

Chapter 2

ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY IN UNDP

This chapter describes UNDP's role in environment and energy in the context of (i) major global developments, (ii) emerging priorities within UNDP, (iii) setting goals and objectives and reporting on them, (iv) the evolving organization of UNDP's environment and energy work, (v) UNDP's relationships with major partners, notably UNEP and GEF and (vi) the financial resources available for environment and energy at UNDP.

2.1 GLOBAL CONTEXT

UNDP's role in environment and energy since 2002 has been significantly shaped by several key developments during the last three to four decades as environment has emerged as a global concern. This chapter begins with a brief review of some of the more important landmarks as a prelude for discussing how UNDP established its goals and objectives in environment and energy since 2002.

The UN Conference on the Human Environment (the Stockholm Conference) in 1972 was the first major conference on international environmental issues and led to UNEP's establishment, a key development in the current international environmental architecture. At this point UNDP was not active in the environment field, which barely existed as a component of international development assistance.

During the late 1980s, the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED, a.k.a. the Brundtland Commission) promoted an integrated approach to improving environmental management while accelerating economic development in developing countries, introducing the concept of 'sustainable development' to a much broader audience.

UNDP's first programmatic environment role came in 1973, however, in response to the severe Sahelian drought and famine of 1968–1974. The United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office (UNSO) was created under UNDP, even though in practice UNSO was managed autonomously. In 1994 UNSO became the UNDP Office to Combat Desertification and Drought. UNSO was active in the environment field for more than 25 years, initially in providing infrastructure to access disaster areas in 22 Sahelian countries and later under a broader mandate to combat desertification and drought worldwide. This wider mandate appeared to contribute to UNSO's ultimate demise as donors perceived its earlier, more effective efforts being dissipated; as a result, they gradually phased out support for UNSO in favour of their own programmes. UNDP relocated the remaining UNSO staff to Nairobi in 2002 under a new Drylands Development Centre (DDC) that continues to provide global support for drylands development worldwide. Relevant to this evaluation, the director of DDC leads the Poverty-Environment Initiative (PEI), an important UNDP-UNEP partnership programme.

UNDP became much more involved in environment in connection with the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED, or the Earth Summit) in Rio de Janeiro. UNDP took an active role in the conference, notably through the Global Forum which for the first time brought a wide range of civil society organizations to the table in an intergovernmental meeting. The first two major multilateral environmental agreements—the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)—were adopted at UNCED. The Desertification Convention was agreed as part of Agenda 21, a plan of action for sustainable development.

The GEF was also officially launched at UNCED. It was set up specifically to fund projects and programmes that protect the global environment in developing countries and countries with economies in transition. The funding was to be new and additional, that is, not converting official development assistance to environmental programmes. Since its creation in 1991 the GEF has provided a total of \$7.4 billion in grants and generated over \$28 billion in co-financing from other sources to support close to 2,000 projects. One purpose of the GEF was to help the two major development agencies, UNDP and the World Bank, to mainstream environmental concerns into their programming. The three original implementing agencies of GEF projects were UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank, which still dominate the partnership even though other agencies were later added⁷.

In terms of specific thematic areas, UNCED, the GEF, and the multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) have had the effect of singling out biodiversity conservation and climate change as ‘global’ environmental problems as opposed to ‘local’ or ‘national’ concerns, such as water supply and sanitation, land degradation, waste management and the lack of affordable energy. This led swiftly to increased funding for these newly defined global problems and, consequently, to diminished official development assistance for what came to be defined as ‘national’ and ‘local’ problems, despite their ubiquitous presence. The desertification convention may have been an exception where ‘local’ and ‘global’ environmental problems coincided, although it wasn’t accepted as a GEF priority until early in the current decade.

International development cooperation was profoundly influenced by the adoption of eight Millennium Development Goals at the 2000 UN Millennium Summit. Goal 7 (MDG-7) is to ensure environmental sustainability, but its

targets are vague and the MDGs are silent on energy. While it can be argued that environment and energy are implicit in all of the MDGs, they certainly are not explicit.

