

ANNEXES

Annex 1

TERMS OF REFERENCE

BACKGROUND

Managing environment and energy for sustainable development is one of the five practice areas of UNDP under the current multi-year funding framework (MYFF 2004-07). UNDP has for a long time been involved in the area in different ways but its role and contribution has never been evaluated.

The normative underpinnings place managing environment and energy firmly within the concept of sustainable human development in UNDP. The 1992 Human Development Report¹ emphasized the interconnections between poverty, environment and human development. It stated that “one of the greatest threats to sustainable human and economic development comes from the downward spiral of poverty and environmental degradation that threatens current and future generations.” The report further recognized that “the poor are disproportionately threatened by the environmental hazards and health risks posed by pollution, inadequate housing, poor sanitation, polluted water and a lack of other basic services. Many of these already deprived people also live in the most ecologically vulnerable areas.” Outlining the justification for UNDP, a development agency, in the field concluded that:

“...sustainable development implies a new concept of economic growth – one that provides fairness and opportunity for all the world’s people, not just the privileged few, without further destroying the world’s finite natural resources and without compromising the world’s carrying capacity.” (p. 17)

The concept of intergenerational equity was central to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), or Earth Summit, held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. UNDP played an important role in the Summit and was also designated as one of the three implementing agencies of the newly created Global Environment Facility (GEF). The purpose of this move was to explicitly mainstream environmental concerns into the development policies pursued by UNDP.

The 2004-07 MYFF defines Energy and Environment for Sustainable Development² as the third Goal for UNDP. The area consists of six Service Lines:

- 3.1 Frameworks and strategies for sustainable development – UNDP seeks to develop country capacity to manage the environment and natural resources; integrate environmental and energy dimensions into poverty reduction strategies and national development frameworks; and strengthen the role of communities and of women in promoting sustainable development.
- 3.2 Effective water governance – Supports the sustainable use of marine, coastal and freshwater resources and improved access to water supply and sanitation services. This requires the appropriate local, national and regional water governance frameworks, and application of integrated water resources management approaches. This service line also promotes cooperation in transboundary waters management.
- 3.3 Access to sustainable energy services – UNDP supports energy activities to reduce

1. *Human Development Report 1992. Global Dimensions of Human Development*, UNDP 1992.

2. Second Multi-year Funding Framework, 2004-2007, UNDP.

poverty and achieve sustainable development objectives at the local, national and global levels. Its work is focused on strengthening national policy frameworks to support energy for poverty reduction; promoting rural energy services to support growth and equity with specific focus on the situation of women; promoting clean energy technologies to mitigate climate change; and increasing access to investment financing for sustainable energy, including through the Clean Development Mechanism. Activities in these areas complement and help integrate GEF programmes in the field of climate change and support sustainable livelihoods.

3.4 Sustainable land management to combat desertification and land degradation – Land degradation is one of the major causes of rural poverty, as well as one of its effects. UNDP works to break this cycle and reduce poverty through sustainable land management and by maintaining land-based ecosystem integrity, particularly in drylands where the poorest, most vulnerable and marginalized people live. UNDP assists countries and communities in land governance, drought preparedness, reform of land tenure and promotion of innovative and alternative sustainable land practices and livelihoods. Special emphasis is given here to the situation of rural women. UNDP supports institutional and systemic capacity building to address desertification and land degradation for rural poverty reduction, through local, national and global multi-stakeholder dialogue and action. UNDP promotes the mainstreaming and integration of major environmental conventions to reduce land degradation, help land users adapt to climate change, and maintain services through ecosystem integrity.

3.5 Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity – Through a close integration of GEF and core activities, UNDP helps countries and communities maintain and benefit from the biodiversity and ecosystem services that underpin human welfare and economic development, and provide the poor

with food security, fuel, shelter, medicines and livelihoods – as well as clean water, disease control, and reduced vulnerability to natural disasters. UNDP supports the sustainable management of agriculture, fisheries, forests and energy, and a pro-poor approach to conservation and protected areas, biotechnology and the development of viable, new markets for ecosystem services.

3.6 National/sectoral policy and planning to control emissions of ozone-depleting substances and persistent organic pollutants – The Montreal Protocol and GEF programmes of UNDP support governments as they develop and strengthen national and sectoral strategies for the sustained reduction and elimination of ozone-depleting substances (ODS) and persistent organic pollutants (POPs). Enterprises are assisted in maintaining their economic competitiveness through provision of best available alternative technologies and opportunities for capacity development.

OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The overall objective of the evaluation is to assess UNDP's positioning and contributions to managing environment and energy for sustainable development. The evaluation will be both retrospective and prospective, i.e. taking stock of the past while looking into the future with respect to UNDP's role in the field, especially with regard to the UN reform process. While taking a longer term perspective on the issue, the evaluation will focus on the period of the past five years since 2002.

The results of the evaluation will be reported to the UNDP Executive Board, both to ensure UNDP's accountability for achieving its intended results, as well as to guide decision-making regarding its future niche and strategies in the area. The evaluation will provide recommendations for enhancing UNDP's performance and strategic positioning, in particular with regard to its role within the UN system.

This evaluation will not study or attempt to conclude on the impact of UNDP's myriad of individual projects, programmes, advocacy and policy initiatives in environment and energy, nor will it analyze in depth each major technical area of environment and energy that UNDP is active in. The emphasis, rather, will be on the overall effort by the organization to optimize its contribution in environment and energy within the context of sustainable development.

KEY EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The essential criteria included under objectives-based evaluations will be addressed, i.e., relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability:

- Relevance – The rationale for UNDP's involvement in the field viz. other actors and its own mandate.
- Effectiveness – Positioning of UNDP's programmes and whether they have been effective in achieving their results.
- Efficiency – Use of approaches, partnerships, resources.
- Sustainability – Whether the results of UNDP's work have contributed to sustainable human development and whether they have contributed to lasting change.

METHODOLOGY

APPROACH

This will be an objectives-based evaluation, focusing on whether the programme's actual outcomes are likely to achieve its stated objectives. The evaluation will take into account the changing global environmental debate as well as evolving international concerns and priorities.

DATA COLLECTION

Primary data collection methods will consist of:
(a) reviews of key documents and financial

information, (b) country case studies, (c) regional consultations, (d) global consultations, and (e) a survey questionnaire. All of these approaches will focus on the questions listed in the section above. Studies on specific themes of importance will also be carried out.

DOCUMENT REVIEWS

UNDP's goals and objectives are elaborated in the multi-year funding frameworks (MYFFs) for 2000-3 and 2004-7,³ the first of which coincided with the introduction of results-based management at UNDP. The two MYFFs, together with the associated reports on progress and performance, provide the defining overview of objectives, priorities and achievements from UNDP management's perspective. These will form a starting point for the evaluation.

A variety of other relevant guidance material, practice notes, performance assessments and evaluations on environment and energy have been produced by UNDP and will be reviewed. Similarly, applicable evaluations carried out by the GEF Evaluation Unit will also be reviewed.

Available financial data on UNDP's environment and energy programmes will be summarized and analyzed.

COUNTRY CASE STUDIES

A representative sample of countries will be selected based on transparent criteria for either a detailed study involving a country study or for a thorough desk study based on a review of documents and evaluations and interviews with key claimholders. The main criteria for the selection of countries will be to achieve (a) a regional balance (with emphasis on sub-Saharan Africa), (b) a mix of country typologies (e.g., large countries, least-developed countries and Small Island Developing States) and (c) an overall mix of core UNDP versus GEF funding. More weighting will be given to countries that have

3. *Environment and Natural Resources* was one of six 'critical areas' in MYFF 1 and *Energy and Environment for Sustainable Development* was one of five 'strategic goals' in MYFF 2.

had a significant UNDP environment and energy portfolio during the second MYFF phase, i.e., since 2004 (the reason why some UNDP country programmes have had smaller environment and energy portfolios will be explored through other inquiries).

In the full country studies, both qualitative and quantitative approaches will be used. Evaluation methods will include interviews, focus group discussions, key informant interviews, and reviews of key documents, including outcome and project evaluations, progress reports and other relevant documents. Each country study will produce a country report which will also undergo stakeholder validation.

A pilot country visit will be carried out to test and provide an opportunity for the evaluation team to reflect on the approach and key questions.

REGIONAL CONSULTATIONS

Selected regional centres will be visited by the evaluation team to interview UNDP staff and to consult with partner organizations operating at regional levels.

GLOBAL CONSULTATIONS

Global consultations will focus on UNDP headquarters staff and management, and organizations with overlapping interests and goals with UNDP. These will explore past, present and future collaboration with key partners as well as UNDP's future positioning on environment and energy within the UN system.

Special attention will be given to UNEP, including the experience to date and future plans for the joint UNDP and UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative. Other global consultations shall include interviews with selected staff of international organizations, government agencies, the private sector, national and international NGOs with overlapping interests, priorities and concerns. These will include the GEF Secretariat, the GEF Evaluation Office, the World Bank, IUCN, the International Institute for Environment and

Development (IIED) and World Resources Institute (WRI).

QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

The main purpose of the questionnaire survey will be to give a range of UNDP staff working on environment and energy as well as the resident representatives and country directors an opportunity to provide structured inputs to the evaluation process. The survey is expected to capture information on UNDP's staff views on UNDP's role and positioning for environment and energy from different perspectives within the organization.

THEMATIC STUDIES

Specific studies will be undertaken on themes of relevance to the topic of the evaluation. These will be specified during the inception phase of the evaluation and may focus on topics such as environmental mainstreaming; country office thematic priorities; the role of GEF in determining the direction of UNDP's work in EE; and/or selected themes in UNDP's EE work.

EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND TIMEFRAME

The main output will be a final evaluation report, not exceeding 50 pages, excluding annexes. The final evaluation report will synthesize the evidence from all three components of this evaluation. The findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation will be summarized in an Executive Summary.

There will also be reports from the country studies that will not exceed 30 pages each, not including annexes. The country reports will be summarized in an annex to the main report.

The main evaluation report is to be submitted to the Evaluation Office by the Evaluation Team Leader no later than 31 March 2008. The final report will be approved by the Evaluation Office and the findings will be presented to UNDP's Executive Board in June 2008. The report will also be circulated to the participating UNDP units and country offices, partner organizations and other key stakeholders.

EVALUATION TEAM

The core evaluation team will comprise three international consultants. One of the international consultants will be designated as the Team Leader, the other two will be designated as Principal Consultants. In addition, and depending on the evaluation methodology developed by this core team, other consultants (international and national) and advisers may be engaged to contribute to the evaluation process. The Evaluation Office Task Manager will take part in the evaluation as a member of the core team. The team will be supported by one research assistant in the Evaluation Office in New York.

The composition of the team shall reflect the independence and substantive results focus of the evaluation. The Team Leader and all other members of the evaluation team will be selected by the Evaluation Office taking into account the technical qualifications of the consultants in the subject matter as well as in evaluation.

Each of the core team members will conduct the evaluation in at least two of the selected case study countries. The country studies will be supported by the UNDP country offices, which will designate a focal point to provide such support in connection with the respective country missions.

ADVISORY PANEL

As part of the consultative process in undertaking the evaluation, an external Advisory Panel comprising three individuals from different countries, including representatives of international agencies, will be set up by the Evaluation Office. The members will be selected on the basis of their recognized stature in the fields of environment, energy, international development and evaluation. The Advisory Panel will ensure quality control of the evaluation. It will review and provide comments on the draft evaluation report before submission to the Evaluation Office. The Evaluation Office will form part of the extended Advisory Panel, which will remain

in existence until the completion, dissemination and final review of the evaluation. The inputs and comments of the Advisory Panel are expected to enrich the process and enhance understanding of the issues among a wide audience.

MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The Evaluation Office will manage the evaluation process. It will provide backstopping support and ensure coordination and liaison with all concerned UNDP units and other key agencies. The Evaluation Office Task Manager will provide overall guidance, ensure substantive supervision of all research, and determine the evaluation team composition.

In the case study countries and regions, the country offices and regional centres will support the evaluation team in liaising with key partners and in discussions with the team, and make available to the team all relevant evaluative material. They will also provide support on logistical issues and planning for the country visits by the evaluation team. In addition, each country office and regional centre will appoint a focal point for the evaluation who will assist in preparing relevant documents, hiring national consultants, and setting up meetings with all relevant stakeholders.

The evaluation team will be responsible for the development, research, drafting and finalization of the evaluation, in close consultation with the Evaluation Office and other relevant units of UNDP, notably the Bureau for Development Policy.

The Evaluation Office will meet all costs related to conducting the evaluation. It will be responsible for the production of the Evaluation Report and presentation of the same to the Executive Board.

FOLLOW-UP AND LEARNING

This corporate evaluation is expected to help UNDP identify key lessons on strategic positioning and results that can provide a useful basis for strengthening UNDP's role in managing

environment and energy for sustainable development. It will present good practices from country case studies and also draw lessons from unintended results. The country offices will be able to use the evaluation to strengthen their strategic position and vision vis-à-vis partners, while the UNDP headquarters and regional centres are expected to use the evaluation as a tool for advocacy, learning and buy-in among stakeholders.

The evaluation report and recommendations will be shared within the organization through a variety of means. The evaluation will be presented to the UNDP management who will be responsible for preparing a management response to the findings and recommendations of the evaluation. Innovative ways of disseminating the evaluation findings will be sought to reach as wide a range of stakeholders as possible.

Annex 2

UNDP PRIORITY SETTING AND PERFORMANCE REPORTING

UNDP's goals and objectives for the evaluation period are identified in two Multi-Year Funding Frameworks for 2000-2003 (MYFF-1) and 2004-2007 (MYFF-2). The MYFF approach was recently succeeded by the strategic plan, 2008-11, adopted in late 2007. 'Environment and Natural Resources' was one of six strategic results frameworks (i.e., priorities) in MYFF-1, and 'Managing Energy and Environment for Sustainable Development' was identified as one of five core goals in MYFF-2 (hence the title of this evaluation). Subsequent achievements in environment and natural resources were included in the Administrators' reports to the Executive Board on MYFF-1 and MYFF-2.

MYFF-1

At its introduction, MYFF-1 was described as a key building block in the application of results-based management: "it is against this framework of specific organizational goals and intended results, reinforced by the business plan, that the results-oriented annual reports (ROARs) will review our progress in future."⁴

Environment and Natural Resources was one of six 'strategic results frameworks' (i.e., priorities) in MYFF-1. Related goals and objectives were intended to "build on the organization's experience in environmental matters particularly in strengthening national capacity for natural resources management, and integrating the goals of global international agreements, conventions and action plans."

The main goal was spelled out as "To protect and regenerate the global environment and natural resources asset base for sustainable human development," and three sub-goals were identified: (i) to promote the integration of sound environmental management with national development policies and programmes, (ii) to contribute to the protection and regeneration of the environment and to promote access to natural resources assets on which poor people depend and (iii) to promote equity and burden-sharing in international cooperation to protect and enhance the global and regional environment.

These goals were to be met by "focusing on specific aspects of capacity building," such as: (i) ratification of, and national follow-up to, international conventions, (ii) legal/regulatory framework and policy implementation, (iii) national/local programmes for sustainable environmental management, (iv) management capacity of national environmental agencies and (v) capacity for local participation in programme design/implementation.

MYFF-2

Consistent with its predecessor, MYFF-2 was "designed to be a key instrument for the strategic management, monitoring and accountability of UNDP." This MYFF again drew on country programmes' identification of priority areas, this time supplemented by three other considerations—the MDGs, the Secretary General's reform programme and the "transformation of UNDP in terms of operational effectiveness" launched with MYFF-1.⁵

4. DP/1999/30.

5. DP/2003/32.

Enhancing development effectiveness was “at the core” of MYFF-2, to be achieved by focusing on five “drivers of development effectiveness”: (i) building national capacities, (ii) promoting national ownership, (iii) advocating and fostering an enabling policy environment, (iv) promoting gender equity and (v) forging strategic partnerships.

‘Managing energy and environment for sustainable development’ was identified as one of five core goals in MYFF-2 (hence the title of this evaluation). The others were: achieving the MDGs and reducing poverty, fostering democratic governance, supporting crisis prevention and recovery and responding to HIV/AIDS. In an effort to simplify the Strategic Results Framework, which in the previous MYFF had “comprised six goals, 14 sub-goals and 45 strategic areas of support,” the second MYFF had the five goals mentioned above, but made a reduction in the number of sub-goals, now termed ‘service lines’, to 30.

The following service lines were identified for energy and environment: (i) frameworks and strategies for sustainable development, (ii) effective water governance, (iii) access to sustainable energy services, (iv) sustainable land management to combat desertification and land degradation, (v) conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and (vi) national/sectoral policy and planning to control emissions of ozone-depleting substances and persistent organic pollutants.

The Administrator’s 2007 Report to the Executive Board on MYFF-2 adopted more assertive language than its predecessor, reporting for environment the emergence of a “clear role for UNDP.” The report goes on to give an impression of considerable progress in identifying indicators, targeting, benchmarking and proving impact of activities, and generally “improving organizational effectiveness.” Considerable progress is noted in contrast to MYFF-1, with its three-tier structure of goals, sub-goals, and 45 strategic areas of support, UNDP was now engaged in only 30 service lines and supporting 90 types of outcome.

RESULTS-ORIENTED ANNUAL REPORT

The ROAR “is UNDP’s principal instrument for reporting on the entire range of activities implemented by operational units. It provides the most comprehensive analysis of the performance of UNDP and is a key element in meeting UNDP’s commitment to manage for results.” A ROAR was required each year from every country office during the two MYFF phases. The ROARs related to environment and energy programmes should therefore be expected to provide useful insights on UNDP’s performance.

The first reaction on looking at a country office ROAR for a particular year is that an impressive amount of performance-related information appears to have been assembled. There is no doubt that a considerable level of staff time and effort has been invested in preparing and updating these reports. A closer look, however, highlights a number of issues that limit the utility of this tool in assessing performance:

- Although the ROARs apparently intend to document the eventual *outcome* of activities, they are often more focused on immediate *outputs* and *activities*. As a result, they give little idea of whether, or to what degree, a particular outcome has been achieved, and they are not helpful in identifying longer term impacts.
- Difficulties also arise from the use of terminology and a tendency to assume that the concepts used are universally clear. For example, ‘drivers’ are a key element of the ROAR structure although the term does not seem to be used consistently. There is considerable vagueness in the use of the following drivers: ‘developing national capacities’, ‘enhancing national ownership’ and ‘creating an enabling policy environment’. It is not clear exactly what these terms mean in operational terms, how progress might be assessed or what success might look like. The looseness of the terms would be less problematic if appropriate indicators of expected achievements had been formulated, but this is rarely the case.

