 and 13 below.</p> |

²³ The fourth phase of the TNA project was Council approved on June 13, 2019 and was still in the process of being approved by the GEF CEO at the time of the writing of this report.

| UNFCCC COP 25 Decision ¹⁵ / CMA 2 Decision ¹⁶ / SBI 51 and 50 Conclusions/SBSTA 51 and 50 Conclusions | GEF's Response |
|--|---|
| 12–13 below, in accordance with decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 61. | |
| <p>Paragraph 12: <i>Welcomes</i> the report of the Global Environment Facility to the Conference of the Parties at its twenty-fifth session, including the list of actions taken by the Global Environment Facility in response to the guidance received from the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement.</p> | Noted with appreciation of recognition. |
| <p>Paragraph 13: <i>Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility, as an operating entity of the Financial Mechanism, under its seventh replenishment and throughout its replenishment cycles, to adequately support developing country Parties in preparing their first and subsequent biennial transparency reports in accordance with Article 13, paragraphs 14–15, of the Paris Agreement and decision 18/CMA.1.</p> | <p>The GEF stands ready to support developing country Parties in preparing their biennial transparency reports (BTRs). The GEF has held consultations on how to meet the needs for the BTRs under GEF-7 with existing resources. The GEF also continues to provide support to developing country Parties in transparency-related capacity-building in accordance with the Paris Agreement and relevant decisions through the CBIT.</p> <p>On June 18, 2020, the GEF held a virtual informal consultation meeting on financial support for BTRs to discuss support needs, possible modalities, and timing with partners. The meeting was attended by 45 participants including country representatives, and representatives from the LDC Group, UNFCCC Secretariat, the United Nations Environment Programme, and the United Nations Development Programme. The discussion focused on considerations for costing BTRs, supporting BTRs in conjunction with National Communications (NCs), avoiding duplication of support in the transition to BTRs, preliminary options for supporting the first BTR based on existing modalities, and potential resource implications. Meeting information is available on the GEF website.²⁴ With the feedback provided, the GEF will further develop programming modalities and guidelines for BTRs, and continue to seek feedback.</p> |
| <p>Paragraph 14: <i>Invites</i> Parties to submit to the secretariat via the submission portal, no later than 10 weeks prior to the twenty-sixth session of the Conference of the Parties (November 2020), their views and recommendations on elements to be taken into account in developing guidance to the Global Environment Facility.</p> | This is an invitation to Parties. |
| <p>Paragraph 15: <i>Requests</i> the Standing Committee on Finance to take into consideration the submissions referred to in paragraph 14 above when preparing its draft guidance to the Global Environment Facility for consideration by the Conference of the Parties and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement.</p> | This is a request to the Standing Committee on Finance. |

²⁴ GEF, 2020. [Informal Consultation Meeting on Financial Support for Biennial Transparency Reports under the Paris Climate Agreement](#).

| UNFCCC COP 25 Decision ¹⁵ / CMA 2 Decision ¹⁶ / SBI 51 and 50 Conclusions/SBSTA 51 and 50 Conclusions | GEF's Response |
|--|---|
| Paragraph 16: <i>Also requests</i> the Global Environment Facility to include in its annual report to the Conference of the Parties information on the steps that it has taken to implement the guidance provided in this decision. | The present report includes information on the steps taken to implement the guidance received from COP 25. |
| Decision 14/CP.25 Enhancing climate technology development and transfer through the Technology Mechanism | |
| Paragraph 5: <i>Welcomes</i> the engagement and collaboration of the Technology Executive Committee and the Climate Technology Centre and Network with the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism and <i>encourages</i> their continued and enhanced collaboration. | The GEF continues to collaborate with the Technology Executive Committee and the Climate Technology Centre and Network. |
| CMA.2 DECISIONS | |
| Decision 2/CMA.2 Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts and its 2019 review | |
| Paragraph 36: <i>Invites</i> Parties to make use of available support relevant for averting, minimizing and addressing impacts related to extreme weather events, slow onset events, non-economic losses and human mobility and for comprehensive risk management from a wide variety of sources, public and private, domestic bilateral and multilateral, under and outside the Convention and the Paris Agreement, including through the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism, as appropriate, to the extent consistent with their mandates. | This decision is for Parties. |
| Paragraph 37: <i>Requests</i> the Executive Committee to further engage and strengthen its dialogue with the Standing Committee on Finance by providing input in line with decision 2/CP.19, paragraph 5(c)(ii), to the Standing Committee on Finance when, in accordance with its mandate, it provides information, recommendations and draft guidance relating to the operating entities of the financial mechanisms under the Convention and the Paris Agreement, as appropriate. | This decision is for the Executive Committee. |
| Decision 5/CMA.2 Matters relating to the Standing Committee on Finance | |
| Paragraph 13: <i>Looks forward</i> to the inputs that may be provided by the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts to the work of the Standing Committee on Finance for its consideration in preparing elements of draft guidance for the operating entities. | This decision is for the Executive Committee. |
| Decision 7/CMA.2 Guidance to the Global Environment Facility | |
| Paragraph 1: <i>Recommends</i> that the Conference of the Parties at its twenty-fifth session transmit to the Global Environment Facility the guidance contained in paragraphs 2–3 below, in accordance with decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 61. | This decision is for the Conference of the Parties. |
| Paragraph 2: | Noted with appreciation of recognition. |

| UNFCCC COP 25 Decision ¹⁵ / CMA 2 Decision ¹⁶ / SBI 51 and 50 Conclusions/SBSTA 51 and 50 Conclusions | GEF's Response |
|--|--|
| <i>Welcomes</i> the report of the Global Environment Facility to the Conference of the Parties at its twenty-fifth session, including the list of actions taken by the Global Environment Facility in response to the guidance received from the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement. | |
| Paragraph 3: <i>Requests</i> the Global Environment Facility, as an operating entity of the Financial Mechanism, to adequately support developing country Parties in preparing their first and subsequent biennial transparency reports under its seventh replenishment and throughout its replenishment cycles in accordance with Article 13, paragraphs 14–15, of the Paris Agreement and decision 18/CMA.1. | Please see the response to paragraph 13 of Decision 13/CP.25 above. |
| CONCLUSIONS of SBSTA 51, SBSTA 50, SBI 51, and SBI 50 | |
| Report of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice on its fifty-first session, held in Madrid from 2 to 9 December 2019²⁵ | |
| Koronivia joint work on agriculture Paragraph 21: The SBSTA and the SBI further welcomed the participation in the workshops of observers and representatives of the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism (the GEF and the GCF), the Adaptation Fund, the GEF-administered Least Developed Countries Fund and Special Climate Change Fund, and the constituted bodies under the Convention. They noted with appreciation the work already undertaken on issues related to agriculture by those entities, and recalled inviting them to contribute to the work and participate in the workshops set out in the Koronivia road map. | The GEF continues to contribute to the Koronivia road map and attend the related workshops, according to the needs and invitations from the UNFCCC. The GEF Secretariat participated in the Koronivia workshops on “Improved nutrient use and manure management towards sustainable and resilient agricultural systems” held at the margins of COP 25 on 3-4 December 2019. On this occasion, the GEF presented its experience and views related to the theme of the workshop. |
| Report of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation on its fifty-first session, held in Madrid from 2 to 9 December 2019²⁶ | |
| Koronivia joint work on agriculture Paragraph 33: The SBI and the SBSTA further welcomed the participation in the workshops of observers and representatives of the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism (the GEF and the GCF), the Adaptation Fund, the GEF-administered Least Developed Countries Fund and Special Climate Change Fund, and the constituted bodies under the Convention. They noted with appreciation the work already undertaken on issues related to agriculture by those entities, and recalled inviting them to contribute to the work and participate in the workshops set out in the Koronivia road map. | Please see the response above. |
| Matters relating to the least developed countries Paragraph 48: The SBI noted with appreciation the financial pledges, totaling USD 160 million, made at the United Nations Climate Action Summit 2019 by the Governments of Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden, the financial pledge of 7.5 million Canadian dollars made by | The GEF appreciates contributions from various donors to the LDCF and would appreciate additional contributions to enable the LDCF to provide additional support to address adaptation priorities of LDCs in a timely manner. |

²⁵ The report of SBSTA 51 is available at: https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/sbsta2019_05_adv.pdf

²⁶ The report of SBI 51 is available at: https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/sbi2019_20_adv.pdf

| UNFCCC COP 25 Decision ¹⁵ / CMA 2 Decision ¹⁶ / SBI 51 and 50 Conclusions/SBSTA 51 and 50 Conclusions | GEF's Response |
|--|--|
| the Government of Canada at the 2019 G7 Summit, and the financial pledge of USD 16.6 million made by the Government of Belgium to the Least Developed Countries Fund, and urged additional contributions to the Fund. | |
| Poznan strategic program Paragraph 64: The SBI welcomed the information on progress in the implementation of the Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer contained in the report of the GEF to COP 25 and noted the related challenges and lessons learned. | Noted with appreciation of recognition. |
| Poznan strategic program Paragraph 65: The SBI also welcomed the continued support provided by the GEF for technology development and transfer on approval by the GEF Council of 8 proposed projects with technology transfer elements for climate change mitigation and 18 proposed projects for adaptation during the GEF reporting period. | Noted with appreciation of recognition. |
| Poznan strategic program Paragraph 66: The SBI further welcomed the approval by the GEF Council of the fourth phase of the global project on TNAs, whereby support is being provided to 15 LDCs and SIDS for conducting or updating their TNAs. The SBI noted that some LDCs and SIDS have not been included in the fourth phase of the project. | Noted with appreciation of recognition. Opportunities were provided for all LDCs and SIDS which had not yet undertaken a TNA to join the fourth phase. The fourth phase involving 17 LDCs and SIDSs was CEO-endorsed in July 2020. |
| Poznan strategic program Paragraph 67: The SBI noted the importance of implementing the technology action plans resulting from the TNA process, and encouraged Parties to consider using the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources for implementing the outcomes of TNAs and technology action plans. | Please see the response to paragraph 8 of the Decision 13/CP.25 above. |
| Poznan strategic program Paragraph 68: The SBI noted and considered the progress, challenges and lessons learned in relation to the global CTCN project supported by the GEF. | Noted. |
| Poznan strategic program Paragraph 69: The SBI welcomed the ongoing collaboration between the CTCN and the pilot regional climate technology and finance centres supported by the GEF, and encouraged the CTCN to consult with the GEF and relevant multilateral development banks to find ways to harness the lessons learned in a manner that benefits future projects. | Noted with appreciation of recognition. The CTCN met with the GEF at COP 25 for the 5 th CTCN-GEF Project Steering Committee meeting, during which the two entities discussed the possibilities for harnessing lessons learned and further developing partnerships. During the reporting period, the GEF has also approved an MSP with CTCN engagement titled <i>Piloting innovative financing for climate adaptation technologies in medium-sized cities</i> from the LDCF and the SCCF through the Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation. |
| Poznan strategic program Paragraph 72: The SBI recommended that the COP invite the GEF to consider: | The GEF has continued to work with partners to support the development of technology needs assessments by LDCs and SIDS which choose to undertake them. Two additional countries were |

| UNFCCC COP 25 Decision¹⁵ / CMA 2 Decision¹⁶ / SBI 51 and 50 Conclusions/SBSTA 51 and 50 Conclusions | GEF's Response |
|---|---|
| (a) Exploring ways to include in the fourth phase of the global project on TNAs the LDCs and SIDS that have never undertaken a TNA and have not been included in the phase; (b) Relevant recommendations contained in the evaluation report referred to in paragraph 70 above, within the scope of its mandate and its operational modalities. | included in the fourth phase of the TNA project, which includes the participation of 17 LDCs and SIDS. Furthermore, the GEF is continuing to work with the TEC and other partners to consider relevant recommendations contained in the TEC's updated evaluation of the PSP. Please see the response to paragraph 8 of the Decision 13/CP.25 above for more detailed information. |
| Report of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice on its fiftieth session, held in Bonn from 17 to 27 June 2019²⁷ | |
| Koronivia joint work on agriculture Paragraph 42: The SBSTA and the SBI welcomed the report on the first Koronivia road map in-session workshop, on topic 2(a) (modalities for implementation of the outcomes of the five in-session workshops on issues related to agriculture and other future topics that may arise from this work), which was held in conjunction with SB 49. The SBSTA and the SBI considered the workshop report and agreed to welcome the presentation made by the GCF on its work on issues relating to agriculture, and welcome the subsequent clarification by the secretariat on the process for Parties to submit their views to the Standing Committee on Finance, in line with existing procedures, on elements to be taken into account in developing guidance for the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism. | Noted. |
| Koronivia joint work on agriculture Paragraph 44: The SBSTA and the SBI welcomed the participation in the workshops of observers and representatives of the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism (GEF and GCF), the Adaptation Fund, the GEF-administered Least Developed Countries Fund, and the constituted bodies under the Convention. They noted with appreciation the work already undertaken on issues related to agriculture by those entities, and recalled inviting them to contribute to the work and participate in the workshops set out in the Koronivia road map. | Please see the above response to paragraph 21 of the SBSTA 51 Report. |
| Report of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation on its fiftieth session, held in Bonn from 17 to 27 June 2019²⁸ | |
| Koronivia joint work on agriculture Paragraph 44: The SBI and the SBSTA welcomed the report on the first Koronivia road map in-session workshop, on topic 2(a) (modalities for implementation of the outcomes of the five in-session workshops on issues related to agriculture and other future topics that may arise from this work), which was held in conjunction with SB 49. The SBSTA and the SBI considered the workshop report and agreed to: | Noted. |

²⁷ The report of SBSTA 50 is available at: https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/sbsta2019_02E.pdf

²⁸ The report of SBI 50 is available at: https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/sbi2019_09E.pdf

| UNFCCC COP 25 Decision ¹⁵ / CMA 2 Decision ¹⁶ / SBI 51 and 50 Conclusions/SBSTA 51 and 50 Conclusions | GEF's Response |
|--|--|
| <p>Welcome the presentation made by the GCF on its work on issues relating to agriculture, and welcome the subsequent clarification by the secretariat on the process for Parties to submit their views to the Standing Committee on Finance, in line with existing procedures, on elements to be taken into account in developing guidance for the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism.</p> | |
| <p>Koronivia joint work on agriculture Paragraph 46: The SBI and the SBSTA welcomed the participation in the workshops of observers and representatives of the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism (GEF and GCF), the Adaptation Fund, the GEF-administered LDCF, and the constituted bodies under the Convention. They noted with appreciation the work already undertaken on issues related to agriculture by those entities, and recalled inviting them to contribute to the work and participate in the workshops set out in the Koronivia road map.</p> | <p>Please see the response above to paragraph 21 of the SBSTA 51 Report.</p> |
| <p>Matters relating to the least developed countries Paragraph 71: The SBI took note of the information note on LDCF support for graduating LDCs prepared by the GEF.</p> | <p>An information document was prepared for the 27th Meeting of the LDCF/SCCF Council held in December 2019, which further specified LDCF support for graduating LDCs.²⁹</p> |
| <p>Matters relating to the least developed countries Paragraph 72: The SBI decided to recommend that in its decision on guidance to the GEF, COP 25 request the GEF, in administering the LDCF, to continue facilitating the smooth transition of countries graduating from LDC status by continuing to provide approved funding through the LDCF until the completion of projects approved by the LDCF Council prior to those countries' graduation from LDC status.</p> | <p>Please see the response to paragraph 10 of the Decision 13/CP.25 above.</p> |
| <p>Development and transfer of technologies: Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer Paragraph 78: The SBI welcomed the information on progress in the implementation of the Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer contained in the report of the GEF to COP 24 and noted the related challenges and lessons learned.</p> | <p>Noted with appreciation of recognition.</p> |
| <p>Development and transfer of technologies: Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer Paragraph 79: The SBI welcomed the continued support provided by the GEF for technology development and transfer, including innovation. It also welcomed the ongoing collaboration between the regional climate technology transfer and finance centres and the CTCN. It encouraged the GEF, the regional centres and the CTCN to continue to collaborate with a view to providing further support to developing country Parties for scaling up their technology-related</p> | <p>The GEF continues to collaborate with the regional centers and the CTCN, to support in assisting developing countries on technology-related needs and activities for enhanced mitigation and adaptation action.</p> |

²⁹ GEF, 2019, [Least Developed Countries Fund Support for Graduating Least Developed Countries](#), Council document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.27/Inf.05.

| UNFCCC COP 25 Decision ¹⁵ / CMA 2 Decision ¹⁶ / SBI 51 and 50 Conclusions/SBSTA 51 and 50 Conclusions | GEF's Response |
|--|--|
| action for enhanced mitigation and adaptation action, in a balanced manner. | |
| <p>Development and transfer of technologies: Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer Paragraph 80:</p> <p>The SBI noted the information provided in the report referred to in paragraph 78 above on the collaboration between the GEF focal points and national designated entities for technology development and transfer in response to an invitation from SBI 47,49 and encouraged strengthened collaboration so as to enhance coherence between the support provided by the GEF and that provided by the CTCN for technology transfer activities. It also encouraged the GEF and the CTCN to facilitate the collaboration, as appropriate.</p> | <p>The GEF continues to respond to invitations to consult with the CTCN on the identification of ways to enhance information-sharing among national designated entities and GEF Operational Focal Points (OFPs). The GEF will continue to receive and share information on collaboration between GEF focal points and national designated entities for technology development and transfer and provide this information in its reports to the COP. The GEF has also invited the CTCN to participate in GEF Extended Constituency Workshops to engage with GEF OFPs on this matter.</p> <p>The GEF has also approved a MSP titled <i>Piloting innovative financing for climate adaptation technologies in medium-sized cities</i>, as part of the Challenge Program on Adaptation Innovation. The Implementing Agency of this project is United Nations Development Agency (UNIDO), which is also the co-host of the CTCN. The Executing Entity for this project will be the Network Members / Consortium Partners of the CTCN.</p> |

2 Engagement with the UNFCCC

6. Over the reporting period, the GEF Secretariat took part in the UNFCCC negotiation process, including through active participation in COP 25, held December 2-15, 2019, in Madrid, Spain, under the Chilean Presidency.

7. The GEF report to COP 25, approved by the GEF Council through decision by mail, was submitted to the UNFCCC Secretariat on August 29, 2019.³⁰ The report summarized support provided to countries through the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, as well as the CBIT Trust Fund (CBIT TF). The report contained the guidance to the GEF received from COP 24 and the GEF responses.

8. On October 9, 2019, the GEF submitted to the UNFCCC an addendum to the COP report on the status of resources approved by the GEF for the preparation of National Communications (NCs) and Biennial Update Reports from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention.

9. The COP agreed on guidance to the GEF that welcomed the GEF Report to COP 25 as well as the policies recently approved by the Council. The COP also welcomed with appreciation the contributions made by developed country Parties to the LDCF and SCCF, and encouraged additional voluntary financial contributions to provide support for adaptation.

10. At COP 25, the GEF Secretariat highlighted the work done to implement COP 24 guidance and its efforts to support the successful implementation of the Paris Agreement, and provided a

³⁰ GEF, 2019, [Report of the GEF to the 25th Session of the COP to the UNFCCC](#).

summary of the progress made in the programming of GEF-7 resources. The GEF also participated in and/or organized several meetings, including the following:

- (a) On December 2, 2019, GEF personnel delivered an intervention outlining GEF support for NCs and Biennial Update Reports (BURs) during the SBI plenary. The GEF delegation also participated in contact groups and other sessions as requested to provide briefings to Parties and to respond to questions on GEF activities, its support to Parties, and its responses to COP guidance.
- (b) Two official GEF side events were organized during the COP: “Scaling up Climate Change Adaptation Action in Vulnerable Countries – The Least Developed Countries Perspective”, on December 4, 2019, and “Decarbonizing Transport: Promoting E-Mobility in Developing Countries” on December 6, 2019.
- (c) GEF personnel participated in mandated events and other engagements, including a workshop under the Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture titled “Improved Nutrient Use and Manure Management Towards Sustainable and Resilient Agricultural Systems”, on December 3, 2019.
- (d) The GEF CEO participated in several high-level events, including the “Ministerial Dialogue on Adaptation” organized by the COP Presidency, on December 10, 2019; the “High-Level Forum of Global Committee on Adaptation Convening Countries Raising Ambition” ahead of the 2020 Climate Adaptation Summit, on December 10, 2019; a meeting organized by the Amazon Governors Forum, also on December 10, 2019; and the “Leadership Dialogue on Turning the Tide on Deforestation”, organized by the UN, on December 12, 2019.
- (e) In the context of the enhanced dialogue and coordinated engagement with the GCF, several events were organized and co-hosted jointly by the GCF and GEF at the joint GCF + GEF Pavilion, attended by the GEF CEO and the Executive Director of the GCF. These included the high-level event on blended finance; an event on collaborative engagement; and the Third Annual Dialogue of Climate Finance Delivery Channels.
- (f) The GEF CEO also participated in the high-level events organized by the GEF during the second week of the COP at the GCF + GEF Pavilion. These included the “Sustainable Food and Land Use Systems for a Cool and Healthy Planet” event on December 9, 2019; the “Adaptation: A Business Imperative” event on December 10, 2019; the “Enhanced Transparency for Informed Decision-Making: Unlocking Climate Action from National and Non-State Actors” event on December 12, 2019; and the launch of the GEF Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation on December 11, 2019.
- (g) Other events attended by the GEF CEO included “Ambition and action for 1.5 degrees: non-Party stakeholders and Paris Agreement implementation” organized by CDP and C40; “Resilience Roundtable on Accelerating Action to Build a Resilient 1.5-Degree World” organized by the Global Resilience Partnership; “Launch of the Alliance for Hydromet Development”; the “Technology Executive Committee Dialogue on Endogenous Capacities and Technologies”; “Accelerating Action on Nature-Based Solutions Together in 2020”; “Nature Agenda and Adaptation: identifying opportunities for mutual reinforcement and nature benefits” organized by the World Wildlife Fund

(WWF); “Supporting the Implementation of Technologies Through Technology Needs Assessments and Nationally Determined Contributions”; and several other events.

- (h) Events coverage and news articles related to GEF participation in COP 25 are available on the GEF website: <https://www.thegef.org/events/gef-unfccc-cop25>.

11. The GEF Secretariat participated in the following other UNFCCC-related meetings and provided updates on the GEF replenishment, programming, responses to COP guidance, thematic programming, and capacity building, among other topics:

- (a) GCF Programming Conference, August 19-23, 2019;
- (b) Second Replenishment Meeting of the GCF, August 29-30, 2019;
- (c) 36th Least Developed Country Expert Group meeting, August 29-30, 2019;
- (d) 2019 Forum of the Standing Committee on Finance on “Climate Finance and Sustainable Cities”, September 12-13, 2019;
- (e) Nineteenth meeting of the Technology Executive Committee, September 16-19, 2019;
- (f) Twenty-first UNFCCC Standing Committee on Finance, October 3-5, 2019;
- (g) GCF Private Investment for Climate Conference, October 7-9, 2019;
- (h) Pledging Conference for GCF’s First Replenishment, October 24-25, 2019;
- (i) UN/GCF/NDC Partnership Consultation: Realizing NDCs through investment planning, February 27-28, 2020; and
- (j) Fourth Paris Committee on Capacity-Building, June 22-25, 2020.

12. Representatives of the UNFCCC Secretariat engaged in the GEF and LDCF/SCCF Council meetings held during this reporting period.

PART II: GEF INITIATIVES

13. Key initiatives underway to enhance GEF support for CCM and CCA, and for the delivery of global environmental benefits, include the roll out of the GEF-7 Impact Programs (IPs), the advances on the GEF-7 agenda on private sector engagement, the continued engagement with other climate funds to ensure complementarity across sources of climate finance, and the updates on environmental and social safeguards and gender equity policies and their application to GEF projects.

14. In addition, the GEF continues to assist countries in moving towards the implementation of the Paris Agreement and COP 25 and other decisions, including as these relate to the CBIT, and to support developing country Parties in aligning, as appropriate, their programming with priorities as identified in their NDCs, where they exist, and promote synergies across its focal areas. The following sections discuss GEF initiatives to implement the Paris Agreement and COP 25 and other decisions, in addition to other GEF initiatives with clear benefits for CCM and CCA that were underway in the reporting period.

1. GEF-7 Impact Programs

15. The GEF 2020 Strategy emphasized that achieving objectives of multilateral environmental agreements, including the UNFCCC, at scale would require focusing on tackling the drivers of environmental degradation in an integrated manner. During GEF-6, the GEF launched three Integrated Approach Pilots (IAPs) in the areas of commodity supply chains, food security, and sustainable cities. These pilots provided useful lessons on importance of integrated approach to achieving large-scale global environmental benefits.

16. Building on these lessons, the GEF-7 Programming Directions included opportunities for countries to participate in Impact Programs (IPs) that collectively address key drivers of environmental degradation in major economic systems at regional and global scales. Three IPs were launched: *Sustainable Cities Impact Program (SCIP)*; *Food Systems, Land Use, and Restoration Impact Program (FOLUR IP)*; and *Sustainable Forest Management Impact Program (SFM IP)*. These IPs offer the potential for the GEF to contribute to systemic and transformational change while achieving global environmental benefits at scale. The details of these programs are provided below.

17. The GEF-7 SCIP aims to help cities pursue integrated urban planning and target systemic drivers of environmental degradation such as urban sprawl, rising consumption, and congestion to achieve sustainable, low-carbon and resilient growth. The SCIP engages with mayors, global city networks, multilateral agencies, private sector, and civil society to support cities in their sustainability ambitions and catalyze integrated planning and investments in innovative sustainability solutions. The SCIP is programmed in the reporting period (as well as at the midpoint of the GEF-7 period) with an investment of \$159.9 million (100 percent of the total resources allocated to the IP) and is estimated to reduce nearly 184.5 Mt CO₂ eq and improve resilience of 47 million people.

18. More specifically, the SCIP has four key components: (i) evidence-based, sustainable, and integrated urban planning; (ii) low-carbon and resilient investments; (iii) innovative financing and scaling up; and (iv) advocacy, knowledge exchange, capacity building, and partnerships

development. The program adopts dual, interlinked components of 1) supporting nine countries and 24 cities to adopt integrated planning approaches and implement sustainability solutions at city level; and 2) building a global platform for knowledge exchange, learning, and fostering partnerships. The program builds on the GEF-6 *Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot Program* which supports 11 countries and 28 cities globally and created the Global Platform on Sustainable Cities.

19. The FOLUR IP seeks to promote transformational shifts in agricultural land use and food systems that are major drivers of environmental degradation around the world. This IP has four main components: (i) development of integrated landscape management systems; (ii) promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible commodity value chains; (iii) restoration of natural habitats; and (iv) program coordination, collaboration, and capacity building. This design aims to promote comprehensive land planning, improve governance and align incentives, scale up innovation and practical applications in commodity value chain partnerships, leverage investments through linkage with private and public partners, and promote institutional collaboration in integrated approaches at the country and landscape level.

20. Building on a GEF-6 pilot program, the GEF-7 FOLUR IP seeks to deepen the GEF's engagement on beef, palm oil, and soy supply chains, and broaden its focus to include cocoa and coffee. In addition to promoting deforestation-free agricultural commodity supply chains, the IP aims to increase sustainability of major food crops (e.g., rice, wheat, maize) to tackle negative externalities, and restore degraded landscapes for sustainable production and ecosystem services. The GEF support helps countries meet the growing demand for increased crop and livestock production, while reducing the risk of further expansion of farmland, erosion of genetic diversity, overexploitation of land and water resources, overuse of chemical fertilizers and pesticides, and inefficient practices that lead to deforestation, biodiversity loss, land degradation, and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The FOLUR IP will directly engage 27 countries across eight commodities and four regions. The FOLUR IP was programmed with \$102.6 million of GEF funding including PPGs and Agency Fees in the reporting period, with expected GHG emissions reductions of 94.9 Mt CO₂ eq. During the first two years of the GEF-7 period, \$340.7 million in total has been programmed (79 percent of the total allocation) and the IP will mitigate 304.6 Mt CO₂ eq.

21. The SFM IP focuses on the Amazon, the Congo Basin, and important dryland landscapes around the world that are globally important for biodiversity and carbon storage, and provide livelihoods and subsistence to communities that rely on forests and agriculture for their survival. In these globally important ecosystems, the IP aims to change the future development trajectory from natural resource depletion and biodiversity erosion to one based on natural capital management and productive landscapes. The program supports integrated ecosystem-scale management for maintaining ecological integrity and functioning, while delivering global environmental benefits in these globally important forest biomes and systems.

22. The *Amazon Sustainable Landscapes 2 Impact Program* seeks to help the region move away from a business-as-usual scenario characterized by forest conversion into low productivity cattle ranching and other unsustainable land uses to forest- and freshwater-friendly landscapes.

23. The *Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program* aims to catalyze transformational change in conservation and sustainable management of the Congo Basin through landscape

approaches that empower local communities and forest dependent people, and through partnership with the private sector.

24. The *Dryland Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program* strives to avoid, reduce, and reverse further degradation, desertification, and deforestation of land and ecosystems in drylands, through the sustainable management of production landscapes. The Program aims to transform the management of drylands in selected regions, establishing the basis for upscaling sustainable dryland management to regional and global levels.

25. These three key forest regions are the major ecosystems where an integrated and concerted SFM approach can truly transform the course of development and produce multiple benefits for biodiversity, climate change, and land degradation. The SFM IP was fully programmed in FY 2019 with \$263.1 million (100 percent of the total resources allocated to the IP) of GEF funding including PPGs and Agency Fees and is expected to achieve 232.3 Mt CO₂ eq GHG emissions reductions in total.

2. Private Sector Engagement

26. The Seventh Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund included a two-pillar strategy to engage with the private sector. The first pillar is focused on blended finance through the Non-Grant Instrument Program (NGI Program) with an amount of \$136.0 million; the second pillar is to work with the private sector as an agent for market transformation. This two-pillar strategy is aligned with UNFCCC guidance to the GEF received at COP 23, which encouraged the GEF to further enhance engagement with the private sector for the development of climate technology projects and to further expand the use of non-grant instruments.

27. Blended finance projects supported through the GEF NGI Program are selected following a competitive process, through several rounds of open calls for proposals to GEF Agencies. Since the start of the GEF-7 period, the GEF has launched two calls for proposals and received 25 project proposals requesting \$381.7 million in financing, well above the amount available for the NGI Program in GEF-7.

28. In the first call for proposals which closed in August 2019, the GEF received eighteen project proposals and selected three projects. The three projects are expected to generate climate change mitigation benefits totaling 22.9 Mt CO₂ eq in GHG emissions reductions towards the GEF-7 target. An example of a project supported by the first call for proposals of the NGI is the Agtech Fund for Inclusion and Sustainability, a venture capital fund that will invest in scaling up innovative agriculture technology companies and start-ups in Latin America and the Caribbean. The fund will invest in companies to develop innovative solutions that decrease intensity of natural resource use in agricultural production; increase the climate resilience of farmers; and enable climate mitigation in carbon-intensive agriculture. It is expected that 25,000 to 33,000 small- and medium-scale farmers will improve environmental performance as a result of the innovations introduced by the invested companies, resulting in significant GHG emissions being sequestered or avoided. The project has identified promising opportunities for investing in innovative agricultural technologies, including precision agriculture and digital farm tools; value-chain solutions to improve market conditions and value capturing; financial services including new models of agriculture insurance; and biological alternatives to reduce or replace agrochemicals.

29. The second call for proposals was launched in January 2020 and resulted in GEF Council approval of four innovative projects totaling \$59.1 million including PPGs and Agency Fees. The common feature of the four projects is their potential to transform industries, create novel financial products, or test new asset classes that are important to the future of the planet yet are challenging for financiers without GEF support. Out of the four projects, two are expected to result in climate benefits and to cumulatively generate 38.8 Mt CO₂ eq in GHG emission reductions towards the GEF-7 emission reduction target.

30. As an example of a project finance through the second round of the NGI, the *IFC-GEF Greener Shipping Investment Platform* has potential to transform one of the largest and most carbon-intensive industries towards a low-carbon future by accelerating the retrofitting of fleets to increase fuel efficiency. Recognizing the vital role that private sector financing must play to decarbonize the shipping sector, the International Maritime Organization has expressed support for this project, which is expected to result in 20.3 Mt CO₂ eq of GHG emission reductions in total.

31. The second pillar of private sector engagement is to mobilize the private sector as an agent of market transformation. This pillar strives to achieve private sector engagement at all scales, and across all GEF programs, to transform the markets and economic systems required to tackle key drivers of environmental degradation, reverse unsustainable global trends, and extend the delivery of global environmental benefits.

32. A core element of this second pillar is multi-stakeholder platforms, which are vital for investments to achieve a greater scale of impact with accelerated timeframes. For example, multi-stakeholder platforms currently engaged with the GEF IPs include initiatives that originated from the Low-Carbon Technology Partnership Initiative from COP 21 in 2015, as well as those featured in the Lima Paris Action Agenda and the Non-State Actor Zone for Climate Action registry. Multi-stakeholder platforms working in climate change provide the GEF with the opportunity to scale private sector partnerships vertically through value chains, as well as horizontally through landscapes, cities, countries, and regions. This horizontal and vertical interconnectivity can extend the reach and influence of GEF funding well beyond specific geographies and bring a wider range of resources and solutions from all levels of the private sector.

33. For example, through the FOLUR IP, the Sustainable Rice Landscapes Initiative is building the resilience of rice landscapes and reducing GHG emissions through methane reduction from paddy rice in Viet Nam, Thailand, Indonesia, Cambodia, and China. The initiative is engaging private sector actors across the entire rice value chain from small-scale farmers, technology, seed, and input providers, the largest global rice traders, and branded rice products. As a further example, also through the FOLUR IP in the West African Cocoa Belt of Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana, the Cocoa Forests Initiative led by the World Cocoa Foundation is working to reduce rates of deforestation, enhance forest restoration activities and build the resilience of cocoa landscapes to the effects of climate change. The Cocoa and Forest Initiative represents over 100 companies covering approximately 80 percent of the global cocoa and chocolate market, therefore representing a huge opportunity for transfer of knowledge and lessons learned widely across the industry and into other commodities linked to deforestation.

34. GEF private sector engagements also include a communications partnership with the Daily Telegraph, a British daily newspaper distributed across the United Kingdom and internationally, to highlight leadership in climate change from business leaders. Recent features involving the GEF have included the High-Level Climate Action Champion for COP 26. Additional coverage is envisaged in the period leading up to COP 26, including developments under the Science Based Targets Initiative and adaptation measures from the private sector in infrastructure and energy.

3. Innovation

35. The GEF-7 strategy calls for innovation, including with the private sector, to transform economic systems to address the drivers of climate change and environmental degradation. Concerted efforts have been made during this reporting period to support innovation through project investments by the GEFTF, as well as through the LDCF and SCCF.

a. Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation

36. With focused support from the LDCF and SCCF, the GEF is advancing innovation for adaptation with the private sector, with the objective of harnessing the potential of private sector actors to achieve the global goal on adaptation for the Paris Agreement. The GEF Challenge Program on Adaptation Innovation was launched in 2019 to test, validate, and learn from scalable, bankable, or otherwise fundable investment approaches, technologies, and partnerships. This program, resourced through the LDCF and SCCF, is breaking new ground in innovating adaptation practice by creating and sharing new and potentially transformative solutions for climate resilience, often with non-traditional partners from private sector finance and technology sectors. Details on progress made through this Challenge Program are provided in Part III, section 2(e), of this report.

b. Global Cleantech Innovation Program (GCIP)

37. Support for innovative private sector solutions on clean technology, or “cleantech”, has been one of the pillars of the work of the GEF since its inception. Early experiences took the form of individual projects and initiatives in support of specific technologies or business models with a potential to be scaled up and generate emission reductions at scale.

38. More recently, the GEF support for innovation in clean technology transitioned to a more programmatic approach, under the umbrella of the *GEF and UNIDO Global Cleantech Innovation Programme (GCIP)*. GCIP’s main objective is to strengthen innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystems that catalyze the transformation of cleantech innovations by Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) into viable investment businesses and link them to financing opportunities. An integral part of GCIP is the development of an enabling environment for cleantech innovation and entrepreneurship. Since a pilot in South Africa, GCIP has been implemented in a total of nine countries under GEF-5 and GEF-6 cycles: Armenia, India, Malaysia, Morocco, Pakistan, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, and South Africa.

39. By late 2019, over 1,200 cleantech SMEs had been trained, mentored, and linked to funding opportunities. A small sample of 14 out of 1,000 GCIP alumni indicated that they had raised \$22 million in investment and created over 300 jobs while delivering 600,000 tCO₂ eq in emission reductions between 2011 and 2017. The leveraging effect of the GCIP is demonstrated by the fact that these 14 companies have such high growth prospects that they projected that by end of

2020, they will have generated revenues of over \$263 million, created over 1,200 new jobs and generated over 4.8 Mt CO₂ eq of direct GHG emissions savings. This was achieved from a total budget of \$12 million invested across the initial nine countries during GEF-5 and GEF-6. Beyond the results at individual businesses level, the GCIP has also delivered outcomes at national level by nurturing innovation ecosystems and strengthening capacity at national organizations.

40. In 2018, the GEF's Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) conducted an evaluation of the GEF-5 and GEF-6 support of the GCIP.³¹ The evaluation concluded that the program is "highly relevant and will remain so as developing countries realize the economic and environmental opportunities to take up cleantech innovation as an engine of low-carbon growth." It also affirmed that the program meaningfully contributed to the development of cleantech innovation ecosystems with improved performance over time through business acceleration, capacity-building, and institutional strengthening. As key forward-looking observations, the IEO evaluation recommended that future efforts in this space would have benefitted from increased coordination at regional or global level, as opposed to independent national projects, and from a coordinated monitoring framework to ensure comparability in reporting of results across countries.

41. In consideration of the continued interest from recipient countries in this topic, the GEF and UNIDO further expanded the GCIP approach during the GEF-7 cycle, increasing its scope to additional countries. During this reporting period, and building on the GEF-5 and GEF-6 experiences and taking on board the key recommendations from the IEO evaluation, a new GEF-7 GCIP phase was approved by the GEF Council in December 2019, which was structured as a global program with several national child projects. With a renewed focus on global coordination and linkages to global markets, the GEF-7 GCIP has included six additional new countries (Cambodia, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Nigeria, and Uruguay) while providing additional funding to four countries with existing national GEF innovation projects (Morocco, South Africa, Turkey, and Ukraine). The GEF-7 GCIP program is funded with \$19.6 million from the GEF, leveraging \$137.9 million in co-financing, and is expected to generate 10.3 Mt CO₂ eq of GHG emission reductions in total.

c. NGI Support for Innovation

42. Based on guidance received from the COP and GEF-7 priorities, innovative financing is also being delivered by the GEF through several projects supported by the NGI, which is described in the previous section on private sector engagement. For example, the NGI-supported *Circular Economy Regional Initiative (Near Zero Waste)* provides a results-based financing mechanism to scale up circular economy initiatives for private sector entities in the Western Balkans and Turkey. The project's innovative financing rewards behavioral change with interest rate reduction and technical assistance, while addressing barriers to investment in a circular economy. The results-based lending mechanism consists of reducing interest rates of a loan provided by the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) when companies achieve pre-defined milestones to achieve a circular economy. The support is to be provided in coordination with EBRD technical assistance aimed at identifying circular economy processes and practices that can deliver transformational change. The project expects to deliver 21.9 Mt CO₂ eq of GHG emission reductions in total, as well as generate disposal avoidance of 50,000 metric tons

³¹ GEF, 2018, [Evaluation of the GEF-UNIDO Global Cleantech Innovation Programme](#), Council document GEF/C.55/03 GEF/C.57/03.

of marine litter, and 10,000 metric tons of contaminated material with an estimated Persistent organic pollutants (POPs) content of 2,000 metric tons. The interventions will also reduce 75gTEQ of unintentionally produced POPs.

4. *Complementarity in Climate Finance*

43. The GEF Secretariat and the GCF Secretariat continued to discuss concrete measures to enhance collaboration and coordinated engagement throughout the reporting period. The GEF CEO and Chairperson and the GCF Executive Director led discussions and joint engagements on shared topics of relevance, including the Great Green Wall initiative and blended finance.

44. Efforts to enhance complementarity through the coordinated engagement initiative between the two funds have continued. Productive dialogue and exchange of information relative to the respective programming strategies continued, for instance regarding land restoration, nature-based solutions for climate change, low- and zero-carbon transportation, clean technology innovation, and climate change adaptation planning.

45. The GEF and the GCF continued to explore opportunities to collaborate on specific projects or programs and to further expand the portfolio of countries that could receive coordinated financial support from the two institutions through either parallel or sequential financing. To date, initiatives for which support from the two institutions is being considered include projects to promote electric mobility in Mauritius, the further expansion of the GEF-funded, large-scale program on the Great Green Wall across the Sahelian countries, and a clean energy access and rural electrification project in Burkina Faso.

46. In addition to the coordinated programming efforts, GEF and GCF participated in, and also co-hosted, a number of events and initiatives as follows:

- (a) GEF Representatives participated to the GCF Global Programming Conference in Songdo, Republic of Korea, August 19-23, 2019. During the Conference, GEF and GCF organized a joint working lunch on coordinated engagement that was attended by GEF Operational Focal Points (OFPs) and GCF National Designated Authorities of several countries, as well as representative from GEF Implementing Agencies and GCF Accredited Entities. GEF and GCF shared reflections on options, including opportunities for synergies and alignment through thematic programming, joint country programming, and support for NDCs update and development of investment plans. The event also served as a platform for several leading countries including Lao PDR, Costa Rica, and Mauritius to showcase the latest examples and lessons being learned from the coordinated engagement initiative.
- (b) GEF Representatives participated to the 2019 GCF Private Investment for Climate Conference in Incheon, Republic of Korea, October 7-9, 2019. The GEF Secretariat presented its experience with private sector engagement, particularly on investments in the forestry and land use sectors.
- (c) The GEF Secretariat hosted the GCF-GEF Technical Consultation on Coordinated Engagement workshop in Washington, DC, USA, on October 16, 2019. The technical workshop brought together approximately 20 staff and managers from GEF and GCF Secretariats, with the view of presenting and discussing the respective

strategies and programming directions and to build mutual understanding. The workshop also explored opportunities for collaboration and sharing of lessons learned on a select number of proposed flagship initiatives, including the Great Green Wall, electric mobility and sustainable cities, as well as to discuss a way forward on coordinated engagement.

- (d) During COP 25, the GEF CEO and Chairperson, together with several GEF Secretariat staff participated to the Third Annual Dialogue of Climate Funds, which was held on December 11, 2019. The event, which was open to members of the respective governing bodies of the institutions, was chaired by the GCF and attended by representatives of the Adaptation Fund (AF), the Climate Investment Funds (CIFs), the GCF, and the GEF. During the meeting, participants concurred that enhanced collaboration among climate financing entities has the potential to mutually strengthen the effectiveness and impact of the solutions offered to developing countries. Participants identified some streams of future work such as (i) Strengthening of country investment planning; (ii) Continuing to deepen the close collaboration among the secretariats including via following up the meeting through an operational workshop; and (iii) Exploring solutions to jointly overcome the knowledge management needs in fields like indicators and methodologies; among others.

47. As a visible manifestation of ongoing coordination, the GEF and GCF, for the first time, hosted a joint Pavilion at COP 25, which held several events organized by both organizations on topics spanning an array of programming strategies. The GCF + GEF Pavilion provided the two climate funds with a common space to showcase and further discuss concrete measures to enhance collaboration and coordinated engagement in service of Parties. It also represented a fruitful opportunity for GEF and GCF Secretariats' staff to interact and build collaboration among peers at different levels.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards

48. The GEF Council, at its 53rd meeting in November 2017, requested that the GEF Secretariat present an updated policy on environmental and social safeguards for consideration at its 55th meeting in December 2018. The GEF's first policy on environmental and social safeguards dates to 2011, when the Council decided to pilot an expansion of the GEF Partnership. In 2017, the GEF IEO reviewed this policy and found it had catalyzed safeguards development in many GEF Agencies and, in a number of cases, prompted GEF Agencies adopt their first comprehensive safeguard policy frameworks. The review found that the GEF did not have requirements in place for monitoring and reporting on safeguards implementation. In addition, the IEO review suggested a number of possible gaps in coverage.

49. In response to IEO's findings and the Council's request, the GEF Secretariat initiated a consultative process to further review and update its safeguards policy in 2018. The GEF council approved an updated Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards Policy³² at its 55th meeting in 2018, covering several expanded and strengthened minimum standards in line with good international practice. The new policy came into effect on July 1, 2019 and apply to all new projects and programs submitted for GEF financing on or after the date of effectiveness. For

³² GEF, 2019, [Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards](#), SD/PL/03.

projects under implementation, the policy applies to all mid-term reviews and terminal evaluations submitted after one year from the date of effectiveness.

50. The policy sets out the GEF's approach to anticipating, and then avoiding, preventing, minimizing, mitigating, managing, offsetting, or compensating adverse impacts that GEF-financed projects and programs may have on people or the environment, thereby enhancing the environmental and social outcomes. The policy further introduces mandatory requirements for identifying and addressing environmental and social risks and impacts in GEF-financed projects and programs, requiring that GEF projects are screened as early as possible to identify risks and potential impacts in areas such as:

- (a) Climate Change and Disaster;
- (b) Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Individuals or Groups;
- (c) Disability Inclusion; and Adverse Gender-related impact, including Gender-Based Violence and Sexual Exploitation;
- (d) Biodiversity Conservation and the Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources;
- (e) Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement;
- (f) Indigenous Peoples;
- (g) Cultural Heritage;
- (h) Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention;
- (i) Labor and Working Conditions;
- (j) Community Health, Safety and Security.

51. In addition, under the provisions of the Policy a compliance assessment of all GEF Agencies was initiated in 2019.³³ In all cases where an Agency was found not to be fully compliant, the Agency developed plans of actions to achieve compliance. Moreover, the policy requests that all GEF projects document and report on environmental and social risks and potential impacts, and their management, throughout the GEF project and program cycle. These requirements are intended to enhance the flow of information on safeguards implementation across GEF-financed projects. The GEF Secretariat issued guidelines³⁴ in 2019 to support the effective implementation of the project and program level documentation and reporting requirements set out in the Policy by GEF Agencies, the GEF Secretariat, as well as GEF OFPs in recipient countries, executing partners, and other stakeholders.

6. Gender Equality

52. The GEF's approach to gender equality corresponds with the recognition by the Parties to the UNFCCC of the importance of involving women and men equally in the development and implementation of national climate policies and projects, including the new UNFCCC gender

³³ GEF, 2019, [Report on the Assessment of Agencies' Compliance with Minimum Standards in the GEF Policies on: Environmental and Social Safeguards; Gender Equality; and Stakeholder Engagement](#), Council Document GEF/C.57/05.

³⁴ GEF, 2019, [Guidelines on GEF's Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards](#), Council Document GEF/C.57/Inf.05.

action plan adopted at COP 25.³⁵ The GEF Policy on Gender Equality³⁶ that introduced new principles and standards on gender equality, including a set of new project specific requirements, has guided the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of all GEF programs and projects since 2018.