MDG-7 originally had three targets, while a fourth was added retroactively: (i) integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes; reverse loss of environmental resources; (ii) reduce biodiversity loss, achieving, by 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of loss; (iii) reduce by half the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and sanitation and (iv) achieve significant improvement in lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers by 2020. UNDP has focused only on the first two targets because neither of the two other, quantified MDG-7 targets has been seen as central to UNDP’s mandate nor a priority of GEF’s global environmental programming. Reliance on GEF funding has in practice meant that UNDP has had limited financial resources to address these principal environmental targets of the MDGs. Furthermore, the primary mandate for water supply and urban slums lies with UNICEF and UN-Habitat respectively.

The 2005 World Summit on Sustainable Development reviewed progress towards the MDGs to date and reported the following for Goal 7: “Most countries have committed to the principles of sustainable development. But this has not resulted in sufficient progress to reverse the loss of the world’s environmental resources. Achieving the goal will require greater attention to the plight of the poor, whose day-to-day subsistence is often directly linked to the natural resources around them, and an unprecedented level of global cooperation.” This assessment helped to re-emphasize the importance of integrating environmental protection with economic development at national levels.

7. African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Inter-American Development Bank, FAO, IFAD, and UNIDO.

2.2 EMERGING PRIORITIES

Prior to UNCED, UNDP had not developed any significant environmental competence beyond the largely autonomous UNSO. In 1991 UNDP had one environmental staff member and then appointed a high-level advisor who subsequently became the Secretary-General of the Earth Summit. However, with a presence in virtually every developing country, UNDP had by this time become established as the UN's principal development agency. This enabled UNDP to emerge from Rio with the mandate of becoming the UN's "Sustainable Development Agency" and to become one of the three initial GEF implementing agencies. During the 1990s, UNDP took on a more active role, placing sustainable development advisers in the country offices and emphasizing sustainable development concerns in the country programmes.

With its focus on the interaction between people and their natural environment, the 1992 UNDP Human Development Report (HDR)⁸ emphasized the role of sustainable development in improving people's choices, both for current and future generations. Consistent with its role as a development agency, UNDP conceptualized environment within sustainable human development. The HDR 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 to broaden its focus, the HDR 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).

For UNDP the 1990s were a period of dramatic expansion in the environment field encouraged by supportive administrators, especially during the second half of the decade. From 2000 onwards, however, this trend changed significantly with a new Administrator who significantly downgraded UNDP's emphasis on and interest in environment and natural resource management, which was viewed as having relatively little to contribute to UNDP's core mandates addressing poverty and governance.

As part of a broader UNDP shift in emphasis upstream towards policy and capacity development, staff positions in forestry, agriculture and sustainable livelihoods were all eliminated, as were sustainable development advisory positions that had been established in more than 40 country offices during the 1990s. These changes demoralized UNDP's environment staff, increased dependence on GEF resources for environment and energy programming and further divided GEF-supported activities from UNDP's major programmes.

2.3 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES AND REPORTING ON PERFORMANCE

UNDP's goals and objectives for the evaluation period are identified in two MYFFs, for 2000–2003 (MYFF-1) and 2004–2007 (MYFF-2). The MYFF approach was recently succeeded by the strategic plan for 2008–11, adopted in late 2007. 'Environment and Natural Resources' was one of six strategic results frameworks (or 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 Administrator's reports to the Executive Board on MYFF-1 and MYFF-2 (Box 1).

8. *Human Development Report 1992: Global Dimensions of Human Development*. UNDP 1992.

Box 1. Performance reported in the MYFFs

MYFF-1 (2000–2003)⁹

- UNDP expended \$451 million in donor co-financing to the environment, including contributions from the Montreal Protocol and the GEF.
- The total core contribution to the sector amounted to around \$113 million, while government cost-sharing came to around \$227 million.
- ‘Sustainable energy’ has had an increasing role in country offices’ environment portfolios (70 percent of country offices reported having programmes).
- Twelve percent of the country offices’ ‘most significant achievements’ were reported in environment and natural resources.
- ‘Strengthening national policy and legal frameworks’ was the predominant mode of assistance.
- About 70 percent of outcomes were reported as achieved in environment and natural resources, although ‘monitoring and assessment of environmental sustainability’ was one of the poorest performing areas with 40 percent of outcomes reported as unlikely to be achieved by the end of 2003.
- In biodiversity, using GEF resources, UNDP promoted conservation of 27 million hectares and supported operations in 285 protected areas.
- Capacity building and technical assistance were reported from climate change mitigation projects in 111 countries. Thirty LDCs received support in preparing national action plans to adapt and respond to climate change.