- Many other terms included in goals and targets lack the precision necessary to be useful in performance assessment, including frequent plans to ‘support capacities for dialogue’, to ‘lobby’, to ‘influence’, to ‘effectively deliver’, to ‘coordinate’, to ‘simplify’, to ‘harmonize’, to ‘promote effective and innovative approaches’, to ‘empower’, to ‘facilitate’ and so on. Given these limitations in defining planned results and outcomes, it obviously becomes very hard to report progress. For example, how should a respondent answer this: “Did efforts in this area help improve capacities to identify and coordinate a comprehensive agenda of specific actions to attain international, national and local development goals and targets”? The actual answer given was “yes.” But is this a ‘yes’ to help, improve, identify, coordinate or attain, and at what levels? All of this, or just some? And here’s another example: “Did efforts in this area support or allow domestic stakeholders assume a coordinating role in the formulation and implementation of national, sectoral and local development plans and strategies?”. Again, the response is “yes,” but ‘yes’ to what?
 - Some activities that may well have been worthwhile undertakings are sometimes included under headings that grossly mischaracterize their scale and potential influence. For example, and this is by no means an untypical case, we encountered the outcome ‘integration of the environment and poverty into national policies and strategies’ with a twofold 2006 target: (i) produce a report on the ‘state of the environment’ and (ii) produce advocacy material ‘for sustainable pastoralism at global levels and commemoration of WCSD nationally’. In fact, this state of the environment report was simply the latest in a sequence of similar efforts produced periodically, while the second seems a tall order, and its value is unclear from the documentation.
- How significant a contribution are these to integrating the environment and poverty into national policies and strategies? This seems more to be a convenient way of categorizing some modest activities for which funding was available.
- Some of these limitations were recognized by the ROAR compilers and some small improvements over time are evident. For example, the concise ‘yes’ answers referred to in the previous point were sometimes replaced in future years by slightly more informative responses such as ‘substantial ongoing effort’ or ‘some effort’, although notably the language has reverted back to that of *inputs* and gives little information on any impacts achieved.
 - There is a lack of clear indicators and targets for each ‘driver’, with the indicators in use needing to be much more specific in relation to separate and clearly defined activities, outputs and outcomes. Even applying these indicators would be hard in many cases due to an almost total lack of baseline information, meaning that any activity and output is likely to be categorized as an improvement or an ‘outcome’.
 - Most activities are undertaken in partnership with stakeholders and/or donors, leading to drivers such as ‘forging partnerships for results’. This naturally makes it hard to isolate and attribute the influence of UNDP or any of the other individual partners, which of course is a key rationale for partnerships in the first place. Identifying the actual UNDP impact on such components as continuing processes, dialogue meetings, workshops, formulation of strategies and plans is notoriously hard. Yet it raises the key question: What would the situation be if UNDP had not taken part? Would comparable results or outcomes still have been achieved due to the actions of the other active partners?

Annex 3

CASE STUDY COUNTRY DATA

Basic Data on the Case Study Countries									
Country	Population (2004)	GDP per capita (PPP US\$) (2005)	Human Development Index (2005)		Environmental Performance Index (2008)*		Electricity Consumption per Capita (kilowatt-hours) (2004)	CO ₂ Emissions per Capita (metric tons) (2000)	Protected Areas (as % of Total Land Area) (2004)**
			Index	Rank of 177	Score	Rank of 149			
Burkina Faso	13,933,000	1,213	0.370	176	44.3	144	31	0.1	11.5
China	1,312,979,000	6,757	0.777	81	65.1	105	1,684	2.7	11.3
Ecuador	13,061,000	4,341	0.772	89	84.4	22	1,092	1.7	9.3
Kenya	35,599,000	1,240	0.521	148	69.0	96	169	0.3	6.0
Macedonia FYR	2,034,000	7,200	0.801	69	75.1	74	3,863	4.4	7.1
Malawi	13,226,000	667	0.437	164	59.9	121	100	0.1	8.9
Fiji	828,000	6,049	0.762	92	69.7	92	926	0.9	9.9
Samoa	184,000	6,170	0.785	77	-	-	619	-	-

Sources: UNDP Human Development Report 2007/2008: Population 2004, GDP per Capita 2005, Human Development Index 2005, Electricity Consumption Per Capita 2004. Yale University, Columbia University 2008: Environmental Performance Index 2008. United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Environment Programme, The World Bank, World Resources Institute 2005, World Resources 2005, The Wealth of the Poor: Managing ecosystems to fight poverty: CO₂ Emissions Per Capita 2000, Protected Areas 2004

*Note: The EPI focuses on two overarching environmental objectives: 1) reducing environmental stresses to human health and 2) promoting ecosystem vitality and sound natural resource management. These broad goals also reflect the policy priorities of environmental authorities around the world and the international community's intent in adopting Goal 7 of the Millennium Development Goals, to "ensure environmental sustainability." The two overarching objectives are gauged using 25 performance indicators tracked in six well-established policy categories, which are then combined to create a final score. The 2008 EPI deploys a proximity-to-target methodology, which quantitatively tracks national performance on a core set of environmental policy goals for which every government can be—and should be—held accountable. By identifying specific targets and measuring the distance between the target and current national achievement, the EPI provides both an empirical foundation for policy analysis and a context for evaluating performance. Source: The Environmental Performance Index Executive Summary (<http://epi.yale.edu/ExecutiveSummary>).

**Note: All areas under IUCN management categories I-V, 2004. Extent of protected areas may include marine components that artificially inflate the percentage of land area protected.

Annex 4

ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY IN THE UNDP COUNTRY COOPERATION FRAMEWORKS

Focus Areas, Programme Components and Outcomes/Outputs by Country			
Country	Strategic Focus Areas	Environment and Energy Programme Components	Planned Outcomes/Outputs
Burkina Faso	CPD 2006-2010		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Élargir les opportunités d'emplois et d'activités génératrices de revenus ■ Réduire la vulnérabilité de l'économie rurale et l'insécurité alimentaire pour les groupes vulnérables et promouvoir une gestion durable de l'environnement ■ Stabiliser/inverser la tendance du VIH/SIDA ■ Promouvoir la bonne gouvernance 	Réduire la vulnérabilité de l'économie rurale et l'insécurité alimentaire pour les groupes vulnérables et promouvoir une gestion durable de l'environnement	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ La gestion durable des ressources naturelles (eau, sols, forêts) est renforcée au profit des groupes défavorisés tels que les femmes et les jeunes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Les politiques, la réglementation des ressources naturelles sont revues
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Accroissement de superficies forestières et de terres aménagées 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Taux de croissance des revenus par an dans les zones rurales 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Les rendements d'une exploitation rentable durables des ressources sont accrus
China	CCF 2001-2005		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Deepening reforms and governance ■ Poverty reduction ■ HIV/AIDS and development ■ Sustainable environment and energy development 	Sustainable environment and energy development	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Environmental governance that emphasizes building national capacity in implementing policy, legal and regulatory measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Incorporation into micro-economic and sector policies of approaches to new and renewable energy sources and end-use energy efficiency that have been pilot tested and shown to be effective ■ Acceptance and use of market-based instruments for sustainable environmental management, notably in the western region ■ Strengthened national capacity and empowerment of local stakeholders in environmental management and in promoting biodiversity and conservation

Focus Areas, Programme Components and Outcomes/Outputs by Country				
Country	Strategic Focus Areas	Environment and Energy Programme Components	Planned Outcomes/Outputs	
China cont'd	CCF 2001-2005 cont'd			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity development to negotiate and implement global environmental commitments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased national capacity to address climate change Successful phase out of ozone-depleting substances being used by several enterprises in the manufacture of solvents 	
	CCF 2006-2010			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achieving the MDGs and reducing human poverty Environment and energy for sustainable human development Responding to HIV/AIDS and other communicable diseases 	Environment and energy for sustainable human development		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support improved end-use energy efficiency in manufacturing industries and buildings, and enhanced application of new and renewable technologies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Voluntary agreements to improve energy efficiency and reduce CO₂ emissions implemented by pilot enterprises Regulations, codes, guidelines, standards and labels for energy efficiency and conservation designed and applied to selected buildings and equipment Capacities increased of energy conservation centres to provide energy efficiency services Implementation of the Energy Conservation Law supported Commercialization of new and renewable energy technologies supported through demonstration and development of strategies, guidelines, standards and regulations 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mainstream biodiversity conservation concerns and actions into the socio-economic sectors and the development vision 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A coordination mechanism among national/international partners for the effective management of biodiversity strengthened in the following areas: biodiversity conservation and mainstreaming biodiversity into planning and investment processes 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthen disaster management efforts for natural and industrial, particularly mining sector-related, disasters. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordination mechanism among national partners strengthened Capacity to analyze and assess risk improved Integrated risk management at the national and community level enhanced Existing policies and risk scenarios reviewed Local risk reduction plans formulated 		

Focus Areas, Programme Components and Outcomes/Outputs by Country			
Country	Strategic Focus Areas	Environment and Energy Programme Components	Planned Outcomes/Outputs
Ecuador	CCF 1999-2003		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sustainable development ■ Governance ■ Poverty eradication 	Sustainable development	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Establish regulations in the public and private sectors to achieve sustainable development of production potential and of the country's natural and environmental resources ■ Provide support to the local and national governments through the introduction of non-polluting technologies, emissions controls and monitoring of compliance with environmental standards ■ Planning and implementation of environmental management projects ■ Strengthen protected areas and support the development of strategies to protect areas which are of global importance with respect to biodiversity and climate change ■ Reconstruction of the la Costa region after El Niño, including land use planning, development of catchment basins and reforestation ■ Take part in conservation programmes in the Galapagos Islands which provide for the needs of the islands' population and establish a sustainable development model ■ Continue to promote the rights of indigenous peoples and their active participation in the life of the nation, as in the principles of the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples' Convention (ILO Convention No. 169) 	
	CP 2004-2008		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Combat poverty and create opportunities for all ■ Democratic governance and transparency ■ Sustainable development: capacities for the future 	Sustainable development: capacities for the future		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Strategic areas of support to national policy, legal and regulatory framework for environmentally sustainable development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ A comprehensive approach to environmentally sustainable development integrated into national development planning and linked to poverty reduction, including sustainable energy and major basic environmental needs 	

Focus Areas, Programme Components and Outcomes/Outputs by Country			
Country	Strategic Focus Areas	Environment and Energy Programme Components	Planned Outcomes/Outputs
Ecuador cont'd	CP 2004-2008 cont'd		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Institutional framework for sustainable environmental management and energy development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Improved capacity of national/sectoral authorities to plan and implement integrated approaches to environmental management and energy development that respond to the needs of the poor ■ Improved capacity of local authorities, community-based groups and private sector in environmental management and sustainable energy development
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Regional cooperation and coordination in natural resource management and sustainable energy development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Improved regional capacity to coordinate and harmonise national policies and programmes for management of shared natural resources and sustainable energy development
Kenya	CPAP 2004-2008		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Opportunities ■ Empowerment ■ Security ■ Sustainability 	Sustainability	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Integration of the environment and poverty into national policies and strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Policies, thematic action and strategic plans developed, reviewed, and approved; national plans reviewed through the poverty environment initiative and better donor coordination achieved ■ Overall national policy framework and principles, and specific framework for forestry and wildlife sectors developed ■ Environment management information system, tools for integration of environment into MTEF and PER guidelines and state of environment reports developed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Improve community level of environment and natural resource governance and use to build capacity and achieve local and national benefits in biodiversity and land management, to support alternative livelihoods and sustainable income-generating activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Action plans prepared by communities for site-specific projects on equity, access, sustainable use for generating benefits ■ Community experiences and expertise scaled up to support locally relevant policy formulation in the areas of agriculture, water, biodiversity and solid waste management 	

Focus Areas, Programme Components and Outcomes/Outputs by Country

Country	Strategic Focus Areas	Environment and Energy Programme Components	Planned Outcomes/Outputs
Kenya cont'd	CPAP 2004-2008 cont'd		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Evaluation of land tenure systems to increase individual and/or joint ownership of land in targeted areas for better land management ■ Improvement of rural livelihoods involving diffusion of appropriate land management innovations and techniques through local environment communities and farmer field schools ■ Improvement of local resource use in arid and semi-arid districts to combat land degradation and desertification ■ Increased sanitation levels and improved livelihoods through sustainable solid municipal waste management activities in the urban area, with particular emphasis on the informal settlements
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Development and distribution of sustainable energy services to meet household needs, to offer income-generating and employment opportunities and to service all sectors of the economy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sustainable energy strategies, action plans and pilots that support broader development goals and objectives, including information tools and development of standards and regulations ■ Capacity built for investment and resource mobilization for sustainable energy options
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Domestication of global conventions through project development to build capacity of institutions at all levels and to support the country to achieve its commitments towards global agreements on environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Intervention projects on climate change and reduction of greenhouse gases emissions ■ Management of international waters and other water bodies projects realized ■ Phasing out ozone-depleting substances project operationalized ■ Intervention projects on sustainable management of biodiversity and land degradation realized

Focus Areas, Programme Components and Outcomes/Outputs by Country

Country	Strategic Focus Areas	Environment and Energy Programme Components	Planned Outcomes/Outputs
Macedonia FYR	CCF 2001-2003		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Local governance and municipal development ■ Environmental governance and sustainable development 	Environmental governance and sustainable development	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Strengthen the policy framework for environmental management and sustainable development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Finalize preparations for a national strategy for sustainable development to establish and make operational the National Council for Sustainable Development ■ Assist government in efforts to meet its commitments to international conventions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Support the implementation of priority policy goals at the local level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Support operational activities that strengthen the capacities of local stakeholders, in particular local governments, to promote environmental protection and sustainable development ■ Test and develop mechanisms for local implementation of policy goals ■ The four priority areas will support: (a) mainstreaming of the national strategy for sustainable development into the activities of the Municipal Development Programme; (b) implementation of the solid waste management plan in selected municipalities; (c) conservation of biodiversity by reinforcing management capacities in protected areas in selected ecosystems and (d) sustainable management of international waters.
	CP 2005-2009		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Capacity-building for good governance and rule of law ■ Promoting an enabling economic environment for poverty reduction ■ Sustainable development, environmental protection and management of natural resources 	Sustainable development, environmental protection and management of natural resources	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Support government in making operational basic environmental laws in order to achieve good environmental governance on local and national level 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Policy, institutional, regulatory/ financial capacities for environment management, energy efficiency in place ■ Improved ability to monitor state of the environment 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Improve the state of environment and livelihoods in watersheds; put in place integrated watershed management and trans-boundary cooperation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Capacities for transboundary cooperation strengthened ■ Mechanisms on watershed management supported 	

Focus Areas, Programme Components and Outcomes/Outputs by Country			
Country	Strategic Focus Areas	Environment and Energy Programme Components	Planned Outcomes/Outputs
FYR Macedonia cont'd	CP 2005-2009 cont'd		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Community outreach programmes developed and implemented
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Assist the country in meeting its obligations under environment conventions such as the United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change, United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity, United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Capacities to implement the ratified multilateral environmental agreements/ protocols improved
Malawi	CCF 2002-2006		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Poverty Reduction Strategy Support Programme ■ Poverty reduction through good governance ■ HIV/AIDS management 	Poverty Reduction Strategy Support Programme	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Poverty policy analysis, programming and monitoring: includes environmental research, impact assessment and monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The adoption by government and endorsement by civil society by 2003 of a holistic poverty reduction programme with monitorable targets and agreed benchmarks, covering income and other identified dimensions of poverty
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Promotion of sustainable social and economic empowerment: includes the promotion of an integrated approach for improved environmental management, and development of community-level technologies to improve the living standards of vulnerable groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Adoption of community-level technologies for improved environmental protection
	CPD 2008-2011		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Environment and energy for sustainable economic development ■ Disaster risk reduction and emergency management ■ Mainstreaming HIV/AIDS in the national and sub-national development agenda ■ Responsive governance, human rights and the rule of law 	Energy and environment for sustainable development	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Assist in addressing climate change and balancing economic growth with utilization of environmental assets 			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Develop national capacity to mainstream environmental sustainability concerns and sustainable use of natural resources in socio-economic sectors and the overall development strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Promotion of sustainable and affordable energy services ■ Enhanced application of new and renewable technologies ■ Assistance with multilateral environmental reporting requirements 	

Focus Areas, Programme Components and Outcomes/Outputs by Country			
Country	Strategic Focus Areas	Environment and Energy Programme Components	Planned Outcomes/Outputs
Pacific Island states: Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Palau, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu	Multi-Country CPD 2008-2012		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Poverty reduction and the Millennium Development Goals ■ Good governance and human rights ■ Crisis prevention and recovery ■ Environment and sustainable management 	Environment and sustainable management	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Mainstream environmental sustainability into regional and national policies and planning frameworks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ National capacity to develop and implement environmental policies, legislative and management frameworks developed and mainstreamed through national policies and budgets ■ Strengthened capacities for improved access and management of multilateral environmental agreements
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Support Pacific communities to effectively manage and sustainably use their environment and natural resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Sustainable livelihoods of vulnerable groups, including women and youth, strengthened through institutional support and leveraging indigenous governance systems, to contribute to sustainable environmental management
Pacific Island states: Cook Islands, Niue, Samoa and Tokelau	Multi-Country CPD 2008-2012		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Equitable economic growth and poverty reduction ■ Good governance and human rights ■ Crisis prevention and recovery ■ Sustainable environmental management 	Sustainable environmental management	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The environment-economic-governance nexus demonstrated through community-based natural resource management and use that supports implementation of gender-sensitive national policies as well as the mainstreaming of environment into national plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ An engendered 'environment hub' of international, regional and Samoa-based experts supported to provide coordinated and gender-sensitive policy and technical advice on serious environmental challenges facing the Pacific ■ Community-based environmental management activities scaled up in the Cook Islands, Niue, Samoa and Tokelau ■ Engendered MDG-based village and local-level plans developed by communities ■ Gender-sensitized environmental sector plans mainstreamed into NDPs/ SDPs in the Cook Islands, Niue, Samoa and Tokelau ■ Gender analysis conducted on the differential impacts on men and women of environmental degradation and natural disasters ■ Energy efficiency improved and renewable energy use promoted ■ Best practices and lessons learned documented and disseminated ■ South-South cooperation enhanced

COUNTRY CASE STUDY SUMMARIES

BURKINA FASO

CONTEXT

Burkina Faso is a landlocked country in the Sahel region of West Africa with a population of 13.7 million (2006) and a GDP per capita of \$376 (2004). The country has experienced economic growth averaging 5.5 percent during the period 1995–2002 (a real per capita growth of around 2 percent). The economy remains vulnerable to external shocks and highly dependent on export earnings from cotton, livestock and, increasingly, gold. Agricultural production fluctuates with variations in rainfall while the unstable political situation in neighbouring Ivory Coast has forced more than 350,000 Burkinabè migrant workers to return home in recent years. Poverty levels, estimated at 41 percent in 2006, have diminished little in recent years. The socio-economic group most affected by poverty is subsistence farmers, who account for close to 75 percent of Burkina Faso's poor.