53. Efforts to ensure meaningful gender mainstreaming in GEF's projects is further supported by the GEF Gender Implementation Strategy³⁷ and Guidance that was developed in close collaboration with GEF partners in 2018.³⁸ In line with the Strategy, the GEF is working to ensure gender-responsive approaches and results in GEF projects by, among other efforts, enhancing capacity of its partners to address gender equality, increasing GEF's collaboration with partners to generate knowledge on links between gender and the environment and enhancing GEF's corporate processes for tracking gender equality results across the GEF project portfolio. Specifically, in terms of raising awareness and building capacity on gender and the environment, the GEF is promoting its "Open Online Course on Gender and Environment."³⁹ The GEF Secretariat has actively promoted the course by including it in events and workshops such as COP 25. As of March 31, 2020, 11,144 certificates were issued across the course's six modules, with over 2,000 certificates issued for the module on gender and climate.

54. An analysis in May 2020, by the GEF Secretariat, of GEF-7 programs and projects⁴⁰ continues to validate good compliance with the principles and requirements set out in the GEF Policy on Gender Equality, suggesting that the Secretariat's activities, guided by the Strategy, is translating into gender-responsive approaches across GEF projects. GEF-7 projects include plans to contribute to gender results in areas such as improving women's access to and control over natural resources, women's participation in natural resource decision-making at different levels, as well as supporting women's economic opportunities. The analysis also suggests a positive trend in terms of projects actively reaching out to women's organizations and gender focal points of relevant national ministries, nongovernment organizations, and civil society.

³⁵ See Decision 3/CP.25 of the UNFCCC, available at:

https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/cp2019_13a01E.pdf

³⁶ GEF, 2017, *Policy on Gender Equality*, Council Document GEF/C.53/04.

³⁷ GEF, 2018, *GEF Gender Implementation Strategy*, Council Document GEF/C.54/06.

³⁸ GEF, 2018, *Guidance to Advance Gender Equality*, Council Document GEF/C.54/Inf.05.

³⁹ GEF, 2018, *Open Online Course on Gender and Environment*.

⁴⁰ For further information, please see GEF, 2019, *Progress report on the GEF Gender Implementation Strategy*, Council Document GEF/C.56/Inf.03 and GEF, 2020, *Progress report on the GEF Gender Implementation Strategy*, Council Document GEF/C.58/Inf.05.

PART III: GEF ACHIEVEMENTS

1. *Climate Change Mitigation*

a. *Overview of GEF Support for Mitigation*

55. Since its establishment in 1991, the GEF has been funding projects with CCM objectives in developing countries and countries with economies in transition (CEIT). As of June 30, 2020, the GEF has funded 1,008 projects on CCM with \$6,689.7 million GEF funding, including PPGs and Agency Fees, in 166 countries. The GEF funding leveraged \$57,193.7 million from a variety of sources, including GEF Agencies, national and local governments, multilateral and bilateral agencies, the private sector, and civil society organizations (CSOs).

56. In addition, the GEF has supported 396 EAs, including NCs, BURs and TNAs, with \$505.8 million, including PPGs and Agency Fees from the GEFTF. The GEF's support to EAs is described in Part III, Section 5. Combined with the 1,008 CCM projects above and these EAs, an average co-financing ratio as of June 30, 2020 is 1 (GEF) to 8.8 (co-financing).⁴¹

57. Out of 1,008 projects that were implemented in developing countries and CEIT (see Table 2), 26.5 percent were in Africa, 30.5 percent in Asia, 18.4 percent in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), and 16.0 percent in Eastern Europe and Central Asia (ECA). In addition, 88 projects were funded with global or regional scope, accounting for 8.7 percent of the overall CCM portfolio.

58. Seventeen GEF Agencies have participated in the implementation of these CCM projects. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the World Bank, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and UNIDO have the major shares of the portfolio in project development and implementation.

59. Table 3 presents these 1,008 projects by GEF phase and categorizes them by areas, including technology transfer, energy efficiency, renewable energy, sustainable transport, and urban systems, AFOLU, SGP, and mixed and others. They also include projects with multiple CCM objectives and multi-focal area (MFA) projects that have direct impact on GHG emission reductions. The total combined share of energy efficiency and renewable energy projects is significant, accounting for approximately 50.2 percent in terms of total number of projects, and 38.6 percent in terms of total CCM funding. The AFOLU sector accounts for 18.1 percent of the total project number and 28.6 percent of the total CCM funding. The sustainable transport and urban systems projects account for 10.4 percent in terms of total number of projects and 12.5 percent of the total CCM funding.

60. The GEF has supported technology transfer in CCM projects and programs. Overall, the GEF CCM portfolio can be characterized as supporting technology transfer as outlined by the COP. The GEF support focuses on testing and demonstrating innovative mechanisms that are complementary to the efforts of other financial mechanisms to scale up, replicate, and reach critical mass in a timely manner.

⁴¹ The co-financing ratio is calculated in accordance with the GEF Updated Co-financing Policy, including EAs but excluding PPGs and Agency Fees (GEF, 2018, [Updated Co-financing Policy](#), Council Document GEF/C.54/10/Rev.01).

Table 2: GEF Projects on Climate Change Mitigation by Region
(Excluding EAs and CBIT Trust Fund^a projects)

| Region ^b | Projects | | GEF amount ^c | | Co-financing | |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|
| | Number | Share | \$ millions | Share | \$ millions | Share |
| Africa | 267 | 26.5% | 1,358.8 | 20.3% | 9,890.0 | 17.3% |
| Asia | 307 | 30.5% | 1,969.7 | 29.4% | 22,537.1 | 39.4% |
| ECA | 161 | 16.0% | 783.8 | 11.7% | 7,056.6 | 12.3% |
| LAC | 185 | 18.4% | 1,286.9 | 19.2% | 8,724.0 | 15.3% |
| Global | 77 | 7.6% | 1,207.3 | 18.0% | 8,273.7 | 14.5% |
| Regional | 11 | 1.1% | 83.1 | 1.2% | 712.4 | 1.2% |
| Total | 1,008 | 100.0% | 6,689.7 | 100.0% | 57,193.7 | 100.0% |

^a CBIT projects funded by the CBIT TF are not included here. Since GEF-7, they have been funded by the GEFTF. Those are included.

^b The individual region rows include single country projects in that region; the “global” row includes multi-country projects spanning at least two regions; and the “regional” row includes multi-country projects in the same region.

^c These amounts include all focal area contributions to climate change, including Agency Fees and PPGs. The total includes \$2.0 billion from other focal areas and set-asides, including IAPs and IPs. These numbers include actual and expected co-financing.

Table 3: GEF Projects on Climate Change Mitigation by Phase
(Excluding EAs and CBIT Trust Fund^a projects) (In \$ Million)

| Phase | | Technology Transfer/ Innovative Low- Carbon Technologies ^b | Energy Efficiency | Renewable Energy | Transport / Urban | AFOLU ^c | SGP ^d | Mixed & Others ^e | Grand Total |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|---|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| GEF Pilot (1991-1994) | Number of Projects | 2 | 7 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 28 |
| | GEF Amount ^f | 10.1 | 33.3 | 94.5 | 9.0 | 4.0 | - | 46.7 | 197.6 |
| | Co-financing ^g | 0.1 | 341.2 | 1,848.0 | 2.0 | 0.1 | - | 145.9 | 2,337.2 |
| GEF-1 (1994-1998) | Number of Projects | 2 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 40 |
| | GEF Amount | 8.2 | 134.4 | 146.9 | - | - | - | 27.0 | 316.4 |
| | Co-financing | 6.2 | 447.5 | 809.7 | - | - | - | 94.5 | 1,357.8 |
| GEF-2 (1998-2002) | Number of Projects | 6 | 32 | 44 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 95 |
| | GEF Amount | 102.3 | 189.9 | 227.8 | 30.0 | 0.9 | - | 19.1 | 570.1 |
| | Co-financing | 827.8 | 2,025.4 | 1,097.8 | 28.3 | 1.0 | - | 182.9 | 4,163.3 |
| GEF-3 (2002-2006) | Number of Projects | 4 | 29 | 53 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 112 |
| | GEF Amount | 64.6 | 228.2 | 248.6 | 88.8 | - | - | 73.0 | 703.2 |
| | Co-financing | 309.2 | 1,310.1 | 1,462.3 | 886.1 | - | - | 339.3 | 4,306.9 |
| GEF-4 (2006-2010) | Number of Projects | 9 | 83 | 47 | 20 | 25 | 3 | 15 | 202 |
| | GEF Amount | 46.3 | 382.5 | 117.8 | 110.9 | 121.5 | 65.3 | 88.6 | 932.9 |
| | Co-financing | 215.2 | 3,747.4 | 855.7 | 2,082.7 | 870.9 | 44.5 | 490.4 | 8,306.8 |
| GEF-5 (2010-2014) | Number of Projects | 37 | 38 | 56 | 26 | 68 | 10 | 17 | 252 |
| | GEF Amount | 221.5 | 199.1 | 206.6 | 124.2 | 506.8 | 159.0 | 105.7 | 1,522.8 |
| | Co-financing | 1,787.9 | 4,355.7 | 2,022.5 | 2,554.1 | 2,338.6 | 160.5 | 1,046.1 | 14,265.5 |
| GEF-6 (2014-2018) | Number of Projects | 12 | 27 | 32 | 32 | 78 | 13 | 25 | 219 |
| | GEF Amount | 32.8 | 114.1 | 169.0 | 249.1 | 645.7 | 76.0 | 90.0 | 1,376.7 |
| | Co-financing | 171.4 | 1,282.6 | 2,778.3 | 3,542.6 | 4,408.4 | 105.3 | 681.2 | 12,969.7 |
| GEF-7 (2018-2022) | Number of Projects | 2 | 11 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 23 | 60 |
| | GEF Amount | 24.9 | 48.1 | 41.4 | 223.7 | 633.6 | 26.5 | 71.5 | 1,069.8 |
| | Co-financing | 189.0 | 671.2 | 481.7 | 2,455.5 | 5,409.4 | 51.1 | 228.6 | 9,486.5 |
| Total | Number of Projects | 74 | 243 | 263 | 105 | 182 | 33 | 108 | 1,008 |
| | GEF Amount | 510.6 | 1,329.8 | 1,252.6 | 835.7 | 1,912.5 | 326.8 | 521.7 | 6,689.7 |
| | Co-financing | 3,506.7 | 14,181.1 | 11,356.0 | 11,551.4 | 13,028.2 | 361.4 | 3,208.9 | 57,193.7 |

^a CBIT projects were funded by the CBIT TF in GEF-6. Since GEF-7, they have been funded by the GEFTF and they are included in 'Mixed and Others.'

^b 'Technology Transfer' (TT) means 'special initiative on technology transfer' up to GEF-4, 'promoting innovative low-carbon technologies (LCTs)' in GEF-5 and 'promoting timely development, demonstration, and financing of LCTs and CCM options' in GEF-6.

^c These include projects under the CCM focal objective focused on land use, land-use change and forestry, climate-smart agriculture, and projects receiving SFM incentive.

^d In addition to 33 GEF SGP projects and one global program in the table, there were 11 SGP projects from GEF Pilot to GEF-3 that have CCM objectives. However, funding contributed from CCM was not recorded in these early periods. The total GEF amount for these projects is \$261 million, and they have leveraged \$204 million of co-financing. In GEF-7, there were two projects supporting the SGP global program with \$128 million in total GEF resources, leveraging \$128 million of co-financing.

^e Mixed projects are projects with multiple CCM objectives. 'Others' include seven projects relating to methane and three projects relating to fuel substitution. In GEF-6, others include five intended nationally determined contribution preparation projects and two applied research projects on the global commons. In GEF-7, others include 20 CBIT projects.

^f GEF amount includes PPGs and Agency Fees in this table.

^g Co-financing includes actual and expected co-financing in this table.

b. Achievements in the Reporting Period

61. In the reporting period, the GEF programmed \$491.6 million, including PPGs and Agency Fees, from the GEFTF for activities expected to generate CCM benefits, of which \$250.9 million were drawn from the CCM focal area and the rest from other GEF focal areas and incentive set-asides. These resources supported six investments in GEF programs, including three new programs and three additional investment tranches in existing programs, 32 CCM projects, and 12 EAs. These 50 programs and projects are expected to leverage approximately \$5.2 billion in co-financing, resulting in a co-financing ratio of 1 (GEF) to 11.5 (co-financing).⁴² Out of the 38 projects and programs excluding the 12 EAs (EAs are covered in Part III, Section 5 of this report), 16 were Medium-sized Projects (MSPs) and 22 were Full-sized Projects (FSPs). These 38 projects received \$476.3 million in GEFTF resources. Annex 2 lists the CCM projects, programs, and EAs approved under the GEFTF in the reporting period. In the first two years of the GEF-7 period, 34 countries have fully utilized their CCM System for Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) allocation while 77 countries have accessed their CCM STAR allocation. Of the 67 countries that have not accessed their CCM STAR allocation, 11 countries have used flexibility provisions to fully utilize their GEF-7 STAR allocation through other focal areas.

62. The 38 new investments in projects and programs with mitigation potential approved in the reporting period are expected to avoid or sequester 431.4 Mt CO₂ eq in total over their lifetime. As of June 30, 2020, half way through the GEF-7 programming cycle, with \$470.1 million or 58.6 percent of the GEF-7 CCM resources committed, the cumulative expected emission reductions from GEF-7 approved projects was approximately 1.2 billion (1,152.5 million) tCO₂ eq, corresponding to 77.2 percent of the overall GEF-7 GHG emission reduction target of 1.5 billion tCO₂ eq. This indicates that the GEF is on track to deliver on the overall GEF-7 climate mitigation targets and to support countries in mitigating climate change.

63. The 38 new projects approved during the reporting period are distributed across 64 countries in four regions and include regional and global projects. Seven projects are in Africa, 11 are in Asia and the Pacific, five are in LAC and four are in ECA, and 11 are global. Regional distribution of GEF mitigation-relevant investments is \$37.8 million (7.7 percent) for the African region, \$39.3 million (8.0 percent) for Asia and the Pacific, \$15.7 million (3.2 percent) for LAC, \$23.1 million for ECA (4.7 percent) and \$360.4 million (73.3 percent) for global and regional projects.

64. It should be noted that global and regional projects include both global or regional funding components and national child projects where program activities will be implemented. Out of the six programs approved during the reporting period, it is expected that a total of 49 national child projects will be submitted to the GEF Secretariat for CEO Endorsement, in addition to the six global or regional child projects. Out of the 49 national projects, 23 projects (46.9 percent) are expected to be approved in Africa, 10 in Asia (20.4 percent), nine in LAC (18.4 percent) and seven in ECA (14.3 percent). The approval of each individual child project under a specific program is final once a CEO Endorsement Request has been submitted and approved for a specific national child project. Child projects will be included in the GEF Report to the COP relative to the reporting period within which they are approved.

⁴² The co-financing ratio is calculated in accordance with the GEF Updated Co-financing Policy, including EAs but excluding PPGs and Agency Fees (GEF, 2018, [Updated Co-financing Policy](#), Council Document GEF/C.54/10/Rev.01).

65. Of the 38 CCM projects and programs, 12 projects (31.6 percent) are categorized as MFA projects, meaning project components and funding support are aligned with other GEF strategic objectives, such as land degradation, biodiversity, and chemicals and waste. Table 4 shows the distribution of funding for stand-alone and MFA projects.

66. Of the 38 CCM projects and programs, six focus on energy efficiency; two on renewable energy; five on sustainable transport and urban systems; one on clean technology innovation; five on AFOLU; and 15 have mixed or other objectives (including 13 CBIT projects funded by the GEFTF). In addition, there are four SGP projects. Table 5 summarizes estimated emission reductions per type of projects and programs.

67. The 38 projects and programs approved during this reporting period are implemented by nine GEF Agencies. 34 projects are implemented by a single Agency, while four are multi-Agency investments. UNDP has the largest share in terms of number of single-Agency projects (19, or 50.0 percent), followed by UNEP (7, or 18.4 percent), Conservation International (CI) (3, or 7.9 percent). The EBRD, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), UNIDO, and the World Bank each have one project or program. UNDP, UNEP, World Bank, and FAO are participating in two or more multi-agency projects or programs, while the Asian Development Bank (ADB) is part of one multi-Agency program. In this reporting period, the multi-Agency projects and programs have larger share (57 percent) of the total GEF programming for activities with CCM benefits.

Table 4: GEF Funding for Projects and Programs with Climate Change Mitigation Components

| | Number of projects | | | GEF amount ^a (\$ million) | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|----------------|
| | <i>CCM stand-alone projects</i> | <i>MFA projects</i> | <i>Total</i> | <i>Funding from CCM Focal Area</i> | <i>Funding from other focal areas^b</i> | <i>Others^c</i> | <i>Total</i> |
| GEF - 4 (2006-2010) | 176 | 26 | 202 | 783.6 | 149.4 | - | 932.9 |
| GEF - 5 (2010-2014) | 167 | 85 | 252 | 1,037.2 | 461.7 | 23.9 | 1,522.8 |
| GEF - 6 (2014-2018) | 111 | 108 | 219 | 706.6 | 670.1 | - | 1,376.7 |
| GEF - 7 ^d (2018-2022) | 41 | 19 | 60 | 356.8 | 713.0 | - | 1,069.8 |
| Total | 495 | 238 | 733 | 2,884.2 | 1,994.1 | 23.9 | 4,902.2 |

^a GEF amount includes PPGs and Agency Fees.

^b Includes funding from SFM, IAP set-aside, IP set-aside, in addition to other focal areas.

^c LDCF/SCCF funding.

^d As of June 30, 2020.

68. In addition to financing the implementation of projects, the GEF assists eligible countries at their request with the preparation of projects, through PPGs. In the reporting period, the GEF provided a total of \$2.5 million in PPGs from the GEFTF for the preparation of 27 projects out of the 38 total projects and programs approved. It is worth noting that the reported number of PPGs does not include the PPGs to be requested by child projects under the programs approved

during the reporting period, as the corresponding PPG requests only get recorded at the time of the CEO approval or endorsement of each child project.

69. Finally, over the reporting period, 32 projects received CEO approval or endorsement after the successful submission of their full project proposals. This included 22 GEF-6 projects, of which 19 were FSPs and three were MSPs, and ten GEF-7 projects, of which four were FSPs, five were MSPs, and one was a non-expedited EA.

Table 5: Expected Results from Projects and Programs Approved during the Reporting Period

| <i>Type of projects and programs</i> | <i>Total GHG emission reductions (Mt CO₂ eq)</i> | <i>Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment</i> | | |
|--|---|---|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | <i>Female</i> | <i>Male</i> | <i>Total</i> |
| <i>Technology Transfer/Innovative LCTs</i> | 10.3 | 4,279 | 7,946 | 12,225 |
| <i>Energy Efficiency</i> | 45.4 | 1,037,760 | 1,042,040 | 2,079,800 |
| <i>Renewable Energy</i> | 26.2 | 998,025 | 906,525 | 1,904,550 |
| <i>Urban/Transport</i> | 214.5 | 28,879,767 | 31,156,517 | 60,036,284 |
| <i>AFOLU</i> | 114.3 | 1,944,610 | 1,931,775 | 3,876,385 |
| <i>Mixed/others</i> | 20.3 | 1,240,913 | 1,261,687 | 2,502,600 |
| <i>SGP</i> | 0.4 | 14,500 | 14,500 | 29,000 |
| <i>Total</i> | 431.4 | 34,119,854 | 36,320,990 | 70,440,844 |

c. GEF Support for Key Mitigation Sectors

70. The thematic scope of the GEF portfolio of CCM projects has significantly changed in GEF-7 compared to the previous replenishment cycles. In particular, the development of CCM projects has moved towards more integrated projects with multisectoral approaches aimed at generating the transformation of key economic systems. The following sub-sections discuss CCM activities in key sectors supported by the GEF in the reporting period. Technology transfer is presented in Part III, Section 4, as it is a cross-cutting topic for CCM and CCA.

c.1. Energy Efficiency

71. In the reporting period, six projects with energy efficiency components were approved with funding amounting to \$32.4 million. These six projects leveraged co-financing of \$379.9 million and are targeted to mitigate 45.4 Mt CO₂ eq. These projects are aligned with a key entry point, “Accelerating energy efficiency adoption,” under Objective 1 of the GEF-7 Climate Change Programming Directions. For example, the GEF/UNEP project *Zero Carbon Buildings for All: from Energy Efficiency to Decarbonization*, will support developing countries to dramatically enhance the ambition of their decarbonization efforts in the building sector by developing and adopting commitments and roadmaps towards zero carbon buildings both at national and local/municipal level. This project will establish the new Zero Carbon Building Accelerator, building on the first two GEF investments in the SE4All Building Efficiency Accelerator, a collaboration with UNEP and the World Resources Institute. The GEF’s \$2.0 million grant will achieve 4.1 Mt CO₂ eq of direct GHG emission reduction and leverage \$6.8 million in co-financing.

c.2. Renewable Energy

72. The GEF approved one renewable energy project and one program in the reporting period, with \$36.4 million in GEF funding and leveraging \$433.9 million in co-financing. Expected GHG emission reductions amount to 26.2 Mt CO₂ eq. These renewable energy projects are aligned with a key entry point, “De-centralized renewable power with energy storage,” under Objective 1 of the GEF-7 CCM Strategy. They are expected to significantly support other environmental and development issues in developing countries beyond emission reductions. The *GEF-7 Africa Minigrids Program* will support African countries to increase energy access, by focusing on reducing the cost and increasing commercial viability of renewable energy mini-grids. The \$24.2 million program includes participation from 11 countries: Angola, Burkina Faso, Comoros, Djibouti, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Madagascar, Malawi, Nigeria, Somalia, and Sudan. By making minigrids more financially viable and catalyzing increased commercial capital flows, the program will benefit end-users through lower tariffs and expanded service. The program is expected to result in scaled up investments in the minigrid markets throughout sub-Saharan Africa, leveraging \$344.3 million in co-financing and contributing to 22.1 Mt CO₂ eq of direct emission reductions, while benefitting more than 700,000 people and supporting considerable progresses in achieving the goals of SDG 7.

c.3. Sustainable Transport and Urban Systems

73. In the reporting period, the GEF supported the expansion of the *Global Programme to Support Countries with the Shift to Electric Mobility*, with additional GEF funding of \$21.9 million and \$218.8 million in co-financing. The expansion includes ten countries (Bangladesh, Ecuador, Sri Lanka, Albania, Grenada, Indonesia, Philippines, Jordan, South Africa, Tunisia) and will lead to 29.7 Mt CO₂ eq of additional emission reductions. With this addition, the global program spans 27 countries with \$54.6 million in GEF funding and \$651.9 million in co-financing. Beyond the global program, three other national projects promoting electric mobility were approved in this reporting period in Belarus, Lebanon, and Mauritius. These projects are aligned with a key entry point, “Electric drive technologies and electric mobility,” under Objective 1 of the GEF-7 CCM Strategy.

74. The Sustainable Cities Impact Program (SCIP) was approved by the 57th GEF Council in December 2019. The SCIP builds on the GEF-6 Sustainable Cities Integrated Approach Pilot program and will support nine countries and 24 cities across Africa, Asia and Latin America. The nine countries are: Argentina, Brazil, China, Costa Rica, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Rwanda, and Sierra Leone. The program aims to help cities adopt integrated urban planning approaches to tackle systemic environmental degradation challenges and achieve low carbon and climate resilient growth. It is supported with GEF funding amounting to \$159.9 million, of which GEF project financing is \$146.7 million, including \$49.0 million from CCM allocation. The SCIP is expected to leverage close to \$1.7 billion in co-financing and lead to GHG emissions reductions of 184.5 Mt CO₂ eq.

c.4. AFOLU

75. The GEF-7 Programming Directions channel CCM resources to the AFOLU sector through the Food Systems, Land Use, and Restoration Impact Program (FOLUR IP) and the Sustainable Forest Management Impact Program. In the reporting period, the second and third calls for and selection of country concepts for the FOLUR IP took place. These calls resulted in having two program addendums, which added nine countries to the FOLUR IP: Brazil, Guinea, India, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Kenya, Paraguay, Uganda, and Uzbekistan. These added countries expand the coverage of globally important geographies (East and West Africa, South and Central Asia, and Central and Latin America) and commodities (beef, cocoa, coffee, maize, palm, soy, and wheat), while contributing to both scale and sustainability and increasing private sector engagements and the FOLUR IP's reach and impact. The two addendums increased the GEF funding amount by \$102.6 million, of which GEF project financing is \$94.1 million, including \$10.7 million from CCM allocation. They will leverage an additional \$982.6 million in co-financing and target the mitigation or avoidance of 94.9 Mt CO₂ eq.

76. In addition to the expansion of the FOLUR IP, three projects under the NGI Program that fall under the AFOLU category were approved in the reporting period. The GEF/CI *AGRI3 Forest Conservation and Sustainable Agriculture Fund for Developing Countries* seeks to create a de-risking fund that will incentivize commercial lenders in developing countries to provide agricultural loans that include investment in forest protection, reforestation, and sustainable land use through climate smart agriculture. The project is expected to generate multiple environmental benefits which include 18.4 Mt CO₂ eq avoided, 91,000 ha of land restored, and 650,000 ha of land under improved management. The GEF/CI *The Food Securities Fund: A Fund to Finance Sustainable Supply Chains at Scale in Emerging Markets* is an open-ended impact investment fund providing loans to local agri-businesses through "aggregators" or companies operating in developing and emerging countries that aggregate agricultural produce from and/or provide goods and services to farmers, in particular smallholder farmers. The fund is expected to deliver global environment benefits through improved agricultural practices that mainstream biodiversity, restore 100,000 ha of degraded land, and mitigate 1.0 Mt CO₂ eq. The GEF/IADB *Agtech for Inclusion and Sustainability: SP Ventures' Regional Fund (Agventures II)* is a venture capital fund that will invest in scaling up innovative agriculture technology companies and start-ups in Latin America and the Caribbean.

c.5. Mixed and Others

77. In the reporting period, the GEF supported two projects that were categorized as mixed. The GEF/CI *Staying within Sustainable Limits: Advancing Leadership of the Private Sector and Cities* project is an MFA project which aims to develop, communicate, and promote the adoption of entity-specific targets that are critical for maintaining life on Earth. The Earth Commission, consisting of world-leading scientists, will provide a scientific synthesis that underpins the setting of targets, considering the tradeoffs and interactions between systems. Meanwhile, the Science-Based Targets Network and its associated issue hubs will adapt these targets for companies and cities to adopt at their required scales. As one of the issues hubs, the climate hub continues to engage corporations to reach its target of 2 Gt GHG emissions reduction commitments by 2020. Finally, the Global Commons Alliance mobilization effort (Earth HQ) will ensure that the Global Commons Alliance and its work is well publicized and becomes recognized as the best source of guidance regarding quantitative science-based targets.

78. There is another project approved under the NGI Program in GEF-7, *the GEF/World Bank International Finance Cooperation (IFC)-GEF Greener Shipping Investment Platform*, which is described in Part II, Section 2 above. The project is expected to generate 20.3 Mt CO₂ eq of GHG emission reductions in total.

79. Thirteen CBIT projects approved in the reporting period with CCM set-aside funding were categorized as others. These are described in Annex 2, while the CBIT is further discussed in Part III, Section 3.

d. Small Grants Programme

80. Since its launch in 1992, the GEF SGP, implemented by UNDP, has been actively supporting community-based actions that lead to global environmental benefits and sustainable development.

81. The GEF SGP provides grants of up to \$50,000 (and on average \$25,000) directly to CSOs and community-based organizations to undertake projects that address global environmental and sustainable development issues. Since its inception, the Programme has supported more than 24,200 projects implemented by civil society and community-based groups in 133 countries.⁴³ In the CCM focal area, the GEF has cumulatively supported 5,391 grants (or 22.3 percent), totaling over \$159.4 million in GEF funding including PPGs and Agency Fees, and leveraging over \$208.9 million in co-financing.

82. During the reporting period, a second global project of \$64.0 million of GEF funding was approved by the 58th GEF Council in its June 2020 Work Program. Of this amount, a total of \$10.3 million of GEF grant, along with \$10.8 million in expected co-financing, will support community-based grants targeting climate change mitigation objectives.

83. In addition, in December 2019 a total of \$8.2 million in GEF funding including PPGs and Agency Fees was approved at the 57th GEF Council for three SGP Upgraded Country Programmes (Kenya, Egypt, and Malaysia), of which \$2.2 million (or 27.1 percent) will focus on financing CSO and community-based grant CCM activities. Two additional Upgraded Country Programmes (Mexico and Indonesia) were approved by the 58th GEF Council in its June 2020 Work Program with a total of \$9.0 million in GEF funding including PPGs and Agency Fees, of which \$2.1 million are dedicated to CCM actions by civil society in those countries.

84. According to the latest SGP Annual Monitoring Report 2018-2019 (reporting period from July 2018 to June 2019), 326 CCM projects were under implementation with GEF funding including PPGs and Agency Fees amounting to \$10.9 million and co-financing of \$13.9 million, with an additional 239 grants being completed during the same period. The majority of the grants in the portfolio were focused on applying low carbon technologies (67 percent) with renewable energy actions comprising 41 percent, while grants focusing on energy efficiency solutions made up 25 percent; and those on the conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks accounted for 33 percent. Thirty-three percent of the country programmes addressed community-level barriers to deploy low-GHG technologies. SGP grants also restored 81,240 hectares of forests and non-forest lands that contributed to enhance carbon stocks; 86 typologies of community-oriented and locally adapted energy access solutions were successfully

⁴³ Currently the SGP is active in 125 countries.

demonstrated, scaled up, and replicated; and nearly 36,200 households have benefited from energy access, including increased income, health benefits, and improved services.

85. In GEF-7, SGP's CCM strategy aims to demonstrate and scale up low-carbon, viable, and appropriate technologies and approaches to improve community energy access.

86. In supporting community level actions for implementation of the Paris Agreement with an increased focus on the NDCs, SGP will focus on the following initiatives: (i) Promotion of renewable and energy efficient technologies providing socio-economic benefits and improving livelihoods, including innovative and catalytic financing; and (ii) Support of off-grid energy service needs in rural and urban areas. SGP will support innovative technologies and approaches with initial catalytic financing and then encourage wider deployment and scaling up.

87. SGP will focus on capacity building, knowledge management, and systematization, putting in place enabling frameworks and mechanisms at the community level and will partner with national and global initiatives to ensure that innovations are implemented based on programmatic approach creating larger impacts.

88. SGP will utilize its proven mechanisms such as the CSO-Government-Private Sector dialogues to galvanize a "whole society" effort to raise the ambition for climate action, hold local and national governments accountable, and ensure inclusion of community voices and priorities in national and/or local efforts to enhance and implement the NDCs.

89. In Malaysia, for example, SGP grants will build on previous successful experience with micro-hydro power generation, as well as solar PV, biogas, and fuel-efficient stoves, to support implementation of energy-efficiency and renewable energy technologies in areas underserved by the national power grid. SGP will support community organizations to identify the appropriate technology, plan and manage installation, develop operations and maintenance plans, as well as financing and cost-recovery plans. Strategic project financing may be sought to accelerate broader adoption of a particular technology by communities throughout a specific landscape.

SGP Climate Change Adaptation

90. The SGP also supports climate change adaptation initiatives under partnership and co-financing resources from the Australian Overseas Aid Programme, now Australian's Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT). With \$11.8 million in funding from DFAT, the objective of the partnership is to improve the climate resilience of local communities in 41 countries, including 36 SIDS. Community-based adaptation (CBA) projects invest in capacity development and awareness-raising initiatives aimed at strengthening the resilience of local communities to climate change through sustainable nature-based solutions that optimize environmental, economic, and social outcomes. The projects' integrated approach to land, water, forest, and coastal resource management also contribute to environmental benefits in other multi-focal areas.

91. Since 2009, the programme has funded over 166 SGP grant projects and over 50 planning grants. Main project focal areas include water access and sanitation, coastal zone management, land degradation, and climate smart agriculture. To date more than 200,186 persons have benefitted from the CBA projects and activities; 12,520 hectares of land have been restored; and 6,156 hectares of land are under improved management.

2. Climate Change Adaptation

a. Background on GEF Support for Adaptation

92. As an operating entity of the Financial Mechanism of the UNFCCC, the GEF has played a pioneering role in supporting adaptation, and today supports an extensive portfolio on climate resilience. The portfolio comprises of 391 approved projects totaling \$1,855.7 million in GEF finance, including Agency Fees and PPG, and has leveraged \$9,189.9 million in co-financing. The GEF manages two funds prioritizing adaptation, the LDCF and the SCCF, both established in 2001 as an outcome of the Marrakesh Accords.

93. The LDCF was established to support the special needs of LDCs, as enshrined in Article 4 of the UNFCCC and the Least Developed Countries (LDC) work programme. The SCCF was established to finance activities, programs, and measures relating to climate change that complement those funded by the CCM focal area of the GEFTF, and through bilateral and multilateral sources. While the SCCF has four financing windows, climate adaptation was prioritized, in accordance with COP guidance (decision 5/CP.9).

94. The GEF supports adaptation action through the LDCF and SCCF.⁴⁴ Projects and programs supported by the LDCF and SCCF adhere to the guiding principles of country-drivenness, replicability, sustainability, and stakeholder participation, with a strong focus on gender equality and mainstreaming. These guiding principles are elaborated in relevant GEF policies, as well as in the programming principles and strategies that guide its support for adaptation. Projects and programs supported through these mechanisms are designed based on the information and guidance provided in NCs, national adaptation programs of action (NAPAs) and NDCs, as well as other relevant assessments and action plans.

95. Following the COP guidance to support the National Adaptation Planning (NAP) process (decision 12/CP.18, paragraphs 1 and 4), the GEF provided support to countries to initiate or advance their NAP processes. Further details are contained in Sub-section (d) below.

96. The GEF continues to work with the LDC Group, the Adaptation Committee, and other relevant bodies to enhance the effectiveness of support provided through the LDCF and the SCCF to developing countries towards the formulation of their NAP processes.

97. In accordance with the guidance provided by the COP, the GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the LDCF and SCCF and Operational Improvements for the period 2018-2022 has three strategic objectives that guide programming under the LDCF and SCCF in GEF-7:

- (a) Objective 1: Reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation;
- (b) Objective 2: Mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact;

⁴⁴ The Strategic Priority on Adaptation (SPA), launched in 2005 as a \$50 million allocation towards adaptation within the GEFTF, supported twenty-six innovative pilot projects. Initial lessons from the SPA portfolio were captured in a 2010 evaluation. The SPA resources have been fully allocated.

- (c) Objective 3: Foster enabling conditions for effective and integrated climate change adaptation.

98. The Programming Strategy has four associated Core Indicators, presented in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Core Indicators for the LDCF and the SCCF (2018-2022)

| Climate Change Adaptation Strategy Objective | Corresponding Core indicators | Sex disaggregated? |
|---|---|--------------------|
| Reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation | Number of direct beneficiaries | Yes |
| | Area of land under climate-resilient management (ha) | N/A |
| Mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact | Number of policies, plans, or development frameworks that mainstream climate resilience | N/A |
| Foster enabling conditions for effective and integrated climate change adaptation | Number of people with enhanced capacity to identify climate risk and/or engage in adaptation measures | Yes |

99. The updated results framework for the Strategy, with indicators for expected outcomes and outputs, was finalized in August 2019 after consultation with GEF Agencies.⁴⁵

b. Least Developed Countries Fund

Achievements since inception

100. The LDCF is designed to address the special needs of LDCs under the UNFCCC. As of June 30, 2020, cumulative pledges to the LDCF amounted to \$1,593.7 million, of which \$1,495.0 million have been received (see Annex 6). The LDCF received approximately \$192.3 million in new pledges in the reporting period.⁴⁶

101. From its inception to June 30, 2020, \$1,505.9 million has been approved for 305 projects, programs, and EAs to meet the mandate of LDCF, mobilizing an additional \$6,529.4 million in co-financing, which is not required. The LDCF has to date supported 51 countries⁴⁷ to prepare their NAPAs and funded two global NAPA projects, all of which have been submitted to the UNFCCC. As of June 30, 2020, \$58.6 million of LDCF is available for new approvals.⁴⁸

102. The annual and cumulative funding approvals under the LDCF as of June 30, 2020 are shown in Figure 1. The distribution of funding across regions is shown in Figure 2. Africa has received the largest share of the LDCF financing of \$1,018.5 million, or 66.3 percent, which is in line with the geographical distribution of LDCs. The distribution of funding across GEF Agencies during this

⁴⁵ GEF, 2019, [GEF Climate Change Adaptation Results Framework \(GEF-7\)](#).

⁴⁶ Includes contributions from Belgium including Belgium's Walloon Region, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Iceland, Switzerland, and Sweden.

⁴⁷ Afghanistan, Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Kiribati, Lao PDR, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Niger, Rwanda, Samoa, São Tomé and Príncipe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, The Gambia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Yemen, and Zambia. No new NAPAs were supported in this reporting period.

⁴⁸ This figure provided by the GEF Trustee factors in interest gained on the Trust Fund.

reporting period is shown in Table 8, and the cumulative distribution of funding across GEF Agencies is shown in Figure 3. Cumulatively since inception, among Agencies, UNDP has implemented the largest portion (49.6 percent) of LDCF funding. During the reporting period, FAO has been the Agency that has received the largest share of LDCF funding (35.0 percent), followed by UNDP (29.7 percent) and UNEP (9.4 percent).

Figure 1: Annual and Cumulative Funding Approvals under the LDCF (as of June 30, 2020)




Table 7: Regional Distribution of Adaptation Projects and Programs Approved under LDCF during the Reporting Period

| <i>Region⁴⁹</i> | <i>Number of projects/programs</i> | <i>LDCF amount (\$ million)*</i> | <i>Percentage of total LDCF</i> | <i>Co-financing (\$ million)</i> |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Africa | 14 | 87.3 | 67.4% | 515.6 |
| Asia | 3 | 26.0 | 20.1% | 102.0 |
| SIDS | 2 | 12.6 | 9.7% | 60.7 |
| Global | 3 | 3.1 | 2.4% | 11.5 |
| Regional | 1 | 0.5 | 0.4% | 0.7 |
| Total | 23 | 129.5 | 100% | 689.7 |

*includes GEF project financing, Agency Fees and PPG

⁴⁹ The individual region rows include single country projects in that region; the “global” row includes projects that take place in multiple countries in least two regions or those with global scope; and the “regional” row includes projects that take place in multiple countries in the same region or those with regional scope.

**Figure 2: Cumulative Regional Distribution of Projects and Programs Approved under LDCF
(as of June 30, 2020)⁵⁰**





Table 8: Agency Distribution of Projects and Programs Approved under LDCF during the Reporting Period

| <i>Agency</i> | <i>Number of projects/programs</i> | <i>LDCF amount (\$ million)⁵¹</i> | <i>% of total LDCF amount</i> | <i>Co-financing (\$ million)</i> |
|---------------|------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| ADB | 1 | 0.5 | 0.4% | 0.7 |
| AfDB | 2 | 9.2 | 7.1% | 159.6 |
| CI | 1 | 1.2 | 0.9% | 2.8 |
| FAO | 7 | 45.3 | 35.0% | 197.5 |
| IFAD | 1 | 2.2 | 1.7% | 77.0 |
| UNDP | 5 | 38.5 | 29.7% | 161.0 |
| UNEP | 2 | 12.2 | 9.4% | 15.1 |
| UNIDO | 2 | 10.3 | 8.0% | 41.5 |
| WWF-US | 1 | 0.7 | 0.5% | 8.0 |
| UNDP/UNIDO | 1 | 9.5 | 7.3% | 26.5 |
| Total | 23 | 129.5 | 100% | 689.7 |

⁵⁰ The figures in the regional distribution have not been updated for project cancellations and recent migration of information to new GEF Portal from the previous database.

⁵¹ Inclusive of GEF project financing, Agency Fees, and PPG.

Figure 3: Cumulative Agency Distribution of Projects and Programs Approved under LDCF
(as of June 30, 2020)



LDCF achievements in the reporting period

103. The LDCF continued to deliver enhanced and timelier GEF-7 support. Within two years of the new LDCF/SCCF strategy roll-out, 32 LDCs, or 68 percent of all LDCs, have successfully accessed LDCF resources through 35 projects and programs, totaling \$275.1 million of LDCF resources. This includes 17 LDCs, or 36 percent of all LDCs, which have reached the cap of \$10.0 million LDCF funding. At the mid-point of the GEF 7 period (2018-2022), resource being accessed by nearly two-third of the 47 LDCs indicates strong overall support and proactive engagement of LDCs, donor countries, and GEF Agencies. Efforts are being made to maintain and build on this momentum with enhanced engagement of donors and partners.

104. Efforts have been made to raise resources for the LDCF during this reporting period. For example, a ministerial pledging event was co-hosted by the LDCF Group, the Government of Germany, and the GEF Secretariat on the margins of the UN Climate Action Summit in New York on September 26, 2019. During the event, pledges of \$160.0 million in new and additional funds were made to the LDCF by the Governments of Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, and Sweden. The Government of Canada had made a pledge of CAD 7.5 million at the G-7 Summit, which took place earlier in 2019.⁵²

105. In the reporting period, 17 FSPs totaling approximately \$122.6 million were approved by the LDCF-SCCF Council with use of LDCF resources. This amount includes GEF financing, Agency Fees, and PPGs. These projects and programs support urgent and immediate adaptation priorities of LDCs and are aligned with the LDCF strategy for adaptation. Twelve of the 17 FSPs approved by Council were in Africa, four in Asia and Pacific, and one was in LAC and Caribbean region. These activities are expected to mobilize over \$598.5 million in indicative co-financing from the governments of the recipient countries, GEF Agencies, other multilateral and bilateral agencies

⁵² GEF, 2019, [Governments commit to shared climate action through Least Developed Countries Fund](#), September 26, 2019.

and others. The 17 FSPs approved by Council during the reporting period will support implementation of adaptation priorities in 16 countries.⁵³ They include: Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Guinea, Haiti, Lao PDR, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Myanmar, Sudan, South Sudan, Tanzania, Vanuatu, and Yemen. The projects encompass a range of adaptation priorities including climate resilient agriculture and livestock planning, urban and coastal resilience, water resource management, diverse climate-resilient livelihoods, climate-proof infrastructure, and climate information services. The portfolio of projects aims to adopt integrated and landscape-based approaches for large-scale climate adaptation benefits for vulnerable communities and ecosystems and facilitates the adoption and further development of nature-based solutions.

106. In addition, six MSPs were approved by the CEO, totaling approximately \$6.9 million, inclusive of GEF project financing, PPG, and Agency Fees. The total approved figures are included in Figure 1 and shown in Table 7 above. These projects support urgent and immediate adaptation priorities of LDCs and are aligned with the LDCF strategy to strengthen capacity of LDCs and promote innovative solutions for adaptation. Of the six MSPs supported by LDCF, one is for Sudan and rest are global or regional in nature, providing catalytic support to multiple LDCs, including four projects under the Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation. One project, titled *Strengthening Endogenous Capacities of Least Developed Countries to Access Finance for Climate Change Adaptation*, aims to strengthen capacities of LDCs to adapt to climate change by fostering the development of sustained endogenous technical services with institutions in LDCs. The project is part of GEF's contribution to help support the LDC work programme as described further below and was developed in consultation with the LDC Group.

107. In terms of results and impacts from the LDCF support approved during the reporting period, contributions of the 23 LDCF projects and programs (17 FSPs and 6 MSPs) on the core indicators are as follows:

- (a) 9,244,650 direct beneficiaries, of whom 4,722,481 are female;
- (b) 655,294 hectares of land under climate-resilient management;
- (c) 292 policies and plans that mainstream climate resilience; and
- (d) 247,476 people with enhanced capacity to identify climate risks and/or engage in adaptation measures, of whom 126,783 are female.

108. During the reporting period, \$2.5 million was approved in LDCF resources towards the Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation (see Section (e) for further information). Under this Program, four MSPs will apply LDCF grants toward innovative, private-sector-oriented and highly strategic adaptation projects. This includes one stand-alone and three MTF projects blended with SCCF resources. The projects are supporting highly innovative and critically important areas of adaptation action in LDCs.

109. As of June 30, 2020, 244 LDCF projects had been endorsed or approved by the GEF CEO and were in some stage of implementation or already completed. Of these projects, 224 provided an

⁵³ Two projects in Tanzania were approved by the Council in this reporting period.

estimate of the number of direct beneficiaries. These projects aim to directly reduce vulnerability of an estimated 22.7 million people.

110. In FY 2020, there were 101 projects supported by the LDCF reported as actively under implementation. Eighty-nine of these 101 active LDCF projects, or 88 percent, were rated moderately satisfactory or higher in terms of their progress towards development objectives. As of June 30, 2020, these 101 active LDCF projects had already reached more than 13.6 million direct beneficiaries, trained 414,000 people in aspects of CCA, placed an 2.19 million hectares of land under more resilient management, strengthened or developed 111 regional, national, and sector-wide policies, plans or processes in 22 LDCs to better address climate change risks and adaptation, and enhanced climate information services in 27 countries.

National consultations

111. As outlined in the 2018-2022 Adaptation Strategy, LDCF project selection and approval transitioned in GEF-7 to a Work Program model, under which projects selected based on strategic prioritization factors are presented for approval by the LDCF/SCCF Council. The LDCF/SCCF Council has approved two Work Programs in the reporting period.

112. With the introduction of a new cycle for GEF-7, the 2018-2022 Strategy recognized the need to address the pipeline of technically cleared projects from GEF-6. At the end of GEF-6, there were 21 projects from 17 countries in the LDCF pipeline requesting a total of \$159.9 million.

113. During the reporting period, consultations continued to be held with countries to review their pipeline of projects and develop a plan for LDCF support, considering the new opportunities presented in the 2018-2022 Adaptation Strategy. The consultations offered countries opportunities to: (i) Seek more synergistic and harmonized programming with the GEFTF or other sources; and (ii) Re-evaluate whether and how their existing pipeline proposal(s) remain viable in terms of alignment with the national plan for GEF-7. Countries were then invited to develop or revisit and submit or re-submit proposals according to their respective national plans, which may or may not include updated proposals from the GEF-6 pipeline.

114. Based on the outcomes of these consultations, seven countries confirmed or updated their proposals or submitted new priority projects, which were approved in the LDCF Work Programs in December 2019 and June 2020. The Secretariat has consulted with all 17 countries and will continue to work with a few countries with remaining GEF-7 resources that had GEF-6 pipeline projects to ensure that the LDCF support is provided to address current national adaptation priorities in line with the 2018-2022 Strategy.

c. Special Climate Change Fund


Achievements since inception

115. The SCCF was established under the UNFCCC in 2001 to finance activities, programs, and measures relating to climate change that are complementary to those funded under the CCM focal area of the GEFTF and through other bilateral and multilateral sources. While the SCCF has four financing windows, climate change adaptation was given top priority in accordance with the UNFCCC guidance (decision 5/CP.9).

116. As of June 30, 2020, the SCCF has provided a total 86 projects with \$349.8 million in GEF funding and approximately \$2,660.5 million in co-financing. Of this, the SCCF-A (CCA window) has supported 74 projects with \$290.1 million of GEF funding (see Figure 4) and \$2,240.1 million in co-financing; and the SCCF-B (technology transfer window) has supported 12 projects with \$59.7 million in GEF funding (see Figure 5) and approximately \$420.4 million in co-financing.