MYFF-2 (2004–2007)¹⁰

- Environment and energy received \$963 million (11 percent) of total UNDP programme expenditures of \$10.6 billion.
- Annual spending on environment and energy increased by 30 percent from 2004 to 2006, largely due to GEF resources.
- Environment activities were underreported by ‘at least \$130 million’, due to many environmental projects being misclassified under other service lines.
- About 28 percent of UNDP’s environmental resources went to sustainable development frameworks and strategies, 28 percent to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and 20 percent to access to sustainable energy resources.
- During 2006, country offices reported that 34 percent of environmental outcomes were associated with support for sustainable development frameworks and strategies in 84 countries.
- \$108 million was spent on effective water governance.

During the formulation of both of the MYFFs, consideration was given internally to excluding environment as a specific priority. An internal debate on whether UNDP should be giving priority to environment, and to a lesser degree, energy, has continued until today and reappears each time UNDP enters a new round of strategic planning. The new strategic plan, however, clearly confirms UNDP’s commitment to the area.

2.4 ORGANIZATION

2.4.1 ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY PRACTICE

Significant changes in the organization and title of UNDP’s environment and energy practice have reflected key shifts in the roles, priorities and physical location of staff. This section covers the period since the early 2000s, during which time two main features stand out: continued

9. DP/2003/12.

10. DP/2007/17.

decentralization from the headquarters and a sharp decline in the number of core staff positions in environment.

As with other practice areas, the strategic development of environment and energy is the responsibility of BDP. The practice area was extensively restructured in 2001 to combine energy and environment under an Energy and Environment Group¹¹ within BDP. The role of EEG is to provide orientation and a coherent intellectual position to UNDP on global issues as well as to engage in global debates on core issues with external partners. EEG also manages the environment and energy part of the Global Cooperation Framework (GCF) as well as a number of projects, most of which are externally funded. EEG's core function is to link with global processes, provide knowledge management and ensure that all of the organization's operations in environment and energy draw upon a common understanding, lessons from experiences and a solid evidence base.

In 2000, the 'New BDP Implementation Plan' defined two general corporate roles for the bureau: (i) translating Executive Board decisions on UNDP's development priorities into specific policy instruments, products and service for practical use by global, regional and country programmes and (ii) actively engaging with regional bureaux and country offices to help provide policy support to programme countries and systematize the ensuing lessons into a more coherent corporate approach.

EEG is charged with providing intellectual leadership to the organization in environment and energy while engaging in global processes with external actors and partners. EEG is also expected to unify the organization's policies and approaches, thus ensuring that the operational units are aligned according to a consistent and informed UNDP position and common understanding. EEG and other BDP headquarters units are

intended to possess the substance matter specialist knowledge and space to focus on such policy research on behalf of the rest of UNDP, which is occupied with more operational aspects. An important function of EEG is therefore to disseminate corporate thinking and provide policy advice to the operational units, including the regional bureaux and country offices.

Organizationally EEG also includes UNDP's GEF and Montreal Protocol units. Both the GEF and Montreal Protocol units have specific mandates—to mobilize funding from their respective funding sources and support the development, management and monitoring of the ensuing projects—which differ considerably from that of the EEG as a whole.

2.4.2 COUNTRY-LEVEL OPERATIONS

At operational levels environment and energy are the responsibility of the regional bureaux and the country offices, each of which have focal staff members responsible for the practice area. At the regional bureau level, the focal point is normally one of the programme specialists who handles environment and energy practice matters in addition to her or his other duties related to certain sub-regions or countries.

The country offices are quite autonomous and work under the overall oversight of the regional bureaux. Guided by the MYFFs and now the strategic plan, country office management has full authority in allocating both financial and staff resources within the country programme. Using the Targeted Resource Allocation to Countries (TRAC) fund, country offices are allocated resources through a complex process managed by the regional bureaux. However, it is at the resident representative's discretion how these funds are used. In addition, it is expected that the country offices mobilize additional funds for their operations. The country offices report back to the headquarters through the ROAR as well as other mechanisms, such as the Resident

11. Its immediate predecessor had been named the Environmentally Sustainable Development Group (ESDG) and, prior to that, Sustainable Energy and Environment Division.