Burkina Faso's development is closely linked with management of its natural resources. Agriculture is Burkina Faso's key economic sector, and it is challenged by water shortages, soil and wind erosion, deforestation and overgrazing. Since 2004 the country's national poverty reduction strategy has included several environmental management targets. This national strategy recognizes that sound natural resource management is necessary for national economic performance but does not assign an important strategic role to environmental issues. In general, government interest in environmental management challenges has declined precipitously over the past ten years, as the combined threats of drought and desertification have diminished.

UNDP'S ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY PROGRAMME

'Environment and energy' was identified as one of five priority areas in UN's Common Country Assessment (CCA) in 2000. In the CCA of 2004 the environment was assigned a more marginal role. In the UNDAF for 2006–2010, environmental concerns appear as a dimension of one of the five priorities areas for the UN team—'addressing the vulnerability of the rural economy, food insecurity issues and the *sustainable management of the natural resources*'.

UNDP's core funding for environment and energy in Burkina Faso has been limited, averaging around \$900,000 per year during the second MYFF, 2004–2006. This is roughly the amount that might be disbursed in Burkina Faso annually by a mid-sized international NGO. According to country office estimates, the main donor contributions to environment and energy in 2007 came from the African Development Bank (more than €10 million), the European Community, Italy and Sweden (each with between €1 and €5 million) and the World Bank, Belgium, France and Luxembourg (each contributing under €1 million).

UNEP and UNDP have begun collaboration in Burkina Faso on their shared multi-country Poverty-Environment Initiative though the results have not been significant to date. In the past, UNDP helped UNEP deliver the Burkinabè component, a regional programme for the development of environmental legislation.

The country office contributed to the Regional Bureau of Africa's regional strategy on poverty reduction and management of natural resources. This in turn helped shape UNDP's country programme in Burkina Faso. On the other hand,

the country office found that headquarters often didn't listen to their views or try to learn from the country office's experience. The country office complained that headquarters 'dumped' new administrative and financial systems upon them without proper consulting. The country office found the advice provided by the Dakar Regional Centre to be of uneven quality and utility.

UNDP's enhanced interest in environment and energy issues in the past several years is apparently the result of decisions by the management team in the country office. The growing importance of the environment and energy practice area within UNDP's Burkina Faso programme is reflected in the growth of their environmental team, from one environmental officer in 2003 to six officers today. Some major bilateral donors have withdrawn from the sector over the same period, leaving UNDP to play a more prominent role.

Core environment and energy resources provided have been widely dispersed thematically and geographically and devoted to a large number of small projects. The Environmental Team in the country office is reshaping its portfolio to focus on fewer, larger projects and programmes, such as the Programme to Improve Incomes and Food Security (ARSA) and the Programme for Sustainable Management of Natural Resources (PGDRN).

The 'Multifunctional Platform' project, a key component of the ARSA Programme, was originally developed by UNIDO. Primarily intended to address local communities' demand for affordable energy, the project employs a simple diesel motor to produce a variety of village-level services. The motors provide surrounding communities with electricity that they can use, for example, to recharge batteries, to make TV or video presentations, to pump water for drinking or small-scale irrigation or to power local artisans' electrical tools. Indirect environmental benefits are likely as a result of communities' enhanced capacities to invest in improved land management.

The platforms primarily support local women,

helping them with arduous and time-consuming tasks such as husking and hulling grains, grinding and milling grain or shea nuts and so on. Women relieved from the most tiring physical tasks have more time to attend literacy classes, participate more vigorously in public life or generate surpluses to invest in small businesses. Local women's associations play a lead role in running the multifunctional platforms; this is aimed at strengthening gender balance in local communities.

At the time of the evaluation visit, some 220 multifunctional platforms had been installed in Burkina Faso, with double this number expected by the end of 2008. The longer termed ambition is establish a 'platform' in each of the country's 8,000 villages. For this to happen their longer term financial and institutional sustainability within the communities will need to be ensured. The first generation of multifunctional platforms was 90 percent subsidized by funds from outside the communities where they were installed. These communities' capacities to sustain the operations of the multifunctional platforms over the longer term—particularly to cover the costs of operation, maintenance and eventual new capital investments—are still uncertain.

GEF funding has played a modest but significant role in UNDP's environment and energy programming to date. On the one hand, GEF money has enabled the country office to provide support related to international conventions, notably those on biodiversity and desertification. On the other hand, and much more significantly, the GEF Small Grants Programme has provided the country office with valuable lessons in working on participatory local community-based projects. These are reflected in the country office's two largest current projects, the ARSA and the PGDRN.

ASSESSMENT OF UNDP'S CONTRIBUTION

An earlier generation of UNDP projects in the 1990s included support for natural forest management that appears to have been highly relevant and appropriate to Burkinabè needs. This project was funded for more than fifteen

years and has provided a basis for much of UNDP's subsequent efforts in the sector. A more recent GEF-funded project in support of wildlife ranching had only modest results and was not successful in developing sustainable approaches to wildlife management involving local communities.

The current generation of environment and energy projects is largely focused on sustainable livelihoods approaches and appears well adapted to Burkinabè needs, though it is too early to predict how much they will contribute to positive lasting change. The high-profile multifunctional platforms discussed above, for example, clearly still need to address issues of longer term financial sustainability.

On another level, the Burkinabè government appreciates UNDP support, which has enabled them to draft national environmental plans and strategies and to deal with a growing number of international environmental conventions, frameworks and protocols.

Yet, as in many countries, there is concern that the considerable body of Burkinabè plans and strategies related to different global environmental challenges that have been underwritten by UNDP-GEF over the past decade have not led to commensurate levels of activities to implement these strategies. The task of implementing these strategies remains overwhelmingly dependent on the availability of ongoing GEF financing, which in the case of Burkina Faso looks likely to be modest.

Most partners in international organizations, national and regional NGOs and the GEF Small Grants Programme expressed a high level of satisfaction with their collaboration with UNDP. They appreciated the leadership UNDP provides to the international community and its support for the environment and energy sector in general.

Overall, UNDP's environment and energy programme is relevant to Burkina Faso's environment and energy needs and is being implemented with considerable effectiveness and efficiency.

Recent moves towards focusing UNDP support on fewer, larger projects and programmes are likely to enhance the sustainability of results.

Where higher level outcomes of UNDP support can be identified, these tend to be more of a process nature. For instance, UNDP support was instrumental in retrofitting Burkina Faso's national poverty reduction strategy in 2004 to better reflect environmental management issues. In general, however, there is a dearth of monitoring and evaluation information and particularly of high-quality information related to the quality of performance or progress towards higher level results.

CONCLUSIONS

Commitment to environmental sustainability is now part of the country's political discourse. There are environment offices within key ministries responsible for energy, agriculture, livestock and infrastructure and requirements for systematic environmental impact assessment of government initiatives in these sectors. On the other hand, there is considerable concern that Burkina Faso may be moving away from environmental mainstreaming *de facto*. As the combined threats of drought and desertification recede from public consciousness, the political and development agendas focus more exclusively on maximizing short-term economic growth. Similarly, the UNDP country office is not mainstreaming environmental concerns in its own governance programme.

UNDP's greatest strength in Burkina Faso is its human resources, in particular a senior Burkinabè officer who is well known and experienced, with a relevant professional background and respected among his peers. A stable, knowledgeable, long-term presence in the sector gives UNDP a voice that most international partners—especially those with resources as modest as those of UNDP—do not have.

UNDP's biggest weaknesses are first, the modest and sometimes hard-to-predict nature of the financial support it has to offer and second, the

cumbersome financial management procedures associated with the 'direct procurement' approach currently used. For example, the country office is counting on support from the GEF-financed Country Partnership Programme to help them lobby for the systematic integration of sustainable resource management practices into Burkina Faso's rural development policies and programmes. Yet they worry that by the time this support is available in the country, the whole approach may need to be redesigned to reflect the steadily evolving situation.

CHINA

COUNTRY CONTEXT

China is immensely important for the global community and the global environment. China's 1.3 billion people constitute over 20 percent of the global population, and its rapidly growing economic and political role in the world make the country's sustainable development choices and strategies particularly important for the global community. Since the country began opening its economy in the 1980s, China has seen extraordinary economic growth, sustained at close to 10 percent annually for most of the past quarter century. In late 2007, China overtook Germany as the world's third largest economy and is expected to become the world's largest economy by 2020. Yet hundreds of millions of Chinese citizens are still faced with chronic hardship. Despite the country's unprecedented growth in recent decades, the Human Development Report 2007/2008 ranked China only 81 of 177 countries, with a 'medium' Human Development Index of 0.78.

China's sustained rapid economic development has had numerous negative consequences for the environment at local, national and global levels. Crucial natural resources, such as water, land and clear air are becoming scarce, especially in the coastal provinces and rapidly expanding urban areas. China is an increasingly prolific consumer of energy, contributing to severe air, water and soil pollution and rapidly rising greenhouse gas emissions. Climate change is recognized

as a major threat to China's future economic development due to its likely effects on water resources, agricultural land productivity and coastal zones. These issues in turn are linked explicitly to poverty, especially in rural areas where livelihoods remain highly dependent on natural resources and people lack the capacities needed to adapt to a changing climate. Rapid growth of China's agriculture and industry also threatens biodiversity in this mega-diverse country.

Minimizing the environmental impacts of economic development—particularly in the energy, water and transport sectors, in both urban and rural areas—will be one of China's key environmental management challenges for the future. Urban environmental management problems (including air pollution and water pollution, collection and treatment disposal, including recycling and reusing wastes) will be especially daunting. Of the 20 most polluted cities in the world, 16 are located in China. Experts believe the declining availability of water for domestic, agricultural and industrial consumption—China has just 8 percent of the world's fresh water—could well become a major environmental crisis for 21st century China.

UNDP'S ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY PROGRAMME

UNDP's environment and energy strategy in China is focused on helping the country achieve the goals of its 11th Five-Year Plan while also improving compliance with Multilateral Environmental Agreements such as those related to climate change, biological diversity, persistent organic pollutants and the protection of the ozone layer. China's 11th Five-Year Plan (2006–2010) sets ambitious targets for achieving energy security and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. It focuses on improving industrial energy efficiency, expanding use of renewable energy for power generation and poverty reduction, increasing China's share of the global carbon market and enhancing the availability of commercial finance for locally made renewable and alternative technologies. The plan further emphasizes the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation into poverty reduction, in particular

in production landscapes for livelihoods and rural development. Reflecting rising concerns about environmental health hazards, the plan also calls for better management of hazardous chemicals. Overall, it emphasizes the importance of environmental governance, including policy and legal measures, enhanced citizen awareness and participation in decision making and improved capacities.

UNDP's programme in China responds to the priority areas identified in China's latest 5-year plan. The obvious overlap with the GEF focal areas, notably climate change, biodiversity and chemicals, allows UNDP to tap into GEF financial resources. The current programme is organized into the following areas: (i) Climate Change and Sustainable Energy, (ii) Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, (iii) Environmental Governance and (iv) Toxic Chemical Management. Issues related to water and natural resources management, mining and disaster reduction are of growing interest for UNDP in China.

ASSESSMENT OF UNDP'S CONTRIBUTION

Since the 1990s UNDP has been playing a significant role in building capacity and providing technical assistance on environmental management and sustainable development in China. UNDP has mobilized \$467 million for the environment and energy sector, much of these funds channeled from the GEF and MPF. Though UNDP's TRAC funds in China have been limited, the organization has been able to make a significant contribution in China's achievement of its environment and energy goals, including its national energy policy.

From the point of view of the global environment and sustainable development, China is arguably the most important country in the world. In response, UNDP's own environment and energy programme in China is its largest worldwide. The GEF as well has allocated more resources to mitigating climate change in China than anywhere else, much of this passing through the UNDP country office. In recent years, UNDP has also invested considerable human resources

in China, more than doubling the size of its country office environment and energy team between 2005 and 2007.

UNDP's role in China is well defined and the programme is nationally driven, reflecting the Government of China's priorities. UNDP's strategic positioning in China cannot be judged on the same terms as in other countries. In this giant, centrally planned country, the government has a high degree of control over its development priorities and how environmental and energy policies relate to these. Programmes and priorities of international organizations do not drive Chinese policy; international projects do not have direct policy impacts. The role of such projects is rather to introduce new concepts, such as energy efficiency or market-based mechanisms, which can be piloted and tested. Those deemed promising may be replicated by the government, and the successful ones may contribute to policy development. Policy development in itself is the government's role. UNDP does not provide direct inputs to Chinese national policy formulation, but UNDP serves as an important channel of information and knowledge about internationally available concepts, ideas and technologies that are relevant to China's policy development.

This is not to say that UNDP cannot have an impact on environment and energy issues in China. In consultation with the Government of China, UNDP can select areas where it can contribute by bringing in international experience and approaches and testing their application in the Chinese context. Examples include the 'Energy Efficient Refrigerators' project and the 'Energy Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction in Chinese Township and Village Enterprises' project. UNDP's global knowledge networks are a critical asset in these undertakings.

UNDP can and does enhance the impact of its work through carefully selecting which partners to work with. For example, well-positioned national organizations such as the National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC)

and State Environmental Protection Administration can ensure that lessons from projects are fed into policy-making processes. A key example is the End-Use Energy Efficiency Programme with NDRC.

Another role for UNDP is more symbolic. Cooperating with authorities, especially at local levels, can provide an added level of legitimacy to its projects and thus help UNDP to attract additional funding, partnerships and attention. Similarly, it can promote alternative ways of designing and implementing projects and involving partners, including NGOs or the private sector, which can eventually demonstrate their added value to Chinese policy makers. Examples of this approach include the 'China Green Lights' programme and the 'Capacity Building for Rapid Commercialization of Renewable Energy' project. Both of these successfully introduced market-based instruments into the planning and implementation processes by exposing participants to international experiences and providing training to national and local officials.

UNDP's Environment and Energy programme has been effective, particularly in helping establish an energy policy coordination mechanism as well as pilot renewable energy technologies. UNDP played a unique role in developing capacities among local entrepreneurs, bringing international experiences and an understanding of global concerns for environment and energy.

The efficiency of UNDP-funded projects is sometimes adversely affected by a lack of the required level of technical capacities within UNDP's counterpart agency, the Chinese International Centre for Economic and Technical Exchanges (CICETE).

UNDP's environment and energy programmes are sustainable wherever they are closely aligned with national priorities and policies. For example, the energy efficiency programmes are closely aligned with the country's mainstream energy policy and priorities and were highly sustainable

as a result. The wetlands biodiversity programme, on the other hand, was not.

CONCLUSIONS

Financial contributions from UNDP's core funding to environment and energy activities in China have been low. It would be desirable for UNDP to provide more TRAC funding as a demonstration of its corporate commitment to environmental sustainability. Nevertheless, overall funding mobilized by UNDP China through the GEF, Montreal Protocol, the private sector and, most importantly, government counterpart contributions has enabled the development and implementation of a number of successful projects. UNDP has established a niche for itself and the necessary funding and leverage to play a lead role in coordinating environment and energy activities within the UN system in China. What has been missing is the deployment of truly high-level expertise in the UNDP country office to enable UNDP to effectively engage in policy dialogue with the Chinese government and other international partners on key environment and energy issues. The absence of this capacity in the country office is recognized as a weakness by both the government and UNDP.

From a corporate point of view, UNDP China should document Chinese experiences and transfer its successful practices to other programme countries through the UNDP development network. Again, to effectively support this kind of function, the country office will need to further develop its analytic capacities.

ECUADOR

CONTEXT

Ecuador is a middle-income country on the Pacific coast of South America characterized by high levels of ecological and ethnic diversity. Economic growth in recent years has been rapid but significant inequalities in income distribution and living standards remain between rich and poor, urban and rural, and different ethnic groups.

The country has gone through several bouts of political instability over the past decade. These have weakened the institutional capacities of the central government, affecting its performance and coordination.

The expansion of the agricultural frontier into eastern Ecuador's tropical forest regions with high biodiversity values, the intensive banana cultivation in the western coastal plains and the growth of the petroleum extraction industry have all had significant environmental impacts in recent decades. The National Development Plan for 2007–2010 is Ecuador's first national plan in ten years. Its objectives include a healthy and sustainable environment, and it guarantees citizens' access to safe water, air and soil. The new plan highlights the following environmental management priorities: (i) conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity; (ii) integrated forest management; (iii) integrated watershed planning; (iv) development of a response to climate change; (v) sustainable and renewable energy development; (vi) a consolidated institutional framework for environmental management and promoting sustainability policies; (vii) pollution prevention and control; (viii) improved state management of socio-environmental conflict and (iv) reduced public risk and vulnerability to natural disasters.

UNDP'S ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY PROGRAMME

UNDP's 2004–2008 Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) targets three related areas:

- Incorporating sustainable development principles into national/local policies and programmes,
- Improving the availability and access of environmental goods and services, and
- Supporting the prevention and management of natural disasters.

These areas are aligned to the core goal of 'Energy and Environment for Sustainable Development' set forth under UNDP's 2004–2007 Multi-year Funding Framework, where the following outcomes

are also foreseen:

- Improved capacity of national/sector authorities to plan and implement integrated approaches to environmental management and energy development that respond to the needs of the poor;
- Improved capacity of local authorities, community-based groups and the private sector in sustainable energy development; and
- Improved capacity of local authorities, community-based groups and the private sector in natural resources and environmental management.

An environment working group, one of several inter-institutional technical groups created by UNDP Ecuador, is chaired by the country office's sustainable development programme manager. This arrangement has created opportunities for inter-agency collaboration among several UN agencies and the GEF Small Grants Programme in the recently approved Yasuní Reserve project. An environmental 'Response Fund' managed by UNDP's Sustainable Development Unit and the GEF-SGP has been incorporated into UNDP's extensive Northern Border Peace and Development Programme. UNDP is also producing a methodological guide on gender that is based on one used by GEF Small Grants Programme. All these developments reflect the gradual shift towards the 'one UN' approach that is expected to continue in the next programme cycle. The government's decision to cease channelling public funds through UNDP—combined with a gradual decline in donor resources due to Ecuador's status as an oil-exporting, middle-income country—may encourage further collaboration among UN agencies to rationalize available resources.