117. As of June 30, 2020, \$356.1 million have been pledged to the SCCF, of which \$349.4 million were received. The demand for SCCF resources continues to be far higher than the resource availability. As of June 30, 2020, funds available for Council/CEO approval amounted to \$7.5 million, and \$7.1 million for the SCCF-A and SCCF-B, respectively (see Annex 6).

Figure 4: Cumulative Regional Distribution⁵⁴ of Adaptation Projects Approved under SCCF-A (as of June 30, 2020)



118. SCCF access by Agency, both in the reporting period and cumulatively, are shown in Table 9 and Figure 6, respectively. Five GEF Agencies were engaged in the SCCF during this reporting period, implementing one or two projects each. This is the first time that WWF-US has served as Implementing Agency in the SCCF.

⁵⁴ In Figure 4 and Figure 5, the individual regions include single-country projects in that region; the 'Regional' category refers to projects that take place in multiple countries in the same region or those with regional scope; and the 'Global' category refers to projects in multiple countries in at least two regions or those with global scope. In Figure 4, over 44 percent of the projects in the 'Regional' category are multi-country projects in SIDS.

Figure 5: Cumulative Regional Distribution of Adaptation Projects Approved under SCCF-B (as of June 30, 2020)




Table 9: Agency Distribution of Adaptation Projects and Programs Approved under SCCF during the Reporting Period


| <i>Agency</i> | <i>Number of projects/programs</i> | <i>SCCF amount (\$ million)⁵⁵</i> | <i>% of total LDCF amount</i> | <i>Co-financing (\$ million)</i> |
|---------------|------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| ADB | 1 | 0.9 | 13.7% | 2.2 |
| CI | 1 | 2.2 | 32.8% | 0.5 |
| UNEP | 1 | 1.3 | 18.7% | 7.0 |
| UNIDO | 1 | 0.5 | 7.9% | 1.5 |
| WWF-US | 2 | 1.8 | 26.9% | 13.3 |
| Total | 6 | 6.7 | 100.0% | 24.6 |

*includes GEF project financing, Agency Fees and PPG

119. As of June 30, 2020, 77 SCCF projects have been endorsed or approved by the GEF CEO and were in some stage of implementation or ready to enter implementation. Of these 77 projects, 53 provided an estimate of the number of direct beneficiaries. These projects aim to directly reduce the vulnerability of close to seven million people. In addition, 33 SCCF projects are supporting countries in their efforts to integrate climate change adaptation into 140 national and sector-wide development policies, plans and frameworks.

⁵⁵ Inclusive of GEF project financing, Agency Fees and PPG.

Figure 6: Cumulative Agency Distribution of Projects and Programs Approved under SCCF (as of June 30, 2020)⁵⁶



SCCF achievements in the reporting period

120. During the reporting period, the SCCF has supported six MSPs totaling \$6.7 million, which has catalyzed \$24.6 million of co-financing (see Table 10). Of these, three are exclusively supported by the SCCF and three are MTF projects with the LDCF.

Table 10: Regional Distribution of Adaptation Projects and Programs Approved under SCCF during the Reporting Period

| <i>Region⁵⁷</i> | <i>Number of projects</i> | <i>SCCF amount (\$ million)⁵⁸</i> | <i>Co-financing (\$ million)</i> |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| Regional (LAC) | 1 | 1.2 | 7.0 |
| Regional (SIDS) | 1 | 1.2 | 5.3 |
| Global | 4 | 4.2 | 12.3 |
| Total | 6 | 6.7 | 24.6 |

121. Five of the six MSPs supported by the SCCF during this reporting period are under the Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation, totaling \$4.5 million (see section (e) for further information), inclusive of GEF project financing, PPGs, and Agency Fees. These five projects include two stand-alone and three MTF projects combined with LDCF resources. The projects are supporting highly innovative and critically important areas of adaptation action, such as insurance of vulnerable fishing communities as well as coral reefs in Pacific SIDS; climate resilience of coffee value chains in Africa; drone technology to reduce landslide and debris flow risk in Colombia; among others. In cooperation with the GEF Agencies, the Challenge Program projects will be

⁵⁶ Figure 6 is based on information presented by the GEF Trustee, included in Annex 6. The Trustee report does not yet include information on all SCCF projects approved in FY20, for which information is presented in Table 9.

⁵⁷ Regional refers to projects that take place in multiple countries in the same region or those with regional scope; and global refers to projects in multiple countries in at least two regions or those with global scope.

⁵⁸ Inclusive of GEF project financing, Agency Fees, and PPG.

designed and executed by partners such as Willis Towers Watson and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Projects through this program supported by the SCCF tend to focus more on ambitious system transformation strategies directly with key private sector actors, and therefore anticipate particularly high levels of impact. The projects supported through the LDCF, on the other hand, tend to have a substantial in-depth and comprehensive focus in the contexts in which they operate.

122. Another initiative that received SCCF support during the reporting period is a \$2.2 million MSP, inclusive of GEF project financing, PPGs, and Agency Fees, titled *Adaptation SME Accelerator Project (ASAP)*, to be implemented by CI in partnership with the Lightsmith Group. This initiative will build the ecosystem of SMEs involved in adaptation and climate resilience in developing countries through market mapping, convening, and network building, and incubation/acceleration. The project will substantially increase the market awareness and success of adaptation-focused SMEs in developing countries and overall catalyze the markets for climate resilience and adaptation solutions in developing countries.

123. The expected results and impacts from the six SCCF projects approved during the reporting period are as follows:

- (a) 529,017 direct beneficiaries, of whom 274,460 are female;
- (b) 155,199 hectares of land under climate-resilient management;
- (c) 5 policies and plans that mainstream climate resilience; and
- (d) 12,745 people with enhanced capacity to identify climate risks and/or engage in adaptation measures, of whom 6,107 are female.

124. In FY 2019, 86 percent of SCCF projects that were under implementation and have reported on their performance were rated moderately satisfactory or higher in terms of their progress towards development objectives. As of June 30, 2019, cumulative on-the-ground results achieved under the SCCF portfolio comprised 6.1 million direct beneficiaries, 6.0 million hectares of land under better management to withstand the effects of climate change, and some 78,000 people who were trained in various aspects of climate change adaptation. Moreover, 64 regional, national, and sector-wide policies, plans, and processes have been strengthened or developed to better integrate and address climate change risks, and 23 projects have enhanced climate information services in vulnerable developing countries.

125. According to the Status Reports on the LDCF and SCCF prepared by the Trustee (see Annex 6), the SCCF has thus far in GEF-7 received a single donor pledge, from Switzerland, of \$3.3 million, to be paid over the four years. During the reporting period, the Trustee received payment from Switzerland against the signed contribution agreement of \$1.6 million.

126. Pledges and contributions to the SCCF continue to fall short of programming needs, limiting the ability of the GEF to address the adaptation needs of highly vulnerable non-LDC SIDS and other non-LDC developing countries, or to more fully explore and support private sector engagement and innovation in adaptation, given the flexibility regarding financial instruments and approaches that the SCCF can provide.

d. Support to LDC Work Programme and NAP Process

127. The original LDC work program was established in 2001, and the process to formulate and implement NAPs was established in 2010. The updated LDC work programme was adopted at COP 24 in 2018 (Decision 16/CP.24), containing several elements including support for the process to formulate and implement NAPs and related relevant adaptation strategies, including NAPAs.

128. In line with the key elements of the COP decision, the LDCF extended support to LDCs in supporting the process to formulate and implement NAPs and NAPAs, supporting capacity-building initiatives to enable effective engagement, and strengthening capacity of meteorological and hydrological services on weather and climate information actions.

129. The LDCF and the SCCF provide support to NAP processes in response to COP guidance.⁵⁹ GEF's support for NAPs in the GEF-7 period focuses on the identification and implementation of NAP priorities, as well as additional analysis that may be needed to better align GEF proposals with priorities identified in NAPs. Notably, several projects utilized a hybrid approach, combining support for the NAP process with activities that support concrete adaptation investments for NAPA implementation. Such projects typically include separate components that are solely devoted to formulation of NAPs. In its support of NAP processes, the GEF responds to the needs and priorities of recipient countries, while providing the flexibility to combine NAPA and NAP activities in one project, thereby enhancing efficiency and simplifying access to finance. This also responds to COP guidance requesting the GEF to simplify access modalities.

130. The total funding from the LDCF towards the LDCs' NAP processes amounts to \$75.2 million as of June 30, 2020.⁶⁰ During the reporting period, the GEF Secretariat continued to exchange information with the GCF on proposals submitted under the LDCF/SCCF that contribute to the formulation of the NAPs and other adaptation planning processes, to minimize overlapping support and to enhance coordination between the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism. In this reporting period, one project from Djibouti requested for \$0.6 million to build capacity of stakeholders to advancing the NAP process and complement GCF's NAP project in the country. With inclusion of one project in this reporting period, countries that have accessed LDCF for NAP process includes Bangladesh, Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Lao PDR, Niger, Rwanda, São Tomé and Príncipe, Senegal, South Sudan, Djibouti, and Timor Leste. These projects are in addition to targeted technical assistance for tailored one-on-one support that continues to be provided through the LDCF-financed NAP Global Support Program (GSP). The SCCF support amounting to \$5.1 million seeks to complement the LDCF initiatives by assisting non-LDC developing countries with their country-driven processes to advance NAPs.

131. As part of GEF's contributions to help support the LDC work programme, a project titled *Strengthening Endogenous Capacities of Least Developed Countries to Access Finance for Climate Change Adaptation* was approved as an MSP for \$2.2 million during the reporting period, inclusive of GEF project financing, Agency Fees, and PPG. The project, supported by the LDCF and developed in consultation with the LDC Group, aims to strengthen capacities of LDCs to adapt to

⁵⁹ Decision 12/CP.18, paragraph 1.

⁶⁰ This amount comprises projects that are explicitly dedicated, as the sole project objective or through dedicated components, to enhancing a country's NAP process.

climate change by fostering the development of sustained endogenous technical services for: project development, policy mainstreaming, and creating an enabling environment. The project will support twinning of universities in four LDCs which will become a collaborative mechanism and provide resources to LDCs for sustained endogenous technical capacity on climate change adaptation finance. The project will address capacity deficits that serve as an obstacle to scaling up the delivery of climate finance as well as the development of country-driven approaches to climate change adaptation.

e. Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation

132. In line with the approved adaptation programming strategy and based on the information document presented at the 25th meeting of the LDCF/SCCF Council, the GEF announced a Call for Proposals totaling \$10 million for the Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation, to be financed equally from the LDCF and SCCF.

133. The objective of this program is to catalyze innovation to harness the power of private sector actors for achieving adaptation results. The Challenge Program aims to test and validate potentially scalable, bankable, or otherwise fundable investment approaches, business models, partnerships, and technologies.

134. The response to the Call for Proposals was overwhelmingly positive. 388 concepts were submitted by 343 different organizations. Given this high level of interest and limited resources available, this Challenge Program was only able to invite nine out of 388 of submissions to advance, totaling under three percent of the approximately \$550 million requested.

135. One innovative element of the design of this Program was that submission of project concepts could be made by any proponent and was not limited to GEF Agencies. Of the 388 concepts, 92 percent were submitted by proponents who are not GEF Agencies. This created opportunity for private sector actors and others who have not traditionally partnered with the GEF to propose their ideas and engage directly with the GEF Secretariat.

136. Concepts were submitted from countries in all eligible regions, with the greatest number from Sub-Saharan Africa (55 percent); 37 percent of the submissions were from LDCs, and 7 percent were from SIDS. The substantive focus of the concepts submitted vary among different innovation strategies and sectors, with the most common primary innovation strategy being supply chain resilience, followed by SME incubation and acceleration.

137. A detailed analysis of the submissions, including by type of proponent, innovation strategy, region and country, and scale of funding requested is provided in the Progress Report on the Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation delivered to the 27th LDCF/SCCF Council, in December, 2019.⁶¹

138. All 388 submissions were reviewed by multiple GEF Secretariat staff, based on the pre-selection criteria indicated in the Call for Proposals. A technical review committee conducted further review of shortlisted submissions and recommended a set of finalists for consideration by the GEF CEO and Chairperson. Based on these recommendations, the nine project concepts

⁶¹ GEF, 2019, [*Progress Report on the Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation Under the Special Climate Change Fund and the Least Developed Countries Fund*](#), Council document GEF/LDCF.SCCF.27/Inf.04.

indicated in Table 11 have been invited to advance, following the normal LDCF and SCCF project review process. These concepts were announced on December 11, 2019 at the COP 25.⁶²

Table 11: Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation Project Concepts Selected

| Title | Region/ Country | Agency | Proponent/ Partner | LDCF support ⁶³ | SCCF support | Status |
|---|---------------------|--------|--|-------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| Resilience for Peace & Stability, Food and Water Security Innovation Grant Program | Global | UNDP | Global Resilience Partnership | \$1.15 M | | PIF approved August 2020 |
| Public-Private Partnerships for Coral Reef Insurance | Global (Asia, SIDS) | ADB | | \$0.48 M | \$0.92 M | PIF approved in FY 2020 |
| Reviving high-quality coffee to stimulate climate adaptation in smallholder farming communities | Regional (Africa) | IUCN | NESPRESSO and Clarmondial | \$1.3 M | | PIF approved in July 2020 |
| Piloting innovative financing for climate adaptation technologies in medium-sized cities | Global | UNIDO | CTCN | \$0.27 M | \$0.53 M | PIF approved in FY 2020 |
| Blended finance facility for climate resilience in coffee and cacao value chains: CC-Blend | Regional (LAC) | UNEP | Banco de Fomento Agropecuario | | \$1.2 M | PIF approved in FY 2020 |
| Adaptation Accelerator Program: Building Climate Resilience through Enterprise Acceleration | Global | CI | | \$1.15 M | | PIF approved in FY 2020 |
| Investing in Climate Resilience for the Land4Impact Fund | Global | WWF-US | South Pole | \$0.65 M | \$0.65 M | PIF approved in FY 2020 |
| Financial tools for small scale fishers in Melanesia | Regional (SIDS) | WWF-US | Willis Towers Watson | | \$1.15 M | PIF approved in FY 2020 |
| UAVs/drones for Equitable Climate Change Adaptation: Participatory Risk Management through Landslide and Debris Flow Monitoring | Colombia | CAF | MIT Environmental Solutions Initiative | | \$0.55 M | CEO Endorsement approved August 2020 |

139. Careful consideration was given to ensure regional balance among eligible countries and regions. Attention was also given to ensuring a range of innovation strategies to be supported that will be advanced through the nine project concepts. The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) of the GEF provided substantive review and comments on the final nine concepts.

140. The \$10.0 million in GEF support for these MSPs is anticipated to generate significant impact, including 899,000 direct beneficiaries, 230,000 hectares under climate resilient management, and 21,000 people with enhanced capacity, as well as catalyze \$54.5 million in co-financing.

⁶² See Press Release, [Winners of GEF Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation announced](#), December 10, 2019.

⁶³ Inclusive of GEF project financing, Agency Fees, and PPG.

141. Of the nine project concepts invited to advance, six had had their PIFs approved during FY 2020. Two more have had their PIFs approved in July and August 2020, while the ninth project was fully CEO-approved in August 2020.

142. Although this Challenge has only recently been launched, it has been successful in attracting and engaging a range of new partners with whom the GEF has not been able to directly partner with yet. Several private sector and other partners involved in this program are engaging directly for the first time in a GEF project. Furthermore, the wealth of ideas and interest submitted suggest there is significant impact potential to be gained from continuing to increase GEF's investment in catalyzing private sector innovation in climate resilience and adaptation.

143. Learning and knowledge sharing will be undertaken through implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. This learning will help strengthen the individual projects' business models and contribute more broadly to the growing movement of private sector investment for climate change resilience and adaptation.

f. Collaboration with Adaptation Consortia and Partnership

144. Partnerships to enhance action on climate adaptation and resilience were actively sought during the reporting period.

145. Collaboration with the Global Commission on Adaptation (GCA) advanced Over the reporting period, the GEF provided inputs to the GCA flagship report,⁶⁴ and co-hosted a high-level launch event at the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) COP in India on September 10, 2019. The GEF has also been actively engaged in the Steering Group and Working Group of the GCA Action Track on nature-based solutions. A specific activity led by the GEF in the context of this action track included a workshop held May 19-20, 2020, and report led by the STAP in collaboration with the Moore Foundation and Wildlife Conservation Society based on analysis of the portfolios of nature-based solution projects supported by these organizations and the GEF, to arrive at recommendations on best practice for resilience building based on nature-based solutions.

146. The GEF is also partnering with the MAVA Foundation and International Institute for Sustainable Development towards a strategic initiative on valuation of nature-based infrastructure. The initiative seeks to provide investors and policymakers with the tools and models needed to make informed comparisons between grey infrastructure versus nature-based infrastructure options and will integrate climate change adaptation considerations into the analyses.⁶⁵

147. The GEF also continued its engagement as a member of the Alliance for Hydromet Development.⁶⁶ Based on the joint declaration made at its launch in the margins of COP 25, members set three priorities for collective action in 2020, namely: (i) Develop a commonly used National Meteorological and Hydrological Services assessment tool, the 'Country Hydromet Diagnostic' tool; (ii) Develop the concept of the Systematic Observations Financing Facility, i.e.,

⁶⁴ GCA, 2019, [Act Now: A Global Call for Leadership on Climate Resilience](#).

⁶⁵ This project has been approved as an MSP in July 2020, with UNIDO as the GEF Agency. It will be described further in the GEF report to COP 27.

⁶⁶ The 12 founding members of the Alliance are: Adaptation Fund, African Development Bank (AfDB), ADB, EBRD, GEF, GCF, Islamic Development Bank, UNDP, UNEP, World Bank, World Food Programme, WMO.

advancing the concept and design for the creation of a financing facility to support countries in meeting the requirements of the Global Basic Observing Network, important for climate resilience and adaptation; and (iii) Prepare the first Hydromet Gap Report, an annual joint Alliance flagship report to track progress, capture lessons learned, and guide investments using the Country Hydromet Diagnostic as its foundational analytical tool. The World Meteorological Organization (WMO) is the facilitator and technical advisor for the Alliance. As a member of the Alliance, the GEF has been contributing to the three priorities above. In addition, GEF also contributed to the 2019 State of Climate Services Report of the WMO⁶⁷, launched at the UNFCCC COP 25 in Madrid. In the report, the GEF provided technical inputs and information about its financing support to strengthen climate information services and early warning systems in vulnerable countries.

3. Capacity-Building Initiative for Transparency

a. CBIT Trust Fund Capitalization

148. The establishment of the CBIT TF was finalized in September 2016. At COP 22, 12 donors issued a joint statement pledging and expressing their intention to support the CBIT TF with over \$50 million. The CBIT TF received the first donor contributions prior to COP 22 and the GEF Secretariat approved the first set of projects under the CBIT.

149. Originally, the CBIT TF was set to accept contributions until June 30, 2018, at the end of the GEF-6 period. The Council, at its 54th meeting in June 2018, decided to extend the CBIT TF contribution date and project approval date to October 31, 2018, to accommodate additional voluntary financial contributions.⁶⁸

150. As of June 30, 2020, the Trustee had received a total amount of \$61.6 million from 14 donors: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States. This figure represents the full pledged amount by all participating donors per their respective contribution agreements to the CBIT TF. Please see Annex 7 for more information.

151. From late 2016 to October 2018, the GEF approved 44 CBIT projects using resources from the CBIT TF. Within two years of its establishment, the CBIT TF successfully programmed all available resources—amounting to \$58.3 million, or 94.6 percent of the total contributions. The amount includes GEF project financing, PPGs, and Agency Fees.

152. Therefore, resources amounting to \$3.2 million has been set aside to cover CBIT TF administrative costs until the date of the trust fund's termination on April 30, 2025, 18 months after the final Trustee commitment and cash transfer date of October 31, 2023.

b. CBIT Support under GEF-7

153. The adopted GEF-7 Programming Directions include specific provisions for CBIT support through the CCM focal area. This is in line with the “Establishment of a New Trust Fund for the Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency”⁶⁹ document, which states that the CBIT efforts will be

⁶⁷ WMO, 2019, [State of Climate Services](#).

⁶⁸ GEF, 2018, [Joint Summary of the Chairs](#), 54th GEF Council.

⁶⁹ GEF, 2016, [Establishment of a New Trust Fund for the Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency](#), Council Document GEF/C.50/05.

an integral part of GEF's climate change support for GEF-7, financed by the GEFTF under regular replenishment. According to the agreed GEF-7 Resource Allocation Framework, \$55.0 million have been notionally allocated to the CBIT.⁷⁰

c. CBIT Operationalization

154. In the reporting period, the GEF Secretariat approved one global CBIT project and 12 national projects in Benin, Fiji, Guatemala, Haiti, Indonesia, Malawi, Maldives, Mauritius, Namibia, Paraguay, Thailand and Viet Nam with \$27.8 million of GEF funding, including PPGs and Agency Fees. Please see Annex 2 for more information.

155. The total CBIT project portfolio as of June 30, 2020 includes 64 projects that are addressing priority needs to meet enhanced transparency requirements from the Paris Agreement. Of the total project portfolio, there are 58 country projects in Africa, Asia, ECA, and LAC; one regional/multi-country project supporting five eastern and southern African countries; and five global projects that aim to improve knowledge sharing, coordination, and facilitate additional capacity-building.

156. In total, 63 countries have received support for CBIT to date. Through these projects, 18 LDCs and 11 SIDS, of which two are both SIDS and LDC, are being supported in their efforts to enhance transparency.⁷¹

157. As of June 30, 2020, CBIT, through the CBIT TF and the GEFTF, supports a regionally balanced portfolio totaling \$106.0 million. The Africa region has the most CBIT projects approved (20 projects including one regional project; \$30.8 million), followed by LAC (17 projects; \$26.8 million), Asia (14 projects; \$23.9 million), and ECA (eight projects; \$10.0 million). Five CBIT projects (\$14.5 million) with a global scope have been approved.

158. As of June 30, 2020, 63 out of 154 non-Annex I Parties or 41 percent have received CBIT support, a significant increase from 33 percent as of June 2019. Based on 2016 GHG emissions data, 63 non-Annex I Parties, including China and India, that availed financial support under the CBIT, account for approximately 70 percent of total GHG emissions from non-Annex I Parties, or 22,424 Mt CO₂ eq,⁷² a significant increase from 59 percent as of June 2019.

159. The CBIT projects have so far been supported by six out of the 18 GEF Agencies, providing countries with a larger choice of Agency partners compared with projects for NCs and BURs. UNEP has the largest share with 22 projects, followed by UNDP with 18 projects, the FAO with 12, CI with six, IADB with two projects, and one project implemented by The Foreign Environmental Cooperation Center of the Ministry of Ecology and Environment of China. Three projects are jointly implemented by UNDP and UNEP.

160. The national projects respond to nationally identified priorities and are thus specific to each country's transparency-related capacity-building needs. In general, they all seek to enhance

⁷⁰ GEF, 2018, [Summary of the Negotiations of the Seventh Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund](#), Council Document GEF/C.54/19/Rev.02.

⁷¹ LDCs include Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Comoros, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Haiti, Lao PDR, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Togo, Uganda, and Zambia. SIDS include Antigua and Barbuda, Comoros, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Haiti, Jamaica, Maldives, Mauritius, Papua New Guinea, and Seychelles.

⁷² World Resources Institute, 2020, [CAIT Climate Watch Data](#).


coordination at the national level, improve or further develop national Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) frameworks, and strengthen the institutional capacity for transparency-related activities.

161. Overall, the approved CBIT project proposals largely mirrored the eligible programming activities set forth in the CBIT Programming Directions. The most common CBIT project activities among the 59 country projects approved to date were grouped into the following 11 types of activities:

- (a) Enhancement and/or establishment of new institutional arrangements;
- (b) Use of NDC transparency activities to inform policy design;
- (c) Accounting and MRV methodologies for mitigation actions;
- (d) Accounting and MRV methodologies for adaptation actions;
- (e) Economic and GHG emissions scenario modelling;
- (f) GHG inventory data collection and management tools;
- (g) Enhancement and/or establishment of new MRV systems;
- (h) GHG inventory improvements including development of country-specific emission factors and activity data;
- (i) Capacity building, training, and knowledge sharing;
- (j) Tracking climate finance; and
- (k) AFOLU-focused activities.

162. Figure 7 illustrates the percentage of approved CBIT projects that included a particular type of activity in their proposal, while also showing the overall proportion of project activity types as they relate to one another. The percentages in the figure represent a count of occurrences of type of activity across the portfolio and are not correlated to the amount of resources designated for specific activities.

163. Analysis of the CBIT project priorities per type of activity show that all CBIT projects include capacity building, training and knowledge sharing as a priority activity; and building institutional arrangements, developing MRV systems, developing NDC transparency and policy design and improving GHG inventories are important priorities as well. In contrast, fewer projects incorporate scenario modeling and tracking climate finance as priority activities.

Figure 7: Type of Transparency Activities Supported in CBIT Projects as of June 30, 2020

164. Nineteen projects have received CEO approval after the successful submission of their full project proposals since the last reporting period: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Georgia, Jamaica, Lao PDR, Morocco, Panama, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Togo, and the global project towards enhanced transparency in the forest sector. With these, the number of projects that are under implementation as of June 30, 2020 is 37, of which 34 are national projects, while three are providing global support.

165. Over half (52 percent) of the total CBIT portfolio is under implementation. While projects are in various stages of implementation, early observations and findings from country case studies have been shared in the Progress Reports on the CBIT prepared for the GEF Council.⁷³ Additional insights and lessons learned will be gathered from implementation reports as projects go through the required monitoring and evaluation activities of the project cycle.

d. CBIT Coordination and Engagement

166. The GEF continues to actively engage and coordinate with existing and emerging GHG transparency initiatives to help implement the CBIT, including the Initiative for Climate Action Transparency (ICAT), the Coalition on Paris Agreement Capacity Building, the Partnership on

⁷³ GEF, 2019, [Progress Report on Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency](#), Council Document GEF/C.57/Inf.06; GEF, 2019, [Progress Report on Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency](#), Council Document GEF/C.56/Inf.06; and GEF, 2018, [Progress Report on Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency](#), Council Document GEF/C.55/Inf.12.

Transparency in the Paris Agreement, the NDC Partnership, the Partnership to Strengthen Transparency for Co-Innovation, and other entities engaged in enhancing transparency.

167. Through various interactions, the GEF Secretariat and existing initiatives have shared information on ongoing and planned activities, particularly as it relates to ongoing activities at the country and regional levels, to enhance coordination, where possible.

168. The CBIT Global Coordination Platform has been operating since April 2018.⁷⁴ It aims to bring together practitioners from countries and Agencies in order to enable coordination of transparency actions and ideas, identify needs and gaps in national transparency systems, share lessons learned through regional and global meetings, and to facilitate access to emerging practices, methodologies, and guidance on transparency of climate action.

169. The Global Coordination Platform currently contains CBIT project profiles for each country with an approved project, interviews with country implementation experts, links to GHG methodological guidance and upcoming learning events, and houses presentation and other meeting materials from CBIT workshops and other fora.

170. At COP 25, the GEF participated in formal and informal negotiations around the transparency agenda, engaged in bilateral discussions with current and prospective CBIT countries, and reported on the progress of the CBIT. The GEF was invited to participate in several COP 25 side events related to the transparency framework, where the GEF continued to raise awareness of support available through the CBIT, progress to date, and lessons learned, including:

- (a) Transparency Day - 2nd Capacity-building Hub (Paris Committee on Capacity-building, December 5, 2019);
- (b) Moving towards sustainable institutional arrangements for reporting to the Convention and Paris Agreement (UNFCCC, December 5, 2019);
- (c) Means of Implementation Day - 2nd Capacity-building Hub (Paris Committee on Capacity-building, December 9, 2019); and
- (d) Enhanced transparency for informed decision-making: unlocking climate action from national and non-state actors (GCF + GEF Pavilion, December 12, 2019).

171. Beyond COP 25 engagement, awareness raising, and outreach activities have continued through various channels, including the following:

- (a) The CBIT web page continues to be regularly updated, including relevant links to approved project documents.⁷⁵
- (b) The GEF participated in the International Workshop on Partnership to Strengthen Transparency for co-Innovation hosted by the Government of Japan in cooperation with the Government of the Philippines on November 7-8, 2019 and presented the GEF experiences with supporting transparency efforts through the CBIT.

⁷⁴ The CBIT Global Coordination Platform can be accessed from: <https://www.cbitplatform.org/>.

⁷⁵ The website can be accessed from: <https://www.thegef.org/topics/capacity-building-initiative-transparency-cbit>.

- (c) The GEF participated in the ICAT Planning Workshop on February 6-7, 2020, where work carried out to date, including synergies with the CBIT, was discussed, and input on ICAT's 2020 work plan, its new monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework, and its communications and partnership strategy was provided.

172. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Fourth Global CBIT Coordination Meeting and Technical Workshop, which was planned for April 2020 hosted by the Government of Japan, has been postponed to 2021. Opportunities for consultations among partners play an increasingly important role as implementation experiences and lessons learned become available. The GEF is committed to discussing ongoing and planned activities and sharing experiences with partners through available means including virtual meetings, particularly to enhance coordination of activities at the country and regional level.

e. CBIT Outlook

173. After nearly four years of operations, the CBIT is supporting 41 percent of non-Annex I countries representing over 70 percent of non-Annex I emissions. The network of CBIT countries includes a representative proportion of LDCs and SIDS, as well as key economies in each region with significant emission profiles.

174. Programming for CBIT resources in the GEF-7 period has progressed rapidly over the last two years, responding to country requests to address their capacity needs and gaps well ahead of the transition to the new transparency regime from 2024. This early success has also meant that the notional set-aside resources as agreed for the GEF-7 replenishment have been utilized quickly.

175. As of June 30, 2020, \$41.0 million (or 74.5 percent) of the \$55.0 million indicative resources set aside for CBIT from the GEFTF have been programmed. This leaves a current balance of \$14.0 million.

176. The GEF will continue to review and approve new CBIT project proposals in alignment with its programming directions and in response to COP guidance, utilizing available set-aside resources. In addition, the GEF will consider reallocating available set-aside resources from the related enabling activity support for the remaining GEF-7 period.

177. The GEF will continue to conduct outreach to the CBIT countries and agencies, analyze and share early lessons learned of projects supported by the CBIT, facilitate coordination with partners, respond to donor inquiries, and engage with the UNFCCC process and relevant meetings on transparency in FY 2021. Lessons learned from the implementation of CBIT projects are already informing newly approved CBIT projects.

178. Countries are sharing their experiences with the CBIT through meetings and events on transparency. It is worth noting that some countries, such as Uruguay on June 19, 2019, and Chile on December 9, 2019, have highlighted CBIT support in their Facilitative Sharing of Views presentations under the International Consultation and Analysis (ICA) process as a critical source of support that they are using to address identified needs and gaps and enhance future reporting.

179. Finally, the GEF Secretariat is undertaking additional work to respond to guidance from COP 24 and COP 25 on transparency reporting, such as initiating discussions on the provision of support for the first and subsequent BTRs and analyzing possible options for improving the efficiency of

support provision for reporting under Article 13 of the Paris Agreement. Close consultations with the UNFCCC Secretariat and Parties are envisaged as negotiations on transparency and reporting requirements advance.

180. On June 18, 2020, the GEF held a virtual informal consultation meeting on financial support for BTRs to discuss support needs, possible modalities, and timing with partners. The meeting was attended by 45 participants including country representatives, representatives from the LDC Group, UNFCCC, UNEP, and UNDP. The meeting included presentations from the GEF on existing support modalities for NCs and BURs, from the UNFCCC on the enhanced transparency framework and reporting of BTRs, and from UNEP and UNDP on experiences in supporting countries with their NC and BUR preparations. These presentations informed a discussion on the considerations for costing BTRs, supporting BTRs in conjunction with NCs, and avoiding duplication of support in the transition to BTRs. The GEF also introduced preliminary options for supporting the first BTR based on existing modalities as well as potential resource implications. Meeting presentations and documents can be accessed on the GEF website.⁷⁶ With the feedback provided, the GEF will further develop the costing of BTRs and programming modalities and guidelines, and continue to seek feedback through future informal consultations.

4. Technology Transfer

181. The transfer of low-carbon and climate-resilient technology has and continues to be a key cross-cutting theme for the GEF since its establishment. The GEF-7 Climate Change Focal Area Strategy aims to continue to support developing countries in making transformational shifts towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways. To achieve this goal, the strategy emphasizes three fundamental objectives, one of which is to promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs. In GEF-7, partnership with the private sector is a key priority in promoting technology transfer and deployment.

182. Similarly, the results framework for the LDCF and the SCCF in the 2018-2022 Adaptation Strategy includes an outcome on “technologies and innovative solutions piloted or deployed to reduce climate-related risks and/or enhance resilience” under CCA Objective 1: Reducing vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation. Therefore, the entire GEF climate change portfolio can be characterized as supporting technology transfer as defined by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and by the technology transfer framework adopted by COP 7.⁷⁷

183. In the reporting period, for CCM, three Program Framework Documents (PFDs)⁷⁸ and ten projects with technology transfer objectives or elements were approved with \$119.5 million in GEF funding, including PPGs and Agency Fees, and \$1,236.5 million in co-financing.⁷⁹ Under CCA Objective 1 to reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation, 24 projects and programs were approved totaling \$86.6

⁷⁶ GEF, 2020. [Event: Informal Consultation Meeting on Financial Support for Biennial Transparency Reports under the Paris Climate Agreement](#).

⁷⁷ Decision 4/CP.7.

⁷⁸ This includes the Addendum to the project *Global Programme to Support Countries with the Shift to Electric Mobility*.

⁷⁹ These projects are aligned with the objective of CCM-1: Promote innovation, technology transfer, and supportive policies and strategies. They include projects categorized in the areas of renewable energy, energy efficiency and low carbon transportation.

million, inclusive of GEF project financing and Agency Fees, and leverage \$445.9 million in co-financing financing. Of these 24 projects and programs supported under CCA Objective 1, \$82.5 million is from the LDCF and \$4.1 million is from the SCCF, inclusive of GEF project finance and Agency Fees. Detailed project descriptions are provided in Annex 2 and Annex 3.

a. Poznan Strategic Programme on Technology Transfer

184. In November 2008, the GEF Council and the LDCF/SCCF Council approved the Strategic Program on Technology Transfer, which included a funding window of \$50.0 million with \$35.0 million from the GEFTF and \$15.0 million from the SCCF-B.⁸⁰ This program included three funding windows to support technology transfer: (i) TNAs; (ii) piloting priority technology projects linked to TNAs; and (iii) dissemination of GEF experience and successfully demonstrated environmentally sound technologies (ESTs).

185. In December 2008, COP 14 welcomed the GEF's Strategic Program on Technology Transfer, renaming it the Poznan strategic program on technology transfer (PSP), as a step towards scaling up the level of investment in the transfer of ESTs to developing countries. In response to decision 2/CP.14, the GEF submitted a plan for the long-term implementation of the PSP to COP 16.⁸¹ The GEF submission included the following elements to further scale up investments in ESTs in developing countries in accordance with the GEF Climate Change Focal Area Strategy, and to enhance technology transfer activities under the Convention:⁸²

- (a) Support for climate technology centers and a climate technology network;
- (b) Piloting priority technology projects to foster innovation and investments;
- (c) Public Private Partnerships for technology transfer;
- (d) TNAs; and
- (e) GEF as a catalytic supporting institution for technology transfer.

186. The following sub-sections describe the progress made on the PSP according to the three areas recommended by the evaluation of the PSP by the TEC submitted to SBI 43.⁸³ Annexes 4 and 5 also include challenges and lessons learned in the implementation of the projects.

Regional Climate Technology Activities

187. The GEF has supported four regional projects and the CTCN through one global project, listed in Table 12. Of these, one has closed and four are under implementation. The detailed activities of these projects are described in Annex 5. These projects received funding from the GEFTF for CCM as well as from the SCCF-B for CCA. The regional projects are generating lessons

⁸⁰ UNFCCC, 2018, [Report of the Global Environment Facility on the elaboration of a strategic programme to scale up the level of investment in the transfer of environmentally sound technologies](#), SBI Document FCCC/SBI/2008/16.

⁸¹ UNFCCC, 2010, [Report of the Global Environment Facility on the progress made in carrying out the Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer](#), SBI Document FCCC/SBI/2010/25.

⁸² Three of the long-term elements (piloting projects, TNAs, and GEF as a catalytic supporting institution) are a direct continuation and scaling up of the three elements of the initial PSP. See UNFCCC, 2013, [Report of the Global Environment Facility to the Conference of the Parties](#), COP Document FCCC/CP/2013/3, annex, paragraph 140.

⁸³ UNFCCC, 2015, [Evaluation of the Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer: final report by the Technology Executive Committee](#), SBI Document FCCC/SBI/2015/16.

learned to help inform the Technology Mechanism, in particular the CTCN, and facilitate coordination and cooperation on climate technology development and transfer.

Table 12: GEF Projects for Climate Technology Transfer and Financing Centers and the CTCN

| Title | Region | Agency | GEF financing (\$ million) | | Co-financing (\$ million) | Status |
|--|------------------|-----------|----------------------------|------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | | GEFTF | SCCF | | |
| Promoting accelerated transfer and scaled-up deployment of CCM technologies through the CTCN | Global | UNIDO | 1.8 | 0 | 7.2 | Under Implementation - Extended |
| Pilot Asia-Pacific Climate Technology Network and Finance Center | Asia and Pacific | ADB/ UNEP | 10.0 | 2.0 | 74.7 | Closed |
| Pilot African Climate Technology Finance Center and Network | Africa | AfDB | 10.0 | 5.8 | 89.0 | Under implementation - Extended |
| Finance and Technology Transfer Center for Climate Change | ECA | EBRD | 10.0 | 2.0 | 77.0 | Under implementation - Extended |
| Climate Technology Transfer Mechanisms and Networks in LAC | LAC | IDB | 10.0 | 2.0 | 63.4 | Under Implementation - Extended |

188. In addition, in the reporting period, global and regional CCM projects with technology transfer objectives were approved by the GEF Council. This includes the *Global Cleantech Innovation Programme (GCIP)*, described in the section on Innovation in this report. The project is being implemented in 10 countries: Cambodia, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Morocco, Nigeria, South Africa, Turkey, Ukraine, and Uruguay. The project will support participating countries in developing a functioning ecosystem for clean technology entrepreneurship and will provide tailored business development and investment support to more than 1,000 businesses with potential to generate global environmental benefits at scale, such as delivering direct emissions reductions of 10.3 Mt CO₂ eq in total, over the next 10 years (2020-2030).

189. In response to invitations from SBI 37, SBI 39, SBI 40, SBI 41, SBI 42, SBI 45, SBI 46, SBI 47, SBI 48, SBI 49, and SBI 50, the GEF Secretariat, the CTCN, and the GEF Agencies consulted on the collaboration between the CTCN and the regional technology and finance centers on numerous occasions, including in the reporting period. The GEF Secretariat circulates an annual survey to all GEF Agencies of projects supported under the PSP in an effort to support enhanced information sharing among the regional centers and the CTCN (see Annex 5).

190. Constructive dialogue has been established with the respective GEF Agencies to seek synergies and avoid duplication. The GEF Secretariat regularly attends the biannual TEC meetings, and GEF personnel also met with the CTCN, including at COP 25 and SBI 51, with the aim of encouraging collaboration between the regional climate technology and finance centres and the CTCN. The CTCN has been encouraged to utilize GEF National Dialogues and Extended Constituency Meetings as entry points to facilitate further coordination with GEF OFPs to explore potential cooperation in a country-driven manner.

191. All ongoing regional climate technology networks and finance centers have continued to coordinate and collaborate with the CTCN, to strengthen the global and regional networks for supporting the development and deployment of climate technologies, as described in Annex 5.

192. The GEF Secretariat participated in, and/or observed, key discussions supporting the development of technology transfer initiatives in the reporting period. Examples include:

- (a) Nineteenth meeting of the TEC on September 16–19, 2019 (virtual);
- (b) Technology Mechanism Side Event on December 2, 2019, in Madrid, Spain;
- (c) 5th Project Steering Committee of the CTCN on December 4, 2019, in Madrid, Spain;
- (d) TEC Dialogue on Endogenous Capacities and Technologies on December 9, 2019, in Madrid, Spain; and
- (e) Supporting the Implementation of Technologies Through TNAs and NDCs on December 11, 2019, in Madrid, Spain.

193. During the reporting period, the CTCN did not undertake a survey on cooperation between NDEs and OFPs, and therefore, it did not provide updated information on how collaboration between NDEs and OFPs was strengthened during the reporting period.⁸⁴

194. During the reporting period, the GEF approved one project, for which the CTCN is the Executing Agency, as part of the GEF Challenge Program for Adaptation Innovation. The project, *Piloting Innovative Financing for Climate Adaptation Technologies in Medium-Sized Cities*, is implemented by UNIDO. This project develops a methodological approach and financing toolkit for medium-sized cities and conducts on-the-ground pilot projects in three selected cities in Africa, Asia, and LAC. This project will support selected cities in adopting a systematic approach to prioritizing infrastructure needs, identifying key investment projects, and matching with private financiers, leveraging the CTCN network for climate change technology data.

National Climate Technology Activities

195. Guided by COP decision 2/CP.14, the call for proposals for technology transfer pilot projects under window two of the PSP, issued in March 2009, led to the selection of 14 proposals. Only one proposal for CCA was received. This proposal was funded, along with three other proposals that included CCA elements. Total GEFTF and SCCF-B funding for the 14 pilot projects amounted initially to \$58 million, and total co-financing for these projects was initially more than \$195 million.⁸⁵ Three projects were cancelled upon request from the GEF Agencies and/or the concerned national government, one in July 2011, one in February 2012, and one in June 2012.

196. Among the 11 projects, six have closed upon completion of implementation. These six projects took place in Cambodia, China, Jordan, Russian Federation, Senegal, and Thailand. Five projects remain under implementation in seven countries: Chile, Colombia, Cote d'Ivoire, Kenya,

⁸⁴ Email correspondence from CTCN was received on May 14, 2020.

⁸⁵ Financing details can be found in the [Report of the Global Environment Facility on the elaboration of a strategic programme to scale up the level of investment in the transfer of environmentally sound technologies](#), SBI Document FCCC/SBI/2008/16.

Mexico, Sri Lanka, and Eswatini. The funding from the GEFTF and SCCF-B for these projects amounted to \$51.6 million, inclusive of GEF project financing, PPGs, and Agency Fees⁸⁶, and the total co-financing amounted to \$223.2 million and \$5.7 million, respectively.

197. The technologies targeted by the endorsed projects address both CCM and CCA, and are diverse and innovative. They include renewable energy (solar, biomass, wind), energy efficiency (insulation materials, efficient and hydro-chlorofluorocarbon (HCFC)-free appliances), transport (“green” trucks), and composting. Membrane drip irrigation, flood- and drought-resistant crops with sustainable land management practices were included as CCA-related technologies.

198. In response to SBI 36 conclusions, the GEF requested the GEF Agencies to provide updates to further elaborate on the experiences gained and lessons learned in carrying out the Poznan pilot projects, and the progress made by the GEF Agencies in the delivery of technology transfer. The 11 projects have implemented their activities, including demonstration, policy and standards development, and capacity-building. They have identified and trained local companies and technicians to adopt innovative technologies.

199. SBI 45 encouraged the GEF to share the mid-term evaluations of the PSP climate technology transfer and finance centers and pilot projects with the TEC and the CTCN, as available. The implementing agencies of these GEF projects are required to execute mid-term and terminal evaluations, and to submit these reports, along with implementation status reports, to the GEF.⁸⁷ The mid-term reports of all these projects were shared with the GEF as they were received from agencies and are available upon request. Based on the experience from the projects, compiled summaries of these projects are presented in Annex 4.

b. Technology Needs Assessments

200. The GEF provides support for developing countries to undertake TNAs. Since 2001, more than more than 90 developing countries have undertaken TNAs. The first TNA project concept under the PSP, *Global Technology Needs Assessments - Phase I*, was approved by the LDCF/SCCF Council in April 2009 and endorsed by the GEF CEO in September 2009. Project implementation by the UNEP started in October 2009 and was completed in April 2013. Total SCCF-B funding for this project was \$9.0 million, inclusive of GEF project financing and Agency Fees.

201. The Global TNA project, phase I, aimed to provide targeted financial and technical support to assist 36 developing countries in developing and/or updating their TNAs within the framework of Article 4.5 of the UNFCCC and to support them in preparing Technology Action Plans (TAPs). The project sought to use methodologies in the updated TNA Handbook and to provide feedback to fine-tune the methodologies through an iterative process.

202. Phase I supported 36 countries between 2009 and 2013. These countries were:

- (a) Africa and the Middle East: Côte d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Lebanon, Mali, Mauritius, Morocco, Rwanda, Senegal, Sudan, Zambia;

⁸⁶ Please refer to Annex 5 for detailed financing.

⁸⁷ Note that not all reports are made publicly available.

- (b) Asia and Eastern Europe: Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Georgia, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Lao PDR, Mongolia, Nepal, Republic of Moldova, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Viet Nam;
- (c) LAC: Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Peru.

203. The second TNA project concept (TNA phase II) to support 28 countries was approved by the GEF Council in April 2013 and endorsed by the GEF CEO in August 2014. Total GEF funding for this project is \$6.1 million. Project implementation began in November 2014 and is expected to reach completion in 2021. Two countries that already participated in TNA Phase I (Kazakhstan and Lao PDR) have been supported in concluding their TAP reports. The Phase II countries are:

- (a) Africa and the Middle East: Burkina Faso, Burundi, Egypt, Eswatini, The Gambia, Jordan, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mozambique, Seychelles, Tanzania, Togo, Tunisia.
- (b) Asia and Eastern Europe: Armenia, Kazakhstan, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Pakistan, Philippines, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan.
- (c) LAC: Belize, Bolivia, Grenada, Guyana, Honduras, Panama, Uruguay.

204. The project comprises two components: (i) an in-depth analysis of the actual market and trade barriers that hinder the transfer of prioritized technologies, followed by an assessment of the policy, institutional, and finance options to overcome these barriers; and (ii) preparation of TNAs and TAPs through improved training and material. The TNA project Phase II was closed in September 2018. The mid-term evaluation was shared with the GEF in October 2017, and the terminal evaluation⁸⁸ was shared with the GEF in the second quarter.

205. The third TNA project concept (TNA phase III) to support 22 SIDS and LDCs and Ukraine was approved by the GEF Council in June 2016 and endorsed by the GEF CEO in March 2018. Total GEF financing for this project is \$6.5 million from the CCM focal area set-aside and \$0.3 million from Ukraine's STAR allocation, inclusive of GEF project financing and Agency Fees. These countries are:

- (a) Africa and the Middle East: Benin, Central African Republic, Chad, Djibouti, Eritrea, Guinea, Liberia, Malawi, Niger, São Tomé and Príncipe, Uganda.
- (b) Asia and the Pacific: Afghanistan, Fiji, Myanmar, Nauru.
- (c) Europe and Central Asia: Ukraine.
- (d) LAC: Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Haiti, Jamaica, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago.

206. Based on the experience from two previous projects, this project will be improved by: (i) implementing national training for a wider team of stakeholders in the country in order to strengthen their capacities; (ii) peer-to-peer inter-country workshops; and (iii) national event and roundtable to present TNA/TAP products to potential donors, development partners and investors for the financing and implementation of technology actions prioritized by the countries.