Coordinator's Annual Report. Their performance is assessed through mechanisms such as the balanced scorecard, which contains indicators related to client satisfaction, internal efficiency, learning and growth and financial resources. It is worth noting that none of the indicators in the balanced scorecard pertains to substantive performance of the programme.

All country offices have environment and energy teams that are in charge of developing and managing the programme pertaining to the practice area. This will include both upstream activities, such as policy dialogue and capacity development, as well as day-to-day operations. Most country offices rely on national execution for programmes and projects. The capacity of the country offices' environment and energy teams was assessed in connection with the country case studies and is discussed elsewhere in the report (see especially Chapter 5.5).

2.4.3 REGIONALIZATION

UNDP initiated a regionalization process in the early 2000s designed to move the headquarters services closer to its clients. First, Sub-Regional Resource Facilities (SURFs) were established in the main developing regions. Over time, some of these SURFs were converted into full-fledged regional centres set up to support the country offices with analysis, policy advice and support for national capacity development, knowledge networking and sharing of good practices. Regional centres also carry out advocacy and run their own regional programmes. The first regional centres were established in 2003–2005 in the Europe and Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) region (Bratislava) and the Asia-Pacific region (Bangkok and Colombo, with a sub-regional centre in Suva for the Pacific Islands). Regional centres for Southern Africa (Johannesburg), Latin America and the Caribbean (Panama), and the Arab States (Cairo) were established later. SURFs are still operating in West Africa (Dakar) and in the Arab States (Beirut). All of the centres, with the exception of Colombo and the Pacific centre in Suva, have policy advisers and programmes in environment and energy.

The organization of the SURFs and regional centres as well as their role vis-à-vis the country programmes has evolved even over the short period of their existence. Initiated as BDP outposts, they have transformed into joint operations with the regional bureaux. The latter now manage the regional centres, although some BDP staff still work as policy advisers. There have been efforts to define the correct balance between demand-driven work (notably, support for the country offices) and programmatic work on strategic and emerging regional issues (for example, transboundary natural resource management or environmental externalities).

2.5 MAJOR PARTNERSHIPS

Partnerships are essential for UNDP to achieve its goals. This is particularly true at the country level where UNDP works with a large number of partners, not only from the partner governments but from civil society organizations, especially, national and international NGOs, academia and the private sector. They also include donors and other UN agencies. Such partnerships were assessed in connection with the country case studies and will be featured throughout the report. Two major partnerships have been of particular importance for UNDP, those with UNEP and with GEF.

2.5.1 UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

As mentioned above, UNEP was established in 1972 as a result of the Stockholm Conference, with three core functions: (i) knowledge acquisition and assessment, (ii) environmental quality management and (iii) international supporting actions, now referred to as capacity building and development. UNEP's role was to be normative and catalytic, and it was not expected to have operational functions conducted through national programmes.

UNDP has identified a number of areas where there has been active collaboration with UNEP:

- UNDP and UNEP collaborate on a significant portfolio of approximately \$210 million in GEF-funded projects that are under joint implementation.

- UNDP and UNEP co-organized and co-managed the establishment of the Spain MDG Achievement Fund and oversaw the allocation of \$95 million in funding to 18 countries.
- UNDP and UNEP-WCMC (World Conservation Monitoring Centre) undertook a large work programme of workshops and publications linking biodiversity and the MDGs.
- On climate change, UNDP and UNEP:
 - Co-created the 'Nairobi Framework' during the Nairobi UNFCCC Conference of Parties in 2005;
 - Are implementing a joint project on capacity building for climate change negotiators in developing countries; and
 - Co-organized, with the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs and UNFCCC, the September 2007 High-Level Event on Climate Change (with participation by over 80 heads of state).
- UNDP and UNEP are now co-managing the Millennium Assessment Follow-up by co-hosting the secretariat and co-chairing the technical work.
- UNDP is supporting UNEP with its environmental management group activities to make the UN carbon neutral and 'green' UN Procurement.
- UNDP and UNEP have launched a joint sustainable energy programme.