UNDP is gradually reducing its focus on the Galapagos Archipelago and will be focusing more resources on the mainland during the next country programme cycle. This shift is already visible with new projects like 'Adaptation to Climate Change through Effective Water Management' and 'Creation of the Yasuní

Table A1. Ecuador's National Development Plan Policy Priorities

National EE Policy Priority	Relevant UNDP Projects
Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Control of Invasive Species in Galapagos ■ GEF Small Grants Programme
Integrated forest management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Yasuní Reserve ■ GEF Small Grants Programme
Integrated management of water resources through watershed-based planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Adaptation to Climate Change through Effective Water Management
Prevention and mitigation of the effects of climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Adaptation to Climate Change through Effective Water Management ■ Second National Communication for Climate Change
Renewable energy development and efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Renewable Energy for Galapagos – ERGAL
Articulating environment with social and economic policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Galapagos 20/20 ■ PROINGALA
Improving state management in areas of social and environmental conflict caused by extractive activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Yasuní Reserve ■ Environmental Strategy for Sustainable Development
Effective risk management and reduced vulnerability to natural disasters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Galapagos Oil Spill ■ Adaptation to Climate Change through Effective Water Management

Reserve’, which enhance the relevance of UNDP’s environment and energy programme to mainland Ecuador while strengthening UNDP’s already good relations with the Ministry of Environment. This shift towards more projects on the mainland will also expand opportunities for inter-agency collaboration.

UNDP core resources represented less than 3 percent of total UNDP expenditures in their environment and energy (sustainable development) programme between 2004 and 2006. These ‘non-core’ resources for environment and energy activities were important for the overall UNDP Ecuador programme as well, representing 93 percent of all the non-core and non-government resources available to the country office. Of this, some 80 percent came from the GEF.

ASSESSMENT OF UNDP’S CONTRIBUTIONS

Two-thirds of the current environment and energy budget commitments are focused on the Galapagos Islands. This reflects a long-standing UNDP recognition of the archipelago’s global

importance as a biodiversity site. GEF-funded projects support biodiversity conservation and the development of renewable energy sources, while UNDP’s core projects there help close the gap between conservation and development, with support for institutional coordination and integrated regional planning.

The most important outcome achieved to date in UNDP’s environment and energy programme has been in the area of controlling invasive species in the Galapagos. Other significant impacts foreseen are related to renewable energy generation and sustainable financing for invasive species control. At the central government level, UNDP’s support to the Ministry of Environment on strategic planning, project development and stakeholder consultations is much appreciated by the government.

The links between the sample environment and energy projects reviewed by the evaluation and Ecuador’s National Development Plan policy priorities are summarised in Table A1.

CONCLUSIONS

UNDP's environment and energy projects are relevant to Ecuador's national environment and energy priorities—particularly those related to biodiversity conservation and renewable energy—as defined in their 2007-2010 National Development Plan and other policy documents.

The effectiveness and sustainability of UNDP Ecuador's environment and energy projects and programmes varies. They are influenced by low institutional capacity, inadequate coordination, past periods of political instability and systemic efficiency constraints within UNDP. Environment and energy projects, particularly in Galapagos, have been vulnerable to administrative delays that in some cases have led to increased costs and affected performance.

Improvements in the effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of UNDP's environment and energy programmes in Ecuador will require (i) more attention to developing capacities of national partners, (ii) a shift from short and medium-term projects towards support for longer term processes, (iii) streamlined administrative procedures and quicker response times and (iv) greater environment and energy staff involvement in programme management, strategic planning, field monitoring and knowledge management.

KENYA

COUNTRY CONTEXT

Kenya is endowed with a diversity of landscapes, ranging from mountains to savannah grasslands, arid and semi-arid lands and a coastline bordering the Indian Ocean. The Great Rift Valley runs the length of the country, with mountain ranges on the western and eastern fringes and lakes on the valley floor. Kenya's population of 32 million is unevenly distributed, ranging from about 300 people per km² in the areas with high agricultural potential to as low as 3 people per km² in the arid and semi-arid lands. Less than 20 percent of the country is classified as having high agricultural potential while arid and semi-arid lands and lakes account for the rest.

Half of Kenya's population lived below the poverty line in 2005. The majority of Kenyans are highly dependent on natural resources for their livelihoods. The government's 'Economic Strategy for Growth and Wealth Creation in 2003-2007' set out its poverty reduction strategies, and a national 'Vision 2030' lays out an ambitious economic development plan based on comprehensive industrialization.

Over the past decade Kenya has felt the impacts of natural resource mismanagement in the form of diminished hydro-electrical generation potential. This has been the result of forest destruction in the watersheds of major dams, especially around Mount Kenya. Water supplies to the cities have also been disrupted. Droughts have become more prolonged and severe, with ensuing rains coming more often in the form of destructive flash floods. Growing pollution of Lake Victoria has contributed to the proliferation of invasive water hyacinth that threatens the fishing industry and water transportation networks. This pollution has also resulted in fish products from Africa's largest lake being banned in the European Union, with a predictably negative impact on the newly emerged fish export industry.

Kenya has formulated a series of policies and laws to improve its natural resource management in recent years. These followed a period of unprecedented environmental degradation in the 1990s. Policies and laws on wildlife, arid and semi-arid lands and land use are currently being reviewed. The government has ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and the Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). National priorities and plans for implementing these conventions have been developed through GEF enabling activities, mainly with UNDP as the implementing agency.

UNDP'S ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY PROGRAMME

The UNDP country office environment and energy unit was set up in 1999 as a single programme

officer supported by junior professional officers and interns. A further programme officer and an assistant joined in 2002, and there have usually been at least two local UN Volunteers as well. As elsewhere, the Small Grants Programme (SGP) is run separately by a national coordinator supported by several support staff.

The office has seen 49 projects approved since 1999 with a total budget of \$32 million, consisting of \$4 million from TRAC funds, \$12 million from GEF and \$16 million in co-financing. Five full-sized GEF projects account for \$20 million, or over 60 percent of the total budget. The remaining \$12 million in the portfolio finances a large number of small projects, including various GEF enabling activities and support for NGOs. An explicit shift was made during the implementation of the 2004–2008 Country Programme. The country office now aims to work more with NGOs to generate faster results and to more effectively reach communities. Several UNDP projects have demonstrated both the feasibility and the importance of NGO-government collaboration. For example, support for the Kenya Forest Working Group helped this activist organization play a key role in forest protection in a region where degradation was reaching critical proportions.

Project management has proven very time-consuming for the environment and energy team, who have consequently had less opportunity to focus on more strategic or policy-related issues. Inefficient administrative systems within UNDP have led to significant delays in processing transactions and transferring funds, causing considerable frustrations among project partners and stakeholders. The country office team has been obliged to focus more on project procedures and mechanisms than on working closely with grantees and executing agencies to enhance impacts and results.

The scattered nature of the many small projects also seem to lead to a risk of overlap with other donor initiatives or situations where UNDP's role is reduced to that of a subcontractor to larger

projects or programmes, which may hamper UNDP's ambitions of being the UN organization from which the government seeks advice on environmental issues. This is not a clear-cut case, however, as some of the smaller projects were influential, helping build capacity outside government, and UNDP (as an institution, not just the country office) needs to learn how to manage these more efficiently. It would be unfortunate if UNDP was to move away from NGO support when government capacity and commitment seems insufficient to deliver effective larger projects.

ASSESSMENT OF UNDP'S CONTRIBUTION

The overall quality of UNDP projects in Kenya is difficult to measure or assess. The office deserves credit for establishing an elaborate system for monitoring project progress. The office is struggling to demonstrate outcomes or impacts; however its reports focused mostly on activities and outputs. The overall portfolio, while it contains some worthwhile projects, lacks coherence and is clearly driven largely by the availability of GEF funding.

There are high levels of dissatisfaction among partners due to (i) frequent funding delays that jeopardize communities' trust and UNDP's credibility, (ii) frequent and sudden shifts and turns, for example, in budgets and reporting requirements, (iii) a lack of sustained technical input and (iv) poor communications. These challenges undermine the trust needed for solid partnerships, such as little or no feedback on progress, no discussion or information on budget cuts, no information on significant events taking place in the country office, or frequent summons to meetings that are perceived by partners as sudden 'ambushes'.

The SGP is highly regarded by stakeholders in Kenya. Established in 1993, by the end of 2006 it had supported over 200 projects through NGOs and community-based organizations, with grants from \$20,000–30,000. As elsewhere, the SGP in Kenya is often seen as the visible face of not just UNDP but the GEF in the environment field, since the larger projects tend not to be as visible

at local levels. Increasing media interest in environmental issues has resulted in significant coverage of Kenya's SGP projects in the national, regional and international media. Two GEF medium-sized projects have been developed by scaling up earlier SGP grants: 'Market Transformation for Efficient Biomass Stoves for Institutions and Small and Medium-Scale Enterprises' and 'Developing Incentives for Community Participation in Forest Conservation through the Use of Commercial Insects in Kenya'. Notwithstanding these examples, SGP usually operates independently from the country office, making their relationship difficult and impeding their ability to pursue opportunities for synergies. SGP's experience working with local communities could provide useful inputs to other UNDP programmes, not just in the environment field but also in poverty and livelihoods. Furthermore, Kenya is one of the SGP programmes faced with the prospect of graduation—a polite term for a discontinuation of GEF funding—and there is a risk that this valuable programme could be lost if the country office does not begin to play a more proactive and supportive role.

Institutionally, UNDP has played a role in the establishment of the National Environmental Management Authority and, more recently, the Kenya Forest Service. Cooperation with UNDP's Drylands Development Centre has contributed to the development of strategies for coping with drought. A National Cleaner Production Centre was established in 2003 in collaboration with UNIDO.

UNDP support has contributed to new legislation and policy shifts in the environment sector, notably the 1999 Environmental Management Coordination Act, which provided the initial national framework for environmental management, even though it has not been effectively implemented. More recently UNDP has contributed to the preparation of national forestry and energy acts. An inaugural national State of the Environment report was supported in 2003. It is hard to accurately assess how important UNDP's role was in these interventions.

Kenya has been host to one of three pilots for the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative (PEI) that aims to mainstream environmental considerations into the development programmes in all sectors. The PEI is emerging as a critical test case for the UNDP-UNEP partnership. Despite strong support from the top leadership of both agencies, coordination between UNDP and UNEP is proving to be a practical challenge that is hampered by system and procedure incompatibilities as well as staff reluctance in both agencies.

UNDP also helped establish and has chaired the Government of Kenya's joint consultative meetings on environment. But UNDP Kenya does not seem convincingly integrated with donor harmonization efforts or efforts to establish Joint Assistance Strategies, and it does not seem actively involved in the mainstream development discourse. For the most part UNDP is perceived by the other donors more as an implementing agency than a policy influence. The perpetual demands of project management make it hard for UNDP to consistently and significantly influence government. Other donors and government stakeholders would like to see UNDP focus its efforts more on the policy dialogue and capacity building, rather than managing large portfolios of small projects which, apart from SGP, does not seem to be UNDP's comparative advantage.

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, UNDP is a valued development partner for both government agencies and NGOs in Kenya. UNDP is appreciated by its partners in Kenya as an effective mobilizer of funds, a neutral broker and, in a few cases, a source of technical support and policy influence. NGOs in particular are more positive than government partners, citing several examples of project replication or scaling up, effective organizational capacity building and strong outreach achieved through UNDP support. UNDP staff are generally recognized as competent, but overwhelmed by project implementation demands.

FYR MACEDONIA

CONTEXT

The Former Yugoslav Republic (FYR) of Macedonia is a relatively small country covering roughly 25,000 square kilometres with a population of just over two million. It is a young country with a long history in a turbulent region. Like its western Balkan neighbours, FYR Macedonia's overarching goals today are EU accession and regional security. The many challenges of EU accession include the need to greatly enhance local environmental management capacities.

The current priorities of FYR Macedonia's Ministry of Environment are solid waste management, water and waste management and climate change. UNDP helps them face these issues as well as helping them address short-term environmental crises and the longer term challenge of developing decentralized capacities.

UNDP'S ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY PROGRAMME

Environment has been a focus of UNDP support since their first Country Cooperation Framework in 1999-2001. Not long after UNDP opened its office in FYR Macedonia it launched the innovative 'Municipal Employment Assistance Programme—Clean and Green Macedonia' project. With cost-sharing support from Norway and Sweden, the project started in the two major towns of Skopje and Tetovo. By 2001 the project had expanded to include FYR Macedonia's 80 largest municipalities. The project provided emergency employment by recruiting unskilled workers to clean up illegal dump sites, stream beds and river banks, to properly dispose of solid wastes and to rehabilitate urban parks and other green spaces. These activities reflected the priorities of the country's first National Environmental Action Plan, which had identified solid waste management as the country's top environmental priority. Not incidentally the project also created some 7,400 months of temporary employment at a time of severe economic downturn.

In the subsequent period of 2002–2007 UNDP helped FYR Macedonia to:

- Introduce integrated watershed management in the Prespa Lakes watershed;
- Mitigate and prevent pollution at industrial pollution 'hotspots';
- Meet its obligations under multilateral environmental agreements;
- Develop its capacities to respond to natural and man-made disasters;
- Develop its capacities for crisis management;
- Develop national and local environmental management capacities;
- Develop a national sustainable tourism strategy; and
- Launch an environmental small grants programme that helps communities to address local environment and development challenges.

UNDP's core resources in FYR Macedonia are modest in comparison with larger international partners. UNDP TRAC funds spent or available for environment and energy programmes in the period 2002–2010 amounted to \$950,000 by late 2007, or less than 15 percent of the total environment and energy funding for this period. Relatively abundant GEF funding—accounting for around 60 percent of funds spent or available in the same period—has had a considerable effect on the character of the overall UNDP programme. Much of this programme is concentrated around an international waters project financed by GEF in the Prespa Lakes region.

The integrated watershed management programme around the Prespa Lakes accounts for the lion's share of the current UNDP environment and energy budget in FYR Macedonia. Of a budget of approximately \$6.7 million spent and projected for the period 2002–2010, approximately \$4.7 million or 70 percent is committed to the Prespa Lakes region. Of this \$4.7 million, \$3.5 million are GEF funds and the remaining \$1.2 million are from the Swiss government.

The GEF-financed project serves as a hub for a number of complementary projects in the Prespa Lakes region of FYR Macedonia, Albania and Greece. Home to a unique flora and fauna, surrounded by wetlands rich in endemic species and an important breeding and feeding site for vulnerable bird species, the region is also threatened by unsustainable natural resource management and land use practices. The UNDP-GEF project aims to ensure a well-coordinated and integrated regional approach to ecosystem management. The goal is to conserve globally significant biodiversity by reducing the pollution of these transboundary lakes from all three neighbouring countries.

In FYR Macedonia, the GEF project is complemented by three other UNDP projects. The first one is helping restore the Golema River, the main Macedonian tributary feeding the Prespa Lakes. A second project helps reduce the environmental impacts of agriculture by strengthening capacities among the region's tree farmers to optimize and reduce their use of agrochemicals (fertilizers and pesticides) and irrigation water. The third project supports improved solid waste management services and waste minimization in the communities of the watershed. These complementary contributions all help enhance the local relevance of the GEF-financed project.

ASSESSMENT OF UNDP'S CONTRIBUTIONS

UNDP is a relatively small player compared with larger, mostly European donors who provide assistance for Macedonian infrastructure projects, legislative reform and reforms in the energy and agriculture sectors. UNDP aims to complement these bigger interventions and to provide support in areas where others don't, such as helping FYR Macedonia meet its obligations under multilateral environmental agreements.

Theoretically the roles of UNDP and other UN agencies active in FYR Macedonia are complementary. In reality, sometimes these agencies work well together and sometimes they don't. UNDP has worked effectively with the UN's

World Tourism Organization to support development of the national sustainable tourism strategy and with UNESCO, which is working to establish a Biosphere Reserve in the Ohrid and Prespa Lakes region. UNEP and UNDP played a valuable joint role in responding to FYR Macedonia's forest fire emergency of mid-2007; but UNDP's overall relations with UNEP in FYR Macedonia, as with UNIDO, need improvement if the agencies are to work together as parts of a coherent single UN programme in FYR Macedonia. These agencies still operate quite independently in the country much of the time.

UNDP Macedonia has made good use of support from the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery at UNDP headquarters and, especially, support from the UNDP Regional Centre in Bratislava. The Bratislava centre has helped FYR Macedonia develop its portfolio of projects related to climate change as well as an initiative to reduce agriculture input consumption.

The country office has not documented its achievements very effectively to date, though project evaluations in 2001 and 2003 reported impressive results, including the development of substantial technical capacities among local administrations, industrial firms and NGOs as well as increased public awareness of local environmental challenges and the options for dealing with them. By 2003, according to these evaluations, there had been 'significant improvement' in several industrial enterprises' responses to environmental problems, including greater recycling of waste materials that produced considerable savings for the firms and wastewater recycling that eliminated local effluent streams into the main river. Substantial training capacity was developed in a local NGO-run 'Regional Centre for Cleaner Production' while environmental monitoring equipment allowed the local public health institute to compile data on municipal pollution levels.

Outcomes are beginning to emerge as well for the more recent Prespa Lakes projects where local government and NGO partners perceive

UNDP as having been very successful. With UNDP support, effective solid waste collection and disposal systems have been developed in twenty settlements, generating revenues from users' payments to local service providers. Support to local orchardists allows them to reduce their costs for pesticides, fertilizers and irrigation water while also reducing their ecological impacts. These environmental activities have also contributed to achieving local governments' primary goal of stimulating economic growth in this relatively depressed region.

UNDP Macedonia does not mainstream environmental concerns effectively in their own office. Yet they do appear to be helping their partners to mainstream environmental concerns in a number of modest but significant ways, such as helping the national crisis management centre to improve protection of forests and soils and supporting development of a national sustainable tourism strategy.

CONCLUSIONS

On one hand, the country office's environment and energy team works effectively and productively with a wide range of government, civil society and international partners who clearly appreciate the country office's openness and professionalism. On the other hand, larger scale UNDP interventions are plagued by cumbersome administrative procedures dictated by global headquarters and beyond the control of UNDP Macedonia.

The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia's key future environmental management challenges will be to develop decentralized environmental management capacities, to 'approximate' EU environmental standards and practices and to move quickly towards more preventive rather than curative approaches to environmental management. The country office recognizes that these challenges represent emerging opportunities for UNDP in FYR Macedonia but its capacity to respond to them will be constrained by limited human resources and especially the modest TRAC funds available to them.