⁸⁸ UNEP, 2020. [Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP/GEF Project: TNA Phase II](#). Terminal evaluation document.

207. The fourth TNA project (TNA phase IV) to support 17 LDCs and SIDS was approved by the GEF Council in June 2019, and has been subsequently endorsed by the CEO in July 2020. Total GEF financing for this project is \$5.02 million from the CCM set-aside, inclusive of GEF project financing and Agency Fees. The project consists of two components: (i) TNA and development of TAPs; and (ii) evaluations. The participating countries are:

- (a) Africa and the Middle East: Comoros, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Lesotho, Somalia, South Sudan, and Yemen.
- (b) Asia and the Pacific: Kiribati, Maldives, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Timor Leste, Tonga, and Tuvalu.
- (c) LAC: The Bahamas and St. Kitts and Nevis.

208. As in Phase III, the project will continue to build upon lessons and experiences captured from the three previous TNA projects, again focusing on: (i) Implementing national trainings; (ii) Peer-to-peer exchange and learning; and (iii) National events and roundtables.

209. Under the GEF-7 Programming Directions, support for TNAs is possible using national STAR allocations. No countries have chosen to use their national STAR allocation for TNA support during this reporting period. LDCs and SIDS continue to be eligible to draw on the global CCM set-aside.

5. Enabling Activities and Capacity-Building

a. Overview of GEF Support for Enabling Activities

210. The GEF has supported various types of EAs, including NCs, BURs, and NAPAs. They fulfill essential communication requirements to the UNFCCC, and provide information to enable policy and decision-making.

211. Since its inception, the GEF has funded 447 EAs with \$518.0 million from the GEFTF and the LDCF including Agency Fees and PPGs. Of this amount, 396 EAs have been supported with \$505.8 million in funding (see Table 13 and Table 14) from the GEFTF, in support of NCs, BURs, and TNAs. Per the Updated Co-Financing Policy, as in its previous iteration, co-financing is encouraged for EAs, but it is not required.⁸⁹ In line with the updated policy, information regarding the expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing identified in EAs is included in the calculations of the ratio of co-financing to GEF project financing and in the reporting on trends and progress against the level of ambition set for the overall GEF portfolio.

212. In the reporting period, the GEF financed, through the GEFTF, 12 EAs, in the amount of \$15.3 million, inclusive of GEF project financing and Agency Fees. Annex 2 lists projects and programs for CCM and EAs approved under the GEFTF in the reporting period.

213. As of June 30, 2020, a total of 197 BURs have been approved for GEF funding in 132 countries and a total of 489 NCs have been approved for GEF funding in 152 countries. Information on the status of resources approved by the GEF Secretariat for the preparation of BURs and NCs from non-Annex I Parties will be submitted as an addendum to this report.

⁸⁹ GEF, 2018, [Updated Co-Financing Policy](#), Council Document GEF/C.54/10/Rev.01 and GEF, 2014, [Co-Financing Policy](#), Council Document GEF/C.46.09.

Table 13: GEF Trust Fund Enabling Activities Projects by Region (GEF Pilot Phase to end of reporting period)

| <i>Region</i> | <i>Number of projects</i> | <i>GEF amount^a (\$ million)</i> | <i>Co-financing (\$ million)</i> |
|---------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Africa | 111 | 41.9 | 20.9 |
| Asia | 85 | 87.2 | 112.7 |
| ECA | 60 | 26.3 | 6.9 |
| LAC | 108 | 93.1 | 73.8 |
| Global | 32 | 257.3 | 45.1 |
| Total | 396 | 505.8 | 259.4 |

^a GEF amount includes PPGs and Agency Fees.

Table 14: GEF Trust Fund Enabling Activities Projects by Phase

| <i>Phase</i> | <i>Number of projects</i> | <i>GEF amount^a (\$ million)</i> | <i>Co-financing (\$ million)</i> |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| GEF Pilot (1991-1994) | 8 | 34.1 | 9.5 |
| GEF-1 (1994-1998) | 96 | 49.3 | 10.8 |
| GEF-2 (1998-2002) | 105 | 49.8 | 17.6 |
| GEF-3 (2002-2006) | 36 | 83.2 | 10.5 |
| GEF-4 (2006-2010) | 8 | 56.1 | 31.2 |
| GEF-5 (2011-2014) | 59 | 111.6 | 102.4 |
| GEF-6 (2014-2018) | 58 | 82.7 | 18.2 |
| GEF-7 (2018-2022) ^b | 26 | 39.0 | 59.1 |
| Total | 396 | 505.8 | 259.4 |

^a GEF amount includes PPGs and Agency Fees.

^b From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2020.

214. The LDCF has supported the preparation of 51 NAPAs since its inception, in the total amount of \$12.2 million. All requests for NAPAs from LDCs have been financed by the previous reporting period and no additional request was received in this reporting period.

b. National Communications and Biennial Update Reports

215. The GEF continues to provide full-cost funding for NCs and BURs, and all requests to support NCs and BURs have been met by the GEF. The GEF has set-aside resources, separate from the STAR allocations, so that each country can access up to \$500,000 for NCs and \$352,000 for BURs. There are currently four options for countries to access GEF resources for NCs and BURs. In the first option, countries can work with a GEF agency of their choice to develop a project proposal. In the second option, countries can be part of a UNEP umbrella project for NCs and BURs. In the third option, countries can access the set-aside resources directly from the GEF Secretariat. Fourthly, those countries that wish to utilize additional resources can use their STAR allocation to complement the set-aside resources.

216. In the reporting period, 21 non-Annex I Parties submitted their NCs, and 18 non-Annex I Parties submitted their BURs, to the UNFCCC. The GEF, through its agencies, continues to provide assistance to Parties in formulating project proposals identified in their NCs (in accordance with Article 12 of the Convention and decision 5/CP.11) and in their BURs.

217. In order to submit any project proposal for approval, GEF Agencies need to ensure the proposal's consistency with country's national priorities. A country confirms its endorsement of a proposal by providing a letter signed by the GEF OFP. Following the proposal submission, the GEF, as a prerequisite for approval, examines and confirms its linkage to national priorities or programs. All projects approved by the GEF in the reporting period are confirmed to correspond explicitly to national priorities, including those identified in NCs, BURs, TNAs, and NDCs, as applicable.

c. *Global Support Program for National Communications, Biennial Update Reports and Nationally Determined Contributions*

218. The Global Support Program (GSP) for NCs, BURs and NDCs is jointly implemented by the UNDP and UNEP. It provides technical support to developing countries to prepare quality NCs and BURs, while also facilitating backstopping for the submission and improvement of NDCs. Technical support is provided online, offline and, as feasible, onsite to all interested developing countries and complements the work of other supporting bodies, such as the Consultative Group of Experts. The UNFCCC Secretariat collaborates with the GSP.

219. The GSP began in late 2015 and has provided support to more than 130 countries in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Eastern Europe, and LAC through a wide range of activities at national and regional levels. The program is expected to conclude in June 2021, after which support will be provided through an integrated program that brings together the GSP and the CBIT Global Coordination Platform.

220. The GSP has supported the establishment and enhancement of 14 peer-to-peer collaboration networks, through which targeted support is provided while also encouraging exchanges of experiences and lessons learned. In the reporting period, these networks have been supported through in person and virtual country exchanges, translation of guidance documents and tools, and trainings on GHG inventories, MRV systems, peer review, and incorporating gender equality considerations. These networks are also supported by other partners including the UNFCCC Regional Collaboration Centres, FAO, GHG Management Institute, GIZ, and UNEP-DTU.

221. Also during the reporting period, the GSP organized webinars and collaborated on publications on relevant topics, supported eight countries to integrate gender considerations into their NCs and BURs, assisted 22 countries in the review of their national reports, elaborated a workbook on national GHG inventory development for SIDS and LDCs in collaboration with the UNFCCC, maintained the iNDC Help Desk portal, continued coordination and awareness raising activities including through events at COP 25, and provided additional technical guidance to countries upon request.

d. *Capacity-Building*

222. Capacity-building is a key theme of GEF projects, and it is embedded in the design of both CCM and CCA projects. In addition, capacity-building for EAs and fulfillment of Convention obligations is identified as a distinct objective in a large number of projects.

223. The UNFCCC capacity-building framework identifies 15 priority areas for capacity-building, as listed in decision 2/CP.7:

- (a) Institutional capacity-building, including the strengthening or establishment, as appropriate, of national climate change secretariats or national focal points;
- (b) Enhancement and/or creation of an enabling environment;

- (c) NCs;
- (d) National climate change program;
- (e) GHGs, emissions database management, and systems for collecting, managing and utilizing activity data and emission factors;
- (f) Vulnerability and adaptation assessment;
- (g) Capacity-building for implementation of adaptation measures;
- (h) Assessment for implementation of mitigation options;
- (i) Research and systemic observation, including meteorological, hydrological and climatological services;
- (j) Development and transfer of technology;
- (k) Improved decision-making, including assistance for participation in international negotiations;
- (l) Clean Development Mechanism;
- (m) Needs arising out of the implementation of Article 4, paragraphs 8 and 9, of the Convention;
- (n) Education, training and public awareness; and
- (o) Information and networking, including the establishment of databases.

224. In calendar year 2019, the CBIT TF, GEFTF, LDCF, and SCCF portfolios supported 65 (15 CBIT, 34 CCM and 16 CCA) stand-alone and MFA projects with various capacity-building priorities as listed above, in the form of technical assistance. The total GEF funding towards supporting these capacity-building activities in 2019 amounted to approximately \$84.7 million. Of these activities, 30 projects provided support to 26 SIDS and LDCs with capacity-building activities amounting to \$41.2 million. These activities were communicated to the UNFCCC through its capacity-building portal in July 2020.

225. These projects cut across 12 out of the 15 UNFCCC-defined priority areas for capacity-building (a, b, c, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, n, and o). The majority of CCM projects address enhancement of enabling environments, institutional capacity-building, education, training and public awareness and support for NCs. Projects supported by the CBIT TF focused on GHG inventories, emission database management, and systems for collecting, managing, and utilizing activity data and emission factors, on institutional capacity building, and on education, training and public awareness. As for CCA projects, efforts include capacity building for implementation of adaptation measures, institutional development and strengthening, enhancement of enabling environments, and research and systemic observation through climate information systems.

226. The GEF continues to support the implementation of Article 6 of the Convention and the Doha Work Program, including by providing financial resources to non-Annex I Parties, in particular African countries, LDCs, and SIDS. In 2019, the GEF provided a minimum of \$11.4 million towards education, training, and public awareness through its regular CCM and CCA programming. In addition, many NC projects contain components that provide support for education, training, and public awareness.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: GEF-7 FUNDING ENVELOPES AND ALLOCATIONS

The following table provides the initial STAR country allocations for all countries that receive an allocation in GEF-7.⁹⁰

Table A1.1: Initial GEF-7 STAR Country Allocations (\$ million)⁹¹

| <i>Country</i> | <i>Climate change</i> | <i>Biodiversity</i> | <i>Land degradation</i> | <i>Total</i> | <i>Fully flexible</i> | <i>Marginal adjustment⁹²</i> |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|---|
| Afghanistan | 1.50 | 3.00 | 4.43 | 8.93 | no | 2.00 |
| Albania | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 4.00 | yes | |
| Algeria | 4.18 | 3.46 | 2.08 | 9.71 | no | 2.00 |
| Angola | 2.01 | 6.37 | 2.05 | 10.42 | no | 2.00 |
| Antigua and Barbuda | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 4.00 | yes | |
| Argentina | 6.38 | 13.10 | 5.23 | 24.71 | no | 3.21 |
| Armenia | 1.31 | 2.00 | 4.14 | 7.45 | no | 2.00 |
| Azerbaijan | 5.06 | 2.00 | 3.42 | 10.48 | no | 2.00 |
| The Bahamas | 1.00 | 4.76 | 1.22 | 6.98 | yes | |
| Bangladesh | 2.16 | 3.00 | 1.50 | 6.66 | yes | |
| Barbados | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 4.00 | yes | |
| Belarus | 5.64 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 8.64 | no | 2.00 |
| Belize | 1.00 | 2.60 | 1.00 | 4.60 | yes | |
| Benin | 1.50 | 3.00 | 5.11 | 9.61 | no | 2.00 |
| Bhutan | 1.50 | 3.00 | 1.50 | 6.00 | yes | |
| Bolivia (Plurinational State of) | 2.05 | 12.57 | 3.19 | 17.82 | no | 2.32 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 4.00 | yes | |
| Botswana | 1.00 | 2.21 | 4.10 | 7.31 | no | 2.00 |
| Brazil | 17.62 | 52.88 | 6.98 | 77.48 | no | 10.07 |
| Burkina Faso | 1.50 | 3.00 | 6.69 | 11.19 | no | 2.00 |
| Burundi | 1.50 | 3.00 | 1.50 | 6.00 | yes | |
| Cambodia | 1.50 | 3.42 | 1.50 | 6.42 | yes | |

⁹⁰ GEF, 2018, [Initial GEF-7 STAR Country Allocations](#), Council Document GEF/C.55/Inf.03 and GEF, 2018, [Updating the System for Transparent Allocation of Resources \(STAR\)](#), Council Document GEF/C.54/03/Rev.01.

⁹¹ The figures presented here are rounded to two decimal places. On the GEF Portal, these figures are presented as their actual initial amounts.

⁹² This represents the marginal adjustments allowed for countries with total initial STAR country allocations exceeding \$7 million, at \$2 million or 13 percent of their total initial STAR country allocations, whichever is higher.

| <i>Country</i> | <i>Climate change</i> | <i>Biodiversity</i> | <i>Land degradation</i> | <i>Total</i> | <i>Fully flexible</i> | <i>Marginal adjustment⁹²</i> |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|---|
| Cameroon | 1.63 | 10.96 | 1.40 | 13.99 | no | 2.00 |
| Cabo Verde | 1.00 | 6.28 | 1.21 | 8.49 | no | 2.00 |
| Central African Republic | 1.50 | 3.00 | 1.79 | 6.29 | yes | |
| Chad | 1.50 | 3.00 | 3.89 | 8.39 | no | 2.00 |
| Chile | 2.99 | 13.28 | 2.13 | 18.41 | no | 2.39 |
| China | 80.15 | 33.85 | 4.38 | 118.38 | no | 15.39 |
| Colombia | 10.85 | 39.10 | 2.05 | 52.00 | no | 6.76 |
| Comoros | 1.50 | 3.00 | 1.50 | 6.00 | yes | |
| Congo | 1.00 | 3.05 | 1.00 | 5.05 | yes | |
| Cook Islands | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 4.00 | yes | |
| Costa Rica | 1.00 | 9.76 | 1.00 | 11.76 | no | 2.00 |
| Côte D'Ivoire | 1.00 | 4.70 | 3.29 | 8.99 | no | 2.00 |
| Cuba | 1.86 | 9.26 | 1.00 | 12.12 | no | 2.00 |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 3.10 | 16.26 | 2.22 | 21.58 | no | 2.81 |
| Djibouti | 1.50 | 3.00 | 2.70 | 7.20 | no | 2.00 |
| Dominica | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 4.00 | yes | |
| Dominican Republic | 1.00 | 4.98 | 1.00 | 6.98 | yes | |
| Ecuador | 1.45 | 24.38 | 3.06 | 28.89 | no | 3.76 |
| Egypt | 5.93 | 4.18 | 1.67 | 11.77 | no | 2.00 |
| El Salvador | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 4.00 | yes | |
| Equatorial Guinea | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 4.00 | yes | |
| Eritrea | 1.50 | 3.00 | 3.74 | 8.24 | no | 2.00 |
| Ethiopia | 3.76 | 11.53 | 6.01 | 21.30 | no | 2.77 |
| Fiji | 1.00 | 6.13 | 1.00 | 8.13 | no | 2.00 |
| Gabon | 1.00 | 3.45 | 1.00 | 5.45 | yes | |
| Gambia | 1.50 | 3.00 | 5.33 | 9.83 | no | 2.00 |
| Georgia | 1.50 | 2.00 | 2.20 | 5.70 | yes | |
| Ghana | 1.00 | 4.27 | 4.20 | 9.47 | no | 2.00 |
| Grenada | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 4.00 | yes | |
| Guatemala | 1.00 | 7.38 | 1.00 | 9.38 | no | 2.00 |

| <i>Country</i> | <i>Climate change</i> | <i>Biodiversity</i> | <i>Land degradation</i> | <i>Total</i> | <i>Fully flexible</i> | <i>Marginal adjustment⁹²</i> |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|---|
| Guinea | 1.50 | 3.70 | 1.92 | 7.12 | no | 2.00 |
| Guinea-Bissau | 1.50 | 3.00 | 1.50 | 6.00 | yes | |
| Guyana | 1.00 | 2.96 | 1.00 | 4.96 | yes | |
| Haiti | 1.50 | 5.70 | 1.50 | 8.70 | no | 2.00 |
| Honduras | 1.00 | 9.13 | 1.00 | 11.13 | no | 2.00 |
| India | 47.24 | 34.02 | 4.36 | 85.61 | no | 11.13 |
| Indonesia | 12.04 | 64.59 | 2.25 | 78.88 | no | 10.25 |
| Iran (Islamic Republic of) | 4.85 | 3.17 | 2.87 | 10.89 | no | 2.00 |
| Iraq | 3.55 | 2.00 | 3.13 | 8.69 | no | 2.00 |
| Jamaica | 1.00 | 4.12 | 1.84 | 6.96 | yes | |
| Jordan | 1.18 | 2.00 | 3.45 | 6.63 | yes | |
| Kazakhstan | 7.19 | 3.24 | 6.27 | 16.70 | no | 2.17 |
| Kenya | 1.66 | 9.61 | 4.71 | 15.98 | no | 2.08 |
| Kiribati | 1.50 | 3.14 | 1.50 | 6.14 | yes | |
| Kyrgyzstan | 1.02 | 2.00 | 2.70 | 5.71 | yes | |
| Lao PDR | 1.50 | 5.07 | 1.50 | 8.07 | no | 2.00 |
| Lebanon | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.50 | 5.50 | yes | |
| Lesotho | 1.50 | 3.00 | 1.50 | 6.00 | yes | |
| Liberia | 1.50 | 3.13 | 1.50 | 6.13 | yes | |
| Libya | 1.78 | 2.00 | 1.11 | 4.89 | yes | |
| Madagascar | 1.50 | 33.79 | 3.16 | 38.45 | no | 5.00 |
| Malawi | 1.50 | 3.16 | 1.60 | 6.27 | yes | |
| Malaysia | 5.77 | 15.18 | 1.00 | 21.95 | no | 2.85 |
| Maldives | 1.00 | 2.44 | 1.00 | 4.44 | yes | |
| Mali | 1.50 | 3.00 | 5.84 | 10.34 | no | 2.00 |
| Marshall Islands | 1.00 | 3.31 | 1.00 | 5.31 | yes | |
| Mauritania | 1.50 | 3.00 | 2.93 | 7.43 | no | 2.00 |
| Mauritius | 1.00 | 4.24 | 1.00 | 6.24 | yes | |
| Mexico | 13.46 | 47.04 | 4.04 | 64.54 | no | 8.39 |
| Micronesia (Federated States of) | 1.00 | 4.46 | 1.00 | 6.46 | yes | |

| <i>Country</i> | <i>Climate change</i> | <i>Biodiversity</i> | <i>Land degradation</i> | <i>Total</i> | <i>Fully flexible</i> | <i>Marginal adjustment⁹²</i> |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|---|
| Mongolia | 2.35 | 3.39 | 3.34 | 9.09 | no | 2.00 |
| Montenegro | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 4.00 | yes | |
| Morocco | 2.49 | 3.48 | 4.44 | 10.41 | no | 2.00 |
| Mozambique | 2.08 | 10.84 | 4.47 | 17.39 | no | 2.26 |
| Myanmar | 4.26 | 9.84 | 1.50 | 15.59 | no | 2.03 |
| Namibia | 1.00 | 6.25 | 6.62 | 13.88 | no | 2.00 |
| Nauru | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 4.00 | yes | |
| Nepal | 1.50 | 3.75 | 1.77 | 7.03 | no | 2.00 |
| Nicaragua | 1.00 | 5.37 | 1.00 | 7.37 | no | 2.00 |
| Niger | 1.50 | 3.00 | 5.07 | 9.57 | no | 2.00 |
| Nigeria | 10.78 | 5.64 | 4.26 | 20.68 | no | 2.69 |
| Niue | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 4.00 | yes | |
| Pakistan | 5.93 | 3.81 | 4.36 | 14.10 | no | 2.00 |
| Palau | 1.00 | 2.06 | 1.00 | 4.06 | yes | |
| Panama | 1.00 | 10.71 | 1.00 | 12.71 | no | 2.00 |
| Papua New Guinea | 1.00 | 17.31 | 1.00 | 19.31 | no | 2.51 |
| Paraguay | 1.00 | 2.48 | 2.88 | 6.36 | yes | |
| Peru | 3.06 | 29.17 | 2.57 | 34.80 | no | 4.52 |
| Philippines | 4.28 | 32.86 | 1.11 | 38.25 | no | 4.97 |
| Republic of Moldova | 1.00 | 2.00 | 5.28 | 8.28 | no | 2.00 |
| Russian Federation | 39.86 | 13.46 | 6.68 | 60.00 | no | 7.80 |
| Rwanda | 1.50 | 3.00 | 1.50 | 6.00 | yes | |
| Saint Kitts and Nevis | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 4.00 | yes | |
| Saint Lucia | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 4.00 | yes | |
| Saint Vincent and the Grenadines | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 4.00 | yes | |
| Samoa | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 4.00 | yes | |
| São Tomé and Príncipe | 1.50 | 3.38 | 3.41 | 8.28 | no | 2.00 |
| Senegal | 1.50 | 4.45 | 5.19 | 11.14 | no | 2.00 |
| Serbia | 1.47 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 4.47 | yes | |
| Seychelles | 1.00 | 4.59 | 1.00 | 6.59 | yes | |

| <i>Country</i> | <i>Climate change</i> | <i>Biodiversity</i> | <i>Land degradation</i> | <i>Total</i> | <i>Fully flexible</i> | <i>Marginal adjustment⁹²</i> |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|---|
| Sierra Leone | 1.50 | 3.00 | 1.50 | 6.00 | yes | |
| Solomon Islands | 1.50 | 7.31 | 1.50 | 10.31 | no | 2.00 |
| Somalia | 1.68 | 7.31 | 4.70 | 13.69 | no | 2.00 |
| South Africa | 10.15 | 23.83 | 4.12 | 38.11 | no | 4.95 |
| South Sudan | 1.50 | 3.00 | 1.50 | 6.00 | yes | |
| Sri Lanka | 1.00 | 8.15 | 1.70 | 10.85 | no | 2.00 |
| Sudan | 1.50 | 3.00 | 2.87 | 7.37 | no | 2.00 |
| Suriname | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 4.00 | yes | |
| Swaziland (Eswatini) | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.67 | 5.67 | yes | |
| Syrian Arab Republic | 1.15 | 2.00 | 3.10 | 6.24 | yes | |
| Tajikistan | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.73 | 5.73 | yes | |
| Thailand | 7.36 | 9.60 | 1.61 | 18.56 | no | 2.41 |
| The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (North Macedonia) | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.18 | 5.18 | yes | |
| Timor-Leste | 1.50 | 3.00 | 1.50 | 6.00 | yes | |
| Togo | 1.50 | 3.00 | 2.73 | 7.23 | no | 2.00 |
| Tonga | 1.00 | 2.89 | 1.00 | 4.89 | yes | |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 1.05 | 2.07 | 1.16 | 4.27 | yes | |
| Tunisia | 1.29 | 2.00 | 4.32 | 7.61 | no | 2.00 |
| Turkey | 7.25 | 4.53 | 3.59 | 15.37 | no | 2.00 |
| Turkmenistan | 2.37 | 2.00 | 3.15 | 7.52 | no | 2.00 |
| Tuvalu | 1.50 | 3.00 | 1.50 | 6.00 | yes | |
| Uganda | 1.50 | 3.84 | 2.39 | 7.74 | no | 2.00 |
| Ukraine | 10.01 | 2.00 | 3.39 | 15.39 | no | 2.00 |
| United Republic of Tanzania | 1.79 | 16.79 | 5.42 | 24.00 | no | 3.12 |
| Uruguay | 1.00 | 2.54 | 1.00 | 4.54 | yes | |
| Uzbekistan | 10.94 | 2.00 | 5.34 | 18.28 | no | 2.38 |
| Vanuatu | 1.50 | 3.91 | 1.50 | 6.91 | yes | |
| Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) | 3.76 | 15.05 | 1.00 | 19.82 | no | 2.58 |
| Viet Nam | 3.62 | 13.00 | 1.39 | 18.01 | no | 2.34 |
| Yemen | 1.50 | 5.64 | 2.19 | 9.33 | no | 2.00 |

| <i>Country</i> | <i>Climate change</i> | <i>Biodiversity</i> | <i>Land degradation</i> | <i>Total</i> | <i>Fully flexible</i> | <i>Marginal adjustment⁹²</i> |
|----------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|---|
| Zambia | 3.32 | 5.08 | 2.41 | 10.81 | no | 2.00 |
| Zimbabwe | 1.32 | 3.53 | 4.40 | 9.25 | no | 2.00 |

ANNEX 2: LIST OF FY 2020 PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS UNDER THE GEF TRUST FUND

This Annex lists projects and programs on CCM and EAs approved under the GEFTF in the reporting period (July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020).

1. List of FY 2020 Climate Change Mitigation Projects and Programs

Table A2.1: FY 2020 Climate Change Mitigation Projects and Programs

| GEF ID | Country | Agency | Title | Type ^a | GEF amount ^b (\$ million) | Co-financing (\$ million) | Total (\$ million) |
|--|-----------|---------------|---|-------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Stand-alone projects and programs | | | | | | | |
| 10088 | Global | UNDP/U NEP | <i>Global Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) Platform Phase II B: Unified Support Platform and Program for Article 13 of the Paris Agreement</i> | Mixed | 7.2 | 0.9 | 8.1 |
| 10149 | Malawi | UNEP | <i>Malawi Climate Transparency Framework</i> | Mixed | 1.2 | 0.2 | 1.4 |
| 10150 | Thailand | UNEP | <i>Strengthening Thailand's institutional and technical capacities to comply with the Enhanced Transparency Framework of the Paris Agreement</i> | Mixed | 2.2 | 1.0 | 3.2 |
| 10156 | Benin | FAO | <i>Strengthening capacity in the agriculture, forestry and other land-use sector for enhanced transparency in the implementation and monitoring of Benin's Nationally Determined Contribution</i> | Mixed | 1.5 | 0.3 | 1.8 |
| 10157 | Namibia | UNDP | <i>Enhancing Namibia's capacity to establish a comprehensive Transparency Framework for Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) of climate actions and reporting on NDC implementation under the Paris Agreement</i> | Mixed | 1.3 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| 10260 | Mauritius | UNDP | <i>Strengthening the national greenhouse gas inventory of the Republic of Mauritius to improve climate reporting and transparency</i> | Mixed | 1.4 | 0.8 | 2.2 |
| 10305 | Guatemala | UNDP | <i>Strengthening Guatemala's transparency framework through capacity building to implement the Paris Agreement</i> | Mixed | 1.7 | 0.1 | 1.8 |
| 10308 | Indonesia | UNDP | <i>Strengthening the Capacity of Institutions in Indonesia to comply with the Transparency Requirements of the Paris Agreement (CBIT)</i> | Mixed | 2.1 | 1.0 | 3.1 |
| 10317 | Maldives | UNEP | <i>Capacity Strengthening for Improved Transparency of Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Actions in the Maldives</i> | Mixed | 1.6 | 0.5 | 2.1 |
| 10318 | Haiti | UNDP | <i>Strengthening National Institutions in Haiti to meet the Transparency Requirements of the Paris Agreement</i> | Mixed | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| 10321 | Global | UNEP | <i>Zero Carbon Buildings for All: from Energy Efficiency to Decarbonization</i> | EE | 2.2 | 6.8 | 9.0 |
| 10342 | Paraguay | UNEP | <i>Establish an integral MRV/M&E system to enhance climate transparency in Paraguay</i> | Mixed | 2.1 | 0.4 | 2.4 |

| GEF ID | Country | Agency | Title | Type ^a | GEF amount ^b (\$ million) | Co-financing (\$ million) | Total (\$ million) |
|---|------------|------------|--|-------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 10355 | Viet Nam | UNDP | Strengthen Viet Nam's capacities to manage data flows and report information adequately to fulfill the enhanced transparency framework of the Paris Agreement requirements | Mixed | 2.2 | 3.2 | 5.4 |
| 10358 | Lebanon | UNDP | Lebanon Sustainable Low-emission Transport Systems | TU | 4.0 | 82.5 | 86.5 |
| 10366 | China | UNDP | Enabling Zero Carbon Energy in Rural Towns and Villages in China (EZCERTV) Project | RE | 10.0 | 89.6 | 99.6 |
| 10370 | India | UNDP | Accelerating adoption of super-efficient technologies for sustainable thermal comfort in buildings in India | EE | 5.0 | 94.1 | 99.1 |
| 10372 | Mauritius | UNDP | Promoting Low-carbon Electric Public Bus Transport in Mauritius | TU | 3.6 | 17.8 | 21.4 |
| 10392 | Iraq | UNDP | Promoting Carbon Reduction Through Energy Efficiency (EE) Techniques in Baghdad City | EE | 3.6 | 23.0 | 26.6 |
| 10402 | Azerbaijan | UNDP | Scaling up investment in energy efficiency in buildings through enhanced energy management information system (EMIS) and green social housing | EE | 5.1 | 66.2 | 71.2 |
| 10408 | Global | UNIDO | Global Cleantech Innovation Programme (GCIP) to accelerate the uptake and investments in innovative cleantech solutions | TT | 19.6 | 138.0 | 157.6 |
| 10413 | Regional | UNDP | GEF-7 Africa Minigrids Program | RE | 26.4 | 344.3 | 370.7 |
| 10421 | Belarus | UNDP | Reducing barriers to promote electric mobility in the Republic of Belarus through the introduction of ultra-fast charging stations | TU | 1.5 | 13.6 | 15.1 |
| 10443 | Serbia | UNDP | Enhancing the Energy Management System to Scale up Energy Efficiency Investments in Public Buildings in Serbia | EE | 1.6 | 48.0 | 49.6 |
| 10449 | Fiji | UNEP World | Strengthen capacity to ensure transparency of action implemented and support received to implement Fiji's Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and Low Emissions Development Strategy (LEDS) | Mixed | 1.6 | 0.1 | 1.7 |
| 10501 | Global | Bank | IFC-GEF Greener Shipping Investment Platform | Mixed | 14.7 | 142.3 | 157.0 |
| 10544 | Global | UNEP | Global Programme to Support Countries with the Shift to Electric Mobility - Addendum | TU | 21.9 | 218.8 | 240.7 |
| Stand-alone projects and programs Subtotal | | | | | 147.0 | 1,293.3 | 1,440.2 |
| Multi-focal area projects and programs | | | | | | | |
| 10309 | Global | CI | Staying within Sustainable Limits: Advancing Leadership of the Private Sector and Cities | Mixed | 2.2 | 4.2 | 6.4 |
| 10322 | Global | CI | The Food Securities Fund: A fund to finance sustainable supply chains at scale in Emerging Markets | AFOLU | 15.0 | 773.3 | 788.3 |
| 10328 | Regional | EBRD | Circular Economy Regional Programme Initiative (Near Zero Waste) | EE | 15.0 | 141.9 | 156.9 |

| GEF ID | Country | Agency | Title | Type ^a | GEF amount ^b (\$ million) | Co-financing (\$ million) | Total (\$ million) |
|--|-----------|--|---|-------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 10336 | Regional | IADB | <i>Agtech for inclusion and sustainability: SP Ventures' Regional Fund (Agventures II)</i> | AFOLU | 5.5 | 55.0 | 60.5 |
| 10360 | Egypt | UNDP | <i>Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Egypt</i> | SGP | 2.4 | 6.7 | 9.1 |
| 10363 | Malaysia | UNDP | <i>Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Malaysia</i> | SGP | 2.8 | 4.1 | 6.9 |
| 10391 | Global | UNEP, ADB, UNDP, World Bank, UNEP, World Bank, UNEP, FAO | <i>Sustainable Cities Impact Program</i> | TU | 159.9 | 1,689.8 | 1,849.7 |
| 10397 | Global | FAO | <i>Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration (FOLUR) Impact Program Addendum AGRI3 A Forest Conservation and Sustainable Agriculture Fund for Developing Countries</i> | AFOLU | 74.0 | 768.9 | 843.0 |
| 10497 | Global | CI | <i>Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Mexico</i> | AFOLU | 15.0 | 146.0 | 161.0 |
| 10504 | Mexico | UNDP | <i>Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Mexico</i> | SGP | 5.0 | 9.5 | 14.5 |
| 10510 | Indonesia | UNDP | <i>Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Indonesia</i> | SGP | 4.0 | 4.5 | 8.5 |
| 10576 | Global | World Bank, FAO | <i>Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration (FOLUR) Impact Program- Addendum II</i> | AFOLU | 28.6 | 213.7 | 242.2 |
| Multi-focal area projects and programs Subtotal | | | | | 329.4 | 3,817.5 | 4,146.9 |

^a AFOLU: agriculture, forestry and other land uses, EE: energy efficiency, Mixed: includes mixed objectives and CBIT projects, RE: renewable energy, SGP: small-grants program, TU: sustainable transport and urban systems, TT: demonstration, deployment, and transfer of innovative LCTs.

^b GEF amount includes PPGs and Agency Fees.

2. List of FY 2020 Enabling Activity Projects

Table A2.2: FY 2020 Enabling Activity Projects

| <i>GEF ID</i> | <i>Country</i> | <i>Agency</i> | <i>Title</i> | <i>GEF amount^a (\$ million)</i> | <i>Co- financing (\$ million)</i> | <i>Total (\$ million)</i> |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|---------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| 10231 | Marshall Islands | UNDP | <i>Third National Communication and First Biennial Update Report</i> | 0.9 | 0.1 | 1.0 |
| 10294 | Malaysia | UNDP | <i>Fourth National Communication and Third Biennial Update Report (BUR) on Climate Change for Malaysia</i> | 0.9 | 0.2 | 1.1 |
| 10311 | Moldova | UNEP | <i>Republic of Moldova: Preparation of the Third Biennial Update Report (BUR3) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)</i> | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| 10319 | Samoa | UNDP | <i>Third National Communication and First Biennial Update Report</i> | 0.9 | 0.2 | 1.1 |
| 10441 | Indonesia | UNDP | <i>Fourth National Communication and 4th Biennial Update Report to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)</i> | 3.1 | 34.2 | 37.3 |
| 10445 | Jamaica | UNDP | <i>Learning-by-doing preparation of the Fourth National Communication and Second Biennial Update Report to the UNFCCC</i> | 0.9 | 0.3 | 1.2 |
| 10450 | Nicaragua | FAO | <i>Enabling Preparation of Nicaragua's Fourth National Communication and First Biennial Update Report to UNFCCC</i> | 0.9 | 0.4 | 1.4 |
| 10487 | Chile | UNDP | <i>Fourth Biennial Update Report</i> | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| 10491 | Colombia | UNDP | <i>Colombia's Third Biennial Update Report (BUR-3)</i> | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.5 |
| 10493 | India | UNDP | <i>Preparation of India's Fourth National Communication (4NC) and Fourth Biennial Update Report (BUR4) to the UNFCCC and strengthening institutional and analytical capacities on climate change.</i> | 5.0 | 17.5 | 22.5 |
| 10506 | Mexico | UNDP | <i>Mexico's Third Biennial Update Report (BUR3)</i> | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.7 |
| 10513 | Uruguay | UNDP | <i>Fourth Biennial Update Report and Sixth National Communication under the UNFCCC</i> | 0.9 | 0.2 | 1.2 |
| Enabling activities Subtotal | | | | 15.3 | 53.7 | 68.9 |

^a GEF amount includes Agency Fees (there is no PPG).

3. Summaries of Climate Change Mitigation Projects and Programs Approved in FY 2020

Global: *Global Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) Platform Phase II B: Unified Support Platform and Program for Article 13 of the Paris Agreement* (GEF ID: 10088, UNDP/UNEP, GEFTF: \$7.2 million, Total Cost: \$8.1 million). This project will ensure that developing countries are supported by a single comprehensive platform on transparency and reporting. More specifically, the project will focus on combining the efforts of the previously funded UNDP/UNEP Global Support Program (GSP) and the CBIT Global Coordination Platform to become a one-stop shop for information and technical assistance related to MRV and transparency under the Convention and the Paris Agreement. This support program was split into two projects, Phase II A and Phase II B. The Phase II A project, an MSP approved on October 2018, utilized CBIT Trust Fund resources and focused on merging the existing web platforms related to each global initiative and on maintaining the core services provided under them. This Phase II B project is supported mostly by climate change set-aside resources and will be focused on direct technical assistance and supporting South-South sub-regional peer activities to improve the capacity of developing countries to undertake MRV and meet future reporting requirements under the Paris Agreement. It will particularly respond to the needs arising from the modalities, procedures, and guidelines adopted and the requirement to submit the first biennial transparency report (and national inventory report, if submitted as a stand-alone report) by December 31, 2024, which includes elements that many developing countries will need to introduce or strengthen. The project will complement country-level activities from CBIT and enabling activity projects by providing additional, targeted regional and global support, and dissemination of best practices.

Malawi: *Malawi Climate Transparency Framework* (GEF ID: 10149, UNEP, GEFTF: \$1.2 million, Total Cost: \$1.4 million). This project will map and assess the existing MRV stakeholders and legal and regulatory framework on climate transparency initiatives to define roles and responsibilities for enhanced transparency and tracking going forward. The project would formalize institutional arrangements and relevant government structures to assign a climate transparency unit in charge of the MRV system operation, and develop tools and protocols for use by that unit and by other, relevant ministries to track and report GHG emissions, climate actions, and support received. Country-specific emission factors for energy, agriculture, forestry and AFOLU, transport, industry, and waste sectors will be developed. The project will establish and operationalize a data collection, integration, and sharing platform, and train climate transparency unit members and relevant stakeholders to effectively use the data platform and collaborate on planning and decision-making. Data will also be made publicly available through the integrated data platform. Field data teams from the key sectors will be assigned and trained in collecting, processing, and transmitting GHG data.

Thailand: *Strengthening Thailand's Institutional and Technical Capacities to Comply with the Enhanced Transparency Framework of the Paris Agreement* (GEF ID: 10150, UNEP, GEFTF: \$2.2 million, Total Cost: \$3.2 million). This project will strengthen Thailand's national institutions for transparency-related activities and formalize its institutional arrangements in alignment with national priorities, including the development of clear institutional mandates and data-sharing agreements to be adopted by the government. The project also aims to strengthen Thailand's technical and institutional capacities to meet the provisions stipulated in the Article 13 of the Paris Agreement. This project will promote engagement of key stakeholders, including relevant Ministries and Agencies, academia, CSO, and the private sector, in collaboration with other on-going projects such as the UNDP-GEF project on the 4th National Communication and 3rd Biennial Update Report to be submitted to the UNFCCC.

Benin: *Strengthening Capacity in the Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land-use Sector for Enhanced Transparency in the Implementation and Monitoring of Benin's Nationally Determined Contribution* (GEF ID: 10156, FAO, GEFTF: \$1.5 million, Total Cost: \$1.8 million). This project will develop and implement a capacity building program so that by 2023, Benin is preparing reports from the energy, agriculture, and land use sectors consistent with the requirements of the Enhanced Transparency Framework, including more up-to-date inventories of emissions sources and sinks using advanced IPCC guidance and information necessary to track progress against priority actions identified in Benin's NDC. The project will allow the development of new infrastructure, systems, and institutional arrangements using recent advances and tools for estimating GHG emissions or collecting activity data. The core outcome of the project is to establish an enabling institutional coordination mechanism to ensure greater, stable, and financially sustainable collaboration among the involved ministries. The information management systems and infrastructure for monitoring and reporting mitigation and adaptation actions in the energy and AFOLU sectors established under the project will be designed to enable easy replication and adoption by other sectors.

Namibia: *Enhancing Namibia's Capacity to Establish a Comprehensive Transparency Framework for Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) of Climate Actions and Reporting on NDC Implementation under the Paris Agreement* (GEF ID: 10157, UNDP, GEFTF: \$1.3 million, Total Cost: \$1.3 million). This project will establish and strengthen working groups in each of the four key sectors, including energy, IPPU, AFOLU and waste, as key entities for data collection and processing. The legal and regulatory requirements for a national transparency framework will be drafted and adopted as part of the project, and an integrated MRV system (hardware and software) of tracking tools for transparency-related actions established. While Namibia already has a greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory, the project will support the enhancement of the Inventory as per the gaps and needs previously identified, including by developing and implementing a quality control management system and enhanced documentation management. The NDC will be reviewed and information included, as appropriate, to enhance the quality of baseline projections. A methodology to keep track of progress in the implementation of the NDC will be developed and adopted. This way, the project is expected to have long-term impact in enhancing the country's climate ambition.

Mauritius: *Strengthening the National Greenhouse Gas Inventory of the Republic of Mauritius to Improve Climate Reporting and Transparency* (GEF ID: 10260, UNDP, GEFTF: \$1.4 million, Total Cost: \$2.2 million). This project will assist the Republic of Mauritius in strengthening its national GHG inventory and associated data collection process, and to mainstream greater use of the inventory in policy formulation and Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) tracking. Mauritius ratified the Paris Agreement in April 2016 and under its NDC, Mauritius is targeting a 30 percent reduction in GHG emissions by 2030. Mauritius has recently completed its Third National Communication to the UNFCCC, is currently undertaking its first Biennial Update Report and plans to commence work on its Fourth National Communication in 2020. An updated NDC will be submitted in 2020. This work, supported by the Government of France, will address a review of the initial targets set in the NDC and the development of a tracking and MRV framework to assess NDC progress. The project will address the following identified needs: graduation to Tier 2 and Tier 3 GHG estimation approaches, development of a streamlined inventory process, strengthened institutional capacities and upgraded Climate Change Information Centre (CCIC) transparency portal.

Guatemala: *Strengthening Guatemala's Transparency Framework through Capacity Building to Implement the Paris Agreement* (GEF ID: 10305, UNDP, GEFTF: \$1.7 million, Total Cost: \$1.8 million). This project will address barriers identified by previous transparency reporting and help establish an institutionalized and coordinated transparency mechanism. This CBIT project will reinforce the National Climate Change Information System implementation progress through the standardization and digitalization of source of data per mitigation sector and sources of GHG emissions, users access provision, and comparison and trends analytical GHG emissions report per mitigation sector. The project will validate adaptation indicators and obtain a better flow and understanding of bottom-up data in the following prioritized sectors: water resources, human health, infrastructure, and forest resources, ecosystems, and protected areas. The project will also develop an assessment of the needs, constraints, and gaps in the systems of the Ministry of Finance and the Presidential Secretariat of Planning and Programming, particularly on support provided, and elaborate and implement an Action Plan to improve these systems. Finally, the project will support the formalization of sectoral commissions by clarifying mandates, roles, and responsibilities towards the institutionalization of the domestic MRV system; strengthening the NDC's coordination governance framework; and improving coordination among key ministries and other stakeholders.

Indonesia: *Strengthening the Capacity of Institutions in Indonesia to Comply with the Transparency Requirements of the Paris Agreement (CBIT)* (GEF ID:10308, UNDP, GEFTF: \$2.1 million, Total Cost: \$3.1 million). This project will strengthen Indonesia's technical and institutional capacities to meet the PA's Enhanced Transparency Framework requirement. In terms of upgrading the GHG emissions inventory system, the energy, agriculture, and land-use sectors are particularly important in Indonesia as they are key sources of GHG emissions in the country. Capacity gaps should be addressed to improve institutional coordination and a robust system to track progress in achieving NDC goals across sectors and sub-sectors. Previous projects provided an important starting point in terms of capacity development for institutionalized GHG inventory and MRV system, including modeling and impact analysis. This CBIT project will strengthen existing capacities mainly by establishing an institutionalized transparency mechanism and enhancing the quality of data and information related to the GHG inventory and MRV for achieving a successful NDC and low-carbon development.

Maldives: *Capacity Strengthening for Improved Transparency of Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Actions in the Maldives* (GEF ID: 10317, UNDP, GEFTF: \$1.6 million, Total Cost: \$2.1 million). This project will be implemented by UNEP and executed by the Ministry of Environment of Maldives for four years. The project will allow the country to use a more detailed level of emission estimation to better track the emission trend changes by sector and to monitor

the level of NDC implementation. Higher tier methods will be available through the project for estimating GHG emissions for activities such as identification of country-specific emission factors, selection of technology specific calculation methods, designing of modalities and procedures for QA/QC, providing training to staff in line ministries and agencies and development of statistical methods for more comprehensive data gathering. The project will also establish systems for tracking progress on implementing mitigation actions to achieve the NDC goals.

Haiti: Strengthening National Institutions in Haiti to Meet the Transparency Requirements of the Paris Agreement (GEF ID: 10318, UNDP, GEFTF: \$1.5 million, Total Cost: \$1.5 million). This project will set up a national MRV system to track GHG emissions and impacts of mitigation actions, as well as indicators for a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system on adaptation. These systems will serve to track the NDC of Haiti according to the requirements of the enhanced transparency framework of the Paris Agreement. Haiti's NDC has sectoral mitigation targets and prioritizes integrated management of water resources and watersheds; integrated coastal areas management and infrastructures; preservation and strengthening food security; and enhanced information, education and awareness. Key gaps identified that will be addressed by the project include: lack of institutional arrangements; lack of an official national scheme defining responsibilities of each stakeholder for the exchange of data; lack of complete and reliable data sets; and insufficient technical capacities to effectively track GHG emissions and the impacts of climate change mitigation and adaptation actions.

Global: Zero Carbon Buildings for All: from Energy Efficiency to Decarbonization (GEF ID: 10321, UNDP, GEFTF: \$2.2 million, Total Cost: \$9.0 million). This project will establish the new Zero Carbon Building Accelerator, building on the first two GEF investments in the SE4All Building Efficiency Accelerator (BEA), a collaboration with UN Environment Programme and the World Resources Institute. Aligned with the Paris Agreement 1.5 degrees goal, this new initiative aims at supporting developing countries to dramatically enhance the ambition of their decarbonization efforts in the building sector. This new accelerator will support two countries, which will be selected based on pre-agreed selection criteria, in developing and adopting commitments and roadmaps towards zero carbon buildings both at national and local/municipal level. Private sector actors will be key participants in local and national partnership working groups, local workshops, regional workshops, and global events. Because the private sector designs, constructs, retrofits, and operates most buildings, the active participation and input of private sector actors in the working groups will be key to the project's success. The project is expected to result in a total direct GHG emissions savings of 4,105,973 tCO₂e over the 20-year expected lifetime.