There are many potential benefits from operational collaboration between UNDP and UNEP. Perhaps most important, UNDP has a network of country offices with considerable experience implementing national projects that UNEP does not, while UNEP has scientific and technical expertise and networks in specific environmental areas that UNDP does not.

Since GEF was established, UNEP has been the third largest implementing agency (after UNDP

and the World Bank). Joint implementation of GEF projects represents the most substantive set of collaborative activities during the period covered by the evaluation. These joint projects were noted in some of the case study countries, but were not subject to individual or detailed study as a full assessment of the relationship and division of labour between UNEP and UNDP's environment and energy programmes was beyond this evaluation's scope.

While there are many positive examples of the two organizations working well together, as listed above, there has been strong competition between UNDP and UNEP for financial resources, especially GEF resources. This has had some negative effects on relationships at both staff and management levels, exacerbated by what was perceived by UNDP as an unwelcome expansion of UNEP into country-level work. From 2007 onwards UNEP could no longer use GEF resources to support in-country work.

During the last two years, several new partnerships and memoranda of understanding on specific operational issues have emerged between the two agencies, with strong support from the UNEP Executive Director and the UNDP Administrator. The principal areas of collaboration include climate change and capacity development related to the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) and chemicals management. The willingness of senior managers of UNDP and UNEP to work together has evidently improved significantly during the last few years. This is an important development in helping build and, where necessary, improve relationships at operational levels.

Most of the current collaborative arrangements are so new that it would be premature to attempt to assess their results. This evaluation has reviewed (but not evaluated) the experience of one particular partnership, the Poverty-Environment Initiative. While relatively small (only \$12 million had been spent as the evaluation began), this is an important case study for three reasons: (i) although still a relatively young programme that is just starting

to scale up significantly after a pilot phase, PEI is one of the longest-running examples of operational collaboration between the two agencies and therefore constitutes an important test; (ii) PEI is aimed at environmental mainstreaming, which this report and others identify as needing particular encouragement and strengthening within UNDP and (iii) PEI is one of very few substantive UNDP programmes in environment that does not rely on GEF resources.

2.5.2 GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

GEF provides grants and concessional resources for projects and programmes that address six complex global environmental issues: biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, climate change, international waters, land degradation, ozone layer depletion and persistent organic pollutants (POPs). As GEF started up in the early 1990s, UNDP appointed regional GEF advisors who were physically located in the respective regional bureaux. Starting around 2000, a separate UNDP-GEF team was formed reporting to the head of BDP.

When GEF was first established, considerable emphasis was put on the funding stream being new and additional, rather than being existing development assistance redirected for the environment. However, contrary to this goal, GEF soon became the most important source (sometimes the only source) of international financing for government environmental programmes, especially in the LDCs and SIDS.

Consistent with GEF's mandate and priorities, the main focus of UNDP's GEF team has been projects generating significant global environmental benefits, that is, benefits reaching beyond the boundaries of the countries in which projects were being implemented, rather than national or local benefits. While there are clearly projects that can deliver both national and global benefits, and UNDP staff have often worked

hard to stretch GEF criteria to support such projects, generating national benefits is not the main purpose of GEF.

2.6 FINANCIAL RESOURCES

While reliable data on UNDP's overall use of financial resources for environment and energy have been hard to obtain, there are strong indications that core-funded environment and energy activities were in decline as UNDP was progressively increasing its share of GEF resources. UNDP's overall core budget declined significantly during the 1990s, from a high of \$928 million in 1994 to \$634 million in 2000, recovering to \$842 by 2004. By then UNDP was mobilizing nearly \$100 million of GEF funding per year. In response, UNDP came to rely more and more on GEF resources to support environment and energy programmes. During the most recent GEF funding phase (2003–2006), UNDP had the highest value of project approvals among the GEF implementing agencies.

It has been suggested that environment and energy resources from the core budget were underreported by about \$130 million during 2004–2006 due to environmental projects being recorded by country offices as governance or poverty activities. This estimate of *underreporting* may well be correct, although environment inputs were significantly *overreported* in at least two of our case study countries. Further investigation revealed that the financial reporting database used by headquarters to capture core resource use under MYFF-2 was unreliable. The evaluation team was then advised to seek more accurate data directly from the country offices. Table 2, drawn from the database in use at headquarters, provides only an indicative general overview of how financial resources were allocated among the priority areas.