MALAWI

COUNTRY CONTEXT

Malawi is a land-locked least developed country in southeastern Africa bordered by Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia. With a high population density and per capita annual income of US\$667, Malawi faces significant development and environmental challenges. Approximately 65 percent of Malawi's 13 million people live below the poverty line, and average life expectancy is just 46 years. The Human Development Index (HDI) ranked Malawi 164 out of 177 countries. Despite the fact that Lake Malawi is the third largest body of freshwater in Africa, one-third of the country's population lacks access to safe drinking water, and child mortality is precariously high, at 133 per 1,000 deaths before age 5. The prevalence of HIV/AIDS among residents 15-49 years of age is 14 percent. Malawi's economy is highly dependent on agriculture, which accounts for 90 percent of export earnings and three-quarters of total employment. The country is highly vulnerable to climatic variations; droughts in recent years have led to widespread food shortages and famine. With 40 percent of Malawi's annual development budget supported by donor assistance, the country is heavily dependent on external financing.

During the period 1994-2003, the government set out its development and environment goals in a series of documents including a National Environment Action Plan (NEAP), Vision 2020, the State of the Environment (SOE) report and the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS). The government has signed the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and ratified the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Kyoto Protocol and the Convention on Biological Diversity. Despite such steps, little has been done to address the country's environmental challenges through comprehensive policy, due to the lack of a concrete action plans, overlapping priorities and, most significantly, a shortage of financial resources.

Environment as a specific area of focus is languishing in Malawi; there is limited interest, and few resources are being invested by the

government or donors. Government budgets for environment and forestry are declining. Though decentralization is a policy priority for the government, environmental management capacity at district levels is almost non-existent, a situation exacerbated by losses of district-level staff due to HIV/AIDS.

Only limited data are available on the state of the environment, including deforestation rates and the MDG7 target of improved access to clean water (one partial baseline survey was conducted in 2002). UNDP was designated to lead an initial donor coordination effort on environment but this did not go well, apparently due to insufficient UNDP capacity and limited government interest. There is little sign of genuine harmonization among the donors.

UNDP'S ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY PROGRAMME

The UNDP Malawi Country Office had only had one energy and environment staff member during the evaluation period. To date, the total budget allocated to the environment and energy programme has been \$15 million, consisting of \$5 million in UNDP core funding, \$4.9 million from GEF, \$3 million from MPF, and \$2.1 million from bilateral donors (primarily from DANIDA).

Environment was identified as an explicit goal in the UNDP's First Country Cooperation Framework (CCF, 1997–2001) in Malawi and as a cross-cutting issue (under poverty reduction) in the Second CCF (2002–2006). In addition, the adoption of community-level technologies for improved environmental protection is identified as one of the key expected results under the Poverty Reduction Strategy Support Programme. The country office did not allocate TRAC funds to environment and energy because they anticipated funds would be mobilized through the GEF and Montreal Protocol Fund. GEF resources did not materialize on the scale anticipated. DANIDA's withdrawal from Malawi further reduced the availability of funds, and Malawi is now almost entirely reliant on lower-than-expected GEF financing for its environment and energy work.

The UNDP Malawi's environment and energy portfolio contains three major projects: (i)

'Phase-out of Methyl Bromide in the Tobacco Sector in Malawi', a \$3-million project financed by the Montreal Protocol Unit; (ii) 'Barrier Removal to Renewable Energy (BARREM)', a \$3-million GEF-financed project that promotes the use of solar power for homes outside the rural electrification grid and (iii) the 'Sustainable Socio-Economic Empowerment Project for Poverty Reduction', a participatory development project built upon earlier UNDP work on community-based capacity development and benefiting from strong collaboration with several NGOs. This project has had positive impacts and the use of African UN Volunteers at the community level appears sustainable, though the proposed implementation period seems too short to hope for structural change.

Other environment and energy activities largely consist of GEF-financed enabling activities, communications for international environmental agreements and biodiversity projects. The GEF-funded Sustainable Land Management in the Shire River Basin, part of a larger World Bank/GEF TerrAfrica programme, is under preparation.

UNDP led the process of preparing an UNDAF for 2008–2011, consistent with the government's expressed priorities of economic growth, agricultural development and food security. UNDP's own CPD shows little connection to UNDP's global strategies; it has apparently been more influenced by the Strategic Plan of the UNDP's Africa Bureau.

ASSESSMENT OF UNDP'S CONTRIBUTION

The government's view of UNDP's support for environmental programming is neutral. UNDP is not regarded as having any particular comparative advantage in this sector. UNDP Malawi's staff is respected but both government and donors complained of slow disbursements and financial reporting. Some government departments appreciated UNDP's local presence as well as the ease of access to technical experts in the regional centres and at headquarters (e.g., for work on methyl bromide and renewable energy).

The country office works mainly with Malawi's Department of Environmental Affairs, which

handles most of the GEF funding and is responsible for international environmental obligations. However, the country's most pressing environmental management challenges are not 'GEF-able' issues; rather the primary issues are in agriculture and other key sectors aiming to enhance sustainable livelihoods and lower poverty levels.

Currently, UNDP appears to have limited credibility with the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security and the Department of Land Conservation, though these are the government agencies that UNDP needs to influence and support with policy and technical advice if it is to have a strategic impact on high-priority environmental management issues in Malawi. This issue came up repeatedly in discussions with various government departments, NGOs and donor agencies. The forthcoming launch of a Poverty-Environment Initiative in Malawi may provide an opportunity to address these issues, with the Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources being the focal point for this initiative.

Malawi's NGO sector appears relatively strong in sustainable land management, water, food security, famine relief and community-based development, although the government has not taken advantage of this capacity. UNDP is providing some support to the sector, and the Sustainable Socio-Economic Empowerment Project for Poverty Reduction involves several NGOs.

UNDP Malawi lacks in-house capacities and resources and its strategic impacts in environment and energy have been limited, despite what appear to be at least two relatively large and effective projects. The country office is about to increase its capacity significantly with a new GEF Small Grants Programme, PEI (together with UNEP), a climate change adaptation programme under a new disaster risk/recovery advisor and additional consultants.

CONCLUSIONS

UNDP's role in managing the environment and energy programme in Malawi has generally been relevant and effective. Removing barriers to the provision of energy services is a good example of successful project activities. Another is the

phasing out of methyl bromide use in the tobacco sector. UNDP's interventions in Malawi have strengthened government capacities to deal with environment and energy issues. UNDP has also achieved positive results at the policy level, helping the government comply with international treaties on climate change and biodiversity conservation. Yet neither UNDP nor its non-GEF partners show much interest in making long-term commitments to support environment and energy programming in Malawi. As GEF funds diminish, environment and energy will decline commensurately.

The government and UNDP country office are mostly focused on food security, poverty reduction and human health concerns—for very valid reasons. For the environment and energy programme to be more sustainable over the longer term in Malawi, two things must happen. First, UNDP needs to allocate a significant portion of its own resources and tap other, non-GEF resources for environment and energy programming. Second, the environment and energy programme must find entry points related to economic growth, poverty reduction and food security. UNDP will need to be more proactive in strengthening partnerships with such organizations as UNEP, FAO and WFP.

PACIFIC ISLAND COUNTRIES

CONTEXT

The Pacific Island Countries (PICs) are characterized by small populations (all have less than 0.9 million inhabitants and most have far fewer), remoteness, vulnerable economies, very high transaction costs for almost any investment initiative, very small cadres of skilled people, high population mobility with exceptionally high rates of overseas emigration rates, extreme dependence on imported petroleum fuels for energy needs and fragile ecosystems. These countries are typically very vulnerable to externally generated economic and environmental change such as climate change.

Government departments dealing with environmental and energy matters are very small, poorly resourced and generally do not exert much influence on key policy decisions. Many Small

Island Developing States (IDS) share these characteristics, although in the Pacific the distances within and between countries and the extent of isolation are extreme. Furthermore, per capita economic growth in the Pacific has been very low for a decade.

Several PICs (Fiji, Tonga and Solomon Islands) have suffered from political instability. Significant levels of inequality and poverty remain in a number of PICs, particularly in Melanesia. In many, depletion of land and marine resources continues apace. For the atoll countries, rapid urbanization has led to serious overcrowding on main islands along with growing sanitation and waste management issues.

UNDP'S ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY PROGRAMME

UNDP has multi-country offices (MCOs) in Fiji and Samoa, managing programmes in ten and four countries, respectively. There is also a national UNDP office in Papua New Guinea, which is not covered by this case study, although many of the sub-regional programmes handled by the two MCOs also include Papua New Guinea. There are environmental teams in both MCOs. UNDP is viewed by the PICs as a neutral and solid partner, with a long history in the region and a good understanding of how to access GEF resources.

GEF has historically been the most important funding source for regional/multi-country environment and energy activities in the Pacific sub-region,⁶ with over 90 percent of all GEF projects implemented by UNDP. No other GEF implementing agency has offices within the region, although UNEP has a small presence in Samoa, and the World Bank provides some sub-regional services to the PICs from Sydney, Australia, which is about 3,200 km from Fiji and 4,300 km from Samoa. The use of UNDP core funds for environment and energy work has been extremely limited, few other donors have had a consistent presence and government budgets are

minimal. GEF projects implemented by UNDP have thus constituted the bulk of sub-regional environment and energy programmes in recent years, although the European Community has a sizeable and growing presence.

Genuine links to the MDGs, poverty reduction, governance and sustainable livelihoods—or any other signs of mainstreaming—are hard to detect within the governments and are almost nonexistent within the UNDP MCOs. Although UNDP is viewed positively by the PICs, its influence appears to be waning, and it is seen as an organization lacking any clear environment and energy niche or expertise, weak in technical skills, inconsistent in project design quality and perhaps less flexible than some other potential implementing agencies. There is little perception among key donors that UNDP is a source of real environmental or energy expertise in the region. UNDP has been complacent and could easily lose its preeminent GEF role.

ASSESSMENT OF UNDP'S CONTRIBUTION

GEF funding in the PICs has been short term and project based. Considerable resources have been provided for enabling activities that have led to a variety of plans, strategies and communications related to MEAs, few of which appear to be clearly connected to genuine national priorities. On the other hand much valuable information from these initiatives has been synthesized in various studies and forms a potentially valuable basis for decision making and future project development. A number of more recent, larger projects appear to be increasingly relevant to such national and regional concerns as protection of fish stocks, water resources management, adaptation to climate change and renewable energy. Largely through UNDP-GEF assistance, the PICs as a group have been very active in global environmental forums and have worked effectively with other IDS to help focus global attention on their shared concerns.

Another clear result in these small countries, however, has been a series of distortions:

6. GEF is the most important funding source for *regional* TA studies in energy and environment for the PICs. It is not so for investment, where ADB has invested a lot into energy systems, as have bilateral agencies from Australia, New Zealand, Japan and China.

Governments suffer reduced capacities to address other energy and environment needs outside the scope of these mostly GEF-financed projects. Staffing patterns are distorted because the majority of staff is project funded. Staff retention patterns are disrupted because local bureaucracies cannot absorb staff financed by projects, once project funding ceases. There is also distortion in the type of skills developed; these projects have nurtured primarily skills in analysis and reporting rather than more action-oriented capacities. Yet, because other potential sources of financial support are limited, the governments consider that they have little choice but to continue to seek GEF funding. There is little evidence that most of the 14 governments consider environmental protection or sustainable resource management as areas in which it is worth investing much of their own resources.

Most UNDP-GEF projects take the form of Pacific sub-regional programmes, seeking economies of scale by sharing services, skills and experiences among the countries. The perception among governments, NGOs and others in the region however is that regional organizations often benefit more from these initiatives than do the individual countries. Although regional organizations compete fiercely for funds, most have not convinced many stakeholders they can deliver practical services at national levels. This leads to increased pressure from governments for more national-level projects, even though many PICs have not effectively implemented national components of sub-regional activities and the transaction costs of single-country projects in this region can be excessive.

Although operational costs are extraordinarily high in the sub-region, the MCOs do not receive additional financial resources to offset these costs. As a result, according to one UNDP staff member: *“...we are stuck in a situation where it is very expensive to operate so we provide lousy services and therefore get even less to spend.”*

CONCLUSIONS

The PICs have often felt pressured to sign and ratify environmental agreements that are of current concern to the global community. These

are not necessarily high priorities locally, relevant to the island states or even necessarily in their interests. Reporting requirements can easily distort the work plans and priorities of small national agencies. A commonly expressed view within the region is a perceived donor tendency toward new emphases every few years, little long-term continuity in their programming, a lack of willingness to support specific national efforts for the period of time needed to make much impact, sudden switches to new programming priorities and progressively shorter project cycles.

Despite significant GEF funding, and capacity-building elements in nearly all projects, these have seldom built long-term government capacities. The capacity of the PIC governments to manage environment and energy has not notably improved in the last one to two decades, with the arguable exception of Samoa. The Pacific sub-region has, nonetheless, developed a sizeable cadre of skilled environmental—and to a lesser extent energy—professionals working for regional organizations, numerous environmental NGOs and a few small consulting companies. The overwhelming bulk of this capacity is concentrated in Fiji and Samoa. UNDP projects have played a significant role in developing this capacity. The donor community draws upon it regularly. Governments of the region, on the other hand, seldom use this capacity directly. UNDP could play a valuable role by helping these countries more effectively draw upon this capacity within the region, using it to better access environmental funds and to design and implement projects well adapted to the needs, constraints and capacities of the PICs.

UNDP has not sustained its previously good relationships with donors active in energy and environment in the region, nor developed effective relationships with prospective new partners. In principle there have been significant recent opportunities for UNDP to leverage its impact through coordination and cooperation with a number of bilateral and multilateral initiatives in both environment and energy, to the mutual benefit of the region, UNDP and the other organizations. These opportunities have not been seized; insufficient efforts have been made to retain and cultivate relationships.

Annex 6

LIST OF PEOPLE CONSULTED

NEW YORK

UNDP

- Alers, Marcel, Climate Change Manager, GEF, EEG, BDP
- Carvalho, Suely, Chief, MPU and Principal Technical Adviser, POPs, GEF, EEG, BDP
- Clairs, Tim, Acting Principal Technical Adviser, Land Degradation, and Regional Technical Adviser, Biodiversity and International Waters, Arab States, GEF, EEG, BDP
- Dobie, Philip, Officer-in-Charge (during main part of evaluation) and Director, DDC, EEG, BDP
- Ghanime, Linda, Adviser, Frameworks and Strategies for Sustainable Development, EEG, BDP
- Gjuzi, Albana, Programme Specialist, Western Balkans, RBEC
- Glemarec, Yannick, Executive Coordinator, GEF, EEG, BDP
- Gold, Stephen, Global Programme Manager, GEF National Dialogue Initiative, EEG, BDP
- Harlin, Joakim, Technical Adviser, Water, EEG, BDP
- Hazlewood, Peter, Coordinator, PEI, EEG, BDP
- Herrera, Raquel, Programme Officer, RBLAC
- Hough, John, Deputy Executive Coordinator, a.i. and Principal Technical Adviser, Biodiversity, GEF, EEG, BDP
- Hudson, Andrew, Team Leader, Water and Principal Technical Adviser, International Waters, GEF, EEG, BDP
- Huseby, Mari, Programme Analyst, North East Asia and Mekong Division, RBAP
- Johnson, Gordon, Practice Manager, EEG, BDP
- Jones, Terence, Deputy Director a.i., Directorate, BDP
- Kayser, Dominique, Programme Coordinator, POPs, EEG, BDP
- Khilji, Taimur, Consultant, Directorate, RBAP
- Kjørven, Olav, Assistant Administrator and Director, Directorate, BDP
- Kwan, William, Deputy Chief, MPU and Programme Coordinator, POPs, GEF, EEG, BDP
- Leshchenko, Oksana, Programme Specialist and Chernobyl Coordinator, Western CIS and Caucasus, RBEC
- Lim, Bo, Principal Technical Adviser, Capacity Development and Adaptation Cluster, and Chief, National Communications Support Programme, GEF, EEG, BDP
- Lockwood, David, Deputy Assistant Administrator and Deputy Regional Director, RBAP
- Makhetha, Metsi, Programme Adviser, Strategic and Regional Initiatives Unit, RBA
- McDade, Susan, Resident Coordinator, UNDP Cuba
- McNeill, Charles, Senior Technical Adviser, Biodiversity, EEG, BDP
- Niamir-Fuller, Maryam, Principal Technical Adviser, Land Degradation and Deforestation, GEF, EEG, BDP
- Remple, Nick, Deputy Global Manager, GEF Small Grants Programme, EEG, BDP
- Reza, Rini, Programme Adviser, South East Asia and Pacific Division, RBAP
- Sekhran, Nik, Acting Principal Technical Adviser, Biodiversity, GEF, EEG, BDP
- Suokko, Maria, Programme Specialist, South and West Asia Division, RBAP
- Takada, Minoru, Acting Manager, Sustainable Energy Programme, EEG, BDP
- Torres, Emma, Consultant, RBLAC
- Udovi_ki, Kori, Assistant Administrator and Director, RBEC
- Van der Vaeren, Claire, Chief, South East Asia and Pacific Division, RBAP
- Vandeweerd, Veerle, Director, EEG, BDP

WASHINGTON DC

UN ORGANIZATIONS AND OTHER MULTILATERAL DONORS

- Andersen, Inger, Sector Director, Water, Environment, Social and Rural Development Department, Middle East and North Africa Region, The World Bank
- Bosi, Martina, Fund Manager, Carbon Finance Unit, Environment Department, The World Bank
- El-Ashry, Mohamed, Senior Fellow, United Nations Foundation
- Feinstein, Charles, Sector Manager, Energy in Sustainable Development, Europe and Central Asia Region, The World Bank
- Hosier, Richard, Team Leader, Climate and Chemicals, Secretariat, GEF
- Lintner, Stephen, Senior Adviser, Quality Assurance and Compliance Unit, The World Bank
- Ramankutty, Ramesh, Head, Operations and Business Strategy, Secretariat, GEF
- Tokle, Siv, Senior Evaluation Officer, Evaluation Office, GEF
- Volonte, Claudio, Chief Evaluation Officer, Evaluation Office, GEF
- Wedderburn, Sam, GEF Coordination Team, Environment Department, The World Bank

CIVIL SOCIETY

- Tunstall, Dan, Director, International Cooperation, World Resources Institute

BURKINA FASO

UNDP

- Compaore, Noël, Assistant de Programme, Programme Fonds pour Environnement Mondial aux ONG de micro financements (FEM/ONG), Burkina Faso Country Office
- Congo, Rosalie, Coordinatrice Nationale, Programme FEM/ONG, Burkina Faso Country Office
- Coulibaly, Clarisse, Chargée de Programme, Environnement et Energie, Burkina Faso Country Office
- Kogachi, Aki, Chargée de Programme, Environnement et Energie, Burkina Faso Country Office

Ouedraogo, Sylvestre B., Chef d'Equipe, Environnement et Energie, Burkina Faso Country Office