Paraguay: Establish an Integral MRV/M&E System to Enhance Climate Transparency in Paraguay Decarbonization (GEF ID: 10342, UNEP, GEFTF: \$2.1 million, Total Cost: \$2.4 million). This project will strengthen Paraguay's transparency capacity to meet the demands of the Enhanced Transparency Framework under the Paris Agreement are identified in Paraguay's second BUR. Some of these barriers include: high dependency on international support for both technical assistance and financing of the work; available data for performing monitoring contains a high degree of uncertainty; lack of tools, and instruments such as registries; and lack of indicators to track the progress of both mitigation and adaptation actions. One of the main goals in Paraguay's MRV 2020-2030 roadmap, from the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, is the consolidations of an MRV national plan. The establishment of an information management system to ensure tracking of progress of mitigation actions is one of the MRV priorities in Paraguay. The project will support the enhancement of Paraguay's GHG inventories through the elevation of emission factors to at least Tier 2 level for some of the key categories and improvement of the collection of activity data. The project will also develop monitoring indicators for the prioritized adaptation sectors within the NDC, to support current efforts in developing local adaptation plans under the umbrella of the National Adaptation Plan.

Viet Nam: Strengthen Viet Nam's Capacities to Manage Data Flows and Report Information Adequately to Fulfill the Enhanced Transparency Framework of the Paris Agreement Requirements (GEF ID: 10355, UNDP, GEFTF: \$2.2 million, Total Cost: \$5.4 million). This CBIT project will strengthen or develop, when necessary, the current national framework to allow Viet Nam to meet enhanced transparency requirements as defined in Article 13 of the Paris Agreement, including building institutional and technical capacity for transparency. This project aims to address identified challenges and barriers to meet these requirements and enhance its NDC and climate actions. These barriers include: lack of defined roles and procedures for data exchange among stakeholders; need to strengthen the national GHG inventory system including the quality control system of line ministries and upgrading methodologies according to 2006 IPCC guidelines; lack of technical expertise at different levels on data collection and disaggregating emissions from international aviation bunkers, marine bunkers fuels, and F-gases; lack of organization and systems to link the national MRV system for the GHG inventory with sectoral MRV systems on mitigation actions; and lack of M&E system for monitoring national and international resources supporting climate change actions. The project will achieve the

following expected outcomes: (i) a robust and sustainable framework for the national GHG inventory is in place; (ii) GHG inventory coverage of large point sources is more robust; (iii) a sustainable national system to track NDC achievement is operational; (iv) gender issues are mainstreamed into MRV; (5) initial preparation for Viet Nam's first BTR and NIR in place; (v) climate expenditures and investments are coded and tracked systematically; and (vi) project knowledge informs approaches to enhanced transparency nationally and internationally.

Lebanon: Lebanon Sustainable Low-emission Transport Systems (GEF ID: 10358, UNDP, GEFTF: 3.6 million, Total Cost: \$86.0 million). This project will promote sustainable transport in Lebanon through transport demand management and low-carbon vehicle initiative. The transport sector in Lebanon, which depends entirely on gasoline and diesel and with dated vehicle population, is the second largest consumer of energy. It contributes to approximately 23 percent of the nation's GHG emissions. In its NDC to the Paris Agreement, the government of Lebanon has identified sustainable transportation as a key area in carbon emission reductions and has committed to modernizing 20 percent of its vehicle population by 2030. The proposed GEF project will provide institutional and policy supports for the promotion of sustainable low-carbon emission transport systems, improve environment for sustainable low-carbon transport systems and supporting services, and promote knowledge sharing, develop capacity, and raise awareness of low-carbon transport in the country. The tangible outputs of the project include the demonstration of low-carbon emission vehicles and renewable energy integrated charging stations for the mass transit system, the expansion of intermediate transport services with low-carbon measures, and the sustainable operation and maintenance systems and viable models for electric vehicle charging stations in the pilot systems. The Global Environment Benefits include 57,000 tCO₂ eq over its lifetime. The project will have a long-term impact on the country's transportation sector that will lead to greater carbon emission reductions by 2030.

China: Enabling Zero Carbon Energy in Rural Towns and Villages in China (EZCERTV) Project (GEF ID: 10366, UNDP, GEFTF: \$8.9 million, Total Cost \$98.5 million). This project will catalyze and accelerate zero-carbon transformation in China's rural area. Well-aligned with the GEF-7 CCM strategy and the Chinese NDCs to the UNFCCC, the project contributes to global climate change mitigation and the achievement of the United Nations sustainable development goals. In 2017, China had rural resident population of 576 million living in 690,000 administrative villages. The total rural energy consumption reached 590 million tons of coal equivalent, which caused massive amount of CO₂ emissions. China has a vast territory and abundant potential renewable energy resources, including 603 GW solar photovoltaic power generation capacity, one billion tons of crop straw resources, and 3.8 billion tons of animal wastes per year. These renewable energy resources will be sufficient for the development of a zero-carbon economy in rural China. This GEF project will incentivize the private sector and other Chinese stakeholders to invest in 182 MW of RE-based power generation capacity in 118 rural villages and three towns for demonstration of zero-carbon economy initiative in rural China. The project is expected to reduce around 4.1 million tons of GHG emissions.

India: Accelerating Adoption of Super-efficient Technologies for Sustainable Thermal Comfort in Buildings in India (GEF ID: 10370, UNDP, GEFTF: \$4.4 million, Total Cost: \$99.1 million). The project will support reduction of GHG emissions from the building sector in India by scaling up adoption of energy efficient cooling technologies. It aims to adopt a comprehensive approach of harmonizing policies related to building codes, cooling, and energy efficiency, and supporting pilots and market incentives for acceleration of innovative super energy-efficient and zero Global Warming Potential (GWP) cooling applications. The project will facilitate coordination between institutions, establish partnerships with the private sector and create consumer awareness to adopt climate friendly technologies to meet rapidly increasing cooling demand. The project will establish linkages with global accelerator platforms such as SE4ALL, Building Energy Accelerator Platform, the Global Cooling Prize, and the Kigali Cooling Efficiency Program for experience sharing and global upscaling of innovative technologies and business models. The project is expected to reduce 4.1 Mt CO₂ eq and also tackle the growing heat island effect in cities. The project is directly aligned with India's NDC and will complement the government's efforts under the Montreal Protocol to phase out high GWP refrigerants.

Mauritius: Promoting Low-carbon Electric Public Bus Transport in Mauritius (GEF ID: 10372, Agency: UNDP, GEFTF: \$3.2 million, Total Cost: \$21.0 million). The project will support the introduction of modern and emissions-free vehicles in Mauritius, complementing the new MetroExpress light commuter train infrastructure by introducing a fleet of small electric buses to be operated along the new train line's feeder and last-mile connectivity routes from rural areas to high-density urban areas. Buses are the principal form of public transport in Mauritius and account for about seven percent of the country's entire vehicle fleet. Over 60 percent of the population uses buses at least once a week, with many passengers using them daily for commuting purposes. At the same time, transportation is the second largest GHG emitting sector after energy generation, and emissions from transportation increased 37.5 percent from 2000 to 2013 and keep growing. The bus fleet is fuel-inefficient, polluting, uncomfortable, and often unsanitary, and

unsuitable for use by physically challenged and elderly commuters. The project will promote capital investments into emissions-free transportation in Mauritius by supporting the introduction of a conducive policy and regulatory framework and through the provision of direct financial incentives for electric buses and solar charging infrastructures. In addition, the project will also build adequate technical capacity in local stakeholders and system operators, as well as raising awareness about the benefits of clean transportation in the general public. The project is being implemented in parallel with concurrent efforts by the Government of Mauritius to significantly increase the share of renewable energy in the electricity generation mix. Furthermore, the project has been designed in the context of the Government-led effort to ensure coordinated engagement between channels of climate finance, particularly the GEF and the GCF. Once implemented, the project is expected to result in approximately 30,000 tCO₂ eq in direct and indirect emission reductions, while also generating significant co-benefits including reducing local air pollution, dependency on imported fossil fuels and traffic congestion from the increase ownership of private vehicles.

Iraq: Promoting Carbon Reduction Through Energy Efficiency (EE) Techniques in Baghdad City (GEF ID: 10392, UNDP, GEFTF: \$3.1 million, Total Cost: \$26.1 million). This project will promote low-carbon development through the creation of an enabling EE strategy, programs and applications in Baghdad with a focus on the building sector. The project consists of three components: enabling policy, institutional, and legislative framework to support the development of EE programs and applications in the building sector; strengthening individual and institutional national capacity development, expertise, building codes and standards, and technical knowledge in the EE buildings sector; and establishing an EE Center. The project aims at mitigating 0.23 million tCO₂ eq in its lifetime. The project will have a long-term impact in delivering global environment benefits for Iraq, which badly needs capacity building and policy development in EE investment and improvement.

Azerbaijan: Scaling up Investment in Energy Efficiency in Buildings through Enhanced Energy Management Information System (EMIS) and Green Social Housing (GEF ID: 10402, UNDP, GEFTF: \$4.5 million, Total Cost: \$70.7million). This project will support Azerbaijan in its efforts to deploy a system-wide upgrade of the legal and regulatory framework for EE in the building sector. The building sector is Azerbaijan's largest final consumer of electricity and heat. Many public buildings were built 40 to 50 years ago and in most cases thermal properties of the building envelope are poor. Typically, heat generation systems in public buildings are outdated and inefficient without automatization and controlling units and indoor heating installations provide no possibility for indoor temperature regulation. While energy consumption in buildings increased significantly over the last decade, EE standards for buildings remained outdated and energy consumption data largely unavailable. The project will support the introduction of minimum efficiency standards for the building stock and will provide technical assistance for the drafting of an ambitious new policy and guidance for the introduction of net-zero carbon buildings, a concept that is new to the country and which will be piloted and demonstrated through the project. The key outcomes of the project will include the revision of the outdated National Energy Efficiency Action Plan and introduction of new secondary legislation to support the new EE law, the introduction of an innovative Energy Management Information System to map energy use in buildings and support capital investment decision-making, technical assistance to the National Social Housing Agency to amend its by-laws and include new EE norms and standards, which will be applied to a package of new investments financed through the project in social housing and facilities, and capacity building to municipal officials, energy auditors, architects, builders, and engineers across 30 municipalities in Azerbaijan to ensure there is enough capacity installed to enact the new EE standards. The project will generate 3.0 Mt CO₂ eq of GHG emission reduction in total.

Global (Cambodia, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Morocco, Nigeria, South Africa, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay): *Global Cleantech Innovation Programme (GCIP) to Accelerate the Uptake and Investments in Innovative Cleantech Solutions* (GEFTF: 10408, UNIDO, GEFTF: \$18.0 million, Total Cost: \$156.0 million). This program will support participating countries in developing a functioning ecosystem for clean technology entrepreneurship and will provide tailored business development and investment support to more than 1,000 businesses, with potential to generate global environmental benefits at scale. Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) often represent the backbone of the economic system in developing countries. As such, they have a strong potential to drive transformational changes towards low-carbon and resource-efficient economies by actively devising, developing, adopting, and scaling innovative cleantech solutions. In most developing economies however, cleantech entrepreneurs face serious barriers to transform promising and innovative ideas into viable businesses. Cleantech SMEs with innovative ideas often lack the skills and organizational capacity to transform their cleantech solutions into marketable products. This is compounded by the existing gaps between demand and supply of funding available for innovation in the markets where SME operate. Finally, the policy and regulatory environment in many developing economies may be not conducive enough to allow for new low-carbon ideas to be brought to fruition and scale. The GEF-7 GCIP will support countries through three pillars: (i) direct support to early-stage cleantech innovators to usher them into commercial

sustainability, (ii) support to strengthen national innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystems, and (iii) programmatic coherence and coordination amongst national child projects, monitoring, and knowledge management services. Implemented in ten countries with diverse geographical and socio-economic representation, the GEF-7 GCIP will generate 10.3 Mt CO₂ eq in direct and indirect emission reductions over 10 years.

Regional (Angola, Burkina Faso, Comoros, Djibouti, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Madagascar, Malawi, Nigeria, Somalia, Sudan): *GEF-7 Africa Mini-grids Program* (GEF ID: 10413, UNDP/AfDB, GEFTF: \$ 24.2 million, Total Costs: \$368.5 million). This program will support African countries to increase energy access by focusing on reducing the cost and increasing the commercial viability of renewable energy mini-grids for both residential and productive uses. 840 million people worldwide—including over half of the population of the African continent—have no access to electricity and to the improved income and savings that depend on electricity. Many millions more suffer from poor quality and unreliable grid-connected power, or expensive and carbon-intense diesel generators. Furthermore, access to clean and reliable energy (SDG 7) is a fundamental enabler of the broader set of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); electricity is an essential ingredient for lifting people out of poverty, improving health, boosting educational levels, reducing gender inequities, and enabling sustainable economic development. Renewable energy minigrids represent a viable solution for rural and peri-urban communities that are not expected to be reached by the electric grid in the near future. In most markets, however, clean energy minigrids are still unable to compete financially with diesel-based alternatives without appropriate incentives. The GEF-7 Africa Minigrids Program will focus on minigrid cost-reduction—across hardware costs, soft costs and financing costs—and will promote innovative business models for minigrids deployment. With lower costs, minigrids will be more competitive financially, commercial capital flows will increase, and end users will benefit from lower tariffs and expanded service. The Program will support participating countries on achieving three main outcomes: (i) facilitating the establishment of a conducive policy and regulatory environment for minigrids penetration at national level; (ii) piloting of innovative business models and private sector engagement strategies, and (iii) designing suitable financing schemes to incentivize investments. A regional child project will provide programmatic coherence and oversee the knowledge management and monitoring functions at program level. At national level, the Program will include participation from 11 countries, representative of diverse socio-economic circumstances. Nine countries (Burkina Faso, Comoros, Djibouti, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Malawi, Nigeria, Somalia, Sudan) as well as in the regional child project will utilize CCM resources, while the participation of Angola and Madagascar will be entirely financed with counterpart funding. The Program will generate more than 20 million tCO₂ eq in emission reductions, while also benefitting more than 700,000 people.

Belarus: *Reducing Barriers to Promote Electric Mobility in the Republic of Belarus through the Introduction of Ultra-fast Charging Stations* (GEF ID: 10421, UNDP, GEFTF: \$1.5 million, Total Cost: \$15.1 million). The project will promote e-vehicles in the country and help the government develop new national and municipal regulations and policy that will catalyze further investments in e-vehicles and relevant infrastructure. The project also demonstrates feasibility and cost-effectiveness of e-vehicle development in Belarus with at least six fast charging stations and build capacity and raise awareness for scaling up e-vehicles in the country. The project will mitigate 143,000 tCO₂ eq in its lifetime.

Serbia: *Enhancing the Energy Management System to Scale up Energy Efficiency Investments in Public Buildings in Serbia* (GEFID: 10443, UNDP, GEFTF: \$1.6 million, Total Cost: \$49.6 million). The objective of this project is to reduce GHG emissions by improving energy efficiency and promoting the use of renewable energy sources in public buildings in Serbia. The project has three components: (i) Developing and enabling policy framework and building capacity for energy audits and energy management; (ii) Catalyzing building related energy efficiency and renewable energy investments; and (iii) Outreach, monitoring and evaluation, and scaling-up the investment. The GEF grant will mobilize approximately \$48,000,000 from the government of Serbia and the Council of Europe Development Bank. The project will mitigate 446,000 tCO₂ eq in total.

Fiji: *Strengthen Capacity to Ensure Transparency of Action Implemented and Support Received to Implement Fiji's Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and Low Emissions Development Strategy (LEDS)* (GEF ID: 10449, UNEP, GEFTF: \$1.6 million, Total Cost: \$1.7 million). This project will strengthen institutional and human capacities to enable Fiji to comply with the requirements of the transparency framework under the Paris Agreement on Climate Change. The project will respond to the identified need for an assessment of data requirements, institutional arrangements, a data management system, standards and procedures for MRV, and an evaluation mechanism. The project will strengthen bottom-up data gathering, which may involve new legislation, policy, and expanded mandates for the main data collecting agencies, and also strengthen institutions through multi-agency activities by addressing new sources and processes for data gathering and reporting and for providing and gathering mandatory data.

Global (Bangladesh, Ecuador, Sri Lanka, Albania, Grenada, Indonesia, Philippines, Jordan, South Africa, Tunisia): *Global Programme to Support Countries with the Shift to Electric Mobility – Addendum* (GEF ID: 10544, UNEP, ADB, UNDP, EBRD, UNIDO, DBSA, GEFTF: \$21.9 million, Total Cost: Co-financing: \$240.7). The Global Programme was originally approved by the 56th Council in June 2019. This supplemental PFD requests approval of ten additional Country Child Projects, bringing the total number of participating countries from 17 to 27. The addendum reflects the increase in GEF-7 resources to be programmed and reports on the incremental information (financial and core indicator targets) relevant for the new participating countries. Additional resources are also being requested for the Global Child project. The program’s design and component structure on this Addendum are consistent with the original PFD and the objective remains to “support countries to design and implement electric mobility programs as part of an overall shift to sustainable, low-carbon transport sector.” The key objectives of this program are to de-risk investments in electric vehicles through demonstration projects that strengthen developing country experience with e-mobility and facilitate learning, while raising awareness of the multiple benefits of accelerating the electrification of the transport sector. The Program is designed to focus on all road transport modes—including two and three wheelers, cars, buses and trucks—and aims to achieve such objectives through a mix of bottom up and top-down approaches. The addendum is expected to bring additional 29.7 Mt CO₂ eq of emission reductions.

Non-Grant Instrument: *IFC-GEF Greener Shipping Investment Platform* (GEFID:10501, WB, GEFTF: \$14.7 million, Total Cost: \$142.5 million). This project will establish a financing platform to accelerate the retrofit of fleets to increase fuel efficiency and has the potential to transform one of the most carbon intensive industries towards a sustainable, low-carbon future. The project will address three barriers hindering investments into low-carbon, fuel efficient technologies specific to shipping industry: first, it will solve the split incentive barriers between ship owners and charterers to pursue energy efficiency measures; second, it will provide a de-risking structure that enables initial anchor investors to test the financing model; third, it will unlock and scale up available private sector financing for greener shipping. In recognition of the vital role that private sector financing must play to decarbonize the shipping sector, the International Maritime Organization has expressed support for this project. The project is expected to result in 20.3 Mt CO₂ eq in GHG emission reductions in total.

4. Summaries of Climate Change Mitigation Multi-Focal Area Projects Approved in FY 2020

Global: *Staying within Sustainable Limits: Advancing Leadership of the Private Sector and Cities* (GEF ID 10309, CI, GEFTF: \$2.2 million, Total Cost: \$6.4 million). The life on Earth that we desire for today and tomorrow fundamentally depends on clean air and water, biodiversity, healthy land and oceans, and a stable climate. This project will apply the best science available to develop, communicate, and promote the adoption of entity specific targets that are critical for maintaining life on Earth. The Earth Commission will define the quantitative boundary conditions that will secure continued functioning life support systems (e.g. water, land, oceans, and biodiversity) and provide a scientific synthesis that underpins the setting of targets, considering the tradeoffs and interactions between systems. Meanwhile, the Science-Based Targets Network and its associated issue hubs will adapt these targets for companies and cities to adopt at their required scales. Finally, Earth HQ, a concerted mobilization effort will ensure that the Alliance and its work is well publicized and becomes recognized as the best source of guidance regarding quantitative science-based targets. The Global Commons Alliance, supported by this project, is an unprecedented international network that aims to ensure our planet remains habitable. The Alliance brings together powerful leadership, technology, science, innovation, and communication to positively transform the world’s economic systems and protect the global commons, including climate stability.

Global (Argentina, Brazil, China, Costa Rica, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Rwanda, Sierra Leone). *Sustainable Cities Impact Program* (GEF ID: 10391, UNEP/ADB/UNDP/WB, GEFTF: \$159.9 million, Total Cost \$1,849.7 million). This Impact Program seeks to promote transformational shift in urban development by supporting cities to pursue integrated urban planning for impactful development outcomes with global environmental benefits. The proposed approach builds from the Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) program launched in GEF-6 and targets systemic drivers of environmental degradation in cities and emphasizes a holistic approach to tackling them for long-term sustainability and resilience. The PFD includes a cohort of 24 cities from nine countries that have been selected based on their strong alignment with the program vision and their high potential to generate Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) through investments in promoting transformational change. These countries represent the urban growth and associated challenges in their respective regions and have shown significant leadership in advancing the urban sustainability agenda. The cities selected in these countries are strategic not only nationally but also in the region and globally due to their economic, political, and environmental importance. Several Mayors, including women, across these cities have demonstrated proven leadership, and a catalytic support through the GEF will enhance their

sustainability ambitions and quickly deliver results on the ground. While each individual country child project will deliver substantial benefits, the program's overall potential for global transformation and sustainability will be realized by ensuring that the impact is significantly larger than the benefits aggregated across individual child projects. The Global Platform under the SCIP will play a crucial role in this. Through the Platform, the program will not only engage with the participating cities but also with other nonparticipating cities including the GEF-6 IAP cities to identify emerging sustainability challenges, understand key drivers for sustainability action, map prototypes of sustainability action, facilitate innovation and create global public good on sustainable cities through new knowledge and experiences. This Program is expected to create or bring under improved management for conservation and sustainable use over 900,000 ha, restore 25,000 ha of land, improve practice over more than 280,000 ha of productive landscapes, improve practices to benefit biodiversity of more than 38,000 ha of marine habitat (excluding protected areas), mitigate more than 184.8 Mt CO₂ eq of GHG emission, and benefit to more than 58,000,000 stakeholders.

Global (Brazil, India, Nigeria, Paraguay, Uganda). *Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration (FOLUR) Impact Program Addendum* (GEF ID: 10397, WB/UNEP/FAO, GEFTF: \$74 million, Total Cost: \$843.0 million). This Impact Program was approved by the 56th Council in June 2019. The global program originally included 18 countries across five continents. This supplemental PFD added five country projects on three continents—Brazil, India, Nigeria, Paraguay, and Uganda—and brought bring the cumulative total of GEF financing for the FOLUR IP to \$306,497,726. The objective of the FOLUR IP is “to promote sustainable, integrated landscapes and efficient food value and supply chains at scale.” The FOLUR IP outlines how GEF-7 financing will support a system-wide approach that brings together strategies and stakeholders through both horizontal (interventions with actors within landscapes, policy reform, governance strengthening, etc.) and vertical (food value and supply chain commitments and financing) dimensions. The IP will build a global coalition that engages key stakeholders in the major food systems and supply chains, including existing platforms such as the Food and Land Use coalition, Tropical Forest Alliance, Consumer Goods Forum, Bonn Challenge and others, to work collectively with countries toward achieving sustainability. The five additional countries represent an important expansion in the coverage of globally important geographies and commodities building upon the countries approved in the first-round and contributing to both scale and sustainability. Importantly, with India joining the IP, the geographic coverage of the program has been extended to include the South Asia Region, and with Brazil and Paraguay joining, the IP coverage is better representative of the soy and beef landscapes and value chains in Latin America. Nigeria and Uganda's inclusion in the program provides greater scope for engagement with sustainable policies and practices in the palm, cocoa, soy, and coffee sectors and for sharing lessons with other FOLUR country projects working on these commodity production systems in Africa and beyond. The addition of the new countries also captures the proposed potential private sector engagements, which will contribute to the FOLUR IP's reach and impact, with a notable addition of proposed engagements with soy-focused initiatives. This addendum is expected to restore over 493,000 ha of land, improve practice over more than 2,850,000 ha of productive landscapes, mitigate 78.2 Mt CO₂ eq of GHG emission, reduce of chemicals of global concern by 33 MT, and benefit to more than 2,000,000 stakeholders.

Global. *The Food Securities Fund: A Fund to Finance Sustainable Supply Chains at Scale in Emerging Markets, (NGI)* (GEF ID: 10322, CI, GEFTF: \$15 Million, Total Cost: \$788.3 million). This project is an open-ended impact investment fund providing loans to local agri-businesses through “aggregators” or companies operating in developing and emerging countries that aggregate agricultural produce from and/or provide goods and services to farmers, in particular smallholder farmers. The Food Securities Fund has a mandate covering global emerging markets, but will prioritize SMEs in Sub-Saharan Africa. This open-ended structure, if successful, can close the gap between international private capital and the growing demand for financing sustainable agricultural production that reduces negative externalities, such as the degradation of soils, water, forests, and biodiversity, or the significant release of carbon emissions. The financial structure includes a GEF equity investment of \$13.4 million and is novel in that there is a risk-sharing mechanism whereby the multinational agribusiness (value corporate partners) that source their supply from local aggregators will provide a first loss guarantee to the financing. The structure is also de-risked by an additional guarantee from USAID. The total size of the fund is expected to be \$772 million with a 52:1 co-financing ratio. The fund is expected to deliver global environment benefits through improved agricultural practices that mainstream biodiversity, land degradation through 100,000 ha of degraded land restored, and climate change with 1.0 Mt CO₂ eq in avoided emissions. The fund also supports and complements the objectives of the FOLUR IP by generating 2,000,000 ha of landscapes under sustainable land management in production system. This is the first private sector project to be aligned with a GEF IP.

Regional (Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia, Turkey). *Circular Economy Regional Programme Initiative (Near Zero Waste) (NGI)* (GEF ID 10328, EBRD, GEFTF: \$15 million, Total Cost: \$156.9 million).

This project will provide concessional funding that seeks to scale up circular economy initiatives for private sector entities (mostly SMEs) in the Western Balkans and Turkey. The project's innovative financial mechanism will focus on addressing barriers to investments in circular economy by rewarding behavior change with interest rates reduction and technical assistance. The project seeks to replace the 'end-of-life' concept with a circular approach, eliminating the use of toxic chemicals that impair reuse, and aiming at the elimination of waste through the superior design of materials, products, systems, and business models. The financing structure includes a \$13.7 million concessional loan from the GEF, and EBRD co-financing for \$140 million, which results in a co-financing ratio of 10:1. The GEF financing is instrumental to create a results-based financing mechanism whereby interest rates will be reduced when companies achieve pre-defined milestones to achieve circular economy. The loan will be provided in coordination with EBRD technical assistance aimed at identifying circular economy processes and practices that can deliver transformational change. The project expects to deliver 50,000 MT of marine litter avoided, 21.9 Mt CO₂ eq in GHG emission reductions in total, and disposal/avoidance of 10,000 MT of POPs contaminated material which has an estimated POPs content of 2,000 MT. The interventions will also reduce 75 gTEQ of unintentionally produced persistent organic pollutants.

Regional (Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay). *Agtech for Inclusion and Sustainability: SP Ventures' Regional Fund (Agventures II)* (NGI) (GEF ID 10336, IADB, GEFTF: \$5.5 million, Total Cost: \$60.5 million). This project is a venture capital fund that will invest in scaling up innovative agtech companies and start-ups in Latin America and the Caribbean. Agtech is a new term to designate investment in disruptive technologies that offer agricultural improvements, access to markets, and environmental solutions for the agricultural sector. The GEF will provide \$5 million in equity investment as a limited partner to the fund. The total size of the fund is expected to be \$60 million and co-financing ratio is expected to be 12:1. The fund's portfolio will focus on companies that seek to develop innovative solutions that would decrease the intensity of use of natural resources in agricultural production (especially water, energy, and land), increase climate resilience of small and medium holder farmers, and enable climate mitigation strategies in high carbon-intensive Ag segment. The fund manager, SP Ventures Gestora de Recursos Ltda, expects that 25,000 to 33,000 small and medium holder farmers will experience improved environmental performance as a result of the innovations introduced by the invested companies. GEB core indicators could not be provided at PIF level as the Fund manager is still in the process of raising capital and identifying the pipeline. Given the fund's investment focus, potential core indicators were identified in the following focal areas: land degradation, climate change mitigation, and chemicals and waste. This project is expected to benefit up to 735,000 stakeholders.

Egypt. *Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Egypt* (GEF ID10360, UNDP, GEFTF: \$2.4 million, Total Cost: \$9.1 million). This project will enable communities and organizations in Greater Cairo, Fayoum, Delta, and Upper Egypt landscapes to take collective action to build social, economic, and socio-ecological resilience of their production landscapes through a participatory landscape planning and management approach. The importance of the selected landscapes reside in the severe environmental problems, particularly pollution in the Cairo region, the existence of two significant protected areas (Wadi Degla and Petrified Forest), and the presence of the largest delta in the world. It also includes the Mediterranean coastline, which due to climate-induced sea-level rise, faces increased salinity, negative impacts on agriculture, and erosion of coastal lagoons. The project will support multi-functional land-use systems, integrated agro-ecological practices, eco-friendly small-scale community enterprises, and will improve market access and the development, demonstration, and financing of renewable and energy efficient technologies and mitigation options at the community level. Beside small grants, the project will also work in the broader context of providing training, capacity building, and advocacy for individuals and organizations to improve value chains, influence public policies and advocate for rights to land and territory. This project is expected to restore 11,000 ha of degraded agricultural land, bring 20,000 ha of productive landscapes under sustainable management, provide 6,000 tCO₂ eq of GHG emission reduction, and benefit 10,000 stakeholders.

Malaysia. *Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Malaysia* (GEF ID 10363, UNDP, GEFTF: \$2.8 million; Total Cost: \$6.9 million). This project will enable communities and organizations to take collective action for adaptive landscape management in building socio-ecological resilience in the Crocker Range Biosphere Reserve, Sabah; the Middle and Upper Baram, Sarawak; and the Klang Valley, Peninsular Malaysia for global environmental benefits and sustainable development. These three biologically significant landscapes have been selected in consultation with government and civil society partners and the consolidation of experiences and lessons learned from the on-going and previously supported community initiatives of GEF-5 and GEF-6 for forthcoming replication, upscaling and mainstreaming. The project will support specific community-based actions in each landscape by financing small-scale projects which include multi-stakeholder governance platforms and participatory decision making; developing sustainable community enterprises; and improving market access and development,

demonstration, and financing of renewable and energy efficiency technologies and climate mitigation options at the community level. This project is expected to restore 1,000 ha of degraded agricultural land, bring 43,000 ha of landscapes under improved practices, provide 300,000 tCO₂ eq of GHG emission reduction, and benefit 10,000 stakeholders.

Global. *AGRI3 Forest Conservation and Sustainable Agriculture Fund for Developing Countries (NGI)* (GEFID 10497, CI, GEFTF: \$15 million, Total Cost: \$161 million). This project seeks to create a de-risking fund that will incentivize commercial lenders in developing countries to provide agricultural loans that include investment in forest protection, reforestation, and sustainable land use through climate-smart agriculture. These types of investments are usually perceived as highly risky by local lenders, as borrowers require new technologies, longer maturities, and additional technical capacity. To unlock financing at local level, AGRI-3 will provide guarantees and subordinated debt to local lenders and capacity building provided by the Dutch Government to support pre-investment and post-investment capacity development. The project is expected to generate multiple environmental benefits which include land degradation, biodiversity, and climate change mitigation. Synergies will be explored in countries where the FOLUR IP is active. At least 18.4 million tCO₂ eq will be avoided while at least 91,000 ha of land will be restored, and 650,000 ha will be brought under improved management.

Mexico. *Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Mexico* (GEF ID: 10504, UNDP, GEFTF: \$5 million, Total Cost: \$14.5 million). The objective of the SGP in Mexico is to strengthen socio-ecological and economic resilience in seven landscapes and seascapes in Mexico: Forest and milpa landscape in Quintana Roo, Yucatan and Campeche States; Sustainable forestry landscape in Quintana Roo, Campeche and Yucatan; Coastal seascape in the Yucatan Peninsula; Agroforestry landscape in Chiapas and Tabasco; Usumacinta and Grijalva rivers watershed; Mixteca Landscape; and Oaxaca Mountain Landscape. Small grants will support activities in the selected landscapes and seascapes that improve connectivity, support innovation in biodiversity conservation, and optimization of ecosystem services. This will include supporting no-take zones to promote sustainable fisheries; agrobiodiversity conservation; wetland and reef restoration; establishment of new community conservation areas and territories, sustainable silvopastoral and agroforestry systems, sustainable forest management, renewable and energy efficient technologies in each landscape, including solar and wind energy applications, micro-hydrogeneration systems, biodigestors, efficient biomass use, and wood stoves. The SGP will coordinate SGP investments in these landscapes with FSP investments being undertaken in the same geographies to ensure complementarity. The global environmental benefits of the project are: (i) 2500 ha of land restored; (ii) 100,000 ha of landscapes under improved practices to benefit biodiversity; (iii) avoided emissions of 80,000 tCO₂ eq.

Indonesia. *Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Indonesia* (GEFID 10510, UNDP, GEFTF: \$4 million, Total Cost: \$8.5 million). The Seventh Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Indonesia aims to enable communities and organizations in Sabu Raijua Regency (part of the Savu Sea National Park in East Nusa Tenggara); Nantu Boliyohuto Forest (Gorontalo and Boalemo Regencies); and Bulukumba Regency (South Sulawesi); and Kendal and Wonosobo Regencies (Central Java) of Indonesia to take collective action through a participatory landscape planning and management approach aimed at enhancing socio-ecological resilience producing local and global environmental benefits. This phase of the SGP Indonesia has two components: (i) Resilient landscapes for sustainable development and global environmental protection; and (ii) Landscape Governance and adaptive management for upscaling and replication. SGP Indonesia will support specific community-based actions in each landscape by financing small-scale projects implemented by local community organizations and coordinating them within the priority landscapes to achieve landscape-scale impacts. These three landscapes and one seascape have been selected in consultation with government and civil society partners with reference to consolidation of experiences and lessons learned from the on-going and previously supported community initiatives of GEF-6 for forthcoming replication, upscaling, and mainstreaming. The targeted results include: 36,000 ha under improved management, 11,471 Mt CO₂ eq GHG emissions mitigated: and 5,000 beneficiaries.

Global (Kenya, Guinea, Uzbekistan, Nicaragua). *Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration (FOLUR) Impact Program 2nd Addendum* (GEF ID: 10576, FAO, GEFTF: \$28.6 million, Total Cost: \$242.2 million). This Impact Program was approved by the 56th Council in June 2019. The global program originally included 18 countries across five continents. An addendum to the Program adding five new countries was approved by the 57th Council in December 2019. This supplemental PFD provides an additional four country projects on three continents—Guinea, Nicaragua, Kenya, and Uzbekistan. The PFD addendum would bring the cumulative total of GEF financing for the FOLUR IP to \$335 million and the cumulative total of projected co-financing to \$2,729 million. The four new countries represent an important expansion in the coverage of globally important geographies and commodities building upon the 23 countries in the

first and second round selection and contributing to both scale and sustainability. Adding Kenya strengthens the program's representation in East Africa with coffee and maize as key commodities. The Kenya and Uganda country projects also now form a unique transboundary landscape (around Mt Elgon) in the portfolio. Inclusion of Guinea as a frontier palm country complements the strong representation of countries in West Africa, including Liberia, Ghana, and Nigeria, and targets a transboundary landscape that is shared with the FOLUR Liberia country project. Importantly, with Uzbekistan joining the IP, the geographic coverage of wheat production landscapes in Central Asia is improved with the linkage to neighboring Kazakhstan. With Nicaragua joining Mexico, Guatemala, Peru, Colombia as an IP country in LAC, the representative coverage of the mixed crop landscape of commodities and countries in Central America is more complete and stronger. The addition of the new countries also captures additional potential for private sector engagements, which will contribute to the FOLUR IP's reach and impact. With these additions, the FOLUR IP includes 27 participating countries. This addendum is expected to restore over 83,000 ha of land, improve practice over more than 1,134,000 ha of productive landscapes, mitigate 16.7 MtCO₂ eq of GHG emissions, and benefit more than 105,000 stakeholders.

5. Summaries of Enabling Activity Projects Approved in FY 2020

Marshall Islands: *Third National Communication and First Biennial Update Report* (GEF ID 10231, UNDP, GEFTF: \$0.9 million, Total Cost: \$1.0 million). The objective of this project is to assist the Marshall Islands in the preparation of its Third National Communication (TNC) and First Biennial Update Report (BUR 1) for the fulfillment of the obligations under the UNFCCC. Building on the initial and second NC, as well as lessons learned throughout, the Marshall Islands plans to submit its BUR 1 in December 2020 and the TNC in December 2022 to the UNFCCC. The project's long-term objective is to mainstream the country's climate change into national and sectoral sustainable development goals, giving continuity to the process of technical and institutional capacity-building, in part, initiated and sustained by the previous NC process.

Malaysia: *Fourth National Communication and Third Biennial Update Report on Climate Change for Malaysia* (GEF ID 10294, UNDP, GEFTF: \$0.9 million, Total Cost: \$1.1 million). The objective of this project is to support the government of Malaysia to prepare its Third Biennial Update Report (BUR 3) and Fourth National Communication (4NC) under the UNFCCC. The goal of the project is to assist Malaysia in the mainstreaming and integration of climate change into national and sectoral development processes, giving continuity to the institutional and technical capacity strengthening process through the biennial update reporting. The project builds on Malaysia's previous efforts and on the recommendations from the international consultation and analysis (ICA) process.

Moldova: *Republic of Moldova: Preparation of the Third Biennial Update Report (BUR 3) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)* (GEF ID 10311, UNEP, GEFTF: \$0.4 million, Total Cost: \$0.4 million). The objective of this project is to support the Republic of Moldova to prepare and submit its BUR 3 to comply with the UNFCCC reporting requirements while responding to its national development goals. It builds on the lessons learned and will address barriers identified in its previous two BUR cycles. This enabling activity will be implemented in coordination with the Fifth National Communication (5NC) currently under implementation, which will be completed by October 2020 and included a national inventory report through 2019.

Samoa: *Third National Communication and First Biennial Update Report* (GEF ID: 10319, UNDP, GEFTF: \$0.9 million, Total Cost: \$1.1 million). The objective of this project is to assist Samoa in preparation of its TNC and BUR 1 for the fulfillment of the obligations under the UNFCCC. Building on the second NC (SNC), Samoa plans to submit its BUR 1 in December 2021 and the TNC in September 2023 to the UNFCCC. The project approach will facilitate learning, policy change and, ultimately, the application of nationally appropriate climate action. To ensure complementarity between the BUR and the TNC, the TNC will focus on the period between 2007 and 2019, and the BUR will focus on the period between 2015 and 2017.

Indonesia: *Fourth National Communication and Fourth Biennial Update Report to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)* (GEF ID 10441, UNDP, GEFTF: \$3.1 million, Total Cost: \$37.3 million). This project will assist the Government of Indonesia meet Convention obligations, while also informing the design of public policies and measures for mitigation and adaptation to climate change and evaluation of environmental, social and economic impacts in their implementation. This project will enhance the technical capacity of sectoral ministries and develop institutional processes for data collection and management within these ministries and the Directorate General of Climate Change. The project will also contribute to building the technical capacity of non-Party actors in

evaluating the progress and the impact of the implementation of mitigation and adaptation actions on emission reduction and climate resilience.

Jamaica: Learning-by-doing preparation of the Fourth National Communication and Second Biennial Update Report to the UNFCCC (GEF ID 10445, UNDP, GEFTF: \$0.9 million, Total Cost: \$1.2 million). The project addresses Convention obligations for climate change and will allow Jamaica to prepare and submit its BUR 2 and 4NC to the UNFCCC, in December 2021 and 2022, respectively. The project will coordinate with the CBIT project currently under implementation with the IDB and will build upon lessons learned from the ICA process. Through the project the national GHG emission inventory for the years 2013–2019 will be prepared, in line with the 2006 IPCC guidelines, and introduction of the 2019 Refinement to the extent possible. The quality of the existing time series data and data collection system will be improved. The project will enhance awareness of methods of inventory preparation for selected national institutions. In terms of vulnerability and adaptation the project will develop updated information as well as adaptation measures, complemented with an estimation of their financial and economic costs, including nature-based solutions using the latest climate change scenarios. These will focus on the priority adaptation sectors of agriculture, coastal resources, human health and human settlements, tourism, and water resources. In terms of mitigation actions, the project will develop a revised, updated, and validated assessment of Jamaica’s mitigation potential by 2070 for the following sectors: energy, forestry, transportation, waste, and water resources.

Nicaragua: Enabling Preparation of Nicaragua’s Fourth National Communication and First Biennial Update Report to UNFCCC (GEF ID 10450, FAO, GEFTF: \$0.9 million, Total Cost: \$1.4 million). This enabling activity will assist Nicaragua in the preparation of its 4NC and its BUR 1 and strengthen national capacity for the implementation of the UNFCCC. With this project, it plans to submit its 4NC by December 2021 and its BUR 1 by December 2022. This is the first time that FAO is supporting an enabling activity under the UNFCCC. FAO is also supporting Nicaragua with its CBIT project and will ensure coordination of activities under both projects.

Chile: Fourth Biennial Update Report (GEF ID 10487, UNDP, GEFTF: \$0.4 million, Total Cost: \$0.4 million). The objective of this enabling activity is to support the Government of Chile to prepare its Fourth Biennial Report (BUR 4) for the fulfillment of the obligations under the UNFCCC to be submitted at the end of 2020. In 2019, the BUR 3 was subjected to the ICA process, which identified some continuous challenges and capacity needs to facilitate preparation of subsequent BURs, such as: sustainability of current arrangements; integration of climate change indicators and MRV as an assessment tool for sectoral institutions; improve capacities on tools for estimating mitigation impacts; centralization of information gathering and management through a unique platform to improve and optimize reporting, and integration of lessons learned in arrangement and design of NDC’s MRV. This project will maintain and improve BUR quality, integrate improvements according to the ICA comments and recommendations, and advance in the revision and analysis of BTR guidelines, to identify future methodological changes of the report and associated capacity-building needs.

Colombia: Colombia’s Third Biennial Update Report (BUR-3) (GEF ID 10491, UNDP, GEFTF: \$0.4 million, Total Cost: \$0.5 million). Colombia has submitted two BURs to the UNFCCC. The BUR 1 was presented in December 2015 and provided information on the national GHG inventory for the years 2010 and 2012. The BUR 2 was presented in December 2018 with updated information presented in the BUR 1 and included the national GHG inventory for the years 2013 and 2014, as well as an update of the 1990 to 2012 series of the inventory presented in the TNC. Based on the results of the needs identified in the second ICA cycle, Colombia’s BUR 3 will continue the work related to the update of national GHG inventory improvement plans. The ongoing CBIT project will be supporting the design and implementation of an information technology platform for managing and calculating the national GHG inventory. Likewise, for the first time, the country will be able to report Tier 2 and Tier 3 emissions estimates for prioritized categories in the energy sector. In general, through both projects and their synergies, Colombia will strengthen the capacity of national entities to consolidate and manage the information needed for the calculation of the GHG inventory.

India: Preparation of India’s Fourth National Communication (4NC) and Fourth Biennial Update Report (BUR4) to the UNFCCC and strengthening institutional and analytical capacities on climate change (GEF ID 10493, UNDP, GEFTF: \$5.0 million, Total Cost: \$22.5 million). The proposed project will help India prepare its 4NC and BUR 4 to fulfill its commitments to the UNFCCC in accordance with the relevant decisions of the Conference of Parties. The project will strengthen institutional and analytical capacities at a decentralized level to enable India to prepare improved climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies, enhanced technology transfer for adaptation and mitigation, and sustained institutional capacity for developing future climate change reporting. The enabling activity will build on findings and recommendations from previous NC and BUR work as well as recommendations resulting from the ICA

process for its first two BUR. India plans to submit the BUR 4 by December 2022 and the 4NC in 2025. Under this project, the GHG inventory will be updated up to 2018 for BUR 4 and the 4NC will present the inventory up to 2022 year per the IPCC 2006 guidelines or subsequent revisions. India is complementing the \$852,000 from set-aside with \$3,714,000 from its climate change STAR allocation. It will also provide \$17.5 million in-kind in co-financing.

Mexico: *Mexico's Third Biennial Update Report (BUR3)* (GEF ID 10506, UNDP, GEFTF: \$0.4 million, Total Cost: \$0.7 million). This enabling activity will assist Mexico in the preparation and submission of its BUR 3 to the UNFCCC by December 2020. Mexico submitted its BUR 2 on November 2018, so this project would enable Mexico to meet the two-year cycle. The long-term objective of this project is to assist Mexico in continuing to mainstream and integrate climate change into national and sectorial development goals by giving continuity to the institutional and technical capacity strengthening process in preparing these reports.

Uruguay: *Fourth Biennial Update Report and Sixth National Communication under the UNFCCC* (GEF ID 10513, UNDP, GEFTF: \$0.9 million, Total Cost: \$1.2 million). The long-term objective of the project is to assist Uruguay in deepening the integration of climate change into national and sectorial development goals by giving continuity to the institutional and technical capacity strengthening process initiated with the preparation of NCs and BURs. This project is aligned with the National Climate Change Policy approved by the Government in 2017. The immediate objective of the project is to allow Uruguay to prepare and submit its sixth NC (6NC) and fourth BUR (BUR 4) to the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC for the fulfillment of its obligations to the Convention. It aims to submit them by December 2021 for the BUR 4 and December 2023 for the 6NC.

ANNEX 3: LIST OF FY 2020 PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS UNDER THE LDCF AND THE SCCF

This Annex provides lists and summaries of projects and programs on CCA approved under the LDCF and the SCCF in the reporting period (July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020).

1. List of LDCF Projects and Programs Approved in FY 2020

Table A3.1: FY 2020 LDCF Projects

| GEF ID | Country | Title | Agency | Total LDCF* (\$ million) | Co-financing (\$ million) | Total (\$ million) |
|--------|-------------|---|--------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 10159 | Sudan | Resilience of Pastoral and Farming Communities to Climate Change in North Darfur | FAO | 2.8 | 10.0 | 12.8 |
| 10160 | Guinea | Increased Resilience and Adaptive Capacity of the Most Vulnerable Communities to Climate Change in Forested Guinea | UNDP | 9.9 | 26.6 | 36.5 |
| 10176 | Mauritania | Enhancing Pastoral Farming Producers Resilience in South East Watershed of Mauritania | FAO | 5.0 | 15.0 | 20.0 |
| 10178 | South Sudan | Watershed Approaches for Climate Resilience in Agro-Pastoral Landscapes† | UNDP | 9.5 | 26.5 | 36.0 |
| 10180 | Djibouti | Planning and Implementing Ecosystem-Based Adaptation (EbA) in Djibouti's Dikhil and Tadjourah Regions | UNEP | 10.0 | 13.1 | 23.1 |
| 10320 | Haiti | Strengthening the Climatic Resilience of the Drinking Water Sector in the South of Haiti | UNDP | 5.1 | 31.6 | 36.7 |
| 10350 | Sudan | Sustainable Natural Resource and Livelihood Adaptive Programme (SNRLAP) | IFAD | 2.2 | 77.0 | 79.2 |
| 10362 | Mali | Resilient, Productive and Sustainable Landscapes in Mali's Kayes Region† | FAO | 2.6 | 9.4 | 11.9 |
| 10364 | Tanzania | Integrated Adaptation Program to Enhance Resilience of Communities and Ecosystems in the dry Miombo Woodlands of Tanzania Mainland and Dryland of Zanzibar | FAO | 5.0 | 41.0 | 46.0 |
| 10376 | Liberia | Enhancing the Resilience of Vulnerable Coastal Communities in Sinoe County of Liberia | UNDP | 10.0 | 53.7 | 63.7 |
| 10377 | Congo, DR | Reducing Vulnerability and Increasing Resilience to Climate Change Through Promoting Innovation, Transfer and Large-Scale Deployment of Adaptation-Oriented Technologies in Priority Agriculture Value-Chains and Creating Jobs | UNIDO | 10.0 | 40.7 | 50.7 |

| GEF ID | Country | Title | Agency | Total LDCF* (\$ million) | Co-financing (\$ million) | Total (\$ million) |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--|--------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 10395 | Myanmar | <i>RICE-Adapt: Promoting Climate-Resilient Livelihoods in Rice-Farming Communities in the lower Ayeyarwady and Sittoung River Basins</i> | FAO | 10.0 | 40.0 | 50.0 |
| 10411 | Malawi | <i>Community-Led and Climate Smart Watershed Management for Sustainable Fisheries in Malawi</i> | AfDB | 5.0 | 14.4 | 19.4 |
| 10415 | Vanuatu | <i>Adaptation to Climate Change in the Coastal Zone in Vanuatu Phase II (VCAP II)†</i> | UNDP | 7.5 | 29.1 | 36.6 |
| 10418 | Tanzania | <i>Building Resilience through Sustainable Land Management and Climate Change Adaptation in Dodoma†</i> | AfDB | 4.2 | 145.2 | 149.4 |
| 10431 | Global | <i>Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) for Coral Reef Insurance in Asia and the Pacific</i> | ADB | 0.5 | 0.7 | 1.2 |
| 10433 | Global | <i>Piloting Innovative Financing for Climate Adaptation Technologies in Medium-Sized Cities†</i> | UNIDO | 0.3 | 0.7 | 1.0 |
| 10435 | Regional | <i>Adaptation Accelerator Program: Building Climate Resilience through Enterprise Acceleration</i> | CI | 1.2 | 2.8 | 4.0 |
| 10436 | Global | <i>Investment Readiness for the Landscape Resilience Fund†</i> | WWF-US | 0.7 | 8.0 | 8.7 |
| 10514 | Lao PDR | <i>Integrated Water Resource Management and Ecosystem-Based Adaptation (EbA) in the Xe Bang Hieng River Basin and Luang Prabang City</i> | UNDP | 6.0 | 20.0 | 26.0 |
| 10516 | Burkina Faso | <i>Improving the Climate Resilience of Agro-Sylvo-Pastoral Production Systems in Burkina Faso</i> | FAO | 10.0 | 40.2 | 50.2 |
| 10525 | Global | <i>Strengthening Endogenous Capacities of Least Developed Countries to Access Finance for Climate Change Adaptation</i> | UNEP | 2.2 | 2.0 | 4.2 |
| 10562 | Yemen | <i>Resilient and Sustainable Livelihoods for Rural Yemen†</i> | FAO | 10.0 | 42.0 | 52.0 |
| LDCF projects Subtotal | | | | 129.5 | 689.7 | 819.2 |

*: Includes GEF project financing, PPG and Fees.