To date UNDP-GEF project approvals have a cumulative total value of more than \$2.3 billion.¹² The average annual value of UNDP-GEF projects approved has increased steadily from about \$70 million in the early 1990s to \$100 million in the

12. The most readily available data is based on GEF approvals, although this does not give a full picture of activity levels due to the often considerable time lag between project approval and the start of implementation.

late 1990s, \$170 million around 2000 and over \$200 million since 2002. UNDP has also increased its share of GEF projects relative to the other implementing agencies. During the most recent GEF funding period, UNDP's share of GEF programming reached 43 percent, more than any other implementing agency. UNDP's cumulative average share since 1992 is about 37 percent.¹³

Within the entire set of UNDP-GEF projects to date, the most important focal areas have been climate change (36 percent), biodiversity (30 percent) and international waters (13 percent). Projects combining two or more focal areas account for 14 percent. Biodiversity has declined over time in relative, but not absolute, terms while climate change has had a stable share since about 2000. Other focal areas have been much smaller: land degradation (4 percent), POPs (2 percent), ozone depletion (1 percent), and integrated ecosystem management (<1 percent), largely because these are still new areas that (with the exception of ozone depletion) were not eligible for GEF

funding during the first decade. Land degradation and POPs have each grown rapidly since 2002, however, and currently account for 14 and 12 percent of approvals, respectively. International waters funding has declined in both relative and absolute terms during the last five to seven years.

In regional terms, the overall data are skewed by unusually high approvals for Asia and the Pacific and Latin America and the Caribbean and low Africa approvals from 1998 to 2001. Since then the pattern has been more consistent, with Africa and the Asia-Pacific region sharing 55-60 percent of approvals fairly equally, while Latin America and the Caribbean received about 20 percent. The Arab States have received about 8 percent over the last ten years, and Europe and the CIS have averaged 15 percent overall.

Comparing focal areas across regions, the total value of approved projects for climate change has exceeded biodiversity in Asia and the Pacific during every GEF phase since 1994, while

Table 2. Total UNDP Environment and Energy Expenditures by Service Line during MYFF-2 Phase¹⁴

| Service line | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | Total | % |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Frameworks and strategies for sustainable development | 61.7 | 90.1 | 110.4 | 262.2 | 28 |
| Effective water governance | 26.0 | 41.6 | 40.1 | 107.7 | 11 |
| Access to sustainable energy services | 52.6 | 59.7 | 76.1 | 188.4 | 20 |
| Sustainable land management and desertification | 15.5 | 19.2 | 14.2 | 48.9 | 5 |
| Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity | 86.0 | 86.7 | 90.7 | 263.4 | 28 |
| Ozone and POPs | 25.9 | 27.3 | 14.1 | 67.3 | 7 |
| Others | 0.9 | 6.3 | 4.5 | 11.7 | 1 |
| Total | 268.6 | 330.9 | 350.1 | 949.7 | 100 |

13. These percentages include programmes implemented by UNDP on behalf of GEF 'corporate', notably the GEF Small Grants Programme.

14. Includes expenditures from core resources, bilateral contributions, thematic trust funds and related co-finance, as well as recipient government contributions.

biodiversity has led climate change in every other region. Biodiversity funding has been more than double climate change funding in Latin America and the Caribbean, and slightly less than double climate change in Africa. In Latin America and the Caribbean this pattern has been more or less stable over time, while in Africa climate change has exceeded biodiversity since 2002 after having been much lower previously.

The implementing agencies receive a flat fee of 9 percent from GEF for the projects they

implement. UNDP has recently obtained access to additional funding, notably the Spain MDG Achievement Fund. This fund was launched in 2007 to programme over €500 million over four years through the UN system, of which \$95 million has been allocated for environment and climate change projects. As this fund has not yet disbursed significant programme funds, it fell outside the scope of this evaluation. UNDP has also reported Japan's 2007 commitment of \$92.1 million to EEG for climate change adaptation work.