Pangah, Mariam, Représentant Résident Adjoint, Burkina Faso Country Office

Rojon, Ruby Sandhu, Directrice de Pays, Représentant Résident a.i., Burkina Faso Country Office

Seyedi, Bahareh, Chargée de Programme, Environnement et Energie, Burkina Faso Country Office

Tapsoba, Isabelle, Coordinatrice, Programme national plates-formes multifonctionnelles pour la lutte contre la pauvreté (PN-PTF/LCP), Burkina Faso Country Office

BILATERAL/MULTILATERAL DONORS

Cheik, Assane Moctar Gansonre, Assistant de Programme, JICA

Compaore, Albert, Chargé de Programme National ressources naturelles et recherche scientifique, Agence Suedoise de Coopération Internationale/Ambassade de Suède

Doi, Hideo, Chargé de Programme, JICA

Horiuchi, Yoshio, Représentant Résident, JICA

Nakayama, Yusuké, Conseiller Technique en Foresterie, JICA

Nikiema, Emmanuel Y., Spécialiste Gestion des Ressources Naturelles, Banque Mondiale, Bureau de Ouagadougou

Reiland, Rol, Chef du Bureau, Bureau Régional de la Coopération au Développement, Luxembourg

Usui, Yukichi, Adjoint au Représentant Résident, JICA

V.d. Loo, Antony, Conseiller de coopération secteur agricole, Ambassade Royale de Danemark

GOVERNMENT

Golane, Pierre, Membre Comité National de Sélection de Projets (CNSP), Programme FEM/ONG, Direction générale de la conservation de la nature (DGCN), Ministère de l'Environnement et du Cadre de Vie

Kone, Noëlie Victoire, Chef de Section, PNUD, Direction Générale de la Coopération (DGCOP), Ministère de l'Économie et des Finances

Nikiema, Mariam Ould, Secrétaire Permanent, Conseil National pour l'Environnement et le Développement Durable (SP/CONEDD), Ministère de l'Environnement et du Cadre de Vie

Ouedraogo, Delphine, Chef de Département, Secrétariat Permanent du CONEDD, Ministère de l'Environnement et du Cadre de Vie

Sedogo, Laurent, Ministre de l'Environnement et du Cadre de Vie

Traore, Alain Edouard, Secrétaire Général, Ministère de l'Environnement et du Cadre de Vie

Traore, Daouda, Représentant le Coordinateur, Programme d'Amélioration des Revenus et de Sécurité Alimentaire (ARSA)/Produits Secondaires Non Ligneux (PSNL), Ministère de l'Environnement et du Cadre de Vie, Direction des Forêts

Yaro, Maïmouna, Membre CNSP, Programme FEM/ONG, Programme de Partenariat pour l'Amélioration de la Gestion des Ecosystèmes Naturels (PAGEN), Ministère de l'Environnement et du Cadre de Vie

Zangre, Adolphe, Coordinateur, Programme ARSA/petite irrigation, Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Hydraulique et des Ressources Halieutiques

Zangre, Sidnoma Sam, Chef de Cabinet du Ministre, Ministère de l'Environnement et du Cadre de Vie

Zongo, Dominique, Membre CNSP, Programme FEM/ONG, Deuxième projet national de gestion des terroirs (PNGT II), Ministère de l'Agriculture de l'Hydraulique et des Ressources Halieutiques

CIVIL SOCIETY

Kabore, Kardiatou, Présidente, Amicale des Forestières du Burkina (AMIFOB)

Kafando, Pierre, Coordonnateur Projet, Parc National Kaboré Tambi (PNKT), Fondation des Amis de la Nature (NATURAMA)

Konditamde, Ludovic, Responsable Unité Gestion des Ressources Naturelles, Tree Aid

Nana, Adama, Directeur des Etudes et Prestations, NATURAMA

Nianogo, Aimé, Country Representative, Union Mondiale pour la Nature (UICN) Burkina Faso

Ouedraogo, Yacouba, West African Programme Coordinator, Tree Aid

OTHER

Batiga, Dorothee, Membre CNSP, Programme FEM/ONG, Réseau de Communication, d'Information et de Formation des Femmes dans les ONG (RECIF-ONG)

Botoni, Edwige, Membre CNSP, Programme FEM/ONG, Comité Permanent Inter-Etats de Lutte Contre la Sècheresse (CILSS)

Bouda, Elena, Membre CNSP, Programme FEM/ONG, Société TAN-ALIZ

Ouedraogo, Benoît, Membre CNSP, Programme FEM/ONG, Association Burkinabé de Recherche Action et d'Autoformation pour le Développement (ABRAAD)

Ouedraogo, Bruno, Membre CNSP, Programme FEM/ONG, Secrétariat Permanent des ONG (SPONG)

CHINA

UNDP

Khoday, Kishan, Assistant Country Director and Team Leader, Energy and Environment, China Country Office

Nandy, Subinay, Country Director, China Country Office

Soriano, Manuel, Regional Technical Adviser, Climate Change, Regional Centre in Bangkok, UNDP/GÉF

Tisot, Alessandra, Deputy Country Director, China Country Office

OTHER UN ORGANIZATIONS

Shao, Xuemin, Former Representative, UNEP Country Office and Senior Adviser, UNDP-UNEP, UNEP

OTHER BILATERAL/MULTILATERAL DONORS

Mau, Gunther, Programme Manager, Australia China Environment Development Programme (ACEDP)

Niu, Zhiming, Senior Programme Officer, PRC Resident Mission, ADB

Shibuichi, Toru, Country Director, PRC Resident Mission, ADB

GOVERNMENT

Gao, Wei, Programme Officer, EU-China Biodiversity Project (ECBP)/Project Management Office (PMO)

Gao, Xinquan, Programme Officer, Division of Global Environment, PMO of Carbon Finance for Achieving MDGs in China, The Administrative Centre for China's Agenda 21 (ACCA21), Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST)

Guo, Coordination Officer, PMO of Energy Conservation and GHG Emissions Reduction in Chinese TVEs – Phase II, Ministry of Agriculture (MOA)

Guo, Jing, Director, China Council for International Cooperation on Environment and Development (CCICED), The State Environmental Protection Administration (SEPA)

Li, Gao, Acting Director, Division of Global Environment, PMO of Carbon Finance for Achieving MDGs in China, ACCA21, MOST

Liu, Yuan, Deputy Division Chief, Project Management Division IV, PMOs of Energy Efficient Refrigerators Project, EERP

Ma, Jinjin, Project Assistant, PMO of China End Use Energy Efficiency Programme, Energy Research Institute (ERI), National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC)

Pan, Zhiming, Project Manager, Building Component, PMO of China End Use Energy Efficiency Programme, ERI, NDRC

Song, Dongfeng, Contract Officer, PMO of Energy Conservation and GHG Emissions Reduction in Chinese TVEs – Phase II, MOA

Song, Xiaozhi, Deputy Director-General of Foreign Economic Cooperation Office (FECO), Deputy National Programme Director (NPD), ECBP

Sun, Xue Feng, Division Chief, Project Management Division IV, GEF

Tang, Yan Dong, Senior Programme Officer, Project Management Division III, MP Solvent Sector Plan Project

Wang, Chunli, Project Manager, Cross-cutting Component, PMO of China End Use Energy Efficiency Programme, ERI, NDRC

Wang, Haibin, National Programme Manager (NPM), ECBP/PMO

Wang, Xiwu, Senior Administrator, PMO of Energy Conservation and GHG Emissions Reduction in Chinese TVEs – Phase II, MOA

Wu, Jinkang, Deputy Director General, International Department and GEF Focal Point, Ministry of Finance (MOF)

Xia, Kunbao, Committee Member and Member of the Board of Directors, All-China Environment Federation, Technology Committee of SEPA

Xin, Sheng, Project Manager, Industrial Component, PMO of China End Use Energy Efficiency Programme, ERI, NDRC

Yang, Lirong, Deputy Division Chief, Project Management Division III, MP Solvent Sector Plan Project

Yu, Cong, Director, Energy Efficiency Centre, PMO of China End Use Energy Efficiency Programme, ERI, NDRC

Zhang, Ou, Programme Officer, CCICED, SEPA

Zhou, Qiangwu, Director, International Financial Institution Division IV, International Department, MOF

Zhu, Duanni, Director, Division II, China International Centre for Economic and Technical Exchanges (CICETE), The Ministry of Commerce (MofCOM)

CIVIL SOCIETY

Deng, Haifeng, Lecturer, Centre for Environmental, Natural Resources and Energy Law (CEREL), Tsinghua University

Shi, Wenyu, Graduate Student, Centre for Environmental, CEREL, Tsinghua University

Sun, Shan, Conservation Director, China Beijing Office, Conservation International and Shanshui

Wang, Mingyuan, Executive Director and Associate Professor, CEREL, Tsinghua University

Yao, Bin, Graduate Student, CEREL, Tsinghua University

ECUADOR

UNDP

Falconí, Cecilia, Sustainable Development Programme Officer, Ecuador Country Office

Proaño, María Mercedes, Sustainable Development Programme Assistant, Ecuador Country Office

Troya, José Vicente, Sustainable Development Programme Manager, Ecuador Country Office

Valdés, Mauricio, Resident Representative, Ecuador Country Office

Varea, Ana María, Coordinator, Small Grants Programme, UNDP-GEF

PROJECT STAFF

Jácome, Carlos, Assistant Coordinator for 'Electrification of Galapagos with Renewable Energy/ERGal' project

Neira, David, Coordinator for 'Adaptation to Climate Change through Effective Water Management' project, GEF

Sancho, Ana, Coordinator for 'Control of Invasive Species in the Galapagos Archipelago' project (telephone interview)

Sandóval, Carlos, Monitoring Officer for the Galapagos-based UNDP/GEF projects

GOVERNMENT

Albán, Ana, Minister of Environment

Carrión, Victor, Coordinator for Species Eradication, Galapagos National Park

Cruz, Marilyn, Coordinator for Galapagos National Park Laboratory

Espinoza, Eduardo, Coordinator for Marine Resources, Galapagos National Park

Naula, Edwin, Coordinator for Public Use of Conservation Areas, Galapagos National Park

Ramos, Washington, Director for Education and Culture, Santa Cruz Municipality (Galapagos)

Tapia, Washington, Undersecretary for Environment

Zapata, Fabián, Director of the National Galapagos Institute (INGALA)

OTHER BILATERAL/MULTILATERAL DONORS

Aznar, Victor, Programme Officer, Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo (AECID)

Maekawa, Yukihiro, Ambassador of Japan

Tello, Eudoxia, Representative, Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KfW)

Tique, Alfonso, Deputy Representative, IDB

CIVIL SOCIETY

Cruz, Felipe, Assistant Technical Director, Charles Darwin Foundation

Hofstede, Robert, Interim Regional Director for IUCN – Latin America

Milstead, Brian, Chief of Vertebrates Department, Charles Darwin Foundation

Ortiz, Fernando, Coordinator of Galapagos Programme, Conservation International

Zapata, Carlos, Director of FUNDAR, Galapagos

OTHERS

Albán, Jorge, Former Vice Minister, Energy and Mines

Bustamante, Teodoro, Environmental Analyst

KENYA

UNDP

Bekele-Thomas, Nardos, Deputy Resident Representative, Kenya Country Office

Chege, Nancy, National Coordinator, GEF/SGP, Kenya Country Office

Dobie, Philip, Director, DDC

Forbes, Alex, Programme Adviser, PEI, Kenya Country Office

Gakahu, Chris G., Assistant Resident Representative, Kenya Country Office

Goumandakoye, Mounkaila, Policy Adviser, DDC

Harding, Brian, Programme Officer, Sustainability, Kenya Country Office

Kwena, Foulata T., Programme Officer, Sustainability, Kenya Country Office

Lwanga, Elizabeth, Resident Representative, Kenya Country Office

Nyandiga, Charles, Programme Analyst, Kenya Country Office

Wasao, Samson W., National Programme Manager, PEI and Capacity 2015, Kenya Country Office

OTHER UN ORGANIZATIONS

- Ambala, Chris, Associate Programme Officer, Division of Early Warning and Assessment, UNEP
- Bankobeza, Sylvia, Legal Officer, Division of Environmental Law and Conventions, UNEP
- Battaglino, Cristina, Evaluation Officer, Evaluation Office, UNEP
- Chenje, Jacquie, Capacity Building Section–Programme Officer, Division of Early Warning and Assessment, UNEP
- Duraiappah, Anantha Kumar, Senior Programme Manager, Division of Environmental Policy and Implementation, UNEP
- Gilruth, Peter, Director, Division of Early Warning and Assessment, UNEP
- Henningsen, Kamilla, Associate Programme Officer, PEI, UNEP
- Kasten, Tim, Chief, Natural Resources Branch, Division of Environmental Policy and Implementation, UNEP
- Kithakye, David I., Senior Human Settlements Officer Regional Office for Africa and the Arab States, UN-Habitat
- Muchai, Annie, Associate Programme Officer, Division of Environmental Policy and Implementation, UNEP
- Ndede, Henry O., Programme Officer, Water, Regional Office for Africa, UNEP
- Norgbey, Segbedzi, Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit, Evaluation Office, UNEP
- Rahman, Anisur, Programme Officer, Capacity Building, Division of Environmental Policy and Implementation, UNEP
- Spilsbury, Michael, GEF Evaluation Officer, Evaluation Office, UNEP
- Thiaw, Ibrahim, Director, Division of Environmental Policy and Implementation, UNEP
- Toikka, Miia, Associate Programme Officer, PEI, UNEP
- Ugolo, John, Legal Officer, Division of Environmental Law and Conventions, UNEP

Varghese, Alexander, Representative for Kenya and Eritrea, UNIDO

Wabunoha, Robert, Legal Officer, Division of Environmental Law and Conventions, UNEP

BILATERAL/MULTILATERAL DONORS

- Alander, Jukka, Counselor and Energy Adviser, Embassy of Finland
- Eid, Thomas, Deputy Permanent Representative, Embassy of Norway
- Just, Charlotte, First Secretary–Environment, Royal Danish Embassy
- Kurauchi, Yuko, Consultant, The World Bank
- Vibe, Sara, Environment Intern, Royal Danish Embassy

GOVERNMENT

- Kafumo, Joseph M., Senior Economist, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
- Mbagua, David K., Director, Kenya Forest Service
- M'mella, Timothy U.K., Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
- Muinde, Julius, Senior Coordinator, Environment Coordinating Unit, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
- Mukui, Joseph, Director, Rural Planning Directorate, PEI Technical Committee, Ministry of Planning and National Development
- Mwangi, Godfrey N., Senior Environmental Planning Officer, National Environment Management Authority
- Nyangena, John, Senior Economist, Ministry of Planning and National Development
- Ondiniu, Kennedy I., Director of Planning and Research, National Environment Management Authority

CIVIL SOCIETY

- Ikiara, Moses M., Executive Director, Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis
- Kepher-Gona, Judy, Executive Officer, Ecotourism Kenya
- Khisa, Kelvin, Deputy Director, Kenya National Cleaner Production Centre

Kiio, Maria, Research Officer, Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute, Nairobi

Kituyi, Evans, Director, Renewable Energy Technology Enterprises

Makhanu, Rudolf, Programme Officer, Kenya Forest Working Group

Matiku, Paul, Executive Director, Nature Kenya

Muchiri, Lydia, Project Officer, Practical Action Eastern Africa

Muchiri, Wangui, CEO, Nairobi Central Business District Association

Musangi, James, Senior Technical and Administration Assistant, World Wildlife Fund

Mutimba, Stephen, Programme Officer, Energy for Sustainable Development in Africa Ltd.

Nangami, Patricia, Project Officer, Nairobi Central Business District Association

Ogada, Tom P.M., Director, Kenya Industrial Research and Development Institute

Ongamba, Harrison, Senior Research Officer, Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute, Mombasa

Salehe, John, Eastern Africa Coastal Programme Officer, World Wildlife Fund

Wamunga, Paul, Project Manager, Kenya Disaster Concern

FYR MACEDONIA

UNDP

Adzievska, Maja, Project Manager, UNDP Climate Change Office

Blazevski, Aleksandar, Project Assistant, UNDP Project Office, Resen

Cvetkovska, Gordana, Project Assistant, UNDP Project Office, Resen

Dzurovski, Anastas, Project Assistant, UNDP Project Office, Resen

Kodzoman, Anita, Environment Practice Coordinator, Head of Energy and Environment Cluster, Macedonia FYR Country Office

Kono, Akihito, Programme Officer-Energy and Environment, Macedonia FYR Country Office

Lopez, Alvin, International Transboundary Adviser, UNDP Project Office, Resen

Memedov, Samir, Programme Associate, Environment Practice Area, Macedonia FYR Country Office

Rajcanovski, Dejan, Project Manager, UNDP Project Preparation of National Tourism Development Strategy

Samardziev, Zlatko, National Coordinator of the GEF Small Grants Programme, GEF, Small Grants Programme Office, Skopje

Sekovski, Dimitar, Project Manager, Golema River project, UNDP Project Office, Resen

Shimomura, Norimasa, Deputy Resident Representative, Macedonia FYR Country Office

Stojanovski, Ljupco, National Project Manager, Prespa project, UNDP Project Office, Resen

Zdraveva, Pavlina, Project Assistant, UNDP Climate Change Office

OTHER BILATERAL/MULTILATERAL DONORS

Dodeva, Stanislava, National Programme Officer, Embassy of Switzerland, Swiss Cooperation Office Macedonia FYR

Gjorgjiev, Petar, Director, KfW, KfW Office, Skopje

Radovanovic, Natasha, Project Coordinator, KfW, KfW Office, Skopje

Sarlamonov, Robert, Programme Officer, Austrian Embassy Technical Cooperation, Austrian Development Agency

Temporal, Claire-Lise, Deputy Country Director, Embassy of Switzerland, Swiss Cooperation Office Macedonia FYR

Visser, Govert W., Deputy Head of Mission, Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Skopje

GOVERNMENT

Buzlevski, Dimitar, Mayor, Municipality of Resen

Jakimovski, Mile, Director of the Environmental Administration Unit, Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning

Jantinska, Darinka, Head of Division of Bilateral Cooperation, National Coordinator for Prespa Project, Member of the Prespa Park Coordination Committee (PPCC), Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning

Kozuharova, Gordana, Head of Department for Cooperation and Project Coordination, GEF Operational Focal Point, Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning

Manevski, Zoran, State Secretary, Ministry of Economy

Murati, Muzafer, Director, Communal Utility “Proleter”–Resen, Water Supply, Sewage and Waste Management Utility

Naumovska, Gordana, Head of Section for International Coordination, Macedonia FYR Crisis Management Centre