†: This is a multi-trust fund project/program. Only the LCDF component is included.

2. List of SCCF Project Approved in FY 2020

Table A3.2: FY 2020 SCCF Projects

| <i>GEF ID</i> | <i>Country</i> | <i>Title</i> | <i>Agency</i> | <i>Total SCCF* (\$ million)</i> | <i>Co-financing (\$ million)</i> | <i>Total (\$ million)</i> |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|--|---------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 10296 | Global | Adaptation SME Accelerator (ASAP) | CI | 2.2 | 0.5 | 2.7 |
| 10431 | Global | Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) for Coral Reef Insurance in Asia and the Pacific† | ADB | 0.9 | 2.7 | 3.6 |
| 10433 | Global | Piloting Innovative Financing for Climate Adaptation Technologies in Medium-sized Cities† | UNIDO | 0.5 | 1.6 | 2.1 |
| 10434 | Regional (LAC) | Blended Finance Facility for Climate Resilience in Coffee and Cacao Value Chains: CC-Blend | UNEP | 1.2 | 7.0 | 8.2 |
| 10436 | Global | Investment Readiness for the Landscape Resilience Fund† | WWF-US | 0.6 | 8.0 | 8.7 |
| 10437 | Regional (SIDS) | Financial Tools for Small Scale Fishers in Melanesia | WWF-US | 1.2 | 5.3 | 6.5 |
| SCCF projects Subtotal | | | | 6.7 | 25.1 | 31.8 |

*: Includes GEF project financing, PPG and Agency Fees.

†: This is a multi-trust fund project with LDCF. Only the SCCF component is included.

3. Summaries of LDCF Projects and Programs Approved in FY 2020^{93, 94}

Sudan: *Resilience of Pastoral and Farming Communities to Climate Change in North Darfur* (GEF ID 10159; Agency: FAO; LDCF: \$2.8 million, Total Cost: \$12.8 million). This project aims to reduce climate vulnerability of pastoral and farming communities along the migratory routes in North Darfur and improve their social protection, food security, and nutritional status. It will enhance resilience by systematically addressing the prevailing conflicts over use of diminishing resources, which is exacerbated by frequent droughts, climate variability, and water shortages. The project is aligned with Sudan's NAP and Darfur-specific policies to tackle climate change and build peace. It is in line with the LDCF objectives on adaptation technology transfer and climate mainstreaming and will contribute directly to addressing the climate risk and security agenda. The project will strengthen planning and decision-making capacity of communities and government by setting up a comprehensive conflict resolution mechanism and developing integrated land-use and sustainable livelihood plans. It will enhance capacity of extension workers and other government service providers to assist private producers identify, prioritize, and implement innovative climate resilient practices and businesses. The project also seeks to mainstream best practices and decision-making tools in key national and regional policy frameworks for uptake and impact at scale. It will directly benefit 50,000 people with 50 percent women beneficiaries and improve land management in 6,000 hectares. It will also build capacity of 10,000 extension services providers and private producers on climate resilient planning and practices. The project has a unique focus on women-headed households and private sector in conflict affected areas, as it aims to engage with them to develop and implement adaptation solutions.

Guinea: *Increased Resilience and Adaptive Capacity of the Most Vulnerable Communities to Climate Change in Forested Guinea* (GEF ID: 10160, UNDP, LDCF: \$9.9 million, Total Cost: \$36.5 million). This project will reduce the vulnerability of communities in Forested Guinea to the additional risks posed by climate change through the adoption of climate-smart agro-sylvo-pastoral strategies as a strategy to promote more sustainable and climate resilient land use and related activities. The project will deliver on its objective through the implementation of three components: (i) Frameworks for promoting a Climate Smart Agricultural model; (ii) Access to climate finance; and (iii) Climate information and mainstreaming adaptation into local practices. The project will directly benefit roughly 650,000 persons. The project will train 20,500 people and will place an estimated 10,000 hectares of land under more climate-resilient management. In addition, four policies/plans will integrate climate resilience, including local development plans and related longer-term investment plans for scaling up climate smart agriculture.

Mauritania: *Enhancing Pastoral Farming Producers Resilience in Southeast Watersheds of Mauritania* (GEF ID 10176; Agency: FAO; LDCF: \$5.0 million, Total Cost: \$20.0 million) This project aims to strengthen the resilience of vulnerable rural populations by improving agriculture and livestock sector planning and the application of innovative practices at the catchment level. The project will achieve its objective through (i) Adaptation and resilience practices secured through local resource use planning and decision-making frameworks; (ii) Innovations applied and supporting uptake of resilience measures by vulnerable communities; and (iii) Monitoring, evaluation, and capture of lessons learned to informed decision-making and upscale of resilience improvements. Although the project will build upon proven models, such as agro-pastoral fields schools, it will also use a watershed approach to address climate change adaptation within the livestock and farming sectors in a participatory way. Further, the project will enable private sector agriculture and livestock producers to deploy innovative technologies supported by creative financial instruments to adopt and benefit from climate coping practices resulting in basin-wide improvement of ecological resilience. To ensure sustainability, the project will focus on community ownership and locally-led action by establishing community-based governance bodies organized around each target watershed to support the completion of strategic land and resource use planning. It will also strengthen national level policies to integrate adaptation and best practices resulting from the project implementation. The project will directly benefit 100,000 people, place 71,000 hectares of land under more climate-resilient management, and train 10,000 people to build community-level capacity to improve agricultural production under the Agro-pastoral Field School model. The project leverages \$10 million in GCF investment in livelihood and food security infrastructure at the regional and national levels for agro-sylvo-pastoral communities in the same region.

⁹³ MTF projects supported by both the LDCF and SCCF approved in FY 2020 are summarized in Section 5 of this Annex.

⁹⁴ LDCF figures include GEF project financing, Agency Fees, and PPGs.

South Sudan: *Watershed Approaches for Climate Resilience in Agro-Pastoral Landscapes* (GEF ID 10178, Agencies: UNDP and UNIDO, LDCF: \$9.5 million, Total Cost: \$36.0 million). This MTF aims to build resilience to climate change risks among agricultural and pastoral communities of South Sudan in the western flood plain agro-ecological zone, which has particularly high levels of food insecurity. Over the past four decades, the rate of warming in South Sudan is estimated to have been two and a half times greater than global averages. This warming trend is amplifying the impacts of prolonged and exacerbated drought, and further reducing crop harvests and pasture quality. Lack of food security is a contributing driver of resource-based conflict in the country. The project seeks to develop and train practitioners in implementing a set of strategies, policies, and guidance materials to integrate climate resilience practices in agriculture and natural resource management practices. It will also implement a set of adaptation actions for climate resilient food production, processing, and associated livelihoods in South Sudan's cross-border areas with Sudan, Ethiopia, Kenya, and Uganda. Moreover, it will support communities in micro-watersheds to reduce climate impacts through improved natural management and restoration practices. The project will also generate benefits for Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) and will contribute to coherence with LDN target setting. The project will directly benefit 75,000 people, of whom 40,000 are female; will bring 15,000 hectares of land under climate resilient management; and will produce 34 policies and plans to mainstream climate resilience.

Djibouti: *Planning and Implementing Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) in Djibouti's Gobaad Plain and Tadjourah Ville* (GEF ID 10180; Agency: UNEP; LDCF: \$10.0 million, \$23.1 million) This project aims to increase the capacity of local communities in Gobaad Plain and Tadjourah Ville to adapt to climate change. The project will address climate vulnerabilities within a complex socio-economic environment through providing evidence-based knowledge of climate change impacts and best-practice adaptation options in Gobaad Plain and Tadjourah Ville. The socio-economic and environmental benefits of project interventions will be monitored to inform the NAP process in Djibouti. Benefits will be achieved through: i) implementing adaptation technologies including both green and grey technologies; ii) training local communities on adaptation technologies using a learning-by-doing approach; iii) improving evidence-based knowledge on climate change impacts and on cost-effective adaptation options in Djibouti; and iv) increasing awareness of the national and local government staff, and local communities on climate change adaptation opportunities. The information collected from monitoring the benefits will be used to identify relevant adaptation technologies to guide regional policies in the target communities. Adaptation interventions such as the planting of 400 hectares of acacia trees, livelihood diversification and drought-resilient agriculture will provide numerous tangible benefits including: (i) buffering against extreme climate events; (ii) reducing soil erosion; (iii) improving and maintaining water quality; (iv) increasing water supply by increasing infiltration and promoting water conservation; (v) improving food security; and (vi) decreasing incidences of disease. The project will directly benefit 207,306 direct beneficiaries; and place 440 hectares of land under more climate resilient management. The project will also train 550 people and produce 30 land use community plans and two regional adaptation plans. The project is innovative in its approach to addressing NAPA priorities while advancing NAP processes in Djibouti through decentralized adaptation planning, and will build upon GCF NAP readiness activities. The sustainability potential will be ensured through the provision of community-level training and investing in community-level capacity building measures, which are integrated into land management plans.

Haiti: *Strengthening the Climatic Resilience of the Drinking Water Sector in the South of Haiti* (GEF ID 10320; Agency: UNDP; LDCF: \$5.1 million, Total Cost: \$36.7 million) The project will support climate resilience in the drinking water sector of Haiti's South-East Department, where low sanitation coverage and inadequate availability and treatment of drinking water have contributed to widespread cases of cholera, a situation that climate change is expected to exacerbate. The project will apply an innovative, multi-sectoral approach to promoting climate resilience in the water supply sector for Haiti. It will support analyses of climate change impacts on drinking water access by calibrating climate change projections with local hydrogeological and hydrometeorological data. This will identify water sources that are likely to dry up and will provide guidance for guaranteed long-term quality water access. The project will also help identify reliable water sources and design piped water systems considering climate change conditions. A key focus of the project is on improved coordination of planning and investments across key institutions managing drinking water and other natural resources and invest in equipment required to effectively enforce adaptation practices. It will strengthen local governance structures to improve the control of activities that negatively affect conditions of water sources and recharge zones and strengthen Water Committees to better oversee and control construction work, operation, and maintenance, and user-rights enforcement. Additionally, the project will focus on concrete physical investments including ecosystem-based adaptation measures to enhance water infiltration and consequent aquifer recharge, rooftop water capture and storage, recycling of grey water, and construction of small reservoirs. The project will directly benefit 90,000 people, enhance the climate-resilient management of 700 hectare of land, mainstream climate resilience in two policies or plans, and train 5,000 people.

Sudan: *Sustainable Natural Resource and Livelihood Adaptive Programme (SNRLAP)* (GEF ID: 10350, Agency: IFAD, LDCF: \$2.2 million, Total Cost: \$79.2 million) The project will support climate resilience mainstreaming in three highly vulnerable regions of Sudan by blending it with a \$63 million International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)-funded natural resource management project. The project is aligned with GEF's LDCF-SCCF programming objectives and with the NAP of Sudan. It will benefit 99,200 vulnerable people, with 60 percent of target beneficiaries being women. The project will strengthen institutional capacity for governance of natural resources with GIS and early warning system infrastructure and support implementation of climate resilient solutions using an integrated approach of land use, natural resources and livelihood planning. As the regions are in the conflict affected areas, the project also has the potential to contribute to addressing resource-based conflicts exacerbated by climate change. Overall, the project demonstrates good value for money.

Mali: *Resilient, Productive and Sustainable Landscapes in Mali's Kayes Region* (GEF ID 10362; Agency: FAO; LDCF: \$2.6 million, Total Cost: \$11.9 million). This MTF supports climate change adaptation and land degradation goals in an integrated manner. It aims to promote innovations in governance, production and finance in order to reduce the vulnerability of the small-holder agro-sylvo-pastoral food systems and livelihoods, reversing land degradation and halting the loss of globally significant biodiversity in fragile landscapes of the Kayes region. With LDCF funding, the project seeks to support innovative measures in governance, production, and finance to reduce the vulnerability of small-holder agro-sylvo-pastoral food systems and livelihoods in the fragile landscapes of the Kayes region. The LDCF activities will directly benefit 13,000 people and place 10,000 hectares of land under more climate-resilient management practices.

Tanzania: *Integrated Adaptation Program to Enhance Resilience of Communities and Ecosystems in the Dry Miombo Woodlands of Tanzania Mainland and Dryland of Zanzibar* (GEF ID 10364; Agency: FAO; LDCF: \$5.0 million, Total Cost: \$46.0 million) This project aims to strengthen resilience of production systems and supply chain to increase resilience of vulnerable communities in Dry Miombo Woodlands and Drylands of Zanzibar. The project will adopt nature-based and landscape-based approaches to introduce and scale up use of technologies and innovative financial incentives for adaptation. Changes in rainfall patterns, including late onset, early cessation, prolonged dry spells, and seasonal shifting, are increasingly common in the dry Miombo Woodlands, with severe impacts on ecosystems and food production. In Zanzibar, climate hazards are also exacerbated by sea level rise and saltwater intrusion, with corresponding losses to agricultural productivity. The project will strengthen policy and institutional frameworks for innovations in climate resilient value chains; increase climate resilience of production systems and landscapes; deployment of climate resilient post-harvest technologies; and strengthen market systems and financial incentives for diversification of livelihoods to reduce vulnerability. Innovative aspects include providing access to markets to which vulnerable communities are currently excluded, through introduction of technologies and practices such as access of small-scale farmers to agro-meteorological information with mobile phones and tablets. The highly participatory nature of the project by local communities, as well as across different scales of government and the private sector, will contribute to its sustainability through broad based ownership and integration. The project will strengthen the resilience of an estimated 82,000 direct beneficiaries and place 27,000 hectares of land under climate resilient management. The project builds on the objectives and priorities in Tanzania's National Climate Change Strategy, the Zanzibar Climate Change Strategy and NAP and NDC Implementation Plan, which are currently under formulation.

Liberia: *Enhancing the Resilience of Vulnerable Coastal communities in Sinoe County of Liberia* (GEF ID 10376; Agency: UNDP; LDCF: \$10.0 million, Total Cost: 63.7 million) This project will protect assets and diversify livelihoods of Liberian coastal communities through implementation of sea and river defense risk management approaches. All of Liberia's coastal counties will be supported to design and implement strategies to address prioritized climate change risks and to incorporate these into county and national development agendas and budgeting processes. This will be achieved by introducing and scaling up use of innovative technologies to support coastal adaptation, including coastal flood and erosion risk management systems, county knowledge hubs on sea and river defense, and Community Action Plans for climate adaptation. The project will support the highly vulnerable southeastern region of the country in Sinoe County to design and implement integrated adaptation solutions for climate-induced sea level rise with local communities, smallholder farmers, government officials, and private sector actors. Benefiting from learning gained in Sinoe County, the project will implement gender-responsive and climate-resilient income diversification opportunities across Liberia's coastal counties, including improving access to microfinance for small and medium-sized enterprises and smallholder farmers to invest in nature-based solutions. This project will build on Liberia's NAP planning supported by GCF and will deepen county-level planning and budgeting for climate adaptation in coastal areas and integrating it in the national process. The project will directly strengthen climate resilience of 200,000 people, and place 50,000 hectares of land under climate resilient management.

Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC): *Reducing Vulnerability and Increasing Resilience to Climate Change through Promoting Innovation, Transfer and Large-Scale Deployment of Adaptation-Oriented Technologies in Priority Agriculture Value-Chains and Creating Jobs* (GEF ID: 10377, UNIDO, LDCF: \$10.0 million, Total Cost: \$50.7 million). This project aims to reduce vulnerability and enhance resilience to climate change through promoting innovation, transfer and large-scale deployment of adaptation-oriented technologies and services by small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs,) and create jobs. DRC is increasingly experiencing frequent and intense combinations of climate hazards and their impacts, including irregular rainfall severely effecting agricultural production and food security; higher humidity due to extreme rainfalls affecting processing and preservation of certain crops; and extreme weather events contributing to destruction of infrastructure. DRC's National Plan of Action and ongoing planning efforts call for adaptation action focused on food, water, and energy security. Accounting for 90 percent of all enterprises in the country, SMEs are the driving force for inclusive economic and social development in DRC. The project will transform early stage climate adaptation-oriented technologies and services into commercial enterprises through identification and incubation of high impact potential adaptation innovations by SMEs. It will also catalyze innovative financing for large-scale deployment of climate adaptation-oriented technologies and solutions to build resilience of vulnerable groups through awareness building, market linkages, and establishment of financial mechanisms to involving adaptation technology suppliers and buyers. Moreover, it will establish linkages with the ongoing national adaption planning process for climate resilience planning focused on technology innovation and finance. The project will strengthen the resilience of an estimated 100,000 direct beneficiaries and manage 37,5000 hectares of land for climate resilience.

Myanmar: *RICE-Adapt: Promoting Climate-Resilient Livelihoods in Rice-Farming Communities in the lower Ayeyarwady and Sittaung River Basins* (GEF ID 10395; Agency: FAO; LDCF: \$10.0 million, Total Cost: \$50.0 million). This project will focus on boosting climate resilience on the lower parts of the Ayeyarwady and Sittaung River basins. The target areas are among the areas of the country highly vulnerable to the effects of climate change and extreme events including cyclones and strong winds, floods and storm surges, intense rains, and sea level rise. The project has four components: (i) enhanced enabling environment for climate change adaptation mainstreaming in priority sectors through integrated policies and planning; (ii) promotion of nature-based solutions across the landscape for resilient livelihoods; (iii) scale up of adaptation technologies and innovations in selected value chains, and improving market access; and (iv) monitoring and evaluation, communication and knowledge transfer. The project is expected to provide direct adaptation benefits to 162,000 people, train 5,000 people about adaptation actions, and increase the climate resilient management of 57,000 hectares of land. In addition, seven policies and plans will mainstream climate resilience.

Malawi: *Climate Resilient and Sustainable Capture Fisheries, Aquaculture Development and Watershed Management* (GEF ID 10411; Agency: AfDB; LDCF: \$5.0 million, Total Cost: \$19.4 million). This project aims to strengthen resilience of communities dependent on fisheries around key Malawi lakes by adopting an integrated lake basin planning and management approach. This integration is important because most existing threats to lake management and fisheries such as pollution, siltation/sedimentation, cultivation, and grazing, which are exacerbated by climate change, occur outside the immediate lake environment. The project is aligned with the LDCF objective of supporting technology transfer and climate resilience mainstreaming. The project is linked with the Malawi NAPA and will directly contribute to the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy, which calls for a systemic and landscape-based approach for tackling climate change. Considering that fisheries is largely a community-driven sector, the project seeks to promote locally led adaptation by making community-based beach village committees (BVCs) the entry point for implementation. The project will strengthen capacity of the BVCs on climate resilient planning and lake basin management; support local and national government to mainstream climate change in policies related to fisheries and watershed management; and implement innovative community-based adaptation solutions for soil and water conservation and restoring fish breeding grounds impacted by climate change. The project will directly benefit nearly 5.7 million people in the region with nearly 50 percent of them being women. It will also bring nearly 8,000 hectares of land under climate-resilient management.

Vanuatu: *Adaptation to Climate Change in the Coastal Zone in Vanuatu – Phase II (VCAP II)* (GEF ID: 10415, Agency: UNDP, LDCF: \$7.5 million, Total Cost: 36.6 million) This MTF seeks to deliver integrated approaches to community adaptation and the management of landscapes and protected and marine areas. Building on the lessons learned from the first phase of the project, it will target all six provinces of this highly vulnerable LDC SIDS, focusing on the Area Council and local levels to support biodiversity surveys and management plans, measures to mitigate illegal and unsustainable species use, sustainable land management measures in priority locations, and climate-smart model farms. It will mainstream climate change adaptation, biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management and

LDN within national and local policies and decision-making processes. In addition, it will climate-proof selected water provision and public conveyance infrastructure, and evacuation facilities, in priority areas of the coastal zone. It will also support automated systems for real time monitoring of climate-related hazards and timely release of early warnings. Finally, the project will build capacity of relevant stakeholders and ensure best practices are captured and shared. This project will bring 36,620 hectares of terrestrial protected area and 2,672 hectares of marine protected area under improved management for conservation, will restore 6,000 hectares of degraded land, bring 15,000 hectares of land under climate-resilient management, and directly benefit 272,459 people. This MTF project requests resources from the LDCF and biodiversity and land degradation focal areas.

Tanzania: Building Resilience through Sustainable Land Management and Climate Change Adaptation in Dodoma (GEF ID 10418, Agency: AfDB, LDCF: \$4.2 million, Total Cost: 149.4 million). This MTF utilizes LDCF and LD Focal Area resources in a complementary manner to improve resilience and avoid land degradation in the Dodoma metropolitan area. The area is the capital region of Tanzania which is rapidly expanding. The project will be unique in combining resilience and land degradation issues in an urban environment. It aims to target systemic drivers of land degradation and climate vulnerability such as urban sprawl, informal small-scale mining, deforestation, and water contamination. It will facilitate integrated urban planning using geospatial mapping and will strengthen the Dodoma Master Plan with integrated plans for land use, water, and flood management by duly factoring in climate risks. It will restore degraded land in the surrounding rural and peri-urban areas using land management practices and will disincentivize informal small-scale mining by creating alternate livelihood opportunities for urban poor. The project will strengthen building design codes and standards to make them climate resilient and will also improve policies and regulations related to sustainable excavation of building materials and construction practices. The project will benefit 408,000 people, of whom 50 percent are women, and bring 75,000 hectares of land under improved and climate-resilient management. The project will be built on significant urban infrastructure investment by the African Development Bank (AfDB) for potential transformational impact.

Regional: Adaptation Accelerator Program: Building Climate Resilience through Enterprise Acceleration (GEF ID: 10435, Agency: CI, LDCF: \$1.2 million, Total Cost: \$4.0 million) This project aims to catalyse investment in adaptation focused SMEs through adaptation accelerators in Least Developed Countries. The project is strategically aligned with the LDCF's adaptation innovation challenge program which aims to promote private sector engagement and investment in adaptation solutions to improve resilience of vulnerable communities. The project builds on the GEF funded Adaptation SME Accelerator Project and aims to focus on two LDCs Liberia and Madagascar and specific adaptation themes including resilient agriculture, irrigation and climate risk insurance and other financial services (e.g. micro-lending) to improve adaptive capacity. It has a distinct focus to work with up to 30 SMEs to build their capacity through a comprehensive training program and select 10 SMEs for pilot investments to demonstrate direct results on ground. Also, the project will use the LDCF funds in the form of innovative rotating grants in selected enterprises and thereby will deliver a multiplier effect due to the rotational aspect of the grant money. This is expected to lead to sustainability of the project beyond the LDCF funding period.

Lao PDR: Integrated Water Resource Management and Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) in the Xe Bang Hieng River Basin and Luang Prabang City (GEF ID 10514; Agency: UNDP; LDCF: \$6.0 million, Total Cost: \$26.0 million) This project will improve the resilience of communities to floods and droughts through integrated management of sites in Savannakhet Province, located in the Xe Bang Hieng river basin, and the city of Luang Prabang, situated at the confluence of the Mekong and Nam Khan Rivers, where floods currently cause damage to transport, housing, and other key sectors. It will support identification and mapping of current and expected future flood zones, improve the hydrological monitoring network, and update early warning and emergency procedures for vulnerable communities. In Luang Prabang City, the project will support economic valuation of urban ecosystem services, drafting and validation of climate-resilient development and land-use plans, and options analyses for on-the-ground investments in peri-urban areas to minimize the flood risk exposure. The project will also support ecosystem-based adaptation measures to restore ecological integrity of the Xe Bang Hieng river basin headwater zone, protecting critical ecosystem services while reducing flood/drought risk downriver, and will strengthen and diversify livelihoods to reduce community pressure on the land and forest. The project will adopt innovative integrated approaches to support green and grey protective infrastructure in the target basin and urban-peri-urban areas to mitigate the impacts of floods and droughts in the lowlands and headwaters. Finally, it will focus on trainings and awareness raising on climate change risks and adaptation measures. The project is expected to directly benefit 492,462 people, of whom over 50 percent will be women, and enhance the climate resilient management of 86,000 hectares of land. It will mainstream climate resilience in 10 policies and plans and build capacity of stakeholders to ensure climate mainstreaming and sustainability of the project outcomes.

Burkina Faso: *Improving the Climate Resilience of Agro-Sylvo-Pastoral Production Systems in Burkina Faso* (GEF ID 10516; Agency: FAO; LDCF: \$10.0 million, Total Cost: \$50.2 million) This project will increase the climate resilience of agro-sylvo-pastoral (ASP) family farming communities in the Sudanian and Sudano-Sahelian zones of Burkina Faso. Burkina Faso is highly dependent on natural resources-based sectors, with agriculture accounting for 60 percent of employment and one third of national Gross Domestic Product, making it particularly vulnerable to the negative impacts of climate change. A changing climate has also exacerbated structural issues existing in Burkina Faso that have resulted in conflict over the usage and allocation of natural resources and is expected to continue to do so over the medium term. This project aims to achieve its objective through (i) Strengthened climate resilience of agro-sylvo-pastoral community development in three pilot landscapes through improved governance and institutional capacity, with a focus on conflict resolution ; (ii) New landscape management plans integrating climate resilience into ASP production systems; and (iii) Diversified and improved livelihoods of agro-sylvo-pastoralists, through upstream upscaling of the Agro-Pastoral Field Schools approach and downstream support to transformation and market linkages and value chain development. This intervention will directly benefit 80,000 people and an estimated 100,000 hectares of land will be managed in a more resilient way to withstand climate stressors. In parallel, the project will create the conditions to maximize the potential for up-scaling and out-scaling of the approaches, practices, and technologies to maximize the adaptation benefits. The project includes several innovative aspects—from the introduction of agro-ecological techniques and technologies; to facilitating governance reforms at multiple levels; and utilizing new business models to build stronger links to the private sector. Sustainability is integrated into project design, which focuses on participatory landscape management, capacity building, and formalizing community-level financial mechanisms.

Global: *Strengthening Endogenous Capacities of Least Developed Countries to Access Finance for Climate Change Adaptation* (GEF ID: 10525, Agency UNEP, LDCF: \$2.2 million, Total Cost: \$4.2 million) The project aims to strengthen capacities of LDCs to effectively adapt to climate change by fostering the development of sustained endogenous technical services for: project development, policy mainstreaming, and creating an enabling environment. The project will achieve its objective through the delivery of three components: (i) Collaborative mechanism for sustained endogenous capacity on climate change adaptation finance; (ii) Technical capacity building for LDC governments; and (iii) Scaling up. The project will deliver adaptation-focused policy and technical service providers through twinning arrangements in universities in four LDCs, which will become a network for the provision of resources on endogenous capacity on climate change adaptation finance. The project is innovative in that it addresses structurally-reinforced capacity deficits that are obstacles to scaling up the delivery of climate finance as well as the development of country-driven approaches to climate change adaptation. The project invests LDC-owned, LDC-hosted, and LDC-staffed institutions which are expected to not only increase the effectiveness of climate adaptation policy development, mainstreaming, and financing in LDCs, but also to reduce the cost of developing fundable projects. The project's investment in these institutions will also contribute to the emergence of adaptation professionals, which will increase LDC ownership and self-sufficiency on mainstreaming adaptation.

Yemen: *Resilient and Sustainable Livelihoods for Rural Yemen* (GEF ID 10562; Agency: FAO; LDCF: \$10.0 million, Total Cost: \$52.0 million) The MTF project with the GEF Trust Fund aims to strengthen climate resilience of rural producers who are at high risk due to climate change and conflict-induced humanitarian crisis. The project will catalyze a shift from current “open-access” regimes to shared productive land and seascapes to a more coherent and strategic “community-based” management regime predicated upon the achievement of social and environmental objectives. Land, water, fisheries, and forest resources that are already under great strain and generally degraded in the country have limited resilience to rapidly advancing climate change impacts. The project will achieve its objective through: (i) Spatial planning which describes and prioritizes conservation and sustainable production practices across terrestrial and marine areas; (ii) Agriculture, livestock, and fisheries practices stimulated to improve livelihoods; and, (iii) Policy and regulatory frameworks. The project will align three productive sectors (agriculture, fisheries, livestock) using innovative community-based approaches supported by capacitated national expertise to deliver social and economic benefits across three large landscapes. The project will ensure sustainability through capacity building and mainstreaming of best practices within government offices, community institutions, and the private sector. This includes the completion of spatial plans, which will be legally binding. The project will directly benefit 700,000 beneficiaries, train 40,000 people, and place 70,000 hectares of land under more climate-resilient management.

4. Summaries of the SCCF Projects Approved in FY 2020⁹⁵

Global: *Adaptation SME Accelerator (ASAP)* (GEF ID 10296, CI, SCCF: \$2.2 million, Total Cost: \$2.7 million) This project aims to catalyze the market for innovative climate adaptation solutions in developing countries. It aims to strengthen the ecosystem of SMEs by creating an enabling policy environment, improving market information, aggregating demand, and facilitating flow of investments. In addition, the project will address the market entry barriers for SMEs in developing countries by mapping market opportunities for adaptation SMEs, establishing a strong network of SMEs for cross learning, bringing incubators and accelerators to support a set of SMEs in raising investments and creating an enabling policy environment for market demand and supply of adaptation solutions. The project builds on the GEF-supported CRAFT project, which has identified SMEs having potential of offering climate adaptation solutions. The SME accelerator will advance engagement with nearly 300 SMEs across key countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, and link them with incubators and accelerators to design, develop, and deploy adaptation solutions in vulnerable countries and sectors.

Regional (Latin America and Caribbean): *Blended Finance Facility for Climate Resilience in Coffee and Cacao Value Chains: CC-Blend* (GEF ID: 10434, Agency: CI, SCCF: \$1.2 million, Total Cost: \$8.2 million) This project aims to strengthen the climate resilience of coffee and cacao producers in El Salvador and other countries in Central America through a blended-finance and technical-assistance facility for nature-based adaptation solutions, as well as catalyze innovation in commercial lending practices by factoring in climate resilience into loan products. The proposed initiative presents a holistic approach to increasing resilience in two highly vulnerable cash-crop value chains in Central America. The SCCF project will focus on piloting activities in El Salvador through a dedicated line of credit with private capital and setting up a replication structure and private investment opportunities elsewhere in the region. The project will directly benefit 10,000 beneficiaries, train 4,500 people, and place 6,400 hectares of land under more climate resilient management.

Regional (Asia-Pacific): *Financial Tools for Small Scale Fishers in Melanesia* (GEF ID: 10437, Agency: WWF-US, SCCF: \$1.2 million, Total Cost: \$6.5 million) This project will support the highly innovative area of financial literacy and tools as resilience-building measures for vulnerable small-scale fishing communities of Fiji and Papua New Guinea. Both countries are heavily dependent upon coastal fisheries for food security, livelihoods, revenue, employment, and development. Climate change is adversely affecting this region through rising temperatures, sea-level rise, flooding, coastal erosion, an increase in extreme weather events, coral reef bleaching, and ocean acidification. Climate change is intensifying natural hazards, and marine heatwaves (causing coral bleaching) and ocean acidification are eroding the ecosystem services on which fishers rely. The project's proposed approach is to build on existing baseline initiatives in climate analytics and microfinance services in the two countries to develop financial products as climate risk management solutions. It is expected to directly benefit 7,500 people, and improve the climate resilient management of 20,000 ha.

5. Summaries of the MTF Projects between LDCF and SCCF Approved in FY 2020

Regional (Asia-Pacific): *Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) for Coral Reef Insurance in Asia and the Pacific* (GEF ID: 10431, Agency: ADB, LDCF: \$0.5 million, SCCF: \$0.9 million, Total Cost: \$4.8 million) This project will explore a public-private partnership model for coral reef insurance for coastal sites in the Philippines, Indonesia, and the Solomon Islands (and also Fiji, which is not receiving GEF support in this project), of which the latter is a Pacific LDC SIDS. Natural hazards such as typhoons, to which the Asia-Pacific region is susceptible, can wreak immense damage on coastal ecosystems and shorelines, business and infrastructure, and community safety and livelihood. Healthy reefs play a major role in dissipating wave energy and thus mitigating the potential full impact of coastal storms. They also support marine biodiversity and are tourism attractions. With climate change projected to exacerbate extreme climate events, effect sea level rise, and contribute to ocean warming events, reef vulnerability is increasing. This project seeks to build resilience of coastal communities and businesses dependent on coral reefs by insuring selected reefs and, in the event of a damaging event, repairing it. The project will directly benefit approximately 133,000 beneficiaries, train 300 people and place about 134,000 hectares of land under more climate resilient management.

⁹⁵ MTF projects supported by both the LDCF and SCCF approved in FY 2020 are summarized in Section 5 of this Annex.

Global: *Piloting Innovative Financing for Climate Adaptation Technologies in Medium-Sized Cities* (GEF ID: 10433, Agency: UNIDO, LDCF: \$0.3 million, SCCF, \$0.5 million, Total Cost: \$3.1 million) This MSP will develop a methodological approach (financing toolkit) for medium-sized cities and conduct on-the-ground pilot in three selected cities in Africa, Asia, and Latin America and the Caribbean. By adopting a systematic approach, urban planners in the selected cities will be able to prioritize their infrastructure needs, identify key investment projects, and match them with private financiers. The project will also ensure that urban planners are trained to continuously update their municipal financing plans. Further, the 'field' tested financing toolkit that will be developed under the proposed project will be available to all countries through various channels—including the CTCN network, which is considered the largest global repository for climate change technology data—in order to secure dissemination and replication. The project will directly benefit 600,000 beneficiaries and place about 42,000 hectares of land under more climate-resilient management.

Global: *Investment Readiness for the Landscape Resilience Fund* (GEF ID: 10436, Agency WWF-US, LDCF: \$0.7 million, SCCF: \$0.6 million, Total Cost: \$17.4 million) The project aims to provide necessary technical assistance and information to adaptation businesses and engage with investors regarding investment-ready project opportunities. It will: (i) Create a pipeline of innovative, investment-ready climate adaptation projects through provision of technical assistance; (ii) Develop systems, provide initial investments and broker match-making through the Landscape Resilience Fund for small businesses to access private investment; and (iii) Conduct effective knowledge management for design of adaptation-oriented commercial enterprises, as well as monitoring and evaluation of assistance provided through this project. The project will directly benefit approximately 25,000 beneficiaries and train 450 people.

ANNEX 4: REGIONAL AND GLOBAL CLIMATE TECHNOLOGY ACTIVITIES

1. This annex summarizes the status of implementation of GEF-supported global and regional climate technology projects, as referred to in Part III, Sub-section 4a. It presents the progress made by the GEF Agencies in the delivery of these projects and summarizes experience gained and lessons learned so far. The information in this annex is based on data provided by GEF Agencies in response to a survey that was circulated and carried out by the GEF in April 2020.

(a) *Promoting Accelerated Transfer and Scaled-up Deployment of CCM Technologies through the CTCN*

2. This project is implemented by UNIDO, was endorsed by the GEF CEO in June 2015, and is still under implementation. The project includes the following components: (i) technical assistance for climate technology in response to requests to the CTCN; (ii) partnerships to accelerate the investment and transfer of climate technology; and (iii) networks and capacity-building for climate technology. This project has been extended with the expected closing date in December 2020.

Status

3. Activities in all countries receiving GEF-funded CTCN technical assistance (Mali, Uganda, Viet Nam, Dominican Republic, Chile, Economic Community of Western African States (ECOWAS), Zimbabwe, Paraguay, and The Gambia) have progressed well. The interventions in Mali (renewable energy use for food processing) and Uganda (geothermal energy) were completed in 2016, Viet Nam (bio-waste valorization) in 2017, and the Dominican Republic (energy-efficient lighting) in March 2018.

4. The project has regularly submitted Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) to the GEF secretariat, with the most recent submitted in September 2019. As of April 2020, a total of \$1,424,069 has been disbursed, and \$314,632 has been obligated. The remaining funds amount to \$61,298 and will be utilized to conduct the terminal evaluation of the project.

5. The following GEF-funded technical assistance was completed before July 2019:

- (a) Mali: Renewable energy use for food processing (2016)
- (b) Uganda: Geothermal energy (2016)
- (c) Vietnam: Bio-waste valorization (2017)
- (d) Dominican Republic: energy-efficient lighting (2018)
- (e) Chile: Replacement F-refrigerants (2018)
- (f) ECOWAS: Mainstreaming gender for a climate-resilient energy system (2018)
- (g) Zimbabwe: Industrial energy and water efficiency (2018)
- (h) Paraguay: Environmental flows and river basin management (2019)
- (i) Gambia: Organic waste for energy (2019)

6. The multi-country technical assistance in Brazil, Chile, Mexico, and Uruguay on promoting circular economy began in July 2019 and is planned to be completed in July 2020.

7. The fifth Steering Committee meeting took place at the sidelines of COP 25 in Madrid, Spain, in December 2019, during which a no-cost extension of the project until 31 December 2020 was approved. The extension was subsequently informed to the GEF Secretariat.

8. During the reporting period, only activities relating to the multi-country technical assistance on circular economy were implemented. Implementation was progressing until the COVID-19 pandemic began in mid-March 2020. In-person interviews and stakeholder meetings have been cancelled and organized virtually. Several key missions required for final activities were not possible, and the project team in consultation with the NDEs and the implementing agency (UNIDO), are identifying options for the best solution. A key event was planned to take place during Climate Week in Latin America and the Caribbean in July 2020, during which time other project results were also meant to be showcased. The event was canceled due to the pandemic.

Notable achievements on the transfer of technology

9. Activities related to the technical assistance on circular economy included initial in-person kick-off meetings with the country counterparts and relevant stakeholders in Brazil, Chile, Mexico, and Uruguay, with a high level of participation (40-60 participants in each meeting). A mapping of relevant actors for promoting a circular economy in the four countries was conducted, focusing on a different scale depending on the country of study. As an example, Uruguay decided to focus on the promotion of circular-economy related technologies on the milk and meat value chain. Currently, analysis of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analyses on the circular economy are being carried out for each country. In addition, the feasibility of implementation of fourth industrial revolution technologies is also being studied. The main output of this technical assistance is the formulation of a draft roadmap on circular economy for each country, including clear project ideas to scale-up.

Outreach and awareness raising activities

10. The outcomes of CTCN technical assistance under this project are published on the CTCN website, included in the CTCN newsletter, and presented in events such as the bi-annual CTCN Advisory Board meetings and COP events (e.g. a side-event on circular economy was organized at COP 25 to discuss the circular economy topic with relevant stakeholders and to showcase the results of the multi-country technical assistance). The promising project ideas are to be presented to investor fora in the respective regions. In addition, the Steering Committee meeting is commonly organized in conjunction with the CTCN Advisory Board meeting. This provides an opportunity to the recipients of the assistance to showcase the accomplishments to the governing body of CTCN. During the 2019 CTCN Forum in Latin America and the Caribbean, which took place in Brazil, the technical assistance was presented by the CTCN team and the National Designated Entities of the participating countries. As a result, other countries showed their interest in implementing a similar technical assistance, and a second multi-country request was received by the CTCN including El Salvador, Cuba, Ecuador, Dominican Republic, and Paraguay.

Lessons thus far

11. There is a significant demand from developing countries for the type of services that the CTCN delivers as indicated by the increasing number of requests for technical assistance. That said, not all requests necessarily relate to the actual deployment of climate technologies. Some of the lessons learned have been summarized below:

- (a) GEF and CTCN pursue compatible objectives. Yet, balancing act to identify common ground between GEF requirements and CTCN *modus operandi* is required;
- (b) There is a demonstrated appetite for CTCN-like services as complements to other mechanisms and initiatives;
- (c) In particular, CTCN can contribute to an early-stage support of climate technology deployment;
- (d) CTCN has a wide range of ready-to-use resources and a network of international expertise and technologies;
- (e) There are multiple opportunities for scaling up and replication;
- (f) CTCN – due to its demand-driven nature – is well positioned to gauge the needs and priorities;
- (g) The GEF-funded technical assistance on circular economy has also appeared to be instrumental for the CTCN to collaborate on the establishment and to become a strategic partner of the Regional Coalition on Circular Economy for the Latin America and the Caribbean.

(b) Regional – Finance and Technology Transfer Centre for Climate Change (FINTECC)

12. The EBRD project was endorsed by the GEF CEO in July 2013 and has started implementation. This project aims to accelerate investments in CCM and CCA technologies in the Early Transition Countries and Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries. It also aims to incentivize deployment of climate technologies with low market penetration, in order to create demonstration projects across these countries. The project components include: (i) regional technology transfer networks; (ii) technology transfer technical assistance; and (iii) financing pilots. The project has been extended from its original end date of 2016 to December 2021.

Status update

13. The FINTECC Project is a well-known facility in the region where it is operational. EBRD bankers and clients are aware of the support that they can get and actively approach the EBRD to develop eligible projects. Around 65

percent of the investment grants have been used (committed and disbursed) so far across 25 projects, with demonstration effect happening across the entire region where the Project is active. In the current reporting period, \$1 million of investment support was committed, and \$150,000 of TA support was disbursed using GEF funds.

14. Given the overall success of FINTECC in 2019, the project was able to secure new donor funds from the European Union that will complement the existing GEF and EBRD Special Shareholders Fund and allow the Project to extend its duration and focus. Funds are expected to be active in 2020 and the EBRD will provide updates in the next reporting period.

Challenges

15. The main operational challenge for this period is the pandemic which is threatening the survival of many companies and challenging in different ways some sectors that FINTECC is supporting, in particular healthcare and tourism. The challenge is particularly significant for SMEs as they are more vulnerable in this crisis. There is also a general challenge associated with climate risks being deprioritized as a result of the health crisis and the ensuing economic constraints.

Notable achievements on the transfer of technology

16. Five corporate projects have been supported with FINTECC grants in the reporting period, including in agribusiness, manufacturing and services, property, and tourism. These include SMEs primarily. Specifically, in the reporting period, a new priority to support SMEs to uptake climate technologies emerged during the implementation of the FINTECC Project. SMEs are largely present in the region where the FINTECC Project is active, and have the potential to provide significant programmatic impact. These companies face specific barriers in the adoption of climate technologies and need dedicated support different from larger corporations. For this reason, the EBRD will pilot some transactions with SMEs in which FINTECC grant support will be tailored considering specifically the barriers in place for SMEs and their capacity of innovate, and will provide updates to the GEF in the next reporting period. EBRD is developing a market penetration methodology based on trade data. The methodology should allow to monitor the diffusion of green technologies over time. This is being tested in several countries.

Outreach and awareness raising activities

17. Through the FINTECC website (www.ebrd.com/fintecc) increased visibility continues to be given to climate technologies and the FINTECC financed projects. The development of case studies for each project supported under FINTECC will provide information about how FINTECC is supporting the adoption of advanced climate technologies and will give specific examples to potential clients and information to the donor community and wider public on how technology transfer can be operationalized. These case studies will continue to be published in addition to news articles, other publications and event announcements.

Collaboration with CTCN

18. No specific activities have been implemented in the region in cooperation with the CTCN. However, it is planned to resume conversations in the coming months, especially in the context of the pandemic challenges.

Lessons thus far

- (a) The pandemic will challenge the implementation of investments, including those in green technologies, and grants will be instrumental to ensure that such investments are not put aside.
- (b) SMEs need specific support as they struggle more than large corporates in this context. In particular, the EBRD will consider extending the grant access to companies borrowing working capital, as during the pandemic this is the main need for companies, which are short in liquidity.

(c) Climate Technology Transfer Mechanisms and Networks in Latin America and the Caribbean

19. The project implemented by IDB was endorsed by the GEF CEO in September 2014, and is under implementation. The project aims to promote the development and transfer of environmentally sustainable technologies in LAC, in order to contribute to the ultimate goal of reducing GHG emissions and reducing the

vulnerability to climate change in specific sectors in LAC. The components of the project include: (i) development of national policy and institutional capacities; (ii) strengthening of technology networks and centers; (iii) pilot technology transfer mechanisms; and (iv) leveraging private and public investments. The project has been extended twice, with the most recent extension until January 2021.