Nikolovski, Zoran, Tourism Department, Ministry of Economy

Obradovic, Grncarovska, Assistant Head of Sustainable Development Department Climate Change and Kyoto Protocol Focal Point, Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning

Panovski, Dejan, State Secretary, UNDP Project Director, Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning

Sukova, Kaja, Head of Sustainable Development Department, Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning

Tarcugovski, Dragi, Head of Section for Operations-OPCEN, Macedonia FYR Crisis Management Centre

Trajkovski, Kosta, Head of Division for Project Preparation, National Coordinator, Environment and Security Initiative, Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning

Zrmanovski, Dejan, Energy Department, Head of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Unit, Ministry of Economy

CIVIL SOCIETY

Dragoljub, Matovski, Manager, Project Proponent for MDG Carbon Fund, Bioreaktor M

Ivanova, Marijana, Project Manager, Journalists’ Legal Environmental Centre (ERINA), Member of the SGP National Steering Committee

Karchicki, Vladimir, President, Proaktiva, Member of the SGP National Steering Committee

Petrovska, Ana, Project Manager, Regional Environmental Centre for Central and Eastern Europe-Country Office

Radovanovic, Kornelija, Project Manager, Regional Environmental Centre for Central and Eastern Europe-Country Office

Sazdovski, Ilija, Project Manager, Proaktiva

Slavkovski, Igor, Project Manager, Milieukontakt International, Member of the SGP, National Steering Committee

Toskovski, Naume, NGO Director, Union of Agriculture Producers

MALAWI

UNDP

Bahamdoun, Maha, Deputy Resident Representative (Programme), Malawi Country Office

Bobfe, Augustine, Economist, Malawi Country Office

Chimbiri, Agnes, Assistant Resident Representative, MDG Cluster, Malawi Country Office

Constable, Michael, Consultant, Malawi Country Office

Keating, Michael, Resident Representative and UN Resident Coordinator, Malawi Country Office

M’angisa, Etta, Programme Analyst, MDG Cluster and Environment Focal Point, Malawi Country Office

Nijholt, Alwin, Trust Fund Manager, Malawi Country Office

Standon, Howard, Adviser, Disaster Reduction, Malawi Country Office

OTHER BILATERAL/MULTILATERAL DONORS

Rohrbach, David, Senior Agricultural Economist, The World Bank

Sauvik, Leif B., Counsellor and Deputy Head of Mission, Royal Norwegian Embassy

Tembo, Autman, NRM Specialist, Mission Environmental Officer (MEO), USAID

Woolnough, David, Infrastructure and Growth Adviser, UK Department for International Development (DFID)

GOVERNMENT

Chirambo, Kasiso, Principal Forestry Officer, Department of Forestry, Ministry of Energy and Mines

- Kabambe, Patrick, Principal Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
- Kafumba, Charles, Director, Department of Energy, Ministry of Energy and Mines
- Kamperewera, A.M., Deputy Director, Department of Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources
- Kamoto, Teddie, Principal Forestry Officer, Department of Forestry, Ministry of Energy and Mines
- Kavalo, Mutemwe, Principal Forestry Officer, Department of Forestry, Ministry of Energy and Mines
- Mainala, Sydney M., Director of Water Resources, Ministry of Irrigation and Water Development
- Maweru, Sandram, Director of Irrigation, Ministry of Irrigation and Water Development
- McCarter, Peter S., Senior Forest Governance Specialist and Technical Assistance Team Leader, EU-Supported Improved Management for Sustainable Livelihoods Programme, Department of Forestry, Ministry of Energy and Mines
- Mchiela, Andrina F., Principal Secretary, Ministry of Irrigation and Water Development
- Mhango, Lewis B., Chief Energy Officer, Department of Energy, Ministry of Energy and Mines
- Mitembe, William, Principal Forestry Officer, Department of Forestry, Ministry of Energy and Mines
- Nakanga, Rodson W. Mkwepu, Director of Administration and Finance, Ministry of Irrigation and Water Development
- Ngalambe, John, Deputy Director, Department of Forestry, Ministry of Energy and Mines
- Ngwira, Naomi, Director, Debt and Aid Division and GEF Political Focal Point, Ministry of Finance
- Njewa, Evans, Environmental Officer, Department of Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources
- Nkosi, Venge, Project Manager, Barrier Removal for Renewable Energy (BARREM), Department of Energy, Ministry of Energy and Mines
- Nyirenda, Custom, Forestry Officer, Department of Forestry, Ministry of Energy and Mines
- Nyuma, Mughogho, Assistant Head of Forestry Extension Services, Department of Forestry, Ministry of Energy and Mines
- Simwela, Director, a.i., Department of Forestry, Ministry of Energy and Mines
- Theka, Caroline, Environmental Officer, Department of Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources
- Tikiwa, C.M., Environmental Officer, Department of Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources
- Zenengeya, Fletcher E.Y., Principal Secretary, Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources

CIVIL SOCIETY

- Banda, Dezio, Monitoring and Evaluation Manager, World Vision International (Malawi Office)
- Changaya, Albert, Chief Estate Extension Officer, Agricultural Research and Extension Trust (ARET)
- Chipezaani, Benson, Operations Director, Malawi Environmental Endowment Trust (MEET)
- Chisale, Caleb, Programme Manager, Target National Relief and Development (TANARD)
- Chisale, Ellen, Programme Officer, Sustainable Socio-Economic Empowerment for Poverty Reduction Project (SSEEP), Kasungu
- Domoya, Emmanuel, Executive Director, TANARD
- Dzimadzi, Chris, Project Manager, National Adult Literacy Centre, SSEEP
- Foday, Augustine, Programme Adviser, UNV, SSEEP, Kasungu
- Guta, Christopher W., Director General, Malawi Industrial Research and Development Centre
- Kaipa, John, Agricultural Engineer, ARET
- Kamanga, Khumbo, Capacity Development Officer, Coordination Unit for Rehabilitation of Environment
- Kulemeka, Peter, Country Director (ex-UNDP ARR until 2006), Clinton-Hunter Development Initiative (CHDI)

Lefu, Hyton, Programme Manager,
SSEEP, Kasungu

Mang'anya, Manuel, Monitoring and
Evaluation Officer, National Adult Literacy
Centre, SSEEP

Matupa, Khama, Natural Resources
Coordinator, COOPI/MALEZA Malawi

Misomali, Ernest, Country Director, Self Help
Development International

Munthali, Flora, Chief Agronomist, ARET

Ngwala, K.L., District Community
Development Officer, SSEEP, Kasungu

Nkhuzenfe, Hetherwick, Programme Manager,
Concern Universal

Phiri, Ibrahim, Deputy Director, ARET

Sanneh, Pa-Ansu, Community Extension
Worker, UNV, SSEEP, Kasungu

FIJI

UNDP

Atalifo, Katarina, Fiji National Coordinator,
GEF Small Grants Programme

Dictus, Richard, Resident Representative, UN
Resident Coordinator, Fiji Multi-Country
Office

Liew, Geoff, Pacific Regional Sustainable
Livelihoods Specialist, Pacific Centre

Muller, Peter, Pacific Regional Crisis Prevention
and Recovery Adviser, Pacific Centre

Ravuvu, Asenaca, Team Leader, Environment
Unit, Environment and Energy Team, Fiji
Multi-Country Office

Wiseman, Garry, Manager, Pacific Centre

OTHER BILATERAL/MULTILATERAL DONORS

Bower, Rhonda, Project Adviser, IWRM, SOPAC
Integrated Water Resources Management

Chang, Gordon, Deputy Executive Director,
Pacific Power Association

Cloin, Jan, Renewable Energy Adviser, SOPAC
Energy

Dalton, James, Project Adviser, IWRM, SOPAC
Integrated Water Resources Management

Fairbairn, Paul, Manager, SOPAC
Community Lifelines

Fung, Christine, Participatory Land Use
Planning and Moderation Specialist, SPC/
GTZ Regional Forest and Trees Project

Holland, Paula, Senior Adviser, Natural
Resources Governance, SOPAC

Environment Mario, Rupeni, Energy
Adviser, SOPAC Energy

Morris, Jared, Import Management Adviser,
Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat

Narsey, Padma Lal, Sustainable Development
Adviser, Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat

Neil, Tony, Executive Director, Pacific Power
Association

Pilger, Horst, First Secretary, Infrastructure,
Delegation of the EC for the Pacific

Ratukalou, Inoke, Land Use and Resource
Policy Adviser, Secretariat of the Pacific
Community Land Resources Division

Seniloli, Tina, Head, Project Administration,
ADB, South Pacific Regional Office (SPRO)

Syngellakis, Katerina, REP-5 Manager, REP-5/
European Commission (EC)

Woodruff, Allison, Adviser, Resource
Economist, SOPAC Environment

Zieroth, Gerhard, Team Leader, PIEPSAP,
SOPAC Pacific Islands Energy Policy and
Strategic Action Plan

GOVERNMENT

Gounder, Kamal, Economy Planning Officer
(Infrastructure and Energy), Ministry
of Finance and Planning National
Planning Office

Khan, Intiyaz, Principal Energy Officer,
Ministry of Transport, Works and Energy,
Department of Energy

Koroisave, Luke, Principal Planning Officer,
Ministry of Finance and Planning National
Planning Office

Kumar, Shakil, Scientific Officer, Ozone,
Ministry of Tourism and Environment,
Department of Environment

Nakavulevu, Peceli, Head, Rural Electrification
Unit and Acting Director of Biofuels,
Ministry of Transport, Works and Energy,
Department of Energy

Nasome, Epeli, Director, GEF OFP, Chair of Fiji GEF SGP Steering Committee, Ministry of Tourism and Environment, Department of Environment

Prasad, Krishna, Chief Planning Officer, Ministry of Finance and Planning, National Planning Office

Waqainabete, Sunia, Fisheries Research Officer, Research Division, Department of Fisheries, Ministry of Fisheries and Forestry

Zariff, Razia, Scientific Officer, POPs, Ministry of Tourism and Environment, Department of Environment

CIVIL SOCIETY

Aalbersberg, William, Director, Institute of Applied Science (IAS), University of the South Pacific (Laucala Campus, Suva)

Erasito, Elizabeth, Executive Director, National Trust for Fiji

Horoi, Rex, Executive Director, FSPI Regional Secretariat

Jenkins, Aaron, Programme Officer, Wetlands International

Kami, Taholo, Regional Director, IUCN Regional Office for Oceania

Koshy, Kanayathu, Professor, Environmental Science, Pacific Centre for Environmental Management and Sustainable Development (PACE-SD), University of the South Pacific (Laucala Campus, Suva)

Kumar, Mahendra, Professor, Sustainable Development, Centre for Energy, Environment and Sustainable Development, University of Fiji (Lautoka)

Mataki, Melchior, Programme Manager, PACE-SD, University of the South Pacific (Laucala Campus, Suva)

McFadzian, Diane, Coordinator, International Policy Initiatives, Asia/Pacific Climate Change Programme, WWF South Pacific and Fiji Country Programme

Morley, Craig, Senior Lecturer, Biology, Department of Biology, University of the South Pacific (Laucala Campus, Suva)

Nawadra, Sefa, Officer-in-charge, Fiji, Conservation International

Sivo, Loraini, Research Officer, Conservation International

Tabunakawai, Kesaia, Director, WWF Fiji, WWF South Pacific and Fiji Country Programme

Thaman, Randy, Professor, Biogeography, Department of Geography, University of the South Pacific (Laucala Campus, Suva)

Tuqiri, Seremaia, Regional Fisheries Officer, WWF Pacific Fisheries, WWF South Pacific and Fiji Country Programme

Watling, Dick, Environmental Consultant, NatureFiji/Mareqeti Viti

OTHER

Clay, Bruce, Consultant, Clay Engineering

Kumar, Premila, Executive Director, Consumer Council

Siwatibau, Suliana, Environment and Energy Consultant

Tuqir, Mere, Media Consultant

SAMOA

UNDP

Jensen, Thomas, Energy Adviser, Samoa Multi-Country Office

Volentras, Laututu Andre, UNDP Regional Technical Adviser, GEF

OTHER UN ORGANIZATIONS

Raj, Suresh, Representative, UNEP

Faulalo, Keneti, Regional Coordinator, UNEP-GEF Biosafety Unit, UNEP

GOVERNMENT

Brown, Steve, GEF Adviser/Consultant, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment

Fifita, Solomone, Programme Manager, PIGGAREP, Secretariat of the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)

Kilepoa, Silia, Principal Energy Officer, Ministry of Finance, Government of Samoa

Lui, Vitolio, Acting Director, Secretariat, SPREP

Pereira, Benjamin, Assistant, CEO Planning Division, Ministry of Finance, Government of Samoa

Rasmussen, Anne, Climate Change
Coordinator, Ministry of Natural Resources
and Environment

Shaw, Alan, Officer-in-charge, Office of the
Ongoing Government of Tokelau, Apia,
Government of Tokelau

Simi, Noumea, Assistant, CEO Aid
Management Division, Ministry of Finance,
Government of Samoa

Stanley, Joe, GEF Adviser, Secretariat, SPREP

Taulealo, Tuuu Ieti, CEO, Ministry of Natural
Resources and Environment

CIVIL SOCIETY

Faatauvaava-Vavatau, Roina, CEO, Samoa
Umbrella NGO

Hunter, David, Acting Head, School of
Agriculture, University of the South Pacific
(Alafua Campus)

Jackson, Vaasiliifiti Moelagi, Vice President,
Samoa Umbrella NGO

Martel, Francois, Executive Director,
Conservation International, Pacific
Islands Programme

Reti, Muliagatele Joe, Partner, Pacific
Environmental Consultants Ltd

Sasega, Sam, Partner, Pacific Environmental
Consultants Ltd

Voight, Raymond, Vice President, Samoa
Umbrella NGO

OTHER

Langham, Edward, Renewable Energy Adviser,
Electric Power Corporation

Percival, Papalii Grant, President, Samoa
Manufacturer's Association

Punivalu, Isikuki, General Manager, IPA
Engineering and Management Consulting

BANGKOK

UNDP

D'Cruz, Joseph, Regional Technical Adviser,
Biodiversity, Environment Finance Group

Dhungana, Bhava, Associate Programme
Specialist, REP-PoR, Environment and
Energy Group

Feld, Sergio, Environment Practice Team
Leader and Policy Adviser, Environment
and Energy Group

Karki, Sameer, Regional Technical Adviser,
Biodiversity, Environment Finance Group

Kran, Marcia V.J., Deputy Regional Manager
and Head of Policy and Programmes,
UNDP Regional Centre in Bangkok

Krause, Martin, Regional Technical Adviser,
Climate Change, GEF, EEG, BDP

Kreingsontikul, Wimonrat, Programme
Associate, UNDP Country Office

Kulthanan, Sirisupa, Assistant Resident
Representative, Thailand Country Office

Laganda, Gernot, Regional Technical Adviser,
Climate Adaptation, Environment
Finance Group

Mek-aroonreung, Nittaya, Programme
Management Associate (Evaluation Focal
Point), Thailand Country Office

Mongia, Nandita, Programme Coordinator,
Regional Energy Programme for Poverty
Reduction (REP-PoR), Environment and
Energy Group

Tirangkura, Inthira, Thailand Country Office

Winichagoon, Phansiri, Manager, Environment
Unit, Thailand Country Office

OTHER UN ORGANIZATIONS

Ichimura, Masakazu, Chief, Environment
Section, UNESCAP

Low, Pak Sum, Regional Adviser, Environment
and Sustainable Development, UNESCAP

Nam, Sangmin, Environmental Affairs Office,
Environment Section, UNESCAP

Pernetta, John, Project Director, Reversing
Environmental Degradation Trends in the
South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand, UNEP

Saha, Pranesh Chandra, Chief, Energy
Resources Section, UNESCAP

Tsering, Dechen, Senior Programme Officer,
Regional Office for Asia and Pacific, UNEP

Verbeek, Henk, Senior Administrative Officer,
Regional Office for Asia and Pacific, UNEP

BILATERAL/MULTILATERAL DONORS

Shah, Jitendra (Jitu), Sector Coordinator,
Environment and Social Development,
South East Asia–Country Management
Unit, The World Bank

Verbiest, Jean-Pierre A., Country Director,
Thailand Resident Mission, ADB

GOVERNMENT

Chinnavaso, Kasemsun, Secretary-General,
Office of Natural Resources and
Environmental Policy and Planning
(ONEP), Ministry of Natural Resources
and Environment

Kheawsaad, Kingkan, Environmental Official,
Office of International Cooperation,
Ministry of Natural Resources
and Environment

Pintukanok, Ampan, Director, Office of
International Cooperation, Ministry of
Natural Resources and Environment

Tummakird, Aree Wattana, International
Affairs (Chief Negotiator to UN
Framework Convention on Climate
Change), ONEP, Ministry of Natural
Resources and Environment

CIVIL SOCIETY

Boonyabancha, Somsook, Director, Community
Organizations Development Institute (CODI)

Chalitanon, Natvipa, Administrative
Coordinator, Asian Coalition for Housing
Rights (ACHR), CODI

De Silva, Janaka A., Coordinator Projects,
Thailand Programme, IUCN

Kabraji, Aban Marker, Regional Director, IUCN

Kongpaen, Preeda, Director,
Chunchong Foundation

Macintosh, Don, Coordinator, Mangroves for
the Future (MFF), IUCN

Singh, Tejpal, Programme Coordinator,
Ecosystems and Livelihoods Group, IUCN

Srikasikul, Nalinee, Chunchong Foundation

BRATISLAVA

Alhazishvili, Nato, Executive Office,
Deputy Director, Programme Support
and Policy Development Unit (PSPD)
Development Directorate

Colville, Geordie, GEF Regional Technical
Adviser for Climate Change and Energy,
Climate Change Mitigation Sub-practice

Dinu, Adriana, GEF Technical Adviser for
Biodiversity, Environment and Energy, and
GEF Team Leader, Biodiversity and Land
Degradation Sub-practice

Gasparikova, Daniela, Country Support
Team, Team Leader, Development
(PSPD) Directorate

Javan, Jafar, Director, Policy Support
and Programme

Kaplina, Anna, Programme Associate, Climate
Change Mitigation Sub-practice

Mamaev, Vladimir, GEF Regional Technical
Adviser for Land Management
and International Waters, Water
Governance Sub-practice

Martonakova, Henrieta, Regional Project
Manager, Strategic Environmental
Assessment, Integrated Environmental
Policies/SEA/ENVSEC Sub-practice

Olshanskaya, Marina, Regional Carbon
Finance Specialist, Climate Change
Mitigation Sub-practice

Reimov, Ajiniyaz, Programme Officer,
Environment and Security, Integrated
Environmental Policies/SEA/ENVSEC
Sub-practice Development (PSPD) Directorate