Status Update

20. The project is in its final year and has executed 93 percent of its total budget. Three agencies have finalized the execution of activities planned under the Capacity Building and Policy Design component, as well as for the Agriculture and Forest Monitoring sectors. The remaining two agencies have entered a final phase and will complete activities for the Transport and Energy sectors in 2020. In general, activities during last year included concluding the response to in-country originated requests and supporting the identification and prioritization of sector-specific ESTs, as well as publishing and disseminating the results obtained. Progress has been made setting-up and advancing the following activities:

- (a) Databases of EST experts and institutions continued to be updated and information and knowledge products shared with network members. Additionally, preliminary results from the agriculture and energy sectors activities have been posted on specific sections of the executing agencies' websites.
- (b) The project continued assisting Chile's Ministry of Energy. The study on low-carbon development for the Chilean cement industry has been completed and the study for the steel industry is under development. Webinars to disseminate the results will be organized in June 2020.
- (c) The work to provide inputs to design a regularization program to connect socio-economically vulnerable households to the electricity grid in Uruguay continued.
- (d) Five new projects started in the region: i) a comparative analysis of integral energy solutions for the *Andes Mendoquinas* to support the public utility of the province of Mendoza (Argentina) to replace the use of liquid fuels for energy supply; ii) a pilot project for energy labeling of housing in Buenos Aires; iii) an evaluation of isolated photovoltaic solar systems and their sustainability schemes in rural areas in Colombia; iv) a study on Cogeneration from agroindustrial residual biomass of African Palm and rice husk in Ecuador, to promote the adoption of technologies that enable the sustainable use of the country's residual biomass for the production of electricity; and v) the development of the Galapagos Archipelago Energy Perspective, as an input to design the "Sustainable Energy Transition Action Plan for the Archipelago, 2020-2040."
- (e) General preliminary results for the energy sector were disseminated and discussed in events such as: i) "Ecuador Energy Roundtable: Sustainable Development in a Country with Abundant Renewable and Non-renewable Natural Resources", in Quito (July 2019); ii) Energy Fair ECUAENERGÉTICA, in Guayaquil (September 2019); iii) the workshop "Lessons learned from promotion mechanisms focused on boosting energy solutions in remote areas," organized by APEC in the city of Castro, Chile (October, 2019); iv) Roundtable "Colombia Energía 2019," organized by the Institute of the Americas in Bogotá (October, 2019); v) the 1st Congress of Renewable Energies and Energy Efficiency, in Cuenca (November 2019); and vi) the "Energy Week 2019" organized by the Latin American Energy Organization (OLADE) in Lima (November 2019).
- (f) The technical assistance to the Bogota's Mobility Secretariat to implement its' Technological Progress Plan continued.
- (g) A monograph on fuel economy standards for vehicles and a paper on electric and hybrid-electric buses financing were published; and two discussion papers, one on formalization of informal transit systems and one on bike sharing systems were released.
- (h) Benefits of the project in terms of potential emissions to be reduced in the transport sector are being estimated.
- (i) One of the regional networks supported by the project on forest monitoring to harmonize national forest inventories (NFI) continue to work successfully. The UN Food and Agriculture Organization and the Brazilian Forest Service have dedicated staff and resources to continue the work. After piloting a second network, jointly with Mexico's National Forest Commission (CONAFOR), this institution continued exploring opportunities to maintain the effort in the future. The project finished implementing the work plans on EST development and transfer for forest monitoring to support Brazil, Costa Rica, Mexico, and Dominican Republic. Suriname's work plan was also implemented, having added and executed four additional activities during the second semester of 2019.

- (j) A regional overview on forest monitoring and three reports on national experiences (Brazil, Guatemala, and Mexico) were published, as well as a case study on technologies to monitor the impacts of traceability in natural forest and associated emissions in LAC.
- (k) A scientific session during the XXV International Union of Forest Research Organizations World Congress, was held in Curitiba, Brazil (September 2019), in collaboration with FAO, the Brazilian Forest Services, and the US Forest Service, among other partners.
- (l) regional agenda for the sustainable intensification of livestock and mitigation of GHG emissions was agreed by the network created by the project. It identified main research priorities on: i) livestock feeding and nutrition; ii) animal health, management, genetics, and reproduction; and iii) policy and socioeconomic studies.
- (m) The project, through an alliance with Climate Change, Agriculture, and Food Security (CCAFS), prepared a database on public and private institutions and experts on key topics on climate change adaptation of smallholder agriculture.
- (n) Two documents were published for the agriculture sector in LAC: i) An overview of EST for climate change adaptation in the agriculture and livestock sector, and ii) a review of the state of the art in sustainable intensification of livestock (which included recommendations of main technologies to increase livestock productivity and reduce GHG emissions intensity under different production systems and agroecologies).
- (o) The city of Bogotá announced the procurement of the largest fleet of electric buses in Latin America, which was achieved in part with technical assistance from the project.

Notable achievements on the transfer of technology

21. Significant progress has been made in the delivery of technology transfer across the region. Some examples are below:

- (a) Argentina: An energy management system for representative buildings in the *Universidad de Buenos Aires* campus was structured and delivered to the University administration and related departments. The results were also shared with interested actors across LAC through a webinar organized with OLADE, in March 2020.
- (b) Brazil: The Brazilian National System of Control of the Origin of Forest Products (SINAFLOR) has been enhanced thanks to the new mobile application that can be used during field monitoring activities, as well as an online platform to disseminate public information and statistics about forest products and trade results generated by SINAFLOR. Also, government officers and private users received an online training course.
- (c) Costa Rica: The economic valuation of the thermal use potential of residual forest biomass in the Huetar Norte Region of Costa Rica was completed and delivered to the national authorities. The Ministry of Environment and Energy is currently analyzing and discussing with other actors who participated in the exercise, the potential and application of the three business models of forest biomass use for steam and electricity generation provided. Interinstitutional discussions and exchange of experiences continued, as part of the work in progress with the National Center for Geo-environmental Information in Costa Rica. The Center is now operating an online platform that integrates, manages, and analyzes national information and statistics.
- (d) Guatemala: The project presented to and discussed with the Ministry of Finance of Guatemala and other national stakeholders, the results of the fiscal policy analysis and recommendations to promote the use of distributed electricity generation from renewable sources in the country.
- (e) Colombia: After launching the publication on fuel economy standards during COP 25, the project received renewed interest from the government of Colombia to continue the technical assistance under the project to implement a fuel standard in the country. Funding for such assistance is being discussed.
- (f) Dominican Republic: In the Dominican Republic, the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources adopted remote sensing processing technologies and software to map and monitor agroforestry systems at the national level. The country now has a national agroforestry systems base map, using Sentinel 2 images, and is using a monitoring tool which consists of a web platform and a mobile application.

- (g) Mexico: CONAFOR in Mexico now access to a graphics interface and a universal database to systematize and analyze field data collected by the National Forest and Soils Inventory. The project also supported the improvement and institutionalization of the Mad-Mex software and developed training materials on carbon accounting and national GHG inventories.
- (h) Panama: Given that the study on rice-farming agricultural practices in different LAC countries concluded that the System of Rice Intensification (SRI) technology has a positive impact on rice production intensification and climate change adaptation for family farmers, an action plan was conducted to guide and facilitate the validation and scaling up of SRI in priority areas of rice cultivation in Panama.
- (i) Nicaragua: Another action plan was established to modernize and increase agricultural productivity based on Integrated Water Resources Management, in the Nicaraguan Dry Corridor. An eventual scaling-up in the country has been discussed with a local private bank and IDB Invest. Both action plans (for Panama and Nicaragua) were published, as well as two more documents, one with the description of eight case studies of research in climate change adaptation and EST, and another related to the adoption of agrotechnology innovation to strengthen the sector's productivity, competitiveness, and resilience of the sector in Central America and the Caribbean countries.
- (j) Suriname: Besides strengthening four existing modules of the Suriname Forestry Information System (SFIS), the Foundation of Forest Management and Production Control (SBB) adopted three new modules to track: i) transportation; ii) irregularities, confiscation, and release of confiscated logs; and iii) financial transactions.

Challenges

22. This document reports activities and accomplishments from July 2019 to June 2020; however, it is being written in April 2020 amid a pandemic that is affecting the LAC region in an unprecedented manner. As the situation progresses, more will be known in order to make decisions on how to finalize three remaining energy sector-related activities that had planned to carry out surveys, in-person interviews, housing labeling, and conducting face-to-face workshops (or if they will take longer than expected). More important, the countries response to the health and economic crisis will presumably impact their governments and sectors' short-term policy priorities and decisions regarding how to move forward with the proposals originated in the project. Besides closing activities and projects, this period was dedicated mostly to documenting achievements and publishing reports, which faced a few delays related to peer reviews and publishing cycles complications. However, none of these would be considered major delays.

Outreach and awareness raising activities

23. The IDB continues to work with the Communications Teams at the project's executing agencies, as well as those from the GEF and CTCN, to disseminate the project's products and events on climate technology transfer across the region. During this period, 12 publications were released and four more will be launched in the coming months (some of them together with associated blogs). Several webinars and virtual events will also be organized to present the project's results. The Project Coordination will be sharing this information as those events are scheduled. After presenting the work done in the transport sector and on capacity building and policy during COP 25 in Madrid, different stakeholders and participants demonstrated interest in knowing and learning more, including members of African countries and SIDS.

24. IDB hosted a session on Climate Technology Transfer at COP 25. During the event, topics such as policy recommendations to integrate EST in National Innovation Systems (NIS), climate change planning guidelines and EST, and the case of the Transportation Sector, were presented and discussed with the international community. Three related publications from the project were launched at the event. Please see the table below for detailed information.

25. Reports and knowledge products completed in the areas of renewable energy and energy efficiency have been disseminated individually and to vast and different audiences. The project will also be publishing an e-book that will integrate these results and will comprehensively analyze them in light of the technical, political, commercial, and regulatory environment, to share conclusions and proposals on how to continue encouraging the use of ESTs across the energy sector.

Table A4.1: Climate Technology Transfer Mechanisms and Networks in Latin America and the Caribbean Knowledge Products and Publications⁹⁶

| Title | Topic | Language | Published |
|---|-------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| Recomendaciones de política para la integración de tecnologías ecológicamente racionales (TER) en los sistemas nacionales de innovación (SNI) | Policy & Capacity | Spanish | 11/26/2019 |
| Marco Analítico y Guía para la planeación ante el Cambio Climático y Tecnologías Ecológicamente Racionales | Policy & Capacity | Spanish | 12/9/2019 |
| Etiqueta y norma de eficiencia para vehículos livianos: Beneficios, barreras y estudios de caso: una herramienta para su implementación en países latinoamericanos | Transport | Spanish | 9/27/2019 |
| Financing Electric and Hybrid-Electric Buses 10 Questions City Decision-Makers Should Ask | Transport | English | 10/1/2019 |
| Guía para la estructuración de sistemas de bicicletas compartidas | Transport | Spanish | May 2020 |
| Informal and Semi-formal Services in Latin America: An Overview of Public Transportation Reforms | Transport | English | Pending |
| Estado del monitoreo forestal en Latinoamérica y el Caribe Tipos de iniciativas y uso de tecnologías | Forest Monitoring | Spanish | 8/6/2019 |
| Experiencias de monitoreo forestal en Guatemala | Forest Monitoring | Spanish | 8/23/2019 |
| Sistemas de monitoreo forestal en México | Forest Monitoring | Spanish | 8/26/2019 |
| Experiencias de monitoreo forestal en la Amazonia Legal relevantes para la mitigación del cambio climático en Brasil | Forest Monitoring | Spanish / Portuguese | 8/26/2019 |
| Tecnologías para el monitoreo de impactos y emisiones de carbono del aprovechamiento forestal y de la trazabilidad de la madera en bosques naturales en Latinoamérica y el Caribe | Forest Monitoring | Spanish | 3/10/2020 |
| Intensificación sostenible de los sistemas ganaderos frente al cambio climático en América Latina y el Caribe: estado del arte | Agriculture | Spanish | 6/14/2019 |
| Hoja de Ruta para el escalamiento de la producción y el procesamiento del Lupino en Bolivia, Chile y Ecuador | Agriculture | Spanish | 10/4/2019 |
| Intervenciones y tecnologías ambientalmente racionales (TAR) para la adaptación al cambio climático del sector agropecuario de América Latina y el Caribe (ALC) | Agriculture | Spanish | 12/20/2019 |
| Innovación Agrotech en América Central y el Caribe: Oportunidades y desafíos frente al cambio climático | Agriculture | Spanish | 3/2/2020 |
| Estrategia de Fortalecimiento y aumento de la productividad del arroz en Panamá con base en el escalamiento del sistema SICA | Agriculture | Spanish | 3/20/2020 |
| Estrategia de Diversificación y aumento de la productividad Agropecuaria en el corredor seco de Nicaragua con base en la gestión integral de recurso hídrico. | Agriculture | Spanish | December 2019 |
| Innovaciones para la adaptación de la Agricultura familiar al cambio Climático en América Latina y el Caribe. Estudios de casos de éxito. | Agriculture | Spanish | December 2019 |
| Blog: América Latina, el monitoreo forestal y la mitigación del cambio climático | Forest Monitoring | Spanish | Oct 2019 |
| Blog: Lupino: A new super food? | Agriculture | English | Nov 2019 |
| Blog: Normas de eficiencia para descarbonizar el sector transporte en América Latina | Transport | Spanish | Dec 2019 |
| Project Agriculture Sector Webstory | Agriculture | English /Spanish | Dec 2019 |
| Bicycle-sharing systems (A Guide); and blog "How Bicycles can propel us toward a more sustainable and inclusive future post-pandemic" | Transport | English/Spanish | June 2020 |

Collaboration with the CTCN

26. The IDB and the CTCN continue to exchange information about initiatives supported in LAC, both on technology transfer, as well as financial mechanisms. This is being done through coordination among the projects, as well as among the two project executing agencies—the Tropical Agricultural Research and Higher Education Center and the

⁹⁶ An online version of the report or publication without a hyperlink cannot be found.

Bariloche Foundation—which also serve as the CTCN’s Knowledge/Consortium Partners (fostering collaboration and access to information and knowledge in order to accelerate climate technology transfer in the LAC region).

27. The IDB and CTCN are currently working on a Memorandum of Understanding to define a collaboration model, based on the lessons learned from project execution and the CTCN’s interaction with other multilateral development banks. As part of this process, the Project Coordination is assessing four projects (two in Peru, one each in Colombia and Chile) to select one that could serve to pilot the model. The effort should continue beyond finalization of the project.

28. The IDB is also collaborating with CTCN communications team to disseminate the project related publications and events (websites and social media). The Project was briefly presented and discussed at the CTCN Regional Forum that took place during the LAC Climate Week in Salvador, Brazil, in August 2019.

Lessons thus far

- (a) The presence of the project in the region created an enabling environment encouraging countries to explore the possibilities of implementing EST solutions to support their climate change plans and strategies.
- (b) Executing agencies have highlighted the importance of having designed this project with a degree of flexibility. The possibility to work with different types of agencies and actors and to adapt the activities to the changing needs of the countries and sectors, as well as to have granted necessary extensions given unforeseen or involuntary changes in work plans, have proved to be critical to assist the region in the best way possible.
- (c) The transfer of climate technologies has been optimized by partnering with organizations and platforms that already successfully aggregate and work with experts and institutions in specific areas and objectives. This, for instance, has been the case of OLADE, for the energy sector; the Regional Low Carbon Development Strategies Platform (LEDS LAC), for transport and energy; and the association of National Institutes for Agricultural Research and Technology in the LAC region, for agriculture.
- (d) Most initiatives developed by the project have shown the need to reduce the risk of the investment by creating innovative ways to connect sector policy with financial mechanisms and private sector participation.
- (e) During this last phase of the project, the documentation, publication, and dissemination of products has been crucial. After launching several documents, the executing agencies have been approached by different national institutions interested to learn more about experiences across the region.
- (f) Strategically aligning the technical assistance in forest monitoring with countries’ priorities, and with other international technical programs’ agendas, was critical to structuring a solid strategy to leverage public funding in the region.
- (g) Complementarity expertise among members of the consortium has improved the quality of products and services provided. An example of this is the support provided by the Ecuador National Institute of Agricultural Research to PROINPA and the Panaseri company in Bolivia in the processing of Andean Lupinus crop.
- (h) In order to pursue agriculture sustainability and an increase of resiliency, four clear and necessary steps have been identified for projects that involve water usage and face climate variability: i) improve knowledge about water resources; ii) develop a clear set of rules on rights and sanctions related to access and water use; iii) modify agricultural practices to reduce pressure and vulnerability of the resource; and iv) raise awareness of the population regarding water problems and opportunities.

(c) *Pilot Asia-Pacific Climate Technology Network and Finance Center*

29. This project was endorsed by the GEF CEO in May 2012, and closed in March 2019, after an extension from the original closure date of December 2018. This was a joint initiative of the UNEP and ADB. The project’s objective was to pilot a regional approach to facilitating deployment of climate technologies (mitigation and adaptation) that combines capacity development, enhancement of enabling environment for market transformation, financial investments, and investment facilitation. Project components were as follows: i) facilitating a network of national and regional centers, networks, organizations, and initiatives; ii) building/strengthening national and regional technology transfer centers and centers of excellence; iii) design, development and implementation of country-driven EST transfer policies, programs, demonstration projects, and scale-up strategies; iv) integrating climate technology financing needs into national development strategies, plans, and investment priorities; v) catalyzing investments in EST deployment; and vi) establishing a marketplace of owners and users of LCTs to facilitate their transfer. UNEP led interventions to

enhance the enabling conditions for climate technology transfer and deployment, and the ADB led the financial investment and investment facilitation interventions.

30. The UNEP component of the project supported capacity building of institutions for assessing technology needs for climate change. With the adoption of the Paris Agreement and submission of NDCs, the countries defined their national strategies for addressing climate change. The final focus of the project was on providing technical assistance to partner countries to support them in designing and developing programs to facilitate technology use for NDC implementation. Countries were supported to work towards developing NDC implementation plans, as well as institutional arrangements for implementation and tracking progress. Coordination among climate change focal points and interactions with stakeholders was also strengthened.

31. The terminal evaluation of this project shared the following insights regarding the project's main achievements and lessons learned:

- (a) Climate technology development, transfer, and investment have been mainstreamed into government planning in those countries that received CTFC supported and also in ADB operations. What happened in Hunan Province of PRC is a good example: government formulated policies and measure to promote low carbon technology investment, supported the establishment of low-carbon technology exchange, and promoted low-carbon development of Xiangtan City. ADB operations can be another good example: ADB has set an ambitious climate finance target, and all ADB lending projects are required to consider using innovative low-carbon or resilient technology interventions.
- (b) Capacity building and investment promotion on climate technology should be strengthened together. Institutional capacity building, including policy making and implementation of climate technology, will play a crucial role in promoting climate technology investment—creating market demand for climate technology investment, while investment promotion will play key demonstration role. The CTFC has supported both capacity building and investment demonstration.
- (c) The institutions that received CTFC supported should have government back-up or should be a part of a business entity to ensure sustained operations after CTFC completion. A registered interim entity to undertake the tasks of promoting climate technology promotion may run high risks, given lack of business operation experience and lack of ability to make profits.
- (d) Promoting climate technology investment project requires a long time frame compared to general capacity building or a policy study project. The CTFC original timeframe proved not realistic in practice and should have been designed for a much longer implementation time frame.
- (e) Substantive joint work needs to be backed up by strong orientation and prioritization, as well as supported by relevant management and supervisory structures, together with incentives and enforcement.
- (f) In a jointly-implemented project, it is incumbent on the key partners at the outset to discuss assumptions, clarify positions, align, and channel collective efforts to assure the project's envisaged performance.
- (g) In a jointly implemented endeavour, the absence of independent joint evaluation conducted mid-way and at project closure missed vital opportunities to identify synergies, realign, and together build sustainability for the results and benefits of the intervention.
- (h) Broadly-based regional projects, which by their nature and resourcing opt for breadth over depth, run the risk of designing and delivering activities at an overly superficial level, responding to the need for inclusiveness across countries, risking missing the in-depth assessment and demonstration value from focusing on a few key priority areas.

(d) *Pilot African Climate Technology Finance Center and Network*

32. This project, implemented by AfDB, was endorsed by the GEF CEO in April 2014 and is under implementation. The project supports the deployment of technologies for both CCM and CCA in Sub-Saharan Africa. CCM activities focus exclusively on the energy sector and are more specifically aligned with the Sustainable Energy for All initiative, whereas the CCA activities focus exclusively on the water sector. The project intends to mobilize additional financing, notably from the AfDB-managed instruments, such as the Sustainable Energy Fund for Africa or the African Water

Facility. The project components include: (i) enhancing networking and knowledge dissemination with respect to climate technology transfer and finance; (ii) enabling scale-up of technology transfer through policy, institutional and organizational reforms of the enabling environments at the national and regional levels through technical assistance; and (iii) integrating climate change aspects into investment programs and projects. The project submitted the Mid-Term Review (MTR) report to the GEF, which was referred to in GEF's report to COP 23.⁹⁷ The project was extended for a third time to July 2021 due to delays resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. Because the project is in its final stages, some information, including coordination with the CTCN, is limited.

⁹⁷ AfDB, 2016, [*African Climate Technology and Finance Center and Network, Mid-term Evaluation.*](#)

ANNEX 5: NATIONAL CLIMATE TECHNOLOGY ACTIVITIES

1. This annex summarizes the status of implementation of the technology transfer pilot projects supported within the framework of the Poznan strategic program on technology transfer (PSP), as requested in the conclusions of SBI 36 agenda item 12. It also includes the information provided by the MTR reports submitted for the pilot projects, as requested in the conclusions of SBI 43 agenda sub-item 10(b). The information in this annex is based on data provided by relevant GEF Agencies in response to a survey that was circulated and carried out by the GEF in April 2020.

Table A5.1: Projects and Programs supported within the framework of the PSP on Technology Transfer

| GEF ID | Country | Agency | Title | GEF Poznan Program funding (\$ million) ^a | Total GEF funding (\$ million) ^a | Co-financing (\$ million) | Status of project |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------|---|--|---|---------------------------|--|
| Ongoing Projects | | | | | | | |
| 4132 | Mexico | IDB | <i>Promotion and Development of Local Wind Technologies in Mexico</i> | 3.0 | 5.5 | 33.7 ^c | The project was endorsed by the GEF CEO in December 2011 and is under implementation. |
| 4071 | Côte d'Ivoire | AfDB | <i>Construction of 1000 Tonne-per-day Municipal Solid Waste Composting Unit in Akouedo Abidjan</i> | 3.0 | 3.0 | 36.9 ^c | This project was endorsed by the GEF CEO in October 2013 and is under implementation. |
| 4136 | Chile | IDB | <i>Promotion and Development of Local Solar Technologies in Chile</i> | 3.0 | 3.0 | 31.8 ^c | The project was endorsed by the GEF CEO in June 2012 and is under implementation. |
| 4682 | Colombia, Kenya, Eswatini | UNEP | <i>SolarChill: Commercialization and Transfer</i> | 2.8 | 3.0 | 8.0 ^b | This project was endorsed by the GEF CEO in February 2014 and is under implementation. |
| 4114 | Sri Lanka | UNIDO | <i>Bamboo Processing for Sri Lanka</i> | 2.7 | 2.7 | 21.3 ^c | The project was endorsed by the GEF CEO in April 2012 and is under implementation. |
| Completed Projects | | | | | | | |
| 4042 | Cambodia | UNIDO | <i>Climate Change-related Technology Transfer for Cambodia: Using Agricultural Residue Biomass for Sustainable Energy Solutions</i> | 1.9 | 1.9 | 4.6 ^c | The project was endorsed by the GEF CEO in May 2012 and closed in December 2018. |
| 4055 | Senegal | UNDP | <i>Typha-based Thermal Insulation Material Production in Senegal</i> | 2.3 | 2.3 | 5.6 ^c | The project was endorsed by the GEF CEO in August 2012 and closed in May 2019. |
| 4129 | China | World Bank | <i>Green Truck Demonstration Project</i> | 3.0 | 4.9 | 9.8 ^c | The project was endorsed by the GEF CEO in March 2011, and closed in December 2015. |

| GEF ID | Country | Agency | Title | GEF Poznan Program funding (\$ million) ^a | Total GEF funding (\$ million) ^a | Co-financing (\$ million) | Status of project |
|--|----------------------|--------|--|--|---|---------------------------|---|
| 4037 | Thailand | UNIDO | <i>Overcoming Policy, Market and Technological Barriers to Support Technological Innovation and South-South Technology Transfer: The Pilot Case of Ethanol Production from Cassava</i> | 3.0 | 3.0 | 31.6 ^c | The project was endorsed by the GEF CEO in March 2012 and closed in December 2018. |
| 4036 | Jordan | IFAD | <i>Dutyion Root Hydration System (DRHS) Irrigation Technology Pilot Project to Face Climate Change Impact</i> | 2.4 | 2.4 | 5.5 ^c | The project was endorsed by the GEF CEO in August 2011 and closed in June 2018. |
| 3541 | Russian Federation | UNIDO | <i>Phase-out of HCFCs and Promotion of HFC-free Energy Efficient Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning Systems in the Russian Federation through Technology Transfer</i> | 3.0 | 20.0 | 40.0 ^c | The project was endorsed by the GEF CEO in August 2010 and closed in 2016. |
| Canceled projects | | | | | | | |
| 4040 | Brazil | UNDP | <i>Renewable CO₂ Capture and Storage from Sugar Fermentation Industry in Sao Paulo State</i> | 3.0 | 3.0 | 7.7 ^b | The project was cancelled in February 2012 upon request from the agency. The project preparation identified investment costs far higher than initially expected, exceeding the available financing. |
| 4032 | Cook Islands, Turkey | UNIDO | <i>Realizing Hydrogen Energy Installations on Small Island through Technology Cooperation</i> | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.5 ^b | The project was cancelled in March 2012 upon request from the agency, following changes in the concerned governments' priorities. |
| 4060 | Jamaica | UNDP | <i>Introduction of Renewable Wave Energy Technologies for the Generation of Electric Power in Small Coastal Communities</i> | 0.8 | 0.8 | 1.4 ^b | The project was cancelled in October 2011 upon request from the agency. |
| Total | | | | 36.9 | 58.6 | 241.4 | |
| Total (cancelled projects excluded) | | | | 30.1 | 51.6 | 228.8 | |

^a Includes PPGs and Agency Fees.

^b Co-financing amount at the GEF Council approval.

^c Co-financing amount at the GEF CEO endorsement.

Ongoing Projects

(a) Mexico: Promotion and Development of Local Wind Technologies in Mexico

2. This project was approved by the IDB and implementation began in May 2013, following the GEF CEO endorsement in December 2011. The project includes the following components: (i) design and specification of the wind turbine components of the Mexican Wind Machine (MEM) project; (ii) procurement, manufacturing, and assembly of the components of the MEM Project; (iii) erection, start up, and operational testing of the wind turbine of the MEM Project; and (iv) capacity-building and institutional strengthening to promote wind power market through distributed generation by small power producers. This project is currently still under implementation, and has been extended to December 2020, from its original end date of February 2017.

Status Update

3. The Executing Agency has delivered PIRs on an annual basis since the start of the project's execution in 2013. During the evaluation period 2019-2020, the Executing Agency has mainly focused on completing the milestones related to the blade manufacturing of the wind turbine. This is the last product committed to be delivered with the grant resources. The project reached an important milestone by completing the aerodynamic, structural, and aeroelastic design, which defines the production line for the blades manufacturing. The design of the master plan was also completed in December 2019, its manufacture started in January 2020 and it is expected to be completed in July 2020. The project extension was granted by the Agency because of a change in the completion of one of the key milestones of the project, the manufacturing of wind blades for the MEM project. The project is expected to have disbursed a total of 50 percent of financial resources by June 2020.

Notable achievements on the transfer of technology

4. Final blueprints of blades were completed during the reporting period, which facilitated the definition of the final list of materials to be purchased in May 2020, and the design of the blades was carried out with criteria at a world-class certification level.

5. In regards to blade design, the executing agency in collaboration with partners, has prepared methodologies to perform the aerodynamic, structural, and aeroelastic analysis. These methodologies could be shared with Mexican companies interested in entering the wind turbine blade design, construction, and repair market. Regarding the production line, the executing agency has prepared the procedures to manufacture the master plan according to the industry's standard, taking into consideration the availability of materials and keeping costs without sacrificing durability. Regarding the blades manufacturing process, the executing agency has implemented the blueprint structures that facilitate the preparation of the fiberglass textiles that will be used to manufacture the blade and to establish the processes of quality control during the development of the final products. All these outcomes constitute additional know-how developed in the project. By the end of the year, Mexico will have the first local team of engineers trained to design and manufacture medium-size wind turbine blades locally, in addition to the different private consortia that have participated in the local manufacturing of other wind turbine components.

Challenges

6. The execution of the contract for the wind blades manufacturing is the main product for the evaluation period of this report. This contract was awarded to the local company TEMACO, in consortium with two Mexican public research and development centers. The consortium was selected for showing enough capacity to carry out the design and manufacturing of a set of five blades for the MEM project.

7. This contract, with a termination date of January 2020, had the international technical supervision of the CENER from Spain. From 2018 and 2019 both public centers CIDESI and CIATEQ, members of the consortium, carried out the design of the wind blades, while TEMACO provided technical advice for the correct selection of the list of materials and equipment in preparation for the manufacturing stage of the final products. However, TEMACO was unable to meet key milestones in the contract, including the construction of a warehouse at the INEEL Regional Wind Technology Center, located in Oaxaca, Mexico, to house the blades. TEMACO requested an extension for the completion of the contract during 2020, but they missed the renewal of a commercial bank guarantee that would allow the approval of the said extension by INEEL. The contract with TEMACO was not renewed.

8. To complete the important milestone of the blades manufacturing, INEEL presented a new workplan to the IDB that allows it to complete at least one of the blades in 2020, in collaboration with CIDESI and CITEQ, which have demonstrated enough capacity to deliver this milestone. CENER's continued support as technical supervisor is also being considered in this new workplan. The IDB has requested to the Executing Agency (INEEL) to get the consent of the Secretaria de Hacienda y Crédito Público (GEF's focal point in the country), as well as the GEF Secretariat to get the IDB's consent for the continuation of the project in 2020.

9. With the declaration of the national emergency due to COVID-19, the possibility of INEEL completing the blades in 2020 is now strongly jeopardized. INEEL has recently expressed to the IDB its concern with regards to the impact that COVID-19 will have for the completion of this milestone, in addition to the existing delays in getting the IDB's agreement.

10. INEEL's General Director and other authorities involved in the project, with the support of General Directors of CIDESI and CIATE, have expressed to the IDB their high commitment to the use of GEF grant resources and the value that the project has generated to the country in the development of human capital, as well as in the design of value chains for the local manufacturing of wind turbine components, that did not exist before.

11. INEEL has stated that they do not yet have all the local contribution resources committed by the Government and will not be able to achieve the final objective of having a prototype wind turbine installed at the Regional Wind Technology Center, as initially planned. However, it is clear that the specific objectives of local capacity building and development of value chains are being met, having designed and manufactured several main components of a wind turbine locally, such as: the tower, the hub, chassis, rotor, generator, inverter, and the potential blades manufacturing. It is worth mentioning that the project originally contemplated the purchase of three blades for the MEM, which could not be secured through the various international bidding processes guided by the IDB. In this case, INEEL has developed local capacities in this milestone, which required an extension for the use of GEF grant resources for the design and manufacturing of wind blades in Mexico.

12. The grant resources available for the project reaches nearly 50 percent since most of the remaining resources were committed under the contract with TEMACO, which has not been concluded. INEEL is awaiting response from the IDB that will allow it to continue using the GEF grant resources.

Outreach and public awareness activities

13. The project has carried out several workshops to socialize aspects of the blades design and manufacturing in 2019. The last one was in Queretaro, Mexico at the facilities of the CIATEQ where specialists conducted trainings in the use of resins and composite materials. Local engineers, technicians and students participated in this workshop.

14. In collaboration with the IDB, this video was prepared to share key project outcomes:

<https://app.box.com/s/j07je5vxi1hrzeic2qfclte1gmvkod3b>

Lessons thus far

15. There is a series of lessons learned from this project over the time of its execution, many of them related to the nature of a research and development project, which have been shared in previous reports and will also be reflected in the final evaluation of the project. The most recent lesson learned is related to the termination of the contract between INEEL (National Institute for Clean Electricity and Energy) and TEMACO (private company) for blade manufacturing. This contract achieved the design of the blades thanks to the participation of the public centers CIDESI and CIATEQ, in consortium with the company TEMACO. However, TEMACO was unable to complete the construction of the industrial warehouse and the final blade manufacturing as established in said contract. TEMACO requested that INEEL extend the contract to complete the projects in 2020 but was unable to extend the corresponding IDB guarantee.

16. Although, through project monitoring, the IDB alerted INEEL about TEMACO's failure to meet the milestones set forth in the contract, INEEL waited until the expiration of the contract, seeking to improve TEMACO's performance with the continuous monitoring by INEEL. This decision jeopardized the timely use of the project's committed resources within 2020 as planned. The lesson learned is the importance of a timely decision to correct deviations based on continuous monitoring.

17. One additional lesson is the need to adapt a different planning mechanism by Executing Agencies in similar Research and Development projects, given that projects of this nature have a different life cycle than traditional infrastructure projects usually carried out in collaboration with multilaterals. The project's final evaluation report will enable identification of further lessons learned with their respective evidence. Another lesson learned is the need to strengthen the IDB's support in the selection and contracting processes of material suppliers, equipment, and services, in accordance with the processes agreed with the Government, in order to expedite them and avoid delays.

(b) Colombia, Eswatini, Kenya: SolarChill: Commercialization and Transfer

18. This project was initially approved with the World Bank as the GEF Agency. However, the World Bank withdrew from the project in 2010. The project was then re-submitted by UNEP with the addition of Eswatini (formerly Swaziland). The project was endorsed by the GEF CEO in February 2014. After two years of discussion and planning, and a new GEF Agency, the project was started in the last reporting period. The project includes the following components: (i) procure and install 200 SolarChill A units in three countries; (ii) laboratory testing of prototypes, procurement, and field testing of 15 SolarChill B units in each of the three countries; and (iii) information dissemination and technology transfer. The project is currently still under implementation, extended from its original end date of December 2018, to December 2020. Reporting is expecting to conclude by January 2021.

Status update

19. The project has submitted two PIRs thus far, and the PIR for 2019-2020 is pending. The amount disbursed to the project to date is \$2,328,079. The project has so far spent \$2,323,079. Between January 1 to December 31, 2019, total project expenses were \$434,413.00.

20. The project objectives are being achieved albeit with significant delays from the original timeline. Delays have been caused by: i) constraints faced at the field level; ii) procurement problems due to negotiation delays with governments; and iii) shipping time and custom clearance issues of SolarChill A Units. SolarChill B also delays occurred due to procurement delays, shipping of incomplete units, and custom clearance delays due to lack of proper documents not supplied by one manufacturer (Leff).

21. The timelines have been revised. While progress has been made on key activities, the scheduled project end of December 2020 remains challenging. Particularly the full monitoring of SolarChill B food refrigerators and the monitoring of SolarChill A vaccine cooler units of Palfridge may not be feasible. The Palfridge units cannot be field tested prior to World Health Organization (WHO) certification.

Challenges

22. The project has suffered delays for several reasons:

- (a) In Colombia, it was expected that technology transfer could mainly be done by reverse-engineering. Due to missing documents, the import of reference solar chill units was delayed and manufacturers started working on the first prototypes. As the technology for most of them was new, many iterations were needed during the development process.
- (b) The Eswatini manufacturer, Palfridge (aka The Fridge Factory), has encountered various technical problems while testing their pre-serial unit under WHO standards and conditions.
- (c) Since mid of March 2020 manufacturers had stopped their activities, and Ministries of Health were difficult to reach due to COVID-19.

Notable achievements on the transfer of technology

23. The progress on outreach and technology transfer have been the highlight of the project.

24. The project has successfully installed 113 SolarChill A Fridges at different locations in all three project countries: 37 in Colombia, 40 in Eswatini, and 36 in Kenya. All of them are continuously monitored. The SolarChill B Fridges have also been installed in all three countries: 11 in Kenya, 10 in Colombia, and 15 in Eswatini (but 4 out of 40

in total still need to be deployed in Kenya).

25. Technology transfer with manufacturers in Colombia and Eswatini is progressing and has been partly completed. The manufacturing partners (three in Colombia and one in Eswatini), have been engaged in the development of the SolarChill prototypes, and both countries are well along in the process of adopting the technology.

26. The project has done comprehensive field testing of the SolarChill A installed vaccine coolers for more than nine months. The field testing has provided valuable information on the performance of a variety of SolarChill coolers. These monitoring results are expected to support the improvement of the technology by the manufacturers. The most recent monitoring data is from December 2019. Information on the field-testing results of SolarChill B are not yet collected. Palfridge has adapted the SolarChill technology and is currently in their final testing and WHO qualification phase of SolarChill A. In Colombia, one manufacturer (Fricón) deployed its first SolarChill B unit in March 2020 and is currently benchmarking its performance with two imported reference units. Another manufacturer (Interhospitalaria) is ready to deploy its unit but is under lock down due to COVID-19. Kenya does not have a local manufacturer.

Outreach and public awareness activities

- (a) The website www.solarchill.org is being updated. Most of the materials developed (Guidelines to manufacture SolarChill Fridge – Technology and all the training material for installations and repair) have been put on the website for open use.
- (b) The participation in network events, such as the Ozone Network Meeting, is key in the outreach strategy.
- (c) Currently it is been under evaluation how the SolarChill technology might be helping in this challenging global health crisis.
- (d) The Project is evaluating the feasibility of launching a promotion campaign for the uptake of SolarChill B.

Lessons thus far

27. The large-scale testing and promotion of the SolarChill A technology may be considered as less innovative in 2020, as it was in 2009 when the GEF funding was initially approved. This indicates GEF's role as an early supporter of this technology. While the testing and monitoring of a variety of SolarChill A units is still relevant, the global market has embraced the technology over the past ten years. Today there are approximately 100,000 SolarChill A vaccine coolers installed around the world. This is an affirmation of the benefits of the SolarChill technology in contrast to earlier generations of vaccine coolers. Increasingly Ministries of Health in developing countries prefer SolarChill units for their vaccine coolers.

28. The SolarChill B food refrigerator is not yet commercialized. But SolarChill B could be a game changer as it has a wide market potential. The lack of adequate refrigeration results in the waste of 200 million tons of food each year.

29. SolarChill B units are currently being field tested in Kenya, Eswatini and Colombia. SolarChill B is applicable for domestic and small commercial purposes. The SolarChill Project has received inquiries from schools and community centers in developing countries; small groceries; silkworm farmers in India; fishers and camel milk farmers in Africa

30. The SolarChill Project aims to encourage manufacturers worldwide (particularly in developing countries) to produce SolarChill products. It is expected that with the economy of scale, the price of the units will decrease.

31. Manufacturers will be encouraged to produce SolarChill Food Refrigerators if it can be demonstrated that there is sufficient market demand worldwide. In this regard, the project is seeking the support of various stakeholders (e.g. governments, NGOs, appliance manufacturers, international organizations) that are engaged with health, nutrition and hunger, and food security.

32. Economy of Scale: The price of SolarChill vaccine coolers and food refrigerators will be directly affected by the economy of scale. Once SolarChill B is commercialized, it may reduce the price of both SolarChill A and SolarChill B units.

(c) Sri Lanka: *Bamboo Processing for Sri Lanka*

33. This project by UNIDO was endorsed by the GEF CEO in April 2012 and began implementation in September 2012. The project includes the following components: (i) policy framework; (ii) bamboo tissue production; (iii) plantation establishment; (iv) plantation operation; and (v) bamboo processing equipment. The project was initially expected to close in May 2019, but has been extended to December 2020.

Status update

34. Thus far, seven project implementation reports have been submitted to the GEF, while a progress report is submitted to the steering committee every six months. As of April 9, 2020, a total of \$2,175,638.35 has been disbursed, which is about 93 percent of project financing. Although this project has been running since 2012, the curfew and other restrictions imposed due to the COVID-19 pandemic has delayed project execution in recent months.

Challenges

35. Taking into consideration the lack of skills present in-country on bamboo processing, as well as the lack of bamboo supply, the project had to re-focus on the transfer of basic technical skills. In this regard, local artisans now have access to intensive bamboo processing trainings related to bamboo handcraft techniques. It is a significant achievement that has created the necessary know-how to support the development of a more sophisticated bamboo value chain in Sri Lanka. Currently, bamboo furniture and handcraft items are imported from neighboring countries, resulting in missed economic opportunities for local SMEs.

36. Another challenge is in engaging the private sector. The project includes the delivery of machinery for the establishment of bamboo processing units; however, the Government does not directly support the private sector, and the private sector views bamboo as a risky investment and is not ready to invest without cash incentives. This project addresses this challenge by subsidizing the relevant machinery, but the bamboo training center hosted by the IDB under the Ministry of Industry remains the owner of all machinery that is distributed to SMEs.

Technology transfer

37. All available bamboo planting material at Walpita Farm (following the germination of the imported seeds from China in 2018) has been dispatched to beneficiaries who will use it as energy source and/or handcraft or other processed products. However, as reported since 2018, the scarcity of land has led to lower results than expected and planned in the project. As a consequence, further efforts were undertaken to raise awareness on bamboo plantation: energy forum, planters' forum, talks at universities, and to the Tea Factory Owners Association and Timber Association, etc. Potential results will take place after the completion of the project.

38. The national know-how on bamboo plantation and management is supported by two manuals, formulated by the University of Ruhuna, Sri Lanka, and URAVU, the Indigenous Science & Technology Study Centre, India. The later manual is supported by six videos which constitute practical guides to select, plant, and maintain bamboo.

39. The Industrial Development Board of Ceylon has received the adequate support to become a training center on bamboo processing. Practitioners are trained on bamboo preservation, bamboo basic handcraft, bamboo furniture making, and glue laminated bamboo board processing. Four workshops over the period of June - December 2019 has been completed, accompanied by the publication of two technical manuals.

40. In parallel, in order to boost the market of bamboo items, an international designer developed a collection of bamboo furniture and bamboo decoration items. For the sustainability of the production, the designer took advantage of this work to train local students in design. The collection is currently produced by trained and equipped handcrafters, and an exhibition was planned for the May 15, 2020. However, due to the current curfew imposed by the State to control the spreading of COVID-19, these activities were postponed.

41. An SME selected through a call for proposal was supported to establish a glue laminated bamboo board facility. The company will remain linked to IDB on a contractual basis and will support the training of trainers of the center beyond the project life.

42. A second call for proposals was launched and four SMEs were selected and supported to formulate their business plan to establish the following processing facilities: bamboo paper; bamboo straws; bamboo bio-char; and bamboo gasifier.
43. A local SME and IDB have received a full set of machinery for the processing of glue laminated bamboo boards.
44. Following the launch of the second call for proposals for low carbon and more climate-resilient bamboo processing technologies, four beneficiaries will receive machinery via IDB for the processing of bamboo straws, bamboo paper, bamboo bio-char, and bamboo gasifier. These sets of machinery are currently being purchased.

Outreach and public awareness activities

45. The project has well-established and constantly updated social media pages:
- (a) Website <http://lankaboo.org/>
 - (b) Facebook Page <https://www.facebook.com/lankaboo.org/?ref=bookmarks>
 - (c) Instagram profile <https://www.instagram.com/lankabooofficial/>
46. Additionally, a website specifically for the handicraft/furniture collection is currently being created and will be shared with the public shortly.

Lessons thus far

47. The project planned to establish a new value chain at industrial scale in a country without a conducive policy framework in place, without extensive resources available and without existing skills. It was overly ambitious, as the creation of an entire value chain has to be approached on step by step basis, starting by pilots that allow learning by doing before scaling up.

(d) Chile: Promotion and Development of Local Solar Technologies in Chile

48. This project, implemented by IDB, was endorsed by the GEF CEO in June 2012, and started implementation in September 2013. The project began to disburse resources in March 2014. The project includes the following components: (i) technology transfer and capacity-building for solar technology; (ii) development of demonstrative projects using solar power; and (iii) design of incentives and financial mechanisms to promote solar power. This project is currently still under implementation, and has been extended to close in August 2020, from its original end date of May 2018.

Status update

49. The IDB has submitted four PIRs via e-mail, with the most recent in 2018, but information regarding this project's implementation progress for 2019 was submitted to the GEF Secretariat as well. As of June 2020, total disbursement is 98.5 percent.
50. Several studies were developed and project activities were progressing, however the social unrest in Chile, which started on October 18, 2019 and continued until February 2020, limited mobility and the provision of services. Prolonged protesting negatively impacted micro and small businesses, even forcing many to close. This was followed by the COVID-19 pandemic. These situations have delayed the implementation of all project activities.
51. Below is list of activities contracted, but not operational:
- (a) Evaluation of the Public Solar Roof Program;
 - (b) Analysis of international trend of thermal solar heaters and profile and formative plan proposal for installers and operator technicians;

- (c) Professional technical training qualifications framework for the energy sector;
- (d) Consultancy for design a strategy for penetration and development of the heating and cooling renewable technologies;
- (e) Projection of distributed generation for residential, commercial and industrial sector in Chile;
- (f) Alternatives for treatment of photovoltaic modules after useful life;
- (g) Thermal solar heaters price index;
- (h) App for energy information exploring with augmented reality;
- (i) Update of the Regulatory Tool Calculation Motor for Verification of Solar Fraction in Thermal Solar Systems.

Notable achievements on the transfer of technology

52. Notable achievements include:

- (a) A new series of distributed generation seminars were delivered from November 2019 to January 2020 in different regions.
- (b) Through the framework of the Law 20.571, Distributed Generation with PV technology has been promoted with affordable prices and reasonable standards. The amendment of Law 21.118 has enabled an increase in the installed capacity allowed for a system at 300 kW. The installed capacity has reached 46.3 MW at March 2020. On the other hand, through Law 20.897 (that reforms Law 20.365 approved on May 2, 2016) more than 100,000 households with PV and CST systems were installed.
- (c) To date, through the Public Solar Roof Program, 300 kWp of PV systems were installed in public facilities; Teletón Calama (40 kWp); Teletón Santiago (70 kWp); Teletón Copiapó (40 kWp); Teletón Arica (25 kWp); Teletón Iquique (25 kWp); Teletón Talca (Maule) (20 kWp); Escuela Gabriela Mistral from Tocopilla (20 kWp); and Liceo de Lo Prado (60 kWp).
- (d) The PV Training Program instated for electric technical schools has been a notable achievement, because it has developed capacities at regional and local levels (out of Santiago, the capital and main city of Chile). The Training Program complements a traditional electric instruction in professional and technical schools, generating huge interest within local students. The graduated students will have the potential to start their own business on the design, operation, and maintenance of small-scale PV systems.

Observations thus far

53. Observations include:

- (a) The Executing Agency has prepared all documents for the bidding process as well as the supervision of PV installations and facilities in the field.
- (b) The implementation of activities was supported by the necessary training for technicians and professionals who operate and maintain PV systems. Trainings (study programs, laboratories) focus on teachers and students from electrical technical schools with specific electrical subjects, with a focus on solar equipment and installations.
- (c) Modern tools, such as e-learning, to train people to accelerate their learning and avoid big displacements, were implemented for the irrigation PV distance learning course developed for consultants and professionals from the National Irrigation Commission and Agriculture Development Institute. At the same time, it was necessary to develop audiovisual material as a complementary activity to disseminate the project contents in a didactic way. In that case, a video regarding PV irrigation was developed, which improved the users understanding of the technology.

Completed projects***(e) Jordan: Dutyion Root Hydration System (DRHS) Irrigation Technology Pilot Project to Face Climate Change Impact***

54. This CCA project by IFAD sought to reduce the vulnerability of irrigated agriculture to climate change by testing innovative and efficient water-use technologies. The project was endorsed by the GEF CEO in May 2011 and closed in June 2018. The project was re-designed, as initial field trials carried out during the project inception showed that the proposed technologies did not perform as expected under the local conditions. After the minor amendment of the planned technologies, the project began in January 2014. The project included the following components: (i) pilot DRHS technology for efficient water use; and (ii) targeted training on the installation/use of the system. IFAD provided the MTR to the GEF, which subsequently shared it with the UNFCCC Secretariat, and the terminal evaluation was submitted to the GEF in August 2019.

Observations and final lessons (from terminal evaluation)

55. The most notable successes of the project were: (i) The work on technology innovation developed by some contractors, who provided considerable improvements for the hydroponic equipment (e.g. increase the height of the greenhouse by 0.7 meters and change the position of the windows for a better ventilation and less time to get rid of hot air; substitute all the welding joints by a special galvanized coupling in thickness of 5mm to connect the joint parts of the greenhouse with galvanized screws and bolts) and for the solar desalination system (e.g. solar desalination improvement with a less solar panels and minimal number or absence of batteries to help reduce equipment and maintenance costs, long-lasting aluminium structure resistant to winds up to 145 km/hour, and improved desalination equipment providing higher water purity and higher quantities per hour, that makes the solar desalination system one of the largest in Jordan); (ii) Despite not being accessible to the poorest farmers, the new equipment has yielded promising results in terms of the preliminary environmental and socio-economic benefits. However, the biggest challenge faced by the beneficiaries is the lack of continued assistance from experts and service providers to allow them adopt sustainable agronomic practices, and make appropriate use of the new technologies; and (iii) The constant interaction among partners has led to the establishment of no-interest loans for purchasing the equipment supported by the project.

56. The most serious shortcomings were: (i) the difficulty and/or inability to reach the target group—poor smallholder farmers, with special focus on women-headed households—due to the high cost of the equipment; (ii) the considerable project delays preventing the completion of most project activities and outputs, and the generation of concrete results from the use of most of the equipment by the beneficiaries, who did not have time to use it in agricultural production within the time frame of the project; a(iii) the absence of planning tools (e.g. Theory of Change model, M&E plan, procurement plan) that have prevented an effective implementation and adaptive management of the project; (iv) the limited supply of continued international technical assistance that would have been critical to ensure that National Centre for Agricultural Research and Extension (NCARE) staff, service providers, and beneficiaries get the necessary understanding and capacity to apply climate-resilient agronomic systems and techniques, and effectively adopt the new technologies; (v) the insufficient capacity of NCARE staff to effectively implement the project; (vi) the limited partnership development with other relevant stakeholders in Jordan that are active in the development and use of similar technologies; and (vii) the lack of strategic decision to anticipate activities to create enabling conditions (e.g. transfer of know-how and awareness raising through training and learning tours) that would have been possible through partnerships. These are the critical areas that the IFAD and the executing agency will have to pay most attention to in follow-up of the project.

57. As the project is now closed, key success stories relate to long- and medium-term yield increases and cost-savings reported by participating farmers, as well as increased participation of smallholders over time, once results were demonstrated, as stated above. This is significant in a country like Jordan, where water scarcity is a limiting factor negatively impacting productivity and income generation for smallholders. The project has also succeeded in different technologies that are specifically suitable for different crops and landscape characteristics of Jordan, which has high replication potential for scaling-up across the country and eventually the region.

(f) Cambodia: *Climate Change-related Technology Transfer for Cambodia: Using Agricultural Residue Biomass for Sustainable Energy Solutions*

58. This project, implemented by UNIDO, was CEO endorsed in May 2012 and was closed in December 2018, after being extended from its original close date of May 2016. The project included the following components: (i) technology transfer and implementation of three pilot plants; (ii) capacity-building and development of tools for technology adaptation and transfer; (iii) strengthening of institutional framework for technology transfer; (iv) upscaling of biomass fueled technologies in Cambodia; and (e) policies, regulations and mechanism to promote sustainable renewable energy generation.

59. Seven PIRs were submitted, one for each year of implementation from 2013-2019, with the most recent submitted to the GEF Secretariat in September 2019. The terminal evaluation was completed in July 2019 and shared with national stakeholders.⁹⁸

Lessons from the terminal evaluation

60. The goal of this project was to demonstrate the viability of using biomass for energy purposes in small and medium-sized industrial facilities, particularly on agro-industrial facilities. This goal is in line with Cambodia's national priorities for energy development. The approach to achieve this proposal was to support a technology transfer process between technology suppliers and end-user companies in order to establish commercial pilot plants. This was a very complex task, since the regulatory framework for supporting this kind of independent power producers was inadequate, the financial system is weak, and local technical resources are very limited. Besides, the small scale of the power facility makes the design of a technological and economic feasible solution very difficult. The above-mentioned circumstances, insufficiencies in the project design, and some project management failures –despite the efforts of the project management unit-- led to an unsatisfactory performance of the project.

61. In addition to design insufficiencies, the project was not able to identify a local supplier to support the new technology to be transferred. Subsequently, the bidding process had to take place through international bidding process, and finding international bidders was not easy. Many suppliers were not interested in a new market, while others were too expensive, and the entire process was very time consuming. The project PMU had to support the procurement process intensively, as the local factory was not able to communicate technical details in English.

62. Though the project has been operationally closed by UNIDO in May 2019, there have been two open contracts. One was a contract with AMRU Rice (Cambodia) Co., Ltd for development of co-generation technology, which later on had been terminated on 30 November 2019 as the company could not find co-financing to realize the investment. The project has sought to different financial institutions, such as PFAN. However, after rigorously reviewing AMRU's proposal, PFAN has confirmed the unlikelihood of providing loans to AMRU. In the end, AMRU could not secure a low-interest loan to purchase co-generation biomass technology and withdrew from the contract with UNIDO. The other contract was with NPCC aiming at the dissemination of the results of the pilot plant as well as the achievements of the project. However, since the pilot plant was not implemented at the factory, the contract with NPCC has been terminated.

Lessons from the terminal evaluation

63. Lessons include:

- (a) In designing technology transfer projects, outputs related to commercial pilot plants is critical. Objective but in-depth considerations regarding existing conditions (policy, legislative, etc.); for specific technology transfer actions should be provided. Special attention should be paid to time and financial resource limitations; considerations which should decide the scope of these output.
- (b) Designing outputs focused on improving policy framework should be limited to promoting change, but not to affecting actual change of regulations during the project implementation period.

⁹⁸ UNIDO, 2018, Terminal Evaluation: [*Climate Change-related Technology Transfer for Cambodia: Using Agricultural Residue Biomass for Sustainable Energy Solutions*](#).

- (c) Outputs aimed at private sector involvement in technology transfer should be carefully formulated, taking into consideration real needs, expectations and business orientation.
- (d) Training and awareness raising activities should receive maximum attention due their importance for developing an enabling environment for the technology transfer process.

64. One serious implementation issue was the decision to initiate some output activities only after achieving certain progress in implementing the pilot projects. The delay in carrying out capacity building actions prevented the formulation of a comprehensive training program for the relevant actors in the technology transfer process for biomass-based energy technologies, as well as the creation of a cadre of trained specialists for promoting biomass-based energy projects. Likewise, it prevented training benefits and raising awareness actions from contributing to project progress. The same thing happens with output activities of the outcome related to policy framework, which were planned for the final stage of the project. Making progress in this component required a time-consuming program of activities with relevant institutions. Therefore, this program should have been initiated at the beginning of project implementation.

65. This program could have been aimed at raising awareness and understanding of the problems faced by this kind of technology transfer process and creating a common vision among participant institutions on the need to improve the legal and regulatory frameworks. Had this been the case, the chances for making a comprehensive policy framework gap analysis and increasing the readiness of policymakers to accept and implement project recommendations would have been much higher.

(g) Senegal: *Typha-based Thermal Insulation Material Production in Senegal*

66. This project by UNDP was endorsed by the GEF CEO in August 2012 and was extended once and closed in December 2018. The terminal evaluation of the project was shared with the GEF Secretariat shortly thereafter. The project includes the following components: i) sustainable Typha management; ii) transfer of Typha raw material processing technology; iii) development of local production; iv) transfer of bio-climatic and energy efficient building technology; v) Typha-based building materials application demonstration; and vi) marketing and dissemination.

67. Results from the terminal evaluation were already shared in the GEF's report to COP 25. Some key conclusions from the TE are included below. Overall, the project achieved a satisfactory rating and succeeded in supporting the development of a market for Typha as a building material.

68. The overall rate of target achievement is 91 percent, and the evaluation states that it would have been even higher, but initial targets were ambitious and did not consider the research/development needs of the project, the time allotted to its implementation, and the allocated financial resources and human resources mobilized in the coordination of the project. However, the project over-delivered on some targets, exceeding 100 percent. For example, one project indicator was that a set target of an area of 3 ha is exploited for Typha development, while the actual achievement was an area of 11 ha, which is a 357 percent achievement rate.

Notable achievements on the transfer of technology

69. Secured Supply of Quality Typha: This result was achieved through activities such as setting up a resource monitoring committee; adopting a standard on harvesting, drying, and transporting Typha; training and equipment of economic interest groupings; and developing scientifically and technically certified materials. However, the standard on materials has not been developed because it is a slower process that requires written know-how from the consensus of a group of experts created for this purpose.

70. The creation of small-scale industrial production units: The achievement of this result can be certified through the small artisanal units developed by the project, some prototypes of which are in use. National contractors are trained on the operation of these units. These industrial units will need improvement in the implementation phase of the project's results (completion of the demonstrations) before a mass reproduction.

71. Professionals capable of implementing bioclimatic building models: Building professionals have been trained and many bioclimatic approaches tailored to the context of each climate zone have been set out through a design guide.

72. Bio-based materials: These materials have been developed and used during successful demonstration sessions. These applications covered both modern buildings and buildings in rural areas.

73. The dissemination of promotional media for materials: Promotional media was distributed throughout the development of materials, which led to an increasing demand for these products. Strategies for the development of these materials have been implemented to reach consumers through their use in public projects and the support provided to private developers.

(h) Thailand: Overcoming Policy, Market and Technological Barriers to Support Technological Innovation and South-South Technology Transfer: The Pilot Case of Ethanol Production from Cassava

74. This project by UNIDO was endorsed by the GEF CEO in 2012 and extended twice to close in May 2019. The key objective of the project was to foster technical innovation and South-South technology transfer from Thailand to neighboring countries, notably Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Viet Nam, to address the issue of the region's high dependence on fossil fuels for transportation. The project includes the following components: i) institutional capacity-strengthening for very high-gravity – simultaneous saccharification and fermentation (VHG-SSF) technology dissemination; ii) South-South technology transfer: capacity-building and policy dialogue with participants from the Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Viet Nam; and iii) demonstration and commercialization of the technology and private sector development. The GEF agency is King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi (KMUTT). The project was extended from its original end date of January 2016, closing in May 2019.

75. Seven PIRs were submitted between 2013 and 2019, one for each year of project implementation, with the final PIR submitted in September 2019 and the terminal evaluation was completed in October 2019.

76. The terminal evaluation concludes that the project funds have been used efficiently, despite initial delays in project startup and early disbursements. Most project activities were executed more quickly than originally anticipated (June 2014 – December 2018). The project was operationally closed by UNIDO in May 2019, however, open contracts with vendors (project execution entities for establishment of training center, support private sector and pilot plant; as well as for supported policy makers in Viet Nam in enabling the needs of bioethanol promotion policy) remain, which require the submission of final reports. This is expected to conclude in May 2020.

77. As highlighted in the TE, the co-financing contribution from all partners stated in the project document is \$31,623,000 in cash, loans and in-kind payments. The distribution by component was reflective of specific activities.

Notable achievements on the transfer of technology (from terminal evaluation)

78. Due to the project's awareness raising campaign, which began in 2016, the Ministry of Industry and Trade (MOIT) Viet Nam has introduced blending of E5 (5 percent ethanol mixed with gasoline) for all 54 provinces in Viet Nam as of 1 January 2018.

79. Official request has been made from Lao PDR to further work on ethanol biofuel standards for the country, based on knowledge shared through this project. UNIDO supported this in Lao PDR by conducting a training for biofuel standards using experts from Thailand.

80. Technology for biofuels production from cassava has been shared with selected cassava producing Nigeria and Tanzania, through an information dissemination workshop and study tour in 2019.

81. According to the TE, GEF support was the catalyst in bringing neighboring countries together to work on collaboratively on shared issues, under a "total value chain" concept. KMUTT was able to successfully test technology transfer with neighboring countries, while also establishing new networks and partnerships. KMUTT continues to provide training to neighboring countries on its own, as of the time of the writing of the TE. This ensures that networks established through this project's activities are maintained even after project closure.

82. The project was able to oversee the development of a successful model for South-South technology transfer, and KMUTT aims to apply this model in other area and toward the transfer of other technologies. The project has opened the door to enhanced cooperation with other countries in the region (and also Africa), as well as proving that a consortium of Thai organizations are capable of working together to provide a unique set of skills. The project has

provoked an awakening in KMUTT regarding roles and responsibilities. At the beginning of the project, not all approaches were found to work. However, the flexibility within the project allowed for adjustments or corrections to be made and this strongly affected the successful outcome.

83. The project has achieved the main goal of providing a model for South-South technology transfer. Collaboration between KMUTT (technology provider) and the receiver of the technology has proven to be effective. FIRI received the technology of high-gravity fermentation from KMUTT and became the local center for technology transfer in Viet Nam. Through the project, a network of bioethanol producers, industrial suppliers, and technology providers was established. FIRI has gained new partnerships and opportunity for contribution to local industry. It was revealed that the competitiveness of bioethanol production depends on the efficiency of by-product utilization and waste management. FIRI is now working actively with the bioethanol producers on this issue. This was beyond the initially anticipated role of FIRI in the project.

Lessons from the terminal evaluation

84. The project addresses a problem that is relevant for most of the countries in the Asia Pacific region and most developing countries. Reduction of fuel imports is a priority in many national development strategies of countries that are net importers of petroleum. The technology promoted by this project to address this problem is of interest for many countries, as it offers an alternative to the raw materials— molasses and corn—commonly used for bioethanol production.

85. The approach used by the project for the promotion of an alternative option is highly appreciated for its potential advantages. Its core methodology for the design and implementation of the project is South-South Technology transfer. However, it also entails a risky challenge due to the complexity and the lack of a representative number of success stories at the international level that could be used for reference.

86. Some project design failures, combined with other factors, such as a complex situation during the startup process, and the implementation of activities in four different countries represented an additional difficulty for the coordination and management of the project. Despite the dedication of the project management unit, the support and adaptive approach to problem-solving shown by the staff at UNIDO Regional office and Headquarters, and the commitment to the project of relevant partners and stakeholders; achievement of the expected project outcomes was limited.

87. Accomplishments of the project include: technology transferred for bioethanol and cassava production; consolidation of the capacity of Thai institutions for the promotion of a genuine South-South technology transfer process; and a cadre of technicians, farmers, researchers, entrepreneurs, and governmental officials that have been trained and motivated. Together these accomplishments created a solid foundation for the reduction of fuel imports.

88. One major outcome of this project is the increased awareness of the opportunity of production of biofuel and the prospect of replacing conventional fossil fuel for various application including transportation especially in Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, and Viet Nam, and for cooking in the Africa region. Many countries have the potential to grow suitable agro-feedstock for the production of bioethanol. Farmers could benefit from participating in the sustainable farming and supply of feedstock directly to the bioethanol production plants and increase the gross income per capital of the local farmers. At the same time, thoughtful policy support on the pricing mechanisms and promotion of biofuel by the respective Government agencies in Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, and Viet Nam and African Countries to replace conventional fuel will help to increase the demand of domestic biofuel. Such policies will also lead to financial savings for local communities that replaces the use of conventional fuel with domestic produced biofuel, help support local government to mitigate risk on foreign exchange and dependency on conventional imported fuel, reduce GHG emissions, and increase technology transfer to the countries supported under this Project. It is anticipated that more external participants and collaboration from biofuel technology, sustainable farming, researchers, experts on know-how development, policy writers, financial institutions, investors, Government agencies, end-user manufacturers of such products as cars, trucks, motorbike, and cooking wares will include biofuel into their design and production roadmap if the prospect of biofuel is positive.

Lessons from the terminal evaluation

89. As part of the GEF-funded PSP, the project focused not only on South-South knowledge sharing and technology

transfer opportunities between countries, but also on the benefits such a model could bring to the region. The project demonstrates the viability of the South-South technology transfer approach to cassava-based bioenergy and some of the factors necessary to make it work successfully.

90. Among the considerations which are considered prerequisites for success, is the need to carefully consider the project design and the interests of all participating parties, promoting mutually beneficial activities and facilitating potential compromise when necessary at national, institutional or individual levels. Apart from contributing to technical success, this also leads to harmony, which was further enhanced by cultural similarities of the participating parties, resulting in better understanding and trust.

91. The project's decision to examine the entire value chain relating to ethanol production from cassava was significant. This examination almost immediately identified where in the project cycle problems were likely to occur. Problems could be anticipated, and resources could be redirected accordingly. At the same time, this enabled the participants to better identify and target the most appropriate recipients for the technology. Such a feature is rare, even in North-South projects, beyond the initial planning stage.

92. Of utmost importance is the existence of an enabling policy environment in all of the member countries concerned.

Outreach and awareness raising activities

93. In June 2019, UNIDO organized a one-week training program and study tour to share information on the innovative technology from KMUTT and the experiences of the GEF-4 South-South technology transfer project. Participants included countries such as Lao PDR, Cambodia, DPRK, Nigeria, Tanzania, and Kenya where various feedstock for ethanol and biofuel productions are available; and where the innovative technology can create a value chain of existing biofuel production reducing post-harvest losses, creating industries, and improving the wellbeing of people thereby achieving several SDG goals. One of the workshops included a panel discussion during which each country's representative shared a brief overview on the current biofuel situation in their respective countries, covering the policies, regulatory regimes, and biofuel roadmap, opportunities, and issues related to biofuels sector.

94. Based on the panel discussion, representatives indicated that although there are still barriers to the implementation of full-scale biofuel in their respective countries, the outlook for a biofuel roadmap is positive.

95. In December 2019, an Expert Group Meeting took place in Vienna, organized by UNIDO. Stakeholders from the project participated and shared their experience with other countries.

(i) Russian Federation: Phase-out of HCFCs and Promotion of HFC-free Energy Efficient Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning Systems in the Russian Federation through Technology Transfer

96. This project began implementation in March 2011 and was closed in 2016. The project includes the following components: (i) building institutional capacity; (ii) Hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) and HCFC life cycle performance analysis; (iii) phase-out of HCFC consumption in the key consuming sectors of foam and refrigeration; (iv) development of ozone depleting substance (ODS) destruction facility and supporting recovery network; (v) stimulating market growth for energy-efficient refrigeration and air conditioning equipment; (vi) technology transfer; and (vii) integrated strategy for HCFC production closure.

97. This project was completed in 2016. The mid-term evaluation report was referred to in the GEF report to COP 22 and the terminal evaluation was completed in December 2018.

ANNEX 6: STATUS REPORTS ON THE LDCF AND THE SCCF FOR FY 2020⁹⁹

The Least Developed Countries Fund for Climate Change (LDCF) was established in November 2002 to address the needs of the least developed countries whose economic and geophysical characteristics make them especially vulnerable to the impact of global warming and climate change. **The Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)**, consisting of two active funding windows, i.e., Program for Adaptation and Program for Technology Transfer, was established in November 2004 to finance activities, programs and measures relating to climate change that are complementary to those funded by resources from the GEF Trust Fund and with bilateral and multilateral funding. The GEF administers both the SCCF and LDCF and the World Bank acts as trustee for both funds.

1. Least Developed Countries Fund

a. Status of Pledges and Contributions

As of June 30, 2020, pledges had been received from 25 Contributing Participants: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States. The total amount pledged to date is \$1.59 billion eq.¹⁰⁰ and signed contribution agreements for \$1.58 billion eq. Of this, payments amounting to \$1.50 billion have been received from donors since inception of the Trust Fund. Annex A6.1 shows details of the status of pledges, contributions¹⁰¹ and payments made to the LDCF since inception.

During the financial year July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020, the LDCF Trust Fund received pledges amounting to approximately \$192.34 million eq. This includes pledges from Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Iceland, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Switzerland. The Trustee has received \$129.94 million against signed contribution agreements during this period.

b. Summary of Funding Approvals, Trustee Commitments and Cash Transfers

As of June 30, 2020, cumulative net funding decisions by the Council and the CEO amounted to \$1.52 billion, of which \$1.37 billion was for projects and project preparation activities, \$132.61 million was for fees, and \$16.76 million was for administrative expenses and corporate activities of the LDCF.

Funding approved by the Council and the CEO is committed by the Trustee and transferred following established procedures for all financial transactions as agreed between the Trustee and the Agencies. The Trustee has committed a net total amount of \$1.14 billion, of which \$1.02 billion relates to projects and project preparation activities, \$108.49 million to fees, and \$16.76 million to cover corporate activities and administrative expenses.

Cash transfers were made to Agencies on an as-needed basis to meet their projected disbursement requirements. Out of the cumulative commitments of \$1.14 billion, upon request from Agencies, the Trustee has transferred \$884.08 million as of June 30, 2020. As a result, \$259.25 million remains payable to Agencies. Details of funding approvals, commitments and cash transfers can be found in table A6.2.

c. Schedule of Funds Available

Funds held in trust without restrictions total \$699.5 million, comprising of cash and investments. Of this amount, \$640.9 million has been set-aside to cover funding decisions by the Council or by the CEO. Consequently, net funds available for approval by the Council or the CEO amounts to \$58.6 million. Details on the funds available for Council or CEO approval as of June 30, 2020 can be found in table A6.3.

⁹⁹ This status report was provided by the Trustee of the LDCF and the SCCF (the World Bank). The GEF Secretariat did not edit this report.

¹⁰⁰ US Dollar Equivalent

¹⁰¹ Represents the amounts for which donors have signed contribution agreements with the Trustee.

d. Investment Income

Pending cash transfers to Agencies, cash contributions paid to LDCF Trust Fund are held in trust by the World Bank and maintained in a commingled investment portfolio ("Pool") for all trust funds administered by the World Bank. The assets in the Pool are managed in accordance with the investment strategy established for all of the trust funds administered by the World Bank. The LDCF had cumulative investment returns from funds held in trust of \$87.27 million as of June 30, 2020.

2. Special Climate Change Fund

a. Status of Pledges and Contributions

As of June 30, 2020, pledges had been received from 15 Contributing Participants: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States. The total amount pledged to date is \$356.09 million eq. and signed contribution agreements for \$354.44 million eq. Of this, payments amounting to \$349.44 million have been received from donors since inception of the Trust Fund. Table A6.4 shows details of the status of pledges, contributions¹⁰² and payments made to the SCCF since its inception; Table A6.5 presents the contributions and payments information broken down by program.

During the financial year July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020, the Trustee has received payment from Switzerland against the signed contribution agreement of \$1.6 million.

b. Summary of Funding Approvals, Trustee Commitments and Cash Transfers

As of June 30, 2020, cumulative net funding decisions taken by the Council and the CEO amounted to \$359.18 million, of which \$318.38 million was for projects and project preparation activities, \$31.22 million was for fees, and \$9.59 million was for administrative expenses and corporate activities of the SCCF.

Funding approved by the Council and CEO is committed by the Trustee and transferred following established procedures for all financial transactions as agreed between the Trustee and the Agencies. Out of total funding approvals of \$359.18 million, the Trustee committed \$352.73 million, of which \$312.34 million relates to projects and project preparation activities, \$30.8 million to fees, and \$9.59 million to cover corporate activities and administrative expenses.

The Trustee transfers cash to Agencies on an as-needed basis to meet the projected disbursement requirements of the Agencies. As of June 30, 2020, out of total cumulative commitments of \$352.73 million, the Agencies have requested and the Trustee has transferred \$300.01 million. As a result, \$52.72 million remains payable to Agencies, pending their request. Details of funding approvals, commitments and cash transfers can be found in Table A6.6.

c. Schedule of Funds Available

Funds held in Trust without restriction comprising cash and investments for both the Adaptation and Transfer of Technology programs total \$73.83 million eq. Of this amount, \$59.18 million has been set-aside to cover funding approved by the Council and endorsed by the CEO. Consequently, net funds available for approval by the Council or the CEO amount to \$14.64 million. Details on the funds available for Council or CEO approval as of June 30, 2020 can be found in Table A6.3 which shows the funding status by program.

d. Investment Income

The SCCF shares the same investment management as the LDCF. Its overall investment return was \$23.41 million from inception.

¹⁰² Represents the amounts for which donors have signed contribution agreements with the Trustee.

Table A6.1: LDCF Status of Pledges and Contributions as of June 30, 2020

| Total Pledges Outstanding and Contributions Finalized | | | | Pledges Outstanding | | Contribution Agreements Finalized | | | | |
|---|----------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------------------|------------|
| Finalized | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 = 5 + 7 | 4 = 6 + 9 + 11 | 5 | 6 | 7 = 8 + 10 | Paid (Receipts) | | Unpaid | |
| | | | | | | | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| Contributing Participant | Currency | Total Amount in Currency | US\$Eq. a/ | Amount in Currency | US\$Eq. b/ | Total Contributions in Currency | Amount Paid in Currency | US\$Eq. c/ | Amount Due in Currency | US\$Eq. b/ |
| Australia | AUD | 46,500,000 | 42,967,350 | 0 | 0 | 46,500,000 | 46,500,000 | 42,967,350 | 0 | 0 |
| Austria | EUR | 1,900,000 | 2,669,600 | 0 | 0 | 1,900,000 | 1,900,000 | 2,669,600 | 0 | 0 |
| Belgium d/ | EUR | 114,190,000 | 137,905,745 | 0 | 0 | 114,190,000 | 111,490,000 | 134,879,450 | 2,700,000 | 3,026,295 |
| Canada e/ | CAD | 73,500,000 | 60,212,270 | 7,500,000 g/ | 5,482,857 | 66,000,000 | 66,000,000 | 54,729,413 | 0 | 0 |
| Czech Republic | EUR | 18,000 | 25,454 | 0 | 0 | 18,000 | 18,000 | 25,454 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark | DKK | 736,400,000 | 115,645,780 | 0 | 0 | 736,400,000 | 736,400,000 | 115,645,780 | 0 | 0 |
| Finland | EUR | 35,598,282 | 45,395,037 | 0 | 0 | 35,598,282 | 35,598,282 | 45,395,037 | 0 | 0 |
| France | EUR | 55,850,000 | 63,954,642 | 0 | 0 | 55,850,000 | 55,850,000 | 63,954,642 | 0 | 0 |
| Germany | EUR | 315,000,000 | 388,381,865 | 0 | 0 | 315,000,000 | 290,000,000 | 360,360,614 | 25,000,000 | 28,021,251 |
| Hungary | EUR | 1,000,000 | 1,344,300 | 0 | 0 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,344,300 | 0 | 0 |
| Iceland | USD | 1,183,500 | 1,183,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,183,500 | 1,183,500 | 1,183,500 | 0 | 0 |
| Ireland f/ | EUR | 12,734,869 | 15,211,406 | 0 | 0 | 12,734,869 | 12,734,869 | 15,211,406 | 0 | 0 |
| | USD | 8,000,000 | 8,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 8,000,000 | 8,000,000 | 8,000,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Italy | USD | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Japan | USD | 1,081,650 | 1,081,650 | 0 | 0 | 1,081,650 | 1,081,650 | 1,081,650 | 0 | 0 |
| Luxembourg f/ | EUR | 1,000,000 | 1,582,900 | 0 | 0 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,582,900 | 0 | 0 |
| | USD | 4,120,000 | 4,120,000 | 0 | 0 | 4,120,000 | 4,120,000 | 4,120,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Netherlands f/ | EUR | 55,200,000 | 73,174,578 | 0 | 0 | 55,200,000 | 55,200,000 | 73,174,578 | 0 | 0 |
| | USD | 34,700,000 | 34,700,000 | 0 | 0 | 34,700,000 | 19,200,000 | 19,200,000 | 15,500,000 | 15,500,000 |
| New Zealand | NZD | 8,100,000 | 5,808,840 | 0 | 0 | 8,100,000 | 8,100,000 | 5,808,840 | 0 | 0 |
| Norway f/ | NOK | 180,000,000 | 30,160,308 | 0 | 0 | 180,000,000 | 180,000,000 | 30,160,308 | 0 | 0 |
| | USD | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Portugal | EUR | 50,000 | 64,065 | 0 | 0 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 64,065 | 0 | 0 |
| Romania | EUR | 150,000 | 214,005 | 0 | 0 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 214,005 | 0 | 0 |
| Spain | EUR | 1,354,185 | 1,773,184 | 0 | 0 | 1,354,185 | 1,354,185 | 1,773,184 | 0 | 0 |
| Sweden | SEK | 1,487,000,000 | 182,096,953 | 0 | 0 | 1,487,000,000 | 1,097,000,000 | 140,466,313 | 390,000,000 | 41,630,640 |
| Switzerland f/ | CHF | 21,050,000 | 20,990,983 | 0 | 0 | 21,050,000 | 21,050,000 | 20,990,983 | 0 | 0 |
| | USD | 4,968,750 | 4,968,750 | 4,968,750 h/ | 4,968,750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| United Kingdom | GBP | 122,000,000 | 186,839,800 | 0 | 0 | 122,000,000 | 122,000,000 | 186,839,800 | 0 | 0 |
| United States | USD | 158,195,000 | 158,195,000 | 0 | 0 | 158,195,000 | 158,195,000 | 158,195,000 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | 1,593,667,966 | 10,451,607 | | 1,495,038,173 | | | 88,178,187 | |

a/ Represents (1) the actual US dollar value of paid-in cash contributions and (2) June 30, 2020 value of pledges outstanding, contribution amounts pending FX, and unpaid amounts.

b/ Valued at the exchange rates available on - June 30, 2020

c/ Represents the (1) actual US dollar value of paid-in cash contributions and (2) June 30, 2020 value of contribution amount pending FX.

d/ Includes contribution of EUR 9.05 million received and EUR 2.7 million pending receipt from the Walloon Government of Belgium.

e/ Includes CAD 6 million received from the Government of Quebec.

f/ Contributions made in more than one currency.

g/ Pledge made at the G-7 Summit in August 2019 and also announced during the Council meeting in December 2019.

h/ Represents 50% of Switzerland's pledge of USD 9,937,500 made during the 25th Council meeting in December 2018 which is subject to parliamentary approval. 25% of the pledge has been formalized with a contribution agreement in CHF currency and paid in October 2019 and 25% has been formalized with a contribution agreement in CHF in May 2020.

Table A6.2: LDCF Summary of Allocation, Commitments and Disbursements as of June 30, 2020 (in \$)

| Entity | Cumulative Net Amounts | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | Approved Allocations | Commitments | Transfers | Amount Due |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) = (2) - (3) |
| <u>Projects</u> | | | | |
| ADB | 30,396,446 | 13,650,000 | 10,550,000 | 3,100,000 |
| AfDB | 147,221,751 | 112,447,003 | 61,451,262 | 50,995,741 |
| CI | 10,229,358 | 30,000 | 0 | 0 |
| FAO | 189,028,732 | 100,253,763 | 74,678,181 | 25,575,582 |
| IBRD | 79,878,302 | 71,983,860 a/ | 71,983,860 | 0 |
| IFAD | 43,488,976 | 31,488,976 | 27,050,289 | 4,438,687 |
| IUCN | 4,587,156 | 4,587,156 | 0 | 0 |
| UNDP | 681,094,665 | 526,077,326 | 454,520,664 | 71,556,662 |
| UNEP | 171,225,692 | 154,331,513 | 70,229,555 | 84,101,958 |
| UNIDO | 16,166,464 | 3,233,377 | 2,404,602 | 828,775 |
| <i>Sub-total</i> | 1,373,317,544 | 1,018,082,975 | 772,868,413 | 245,214,562 |
| <u>Fees</u> | | | | |
| ADB | 2,598,887 | 1,380,991 | 856,800 | 524,191 |
| AfDB | 13,686,166 | 11,238,322 | 3,448,900 | 7,789,422 |
| CI | 920,642 | 167,838 | 2,700 | 0 |
| FAO | 18,024,537 | 11,473,279 | 10,910,995 | 562,284 |
| IBRD | 7,839,839 | 7,237,564 | 6,836,048 | 401,516 |
| IFAD | 4,795,243 | 4,035,243 | 3,094,269 | 940,974 |
| IUCN | 412,844 | 412,844 | 0 | 0 |
| UNDP | 66,301,090 | 56,592,503 | 56,170,071 | 422,432 |
| UNEP | 16,507,874 | 15,374,967 | 14,833,847 | 541,120 |
| UNIDO | 1,521,526 | 576,124 | 279,451 | 296,673 |
| <i>Sub-total</i> | 132,608,648 | 108,489,675 | 96,433,081 | 12,056,594 |
| <u>Corporate Budget</u> b/ | | | | |
| Secretariat | 11,023,114 | 11,023,114 | 9,976,440 | 1,046,674 |
| Evaluation | 416,098 | 416,098 | 375,098 | 41,000 |
| STAP | 1,017,405 | 1,017,405 | 508,405 | 509,000 |
| Trustee | 4,306,232 | 4,306,232 | 3,922,232 | 384,000 |
| <i>Sub-total</i> | 16,762,848 | 16,762,848 | 14,782,174 | 1,980,674 |
| Total for LDCF | 1,522,689,040 | 1,143,335,498 | 884,083,668 | 259,251,830 |

a/ Net of project cancellations amounting to \$2,671,767.97 reported by IBRD, which is being processed to be returned to the LDC Trust Fund.

b/ Includes amounts allocated to cover administrative expenses to manage the LDCF and Corporate activities, including annual audit.

Table A6.3: LDCF for Climate Change Schedule of Funds Available updated as of June 30, 2020

| Trust Fund for Least Developed Countries Fund for Climate Change Schedule of Funds Available as of June 30, 2020 | | | (in USDeq.) |
|--|-------------|--|------------------------------|
| <u>1. Funds held in Trust</u> | | | 699,532,647 <i>a/</i> |
| Cash and investments | 699,532,647 | | |
| Promissory notes | 0 | | |
| <u>2. Restricted Funds</u> | | | 0 |
| Reserve to cover foreign exchange rate fluctuations | 0 | | |
| 3. Funds held in Trust with no restrictions (3 = 1 - 2) | | | 699,532,647 |
| <u>4. Approved Amounts pending disbursement</u> | | | 640,906,504 |
| Amounts Trustee Committed | 256,580,062 | | |
| Amounts pending Council/CEO approval and/or CEO endorsement | 381,753,331 | | |
| Umbrella Set-aside | 2,573,111 | | |
| 5. Funds Available for Council/CEO approval and/or CEO endorsement (5 = 3 - 4) | | | <u>58,626,143</u> |
| <i>a/</i> Amounts pending FX are valued at exchange rate as of June 30, 2020. | | | |

Table A6.4: SCCF Status of Pledges and Contributions as of June 30, 2020

| Total Pledges Outstanding and Contributions | | | | Pledges Outstanding | | Contribution Agreements Finalized | | | | |
|---|----------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------------------|------------|
| Finalized a/ | | | | | | Paid (Receipts) | | | Unpaid | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 = 5 + 7 | 4 = 6 + 9 + 11 | 5 | 6 | 7 = 8 + 10 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| Contributing Participant | Currency | Total Amount in Currency | US\$eq. b/ | Amount in Currency | US\$eq. c/ | Total Contribution in Currency | Amount Paid in Currency | US\$eq. d/ | Amount Due in Currency | US\$eq. e/ |
| Belgium | EUR | 31,000,000 | 41,213,100 | 0 | 0 | 31,000,000 | 31,000,000 | 41,213,100 | 0 | 0 |
| Canada | CAD | 13,500,000 | 12,894,703 | 0 | 0 | 13,500,000 | 13,500,000 | 12,894,703 | 0 | 0 |
| Denmark | DKK | 50,000,000 | 9,041,885 | 0 | 0 | 50,000,000 | 50,000,000 | 9,041,885 | 0 | 0 |
| Finland | e/ EUR | 13,870,000 | 17,945,939 | 0 | 0 | 13,870,000 | 13,870,000 | 17,945,939 | 0 | 0 |
| | USD | 367,592 | 367,592 | 0 | 0 | 367,592 | 367,592 | 367,592 | 0 | 0 |
| Germany | EUR | 90,017,000 | 120,454,867 | 0 | 0 | 90,017,000 | 90,017,000 | 120,454,867 | 0 | 0 |
| Ireland | USD | 2,125,000 | 2,125,000 | 0 | 0 | 2,125,000 | 2,125,000 | 2,125,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Italy | USD | 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 f/ | 5,000,000 |
| Netherlands | EUR | 2,400,000 | 3,128,880 | 0 | 0 | 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 | 3,128,880 | 0 | 0 |
| Norway | NOK | 198,000,000 | 34,592,632 | 0 | 0 | 198,000,000 | 198,000,000 | 34,592,632 | 0 | 0 |
| Portugal | EUR | 1,070,000 | 1,299,099 | 0 | 0 | 1,070,000 | 1,070,000 | 1,299,099 | 0 | 0 |
| Spain | EUR | 9,000,000 | 12,349,100 | 0 | 0 | 9,000,000 | 9,000,000 | 12,349,100 | 0 | 0 |
| Sweden | SEK | 40,000,000 | 6,120,153 | 0 | 0 | 40,000,000 | 40,000,000 | 6,120,153 | 0 | 0 |
| Switzerland | e/ CHF | 14,175,000 | 13,899,125 | 0 | 0 | 14,175,000 | 14,175,000 | 13,899,125 | 0 | 0 |
| | USD | 2,056,250 | 2,056,223 | 1,656,250 g/ | 1,656,250 | 400,000 | 400,000 | 399,973 | 0 | 0 |
| United Kingdom | GBP | 10,000,000 | 18,603,167 | 0 | 0 | 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 | 18,603,167 | 0 | 0 |
| United States | USD | 50,000,000 | 50,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 50,000,000 | 50,000,000 | 50,000,000 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | 356,091,466 | | 1,656,250 | | | 349,435,216 | | 5,000,000 |

a/ Pledged contributions are made towards the Program for Adaptation and for the Transfer of Technology.

b/ Represents (1) the actual US dollar value of paid-in cash contributions and (2) June 30, 2020 value of outstanding pledges and unpaid amounts.

c/ Valued at the exchange rates available on - June 30, 2020

d/ Represents the actual US dollar value of paid-in cash contributions.

e/ Contributions made in more than one currency.

f/ Represents past due contribution.

g/ Represents 50% of Switzerland's pledge of USD 3,312,500 made during the 25th Council meeting in December 2018 which is subject to parliamentary approval. 25% of the pledge has been formalized with a contribution agreement in CHF currency and paid in October 2019 and 25% has been formalized with a contribution agreement in CHF in May 2020.

Table A6.5: SCCF Status of Contributions by Program as of June 30, 2020

| Contribution Agreements Finalized | | | | | | |
|--|----------|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------|------------------------|-------------|
| Contributing Participant | Currency | Total Contributions | Amount Paid in Currency | USDeq. a/ | Amount Due in Currency | USDeq. b/ |
| I. Program for Adaptation | | | | | | |
| Canada | CAD | 11.00 | 11.00 | 10.34 | - | - |
| Denmark | DKK | 40.00 | 40.00 | 7.23 | - | - |
| Finland | c/ USD | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | - | - |
| | EUR | 13.52 | 13.52 | 17.52 | - | - |
| Germany | EUR | 90.02 | 90.02 | 120.45 | - | - |
| Ireland | USD | 1.28 | 1.28 | 1.28 | - | - |
| Italy | USD | 5.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5.00 d/ | 5.00 |
| Netherlands | EUR | 2.40 | 2.40 | 3.13 | - | - |
| Norway | NOK | 181.50 | 181.50 | 31.59 | - | - |
| Portugal | EUR | 1.07 | 1.07 | 1.30 | - | - |
| Spain | EUR | 8.00 | 8.00 | 11.05 | - | - |
| Sweden | SEK | 37.00 | 37.00 | 5.69 | - | - |
| Switzerland | c/ CHF | 9.00 | 9.00 | 8.84 | - | - |
| | USD | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 | - | - |
| United Kingdom | GBP | 10.00 | 10.00 | 18.60 | - | - |
| United States | USD | 50.00 | 50.00 | 50.00 | - | - |
| | | | | 287.80 | | 5.00 |
| II. Program for Technology Transfer | | | | | | |
| Belgium | EUR | 31.00 | 31.00 | 41.21 | - | - |
| Canada | CAD | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.55 | - | - |
| Denmark | DKK | 10.00 | 10.00 | 1.81 | - | - |
| Finland | EUR | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.42 | - | - |
| Ireland | USD | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | - | - |
| Italy | USD | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | - | - |
| Norway | NOK | 16.50 | 16.50 | 3.00 | - | - |
| Spain | EUR | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.30 | - | - |
| Sweden | SEK | 3.00 | 3.00 | 0.43 | - | - |
| Switzerland | CHF | 5.18 | 5.18 | 5.06 | - | - |
| | | | | 61.63 | | - |
| TOTAL | | | | 349.44 | | 5.00 |

a/ Represents the actual US dollar value of paid-in cash contributions.

b/ Valued at the exchange rates available on June 30, 2020.

c/ Contributions made in more than one currency.

d/ This amount is past due.

Table A6.6: SCCF Summary of Allocations, Commitments and Disbursements as of June 30, 2020 (in \$)

| Entity | Cumulative Net Amounts | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| | Approved Allocations | Commitments | Transfers | Amount Due |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) = (2) - (3) |
| Projects | | | | |
| ADB | 10,868,909 | 10,031,770 | 5,990,066 | 4,041,704 |
| AfDB | 12,084,778 | 12,084,778 | 6,475,000 | 5,609,778 |
| CAFVE | 8,456,621 | 8,456,621 | 3,382,648 | 5,073,973 |
| CI | 3,102,636 | 3,102,636 | 1,739,750 | 1,362,886 |
| EBRD | 16,137,943 | 16,137,943 | 9,745,249 | 6,392,694 |
| FAO | 21,917,530 | 21,034,288 | 19,044,735 | 1,989,553 |
| IADB | 6,032,250 | 6,032,250 | 6,032,250 | 0 |
| IBRD | 85,894,018 | 83,116,240 | 73,168,084 | 9,948,156 |
| IFAD | 37,640,024 | 37,640,024 | 33,192,983 | 4,447,041 |
| UNDP | 80,994,144 | 80,994,144 | 79,919,503 | 1,074,641 |
| UNEP | 31,368,101 | 30,276,549 | 23,031,818 | 7,244,731 |
| UNIDO | 3,884,666 | 3,433,333 | 1,961,994 | 1,471,339 |
| <i>Sub-total</i> | 318,381,618 | 312,340,574 | 263,684,080 | 48,656,495 |
| Fees | | | | |
| ADB | 1,111,252 | 1,031,724 | 597,934 | 433,790 |
| AfDB | 1,134,137 | 1,134,137 | 0 | 1,134,137 |
| CAFVE | 482,027 | 482,027 | 482,027 | 0 |
| CI | 279,495 | 279,495 | 279,495 | 0 |
| EBRD | 1,581,831 | 1,581,831 | 1,562,831 | 19,000 |
| FAO | 1,852,773 | 1,785,647 | 1,785,647 | 0 |
| IADB | 603,225 | 603,225 | 603,225 | 0 |
| IBRD | 8,978,316 | 8,844,983 | 8,844,983 | 0 |
| IFAD | 3,747,286 | 3,747,286 | 2,554,346 | 1,192,940 |
| UNDP | 7,953,252 | 7,953,252 | 7,953,252 | 0 |
| UNEP | 3,131,289 | 3,027,592 | 2,927,842 | 99,750 |
| UNIDO | 369,044 | 326,167 | 324,583 | 1,584 |
| <i>Sub-total</i> | 31,223,927 | 30,797,366 | 27,916,165 | 2,881,201 |
| Corporate Budget ^{a/} | | | | |
| Secretariat | 5,610,356 | 5,610,356 | 5,131,432 | 478,924 |
| Evaluation | 524,666 | 524,666 | 448,666 | 76,000 |
| STAP | 1,005,380 | 1,005,380 | 496,380 | 509,000 |
| Trustee | 2,451,575 | 2,451,575 | 2,336,575 | 115,000 |
| <i>Sub-total</i> | 9,591,977 | 9,591,977 | 8,413,053 | 1,178,924 |
| Total for SCCF | 359,197,522 | 352,729,917 | 300,013,298 | 52,716,620 |

a/ Includes amounts allocated to cover administrative expenses to manage the SCCF and Corporate activities, including annual audit.

Table A6.7: SCCF Schedule of Funds Available updated as of June 30, 2020

(in US\$eq.)

| | | |
|--|--------------|----------------------|
| <u>Program for Adaptation</u> | | |
| <u>1. Funds held in Trust</u> | | 44,928,052 a/ |
| Cash and investments | 44,928,052 | |
| Promissory notes | 0 | |
| <u>2. Restricted Funds</u> | | 0 |
| Reserve to cover foreign exchange rate fluctuations | 0 | |
| 3. Funds held in Trust with no restrictions (3 = 1 - 2) | | 44,928,052 |
| <u>4. Approved Amounts pending disbursement</u> | | 37,388,475 |
| Amounts Trustee Committed | 30,920,869 | |
| Amounts pending Council/CEO approval and/or CEO endorsement | 3,556,495 | |
| Umbrella Set-aside | 2,911,111 b/ | |
| 5. Funds Available for Council/CEO approval and/or CEO endorsement (5 = 3 - 4) | | 7,539,577 |
| <u>Program for Transfer of Technology</u> | | |
| <u>6. Funds held in Trust</u> | | 28,898,393 a/ |
| Cash and investments | 28,898,393 | |
| Promissory notes | 0 | |
| <u>7. Restricted Funds</u> | | 0 |
| Reserve to cover foreign exchange rate fluctuations | 0 | |
| 8. Funds held in Trust with no restrictions (8 = 6 - 7) | | 28,898,393 |
| <u>9. Approved Amounts pending disbursement</u> | | 21,795,751 |
| Amounts Trustee Committed | 21,795,751 | |
| Amounts pending Council/CEO approval and/or CEO endorsement | - | |
| 10. Funds Available for Council/CEO approval and/or CEO endorsement (10 = 8 - 9) | | 7,102,642 |
| Total SCCF Funds Available for Council/CEO approval and/or CEO endorsement (5 + 10) | | 14,642,219 |
| a/ Amounts pending FX are valued at exchange rate as of June 30, 2020. | | |
| b/ The umbrella program commitment for "U4620-MENA - Desert Ecosystems and Livelihoods Program MENA-DELP". The funding approved for the project under this umbrella has been cancelled, but the program is still active. | | |

ANNEX 7: STATUS REPORT ON THE CBIT TRUST FUND FOR FY 2020¹⁰³

Table A7.1: CBIT TF Schedule of Funds Available updated as of June 30, 2020

| Trust Fund for Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency Schedule of Funds Available as of June 30, 2020 | | | (in USDeq.) |
|--|------------|--|-------------------------|
| <u>1. Funds held in Trust</u> | | | 42,757,148 |
| Cash and investments | 42,757,148 | | |
| <u>2. Approved Amounts pending disbursement</u> | | | 38,578,023 |
| Amounts Trustee Committed | 25,157,473 | | |
| Amounts pending Council/CEO approval and/or CEO endorsement | 13,420,550 | | |
| <u>3. Admin Budget Estimated from FY22-25</u> <i>a/</i> | | | 632,740 |
| 4. Funds Available for Council/CEO approval and/or CEO endorsement (4 = 1 -2 -3) | | | <u>3,546,385</u> |
| <i>a/</i> FY22-FY25 amounts are based on estimates. | | | |

¹⁰³ This status report was provided by the Trustee of the CBIT Trust Fund (the World Bank). The GEF Secretariat did not edit this report.