Sladkova, Milada, Programme Associate,
Integrated Environmental Policies/SEA/
ENVSEC Sub-practice

Staudenmann, Juerg, Regional Water
Governance Policy Adviser, Water
Governance Sub-practice

Tothova, Klara, Country Support Team CST
Environmental Officer, Development
(PSPD) Directorate

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

MAIN REPORT REFERENCES

- Collaborative Labeling and Appliance Standards Program (CLASP). *Energy-Efficiency Labels and Standards: A Guidebook for Appliances, Equipment and Lighting*. 2nd Edition. Washington, DC. 2005.
- Dalberg. 'Harmonization of UNEP and UNDP Operational Procedures for Joint Programming'. Dalberg Final Report. October 2006.
- Glemarec, Yannick. 'UNDP MDG Carbon Facility: Leveraging Carbon Finance for Sustainable Development'. MEA Bulletin. December 2007.
- Krause, Martin and Sara Nordstrom (eds.). 'Solar Photovoltaics in Africa: Experiences with Financing and Delivery Modes'. UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Report Series 2. 2004.
- ISIS. 'Is Biodiversity a Material Risk for Companies? An Assessment of the Exposure of FTSE Sectors to Biodiversity Risk'. 2004.
- Johansson, Thomas B. and José Goldemberg (eds.). *World Energy Assessment Overview: 2004 Update*. UNDP, UN-DESA and World Energy Council. 2004.
- Modi, Vijay, Susan McDade, Dominique Lallement and Jamal Saghir. *Energy Services for the Millennium Development Goals: Achieving the Millennium Development Goals*. World Bank and UNDP. 2005.
- Swart, Lydia and Estelle Perry (eds.). *Global Environmental Governance: Perspectives on the Current Debate*. Center for UN Reform Education. New York. 2007.
- Takada, Minoru and Ndika Akong Charles (lead authors). *Energizing Poverty Reduction: A Review of the Energy-Poverty Nexus in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers*. UNDP. March 2007.
- United Nations. 'Secretary-General's High-level Panel on UN System-wide Coherence in the Areas of Development, Humanitarian Assistance and the Environment'. 2006.
- UNDP. *Human Development Report 1992. Global Dimensions of Human Development*. Oxford University Press, New York 1992.
- UNDP. 'Sustainable Development, Energy and the Environment: UNDP's Climate Change Initiatives'. 2001.
- UNDP. 'Equator Initiative 2002 Report'. 2003.
- UNDP. 'The Sustainable Difference: Energy and Environment to Achieve the MDGs'. 2004.
- UNDP. 'UNDP and Energy for Sustainable Development'. Bureau for Development Policy (BDP) Energy and Environment Group. 2004.
- UNDP. 'Equator Initiative Annual Narrative Report'. 2004.
- UNDP. 'Equator Prize 2004. A Partnership for Sustainable Communities in the Tropics'. 2004.
- UNDP. *Energizing the Millennium Development Goals: A Guide to Energy's Role in Reducing Poverty*. BDP Energy and Environment Group. 2005.
- UNDP. 'Thematic Trust Fund: Energy and Environment for Sustainable Development'. BDP Environment and Energy Group. 2005.
- UNDP. *Human Development Report 2006. Beyond Scarcity: Power, Poverty and the Global Water Crisis*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York 2006.
- UNDP. 'How-to Guide: National Institutional Frameworks for the Kyoto Protocol Flexible Mechanisms in Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States'. 2006.
- UNDP. *Making Progress on Environmental Sustainability: Lessons and Recommendations from a Review of Over 150 MDG Country Experiences*. BDP Environment and Energy

- Group. October 2006.
- UNDP. 'Global Programme 2006 Annual Report'. BDP. 2007.
- UNDP. 'Consolidated Workplan. Regional Centres in Bangkok and Colombo'. 2007.
- UNDP. 'Regional Business Plan for 2007. Asia-Pacific Region'. Environment Finance Group. 2007.
- UNDP. 'Thematic Trust Fund on Environment and Energy: 2006 Interim Report'. BDP Energy and Environment Group. May 2007.
- UNDP. *Fuel to Change—Overcoming Vulnerability to Rising Oil Prices: Options for Asia and the Pacific*. UNDP Regional Centre in Bangkok. 2007.
- UNDP. 'Millennium Development Goals Report quoted in UNDP-GEF Biodiversity Portfolio Performance Report'. 2007.
- UNDP. *Fighting Climate Change: Human Solidarity in a Divided World. Human Development Report 2007/2008*. Palgrave Macmillan. 2007.
- UNDP. 'Equator Initiative Annual Narrative Report'. 2007.
- UNDP. 'Gender Mainstreaming: A Key Driver of Development in Environment and Energy'. Portfolio Review and Assessment. BDP Environment and Energy Group. 2007.
- UNDP and UNEP. 'Environment for the MDGs. Mainstreaming Environment in National Development Processes to Achieve the MDGs: Scaling-up the UNDP/UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative'. Final Draft Proposal. Poverty-Environment Initiative. 2007.
- UNDP, UNEP, World Bank and World Resources Institute. *World Resources 2005. The Wealth of the Poor: Managing Ecosystems to Fight Poverty*. 2005.
- UNDP, UNEP, IIED, IUCN and WRI. *Poverty-Environment Partnership. Assessing Environment's Contribution to Poverty Reduction: Environment for the MDGs*. 2005.
- UNDP, UNEP, IIED, IUCN and WRI. 'Sustaining the Environment to Fight Poverty and Achieve the MDGs: The Economic Case and Priorities for Action. Environment for the MDGs: A Message to the 2005 World Summit'. 2005.
- World Bank. 'Carbon Finance for Sustainable Development'. 2006.
- WRI. *Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Synthesis*. Island Press. Washington, DC. 2005.
- Yale University and Columbia University. 'Environmental Performance Index'. 2008.

UNDP PLANNING AND STRATEGIC DOCUMENTS

- The Clean Development Mechanism: An Assessment of Progress. 2006.
- Draft Strategic Plan 2008-2011: Accelerating Global Progress on Human Development. Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund: Annual Session. 2007.
- Environment and Energy Contribution to the Multi-Year Funding Framework. Cumulative Report 2004-2006, Revision 2. 5 March 2007.
- Environment and Energy Global Practice Strategic Planning Workshop. Goa, India, 14-16 June 2006. Final Report. BDP Environment and Energy Group. 2006.
- Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund. Draft Regional Programme Document for Africa 2008-2011: Second Regular Session. 2007.
- MDG Carbon Facility: Mobilizing Carbon Finance for the Millennium Development Goals. 2005.
- MDG Carbon Facility Booklet. 2007.
- Memorandum of Understanding Between the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Environment Programme. 24 November 2004.
- Monitoring Country Progress Towards MDG7: Ensuring Environmental Sustainability (Practice Note). 2005.
- Multi-Year Funding Framework 2000-2003. Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund: Third Regular Session. 1999.
- Multi-Year Funding Framework Cumulative Report on UNDP Performance and Results for 2004-2006. Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme

- and of the United Nations Population Fund: Annual Session. 2007.
- Poverty-Environment Initiative Joint Programme Document: Scaling-up the UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative. n.d.
- Poverty-Environment Initiative—Phase 2 Project Document. Energy and Environment Practice Area, Environmentally Sustainable Development Group, Bureau for Development Policy. 2003.
- Regional Business Plan 2007. UNDP Environmental Finance Group. 2007.
- Regional Strategy on Adaptation—Asia and the Pacific. 2007.
- Regional Strategy on Adaptation—Europe and CIS. Regional Bureau for Europe and the CIS (RBEC). n.d.
- Report on the Multi-Year Funding Framework 2000-2003. Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund: Annual Session. 2003.
- Results-Oriented Annual Report 2001. 2002.
- Second Multi-Year Funding Framework 2004-2007. Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund: Second Regular Session. 2003.
- UNDP Environmental Mainstreaming Strategy: A Strategy for Enhanced Environmental Soundness and Sustainability in UNDP Policies, Programmes and Operational Processes. 2004.
- UNDP Global Programme: 2006 Annual Report. Bureau for Development Policy (BDP). 2006.
- Water Governance Facility. SIWI Self-Assessment of the UNDP Water Governance Facility at the Stockholm International Water Institute 2005-2006. 2007.
- Climate Change at UNDP: Scaling Up to Meet the Challenge. 2007.
- Europe and the CIS UNDP-GEF Biodiversity PIR Report 2006 (Parts 1, 2 and 3). 2006.
- Global UNDP-GEF Biodiversity PPR 2006. 2006.
- International Waters. 2005 Project Implementation Review Focal Area Report. 2005.
- International Waters Programme—Delivering Results. 2007.
- Latin America and the Caribbean UNDP-GEF Biodiversity Regional PPR Report 2006 (Part 1 and 2). 2006.
- Legro, Susan and Grant Ballard-Tremeer. Lois Jensen (ed.). Heating in Transition. UNDP-GEF. 2005.
- Ministry of Environment and Tourism. Strengthening the System of National Protected Areas Project. Terms of Reference for the Subcontract No.1 Economic Analysis and Feasibility Study for Parks Financing. n.d.
- Project Implementation Review: Climate Change Focal Area Report 2006. 2006.
- Schwarz, Virginie. Public Policies Supporting Wind Energy: Examples and Results. UNDP. 2007.
- UNDP-GEF Adaptation Guidebook. Section 2. User's Guidebook. n.d.
- UNDP. Fuel Cell Bus Programme: Update. GEF Council. 2006.
- UNDP-GEF Fast Facts: Action on Water. n.d.
- UNDP Land Degradation Focal Area: Project Implementation Review 2006 Summary Report. 2006.
- UNDP-GEF 2006 Business Plan for Europe and the CIS. UNDP-GEF Regional Team. 2006.
- West and Central Africa UNDP-GEF Biodiversity Regional PPR Report 2006. UNDP-GEF Dakar Regional Coordination Unit. 2006.

UNDP-GEF PLANNING AND STRATEGIC DOCUMENTS

- Arab States UNDP-GEF Biodiversity Regional PPR Report 2006. 2006.
- Asia and the Pacific UNDP-GEF Biodiversity Regional PPR Report 2006. 2006.

UNDP OUTCOME EVALUATIONS (OUTSIDE OF CASE STUDY COUNTRIES)

- Mid-term Outcome Evaluation Regarding Improved National Capacity to Negotiate and Implement Global Environment Commitment. Under the Environmental Protection and Natural Resources

Management Project. Final Report. Zambia. 2005.

- Outcome Evaluation: UNDP Indonesian Environmental Management Programme. Strategic Results Framework 2001-2003 and 2004-2005. 2004.
- UNDP Albania: Environment Programme Outcome Evaluation. 2004.
- UNDP Pakistan: Outcome Evaluation 1998-2004. 2005.

ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

- Assessment of Development Results for India. UNDP Evaluation Office. 2002.
- Assessment of Development Results for Bulgaria. UNDP Evaluation Office. 2003.
- Assessment of Development Results for Vietnam Volumes 1 and 2. UNDP Evaluation Office. 2003.
- Assessment of Development Results for Egypt. UNDP Evaluation Office. 2004.
- Assessment of Development Results for Mozambique. UNDP Evaluation Office. 2004.
- Assessment of Development Results for Lao PDR. UNDP Evaluation Office. 2007.

REGIONAL COOPERATION FRAMEWORK EVALUATIONS

- Evaluation of UNDP's Regional Cooperation Framework for the Arab States (2002-2005). UNDP Evaluation Office. 2005.
- Evaluation of the Second Regional Cooperation Framework in Africa (2002-2006). UNDP Evaluation Office. 2007.
- Evaluation of the Second Regional Cooperation Framework in Asia and the Pacific (2002-2006). UNDP Evaluation Office. 2007.
- Evaluation of the Second Regional Cooperation Framework in Latin America and the Caribbean (2002-2006). UNDP Evaluation Office. 2007.

THEMATIC EVALUATIONS

- Evaluation of the Second Global Cooperation

Framework of UNDP. UNDP Evaluation Office. 2004.

- Tsunami Evaluation Coalition (TEC). Tsunami Evaluation Coalition: Joint Evaluation of the International Response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami—Synthesis Report. 2006.
- Evaluation of Results-Based Management at UNDP. UNDP Evaluation Office. 2007.

EXTERNAL REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS

- Damhaug, Marianne and Pernille Holtedahl. Norwegian Multilateral Support to the Energy Sector in Developing Countries. Norad. 2006.
- Scanteam. Analysis of Multilateral Funding of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency: Final Report. Oslo. 2006.

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY EVALUATIONS AND POLICY DOCUMENTS

- Focal Area Strategies and Strategic Programming for GEF-4. GEF Council. 2007.
- GEF. Climate Change Program Study. GEF Office of Monitoring and Evaluation. Washington, DC. 2004.
- GEF. GEF Annual Performance Report 2006. GEF Council (GEF/ME/G.31/1). GEF Evaluation Office. June 2007.
- IW:LEARN . Executive Summary Report on the 4th Biennial GEF International Waters Conference 31 July-3 August 2007. Cape Town, South Africa. 2007.

COUNTRY STUDIES—ALL COUNTRIES

- United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
- Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
- Country Cooperation Framework (CCA)
- Country Cooperation Framework (CCA)
- Country Programme Document (CPD)
- Results Report 2004
- Results Report 2005
- Results Report 2006
- Resident Coordinator Annual Report 2003
- Resident Coordinator Annual Report 2004

Resident Coordinator Annual Report 2005
Resident Coordinator Annual Report 2006
Assessment of Development Results
Project Reports (GEF and Non-GEF Projects)
Outcome Evaluations
MDG Reports
National Human Development Reports

BURKINA FASO

International Food Policy Research Institute.
'Cooperation Collective Action and Natural
Resources Management in Burkina Faso:
From Conflict to Consensus'. CAPRI
Working Paper No. 27. 2002.

International Food Policy Research Institute.
'Managing Resources in Erratic
Environments: An Analysis of Pastoralist
Systems in Ethiopia, Niger and Burkina
Faso'. Washington, DC. 2004.

International Food Policy Research Institute.
'The Emergence and Spreading of an
Improved Traditional Soil and Water
Conservation Practice in Burkina Faso'.
EPTD Discussion Paper No. 114. 2004.

UNDP. 'PNUD Burkina Faso: Portefeuille
Environnement-Energie'. 2007.

CHINA

Biodiversity Planning in Asia—China: What
Lessons Can Be Learned from China's
Experience of Implementing Its National
Action Plan for Biodiversity?

EC PB Bulletins and Newsletters. 'EU-China
Biodiversity Programme Joint National
Programme Office'. 2006–2007.

Khoday, Kishan. 'UNDP China—Energy and
Environment Strategy (2006–2010)'.
UNDP. November 2006.

Pool, Frank and Wen Gang. 'Energy
Conservation and GHG Emissions
Reduction in Chinese Township and Village
Enterprises—Phase II'. Project of the
Government of the People's Republic of
China (Project Number: CPR/99/G31).
Phase II Mid-Term Evaluation. UNDP and
UNIDO. October 2005.

Pool, Frank and Wen Gang. 'Energy
Conservation and GHG Emissions

Reduction in Chinese Township and Village
Enterprises—Phase II'. Project of the
Government of the People's Republic of
China (Project Number: CPR/99/G31).
Final Independent Evaluation. UNDP and
UNIDO. June 2007.

Porter, Gareth, Shi Han and Zhao Shidong.
'Energy and Environment Outcome
Evaluation'. UNDP China. May 2003.

SEPA. 'Act Ozone Friendly, Stay Sun Safe.
Achievements of the Ozone Layer
Protection in China'. In honor of the 20th
Anniversary of the Montreal Protocol. State
Environmental Protection Administration.
People's Republic of China. 2007.

KENYA

Ntiba, Micheni, Evans M. Mwangi and
Arandhati Inamdar-Willets. 'Evaluation
of the UNDP-GOK Environment and
Natural Resources Programme'. The
Government of Kenya and UNDP.
August 2003.

UNDP. 'Kenya: Evaluation of Country
Programme Action Plan Outcomes
2004–2008'. Report prepared for UNDP
and Ministry of Finance Department of
External Resources. n.d.

Wilkinson, Rona and Evans Kituyi. 'Final
Evaluation of the UNDP-GEF Project
Removal of Barriers to Energy Efficiency
and Conservation in Small and Medium
Enterprises in Kenya (KEN/98/G31,
KEN/98/031)'. GEF-KAM Industrial
Energy Efficiency Project. Eco. 10
November 2006.

FYR MACEDONIA

UNDP. 'Debt for Environment Swaps,
Financing Options and Macroeconomic
Implications'. Ministry of Environment and
Physical Planning. 2004.

MALAWI

Saka, V.W. and H. Tchale. 'Evaluation of the
Methyl Bromide Phase-out Project'. Final
Report. Environmental Affairs Department.

Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Affairs. August 2002.

BANGKOK REGIONAL CENTRE

MDG Carbon Facility: Leveraging Carbon Finance for Sustainable Development. UNDP. 2007.

UNCT. 'Advancing Human Development: UN Activities and Achievements 2004–2005'. Report of the United Nations Country Team in Thailand, n.d.

UNDP. 'Energy for Sustainable Development in the Asia-Pacific Region: Challenges and Lessons from UNDP Projects'. 2004.

UNDP. 'Survivors of the Tsunami One Year Later: UNDP Assisting Communities to Build Back Better'. 2005.

UNDP. 'Serving Asia and the Pacific Annual Report 2006'. UNDP Regional Centres in Bangkok and Colombo. 2006.

UNDP. 'Natural Resource Management Country Studies: Regional Synthesis Paper. Regional Indigenous Peoples' Programme. Regional Centre in Bangkok'. 2006.

UNDP. 'Biodiversity Regional Portfolio

Performance Review (PPR): UNDP-GEF RCU for Asia and the Pacific'. 2007.

UNDP. 'Overcoming Vulnerability to Rising Oil Prices: Options for Asia and the Pacific'. Regional Energy Programme for Poverty Reduction. UNDP Regional Centre in Bangkok. 2007.

UNDP. Environmental Finance Group. 'Regional Business Plan for 2007—Asia and the Pacific'. n.d.

UNDP and IUCN. 'Mangroves for the Future: A Strategy for Promoting Investment in Coastal Ecosystem Conservation 2007–2012'. UNDP Regional Centre in Bangkok and IUCN. 2006.

BRATISLAVA REGIONAL CENTRE

UNDP. 'Final Evaluation of the UNDP/GEF Project. RER/01/G32. Danube Regional Project: Strengthening the Implementation Capacities for Nutrient Reduction and Transboundary Cooperation in the Danube River Basin'. Draft Final Report. 2007.

UNDP. 'Capacity Development for the Strategic Environmental Assessment Application: