



Small Grants Programme

MACEDONIA

Country Programme Strategy

Draft v.3 [English]

Skopje, Macedonia

DECEMBER 2006

Table of contents

List of acronyms.....	4
1. Introduction	5
1.1.1. Rationale and Justification for the Selection of the Geographic and Thematic Focus	5
2. Background Information and Analysis of Context.....	5
2.1. <i>Economic and Political Situation</i>	5
2.2. <i>Environmental Situation</i>	6
2.2.1. GEF Focal Areas.....	6
2.2.2. Relevant Environmental Conventions and Treaties	10
2.3. <i>Institutional and Governance Context in the field of environment</i>	11
2.4. <i>Poverty and Poverty Reduction</i>	13
2.5. <i>Indigenous Peoples and Vulnerable Groups</i>	13
2.6. <i>Donor Programming Context</i>	14
2.6.1. Opportunities for Complementarities	16
3. GEF SGP Country Programme Strategy	16
3.1. <i>Introduction to the GEF and SGP</i>	16
3.2. <i>SGP Programming ‘Niche’</i>	17
3.3. <i>Country Program Strategy Impacts to be achieved (2005 – 2010)</i>	17
3.3.1. Environment – Global Environmental Impacts	17
3.3.2. Impacts on Poverty Reduction	17
3.3.3. Contribution to MDGs.....	17
3.3.4. Empowerment Impacts.....	17
3.4. <i>Country Program Strategy Outcomes</i>	17
3.5. <i>Project Outputs</i>	17
3.5.1. Strategic Pipeline	17
3.5.2. Local Priorities	17
3.5.3. Priorities between October 2005 and February 2007	17
3.5.4. Priorities between March 2007 and February 2008.....	17
3.5.5. Priorities between March 2008 and February 2010.....	17
3.6. <i>Monitoring/ Evaluation and Reporting under SGP</i>	17
3.6.1. Monitoring Plan	17
3.7. <i>Reporting Plan</i>	17
4. Bibliography:.....	17
5. Annexes	17
5.1. <i>Annex 1 - Map of the Republic of Macedonia</i>	17
5.2. <i>Annex 2 - The Logical Framework (2005-2010)</i>	17
5.3. <i>Annex 3 - Resource Mobilization Strategy</i>	17
5.4. <i>Annex 4 - Sustainability Program Strategy</i>	17
5.5. <i>Annex 5 - Knowledge Management Strategy</i>	17
5.6. <i>Annex 6 - Relevant Environmental Conventions, Treaties and Trilateral/ Bilateral Agreements (Macedonia)</i>	17
5.7. <i>Annex 7 - List of Indicators for SGP Global Impact Reporting</i>	17
5.8. <i>Annex 8 - Kinds of possible project activities (not as only one individual exclusive activity) which might be eligible for funding under GEF SGP Macedonia</i> 17	17

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AC	Association of Citizens (a.k.a. NGO)
BD	Biological Diversity
BSAP	Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
CARDS	(European) Community Assistance for Reconstruction, Development and Stabilization
CC	Climate Change
EC	Energy Conservation
EC	European Commission
EE	Energy Efficiency
EU	European Union
FSP	Full Sized Project (above \$1m and funded by the GEF)
GTZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (German Development Agency)
IW	International Waters
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
KfW	Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau Bank
LD/SLM	Land Degradation/ Sustainable Land Management
LSG	Local Self Government
MEPP	Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning (of Macedonia)
MSP	Medium Sized Project (up to \$1m and funded by the GEF)
NSC	National Steering Committee (of the GEF/SGP)
POPs	Persistent Organic Pollutants
RE	Renewable Energy
RES	Renewable Energy Sources
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SECO	Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs
SEA	Secretariat for European Affairs (Government of Macedonia)
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
WB	World Bank

1. INTRODUCTION

The **purpose** of this document is to provide a programmatic guidance for implementation of the Global Environment Facility Small Grants Programme (GEF SGP) in the Republic of Macedonia in a 5-year period (2005–2010). Within GEF SGP Third Operational Phase, and beyond, its attempt is to connect the SGP Global Strategic Framework, GEF Operational Strategy with the national strategies linked to the environment and sustainable development. The document is based on the **principle** that local people can and should perform activities resulting in local and global environmental benefits, leading to their empowerment and contributing to poverty reduction. The **target audience** addressed in this document are the project proponents, national and local government agencies, educational institutions, donors, National Steering Committee and the GEF SGP Macedonia itself. GEF SGP adopts the **human rights based approach** and ensures pro-active participation of the vulnerable groups throughout its implementation.

1.1.1. Rationale and Justification for the Selection of the Geographic and Thematic Focus

The **Republic of Macedonia** is a land-locked country in the central part of the Balkan Peninsula, in an area of high seismic activity, positioned between 40°50'16" and 42°22'21" North Latitude, and between 20°27'32" and 22°18'04" East Longitude. It borders Albania to the west (191 km), Greece to the south (262 km), Bulgaria to the east (165 km) and Serbia to the north (231 km). The total length of the border is 849 km, rounding an area of 25,713 km². The country has a population of 2.08 million, with 0.44 million in the capital, Skopje¹.

The gross domestic product (GDP) of Macedonia is US\$ 4,842 million (US\$ 2,382 per capita), with 15.0% of GDP derived from manufacturing industry, 13.6% from the wholesale and retail trade, repair of motor vehicles, motorcycles and personal and household goods, and 11.3% from agriculture, hunting and forestry². The main industries are based on natural resources: coal (brown coal), ferrous and non-ferrous metals (chromium, lead and zinc), textiles and wood products. The country is also developing as a tourism centre – particularly around the Ohrid, Prespa and Dojran Lakes.

In the GEF/SGP perspective, having in mind the size of the Republic of Macedonia, the whole country shall be considered as one geographic area with an accent on activities in the following focal areas: biodiversity conservation, protection of international waters, mitigation of the effects of the climate change, combating land degradation, and, to the extent possible, the elimination of the use of the POPs.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS OF CONTEXT

2.1. Economic and Political Situation

Macedonia is a parliamentary democracy with an executive government and an independent judicial branch with a Constitutional Court. The Parliament consists of a 120 seats. Macedonia is divided into 84 municipalities, including 10 in the City of Skopje, with their own local governments with high degree of decentralization.

Independence was achieved in 1991 after the collapse of the Yugoslavian Federation. There then began the processes of its recognition by other states throughout the world and the establishment of diplomatic relations. In 1993 it became a member of the United Nations. Euro-Atlantic accession is a

¹ Release of the State Statistical Office "Census of Population, Households and Dwellings in the Republic of Macedonia, 2002, no. 2.1.3.30 - Final data -"

² Report of the State Statistical Office "Gross Domestic Product, 2005, no. 3.1.5.06"

major policy objective driving the government agenda. In 2001 a conflict erupted, followed by peace negotiations between ethnic Albanians and ethnic Macedonians, which resulted in the *Ohrid Framework Agreement*. Compliance with the provision of the agreement is a key challenge in Macedonia's accession to the EU and NATO.³

2.2. Environmental Situation

Physical planning, environmental protection and nature conservation are fundamental constitutional values of Macedonia. Everyone has the right to healthy environment as well as responsibility to protect and improve it.

The Republic of Macedonia continues to face same problems in the environmental sector that have been specific to most of the economies in transition in Central and Eastern Europe. Efficient institutional and administrative capacities for implementation of the environmental legislation are still not sufficient. At the same time, financial resources required for ensuring environmental sustainability are limited, largely due to the very restrictive budgetary policy, "assisted" by not so adequate allocation of funds. Some regions are facing poor quality of the air and surface water, resulting particularly from a weak monitoring and enforcement of the legislation. Solid waste management is still inadequate, although many efforts have been done to resolve the issue at least at the strategic and policy level. Situation with wastewater treatment, both domestic and industrial, is even worse, with missing or undeveloped infrastructure. Despite numerous initiatives by the Government and NGOs, the level of public awareness on the linkages between sustainable development and current trends in environmentally responsible practices, such as waste minimization and separation, recycling and energy saving, is still unsatisfactory. Same is happening with the level of public involvement in the environment-related decision-making, though the process of decentralisation is showing positive changes at local level.

Concerning environmental legislation, in the last couple of years, the Parliament has passed several legislations, including the Law on Protection of Nature, Law on Waste Management, Law on Quality of Ambient Air, and the key framework Law on Environment that are fully approximated and consistent with the relevant EU Directives and standards representing a model for harmonization of the remaining legislation. In addition, the Law on Waters, which is in the procedure of adoption, is largely consistent with both EU legislation, and the UN and the Council of Europe conventions pertaining to the environment.

2.2.1. GEF Focal Areas

1. Biodiversity

In accordance with the mandate of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, SGP takes an ecosystem approach to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. SGP projects tackle threats to globally significant biodiversity through local action in all types of ecosystems - arid and semi-arid, coastal, marine, freshwater, forest and mountain zones. SGP focuses its support for community-based biodiversity projects in line with the four strategic priorities of the GEF:

- Catalysing sustainability of protected areas
- Mainstreaming biodiversity into production systems
- Ensuring the fair and equitable sharing of benefits from genetic resources
- Strengthening capacity to disseminate information on emerging biodiversity issues

The decentralized nature of SGP allows for a diversity of approaches to address a wide range of threats, including preservation of agro-biodiversity, apiculture, sustainable harvesting of non-timber forest products, agro-forestry, community monitoring of natural resources, organic agriculture and product certification, eco-tourism, and equitable sharing of benefits from genetic resources.

³ Source: UNDP CO Macedonia, 2005

Biodiversity issues of priority for SGP have been determined taking into consideration the strategic approaches established within the Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan for Macedonia (BSAP, 2004), as well as the recommendations given in the framework of the efforts to develop a comprehensive and strategic approach towards capacity building to meet the global environmental challenges⁴. Out of 20 priorities identified in the BSAP and NCSA based on scale and level of the issue, the following are selected:

- Reducing the “members” of the list on the *threatened species and habitats* (especially wetlands and forests)
- Improvement of the public awareness for: (1) biodiversity in general and (2) importance of the measures required for the conservation of biological diversity
- Integration of the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity within the overriding priorities of the country (economic and social development, and poverty eradication)
- Overcome the lack of information and knowledge concerning biodiversity as a basic prerequisite for successful planning and the conducting of conservation measures, as well as establishing and maintaining programmes for scientific and technical education and training
- Monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of measures concerning conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in order to measure their progress and success regularly

2. International Waters

SGP contributes to the protection of international waters through support to initiatives led by community groups and non-government organizations that prevent degradation of water bodies shared by two or more countries. Promoting innovative local solutions to marine and freshwater environmental problems, SGP works with communities living near threatened water bodies to prevent the release of harmful substances, such as persistent organic pollutants (known as POPs) and heavy metals that cannot be neutralized by marine and freshwater ecosystems, or that accumulate in living organisms. SGP focuses its support for community-led international waters projects on three areas:

- Addressing seriously threatened water bodies and transboundary threats to their ecosystems, such as pollution, overexploitation of living and non-living resources, habitat degradation, and non-indigenous species
- Using integrated approaches to land and water resource management to prevent the degradation of international waters
- Overcoming barriers to the adoption of best practices to limit contamination of international waters

High priority is placed upon:

- Preventing ecological degradation of critical aquatic habitats (including wetlands, shallow waters and reefs) that sustain biodiversity
- Reducing unsustainable use of freshwater and marine resources resulting from over-fishing and excessive withdrawal of freshwater
- Identifying innovative ways to minimize agricultural run-off by improving soil management practices and avoiding use of contaminants, such as chemical fertilizers

The assessments and reviews of national water conditions presented in relevant reports are generally outdated and are constraining the planning and performance of nation wide activities. However, these may be sufficient for locally based activities that will prevent the pollution of local waters by mitigating and/or eliminating local pollution sources⁵.

Virtually all running waters in Macedonia fall under the category International Waters. The list below presents the issues of priority in the water sector in Macedonia:

- Need of an integrated approach to water resources management;
- Increase enforcement of legal requirements on water quality or, in some cases
- Sufficient potable water supply systems in the rural areas;
- Improvement of the irrigation systems for agricultural purposes and efficient irrigation water use

⁴ Capacity Self-Assessment within the Thematic Area of Biodiversity, NCSA, MEPP, Jan 2004

⁵ Draft NEAP, MEPP, 2005

- Increase willingness to pay for water services resulting in a higher rate of fee collection
- Sufficient data on water consumption by different users
- Reduce large quantities of erosion sediments in the rivers and lakes;
- Improve the water quality in the wetlands/ Reduce the urban and industrial waste water discharge in the wetlands/ Control the water abstraction and visitors/ tourists' activities

3. Climate Change

Working with communities to balance climate change concerns with local people's development needs is one of the central elements of SGP's activities. It is the means by which the GEF supports implementation of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) at the community level. Over the past decade, SGP supported climate change activities have produced innovative approaches and experiences, demonstrating community by community how to achieve development goals in a climate-friendly way.

SGP projects address climate change through the following approaches:

- Removal of barriers to energy efficiency and energy conservation
- Promotion of the adoption of renewable energy by removing barriers and reducing implementation costs
- Promotion of environmentally sustainable transport
- Integrated ecosystem management for projects with crosscutting issues related to energy, climate change and biodiversity conservation

The present status within the different sectors that address the climate change issue in Macedonia is not satisfactory. Poor economic situation superimposed by the prolonged transitional period and regional political instability have caused difficulties with the measurements of GHG emission, implementation of environmental friendly technologies, reconstruction and rehabilitation of existing energy sources, research on climate change impact on human life and ecosystems, etc.

The need for the adequate replacement of the existing technologies (and attitudes) with contemporary ones, characterized by lower energy consumption, improved productivity, lower emission of pollutants, closed loop cycles, and other climate change-friendly items, is evident. However, the economic activity in Macedonia is still at unsatisfactory level affecting all aspects of life, including the environmental issue.

It is a prevailing opinion that the available human resources are adequate for successful actions that are aimed at improving the climate change situation. There is a need for training and other types of improvement of existing knowledge and skills, yet this could be achieved with an efficient international transfer of experience and knowledge supported by the international community and donor organizations, such as UNDP.

4. Sustainable Land Management (Land Degradation)

Human activities can degrade the land and negatively impact water and biological resources, affecting the lives and livelihoods ability of vulnerable communities. Evidence of degradation can be seen when land resource potential is lost through desertification and deforestation. Activities that contribute to land degradation include: soil erosion, denudation, pollution, loss of organic matter, loss of fertility and vegetation cover, invasive species, habitat conversion (whether urban or agricultural) and aquifer degradation.

Land Degradation, primarily deforestation and desertification, was eligible for funding during the first decade of GEF if it related to three GEF Focal Areas (Biodiversity, International Waters and Climate Change). In October 2002, the GEF Assembly approved Land Degradation as a new focal area taking into account the objectives of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). The Sixth Conference of the Parties to the UNCCD in 2003 formally accepted the GEF as a financial mechanism of the Convention.

SGP projects that focus on land degradation support community-led sustainable land management projects in the following areas:

- Strengthening capacity at the community/local levels to support sustainable land management

- Supporting the development of agreements and modalities for the management of transboundary natural resources through sustainable land management
- Promoting sustainable agricultural practices, such as crop diversification to reduce the risk of failure and judicious use of fertilizers and other agrochemicals
- Soil and water conservation through improved tillage methods; agro-forestry approaches to reduce erosion; promotion of suitable land uses (including protection from farming where necessary); and improved management of agricultural waste
- Sustainable rangeland/pasture management and ground water conservation. This involves the strengthening of viable traditional systems and mechanisms to resolve conflicts over land use; community-based protection and rehabilitation; fire management; and the replenishment of ground water
- Forest and woodland management, especially in non-protected forests through the strengthening of viable indigenous management systems; rehabilitation of degraded deforested areas

Macedonia in 2004 has performed the National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA) for the implementation of the three Rio Conventions: on Biodiversity, on Climate Change and on Combating Desertification. The thematic report on LD/SLM is, so far, the sole relevant paper on this subject. National priority for Macedonia is the preparation of Strategy and Action Plan for LD/SLM. A GEF MSP project submitted by UNDP and MEPP is to be approved for implementation entitled: Strengthening Sustainable Land Management in the Republic of Macedonia; SGP is in coordination with the two institutions and discussions were held to have synergies and cooperation in the SLM activities on local and national level.

The SGP activities will focus on the following areas:

- Strengthening capacity at the local levels to support sustainable land management.
- Promoting sustainable agricultural practices, such as crop diversification to reduce the risk of failure and judicious use of fertilizers and other agrochemicals.
- Soil and water conservation through improved tillage methods; agro-forestry approaches to reduce erosion; promotion of suitable land uses; and improved management of agricultural waste.
- Sustainable rangeland/pasture management and ground water conservation. This involves the strengthening of viable traditional systems and mechanisms to resolve conflicts over land use; community-based protection and rehabilitation; fire management; and the replenishment of ground water.
- Forest and woodland management, especially in non-protected forests through the strengthening of viable indigenous management systems; rehabilitation of degraded deforested areas.

5. Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)

The SGP Strategy on Reducing and Eliminating POPs, guides Country Programmes and multi-country Strategic Projects on the development and implementation of projects to serve more communities for a larger global environmental impact. National Implementation Plans for the Stockholm Convention (NIPs) will form the basis for future country-level GEF support on POPs. Therefore, based on the convention, SGP country priorities emerge from the NIPs. Since NIPs are going to be the framework for a country to develop and implement, in a systematic and participatory way, priority policy, and regulatory reform, capacity building, and investment programs; GEF SGP Country Programmes, their partners and grantees (especially women and children health groups) are trying to become part of the discussions, development, and, in the case of Macedonia, part of the implementation surrounding the NIP.

POPs Project Priorities of SGP:

- *Targeted (foundational) capacity building*, which refers to the preparation of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) providing a framework for the development and implementation of policy and regulatory reforms, capacity building, and investments, as well as awareness raising among different stakeholders, and dissemination of information on integrated management of POPs, including best management practices.
- *Implementation of Policy/Regulatory Reforms and Investments*, which refers to the actual realization of what is planned in the NIPs.

- *Demonstration of Innovative and Cost-Effective Technologies and Practices*, which may include non-combustion technologies for disposal of products, clean production, phase-out of PCBs, alternatives to DDT, and practices with multi-focal area benefits among others.

Macedonian National Implementation Plan (NIP) after two years of preparation was published in 2004. Its development was funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), and coordinated by the National POPs Office at the MEPP.

One of the NIP activities under the Strategy and Action plan, and according to the provisions of the Aarhus and Stockholm Conventions, are those for raising public awareness on POPs and addresses the target groups identified in both conventions. It foresees two directions for acting: (1) introducing the general public, and (2) introducing the concerned professionals (management and directly exposed workers). The SGP projects should be tailored to the level of the recipients, thus they have to be easily comprehensible.

2.2.2. Relevant Environmental Conventions and Treaties⁶

The following environmental conventions ratified by the Government of Macedonia are relevant to the GEF SGP focal areas. Full list of all environmental conventions, treaties and bilateral/ trilateral agreements are listed in [Annex 6](#).

Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention)

The Convention was ratified by means of the Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia” No. 40/99).

Energy Charter Protocol on Energy Efficiency and Related Environmental Aspects

The Protocol was ratified by means of the Law on Ratification of the final document of the European Conference on Energy Charter (“Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia” No. 16/98).

Convention on Biological Diversity – CBD

The Convention was ratified by means of the Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia” No. 54/97).

Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitats (Ramsar Convention)

The Convention has been ratified by means of the Decree on Ratification (“Official Gazette of the SFRY” No. 9/77).

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change – UNFCCC

The Convention was ratified by means of the Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia” No. 61/97).

Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

The Protocol was ratified by means of the Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia” No. 49/04).

Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants

The Republic of Macedonia signed the Convention in Stockholm, Sweden, on 22.05.2001. The Convention was ratified by means of the Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia” No. 17/04)

United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) in Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa

The Convention was ratified by means of the Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia” No. 13/02).

⁶ Sources: Answers on the Questionnaire for the EU accession process, 2004; NEAP 2, MEPP, 2005

2.3. Institutional and Governance Context in the field of environment

The main stakeholders in the field of environment in Macedonia include the following actors⁷:

- a. National government represented through the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning, and the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Economy, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education and Science
- b. Units of the Local Self-Government (LSG)
- c. Stakeholders in private and public sectors including business and branch organizations
- d. Other educational and scientific and interest organization
- e. Associations of Citizens (ACs) a.k.a. NGOs
- f. The international community and donors

a. National Government

The Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning (MEPP) is charged by law to lead in providing conditions for citizens, companies and institutions of Macedonia to fulfil their rights and responsibilities towards environment, nature and physical space. According the law, MEPP performs activities concerning: monitoring of the state of the environment; water, soil, flora, fauna, air against pollution; protection against noise and radiation; protection of biological diversity, geological diversity, national parks and protected areas; restoration of polluted segments of the environment; proposes measures for solid waste treatment; spatial planning; spatial information system; supervision within the scope of its competences; and performs other activities stipulated by law. MEPP also play its role by: development and implementation of policy, legislation and programmes, assessment and permitting of interventions in the environment, physical planning at the national level, securing environmental public services at the national level, sound management of natural resources under its authority, investment of public funds and mobilization of others resources and international cooperation. The MEPP works together with other ministries, institutions and local government; relies on the services of the environmental market; and fulfils the expectations of citizens with transparency, integrity and quality of its services.

Other key governmental institutions that have responsibilities that directly or indirectly relate to the environment are: the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Economy; the Ministry of Transport and Communication; the Ministry of Health; the Ministry of Economy; the Ministry of Local Self Government; the Ministry of Finance; the Ministry of Culture; the Ministry of Justice; the Ministry of Education and Science; the Ministry of Defence, and the Ministry of Interior. Also the Sector for European Integration and various administrations related to the Ministries have certain responsibilities in relation to environment.

b. Units of the Local Self Governments (LSG)

The implementation of environmental policy is to be effectuated largely at the local level. The LSG are responsible for e.g. urban and rural planning including construction permits; general environmental protection measures within water, air, nature, noise and non-ionising radiation; issuance of B environmental permits to industry⁸; Strategic Environment Assessments (SEAs) on local strategies, plans and programmes; environmental infrastructure for water supply, waste water treatment, handling and treatment of municipal waste and other types of non-hazardous waste; construction and maintenance of local roads; maintenance of green parks and recreational areas; including allied monitoring, inspection and enforcement.

c. Private and public sector, business and branch organizations

The business sector as such has undergone considerable changes during the last several years, most important being the 'privatisation process' of the once 'state owned' big and medium sized companies. The business community and company managers need to become more active partners in the framing and pursuing of environmental policy. Awareness and involvement of the private sector provides for

⁷ Source: NEAP, MEPP, 2005

⁸ According the provisions under Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control (IPPC), the permits for installation listed as group A will be issued by the MEPP and installation listed as group B will be issued on the local level by the units of the LSGs.

more effective environmental policy and environmental standards are not only expected to be a competitive parameter in future market introductions and expansions, but also to be a mandatory precondition for the free movement of goods and services not only vis-à-vis the European Union but also world wide. Particular attention is needed in regard to the new permitting system that derives from the IPPC Directive and with respect also to the voluntary agreements (eco labelling, EMS, EMAS, ISO, etc). An enhanced and highly qualified dialogue between the environmental authorities and the business sector can substantially contribute to identifying the most appropriate strategy to improve and/or introduce new environmental standards and to investigate more into options for an enhanced use of incentive-based financial mechanisms including economic instruments. The reorganised Chamber of Commerce and the new Association of Chambers of Commerce can come to play an important role here. The bigger companies are often able to represent their interests and to present their views. However, to ensure a balanced approach that takes proper account also of views and impacts with regard to small enterprises, it is important that institutional mechanisms are identified to also bring these actors on board in a more formalised manner.

d. Other scientific and interest organization

Academia and other similar organizations also have a potential role to play. This involves for example such institutions as the Macedonian Academy of Science and Arts and Universities/Faculties.

In this regard, the *local consultancy base* is worth mentioning as well. The very dynamic context, in which Macedonian policy making evolves, also in the field of environment, implies that the local consultancy resource base comes to be an important source of information, knowledge and expertise. This applies in particular to important strategic areas such as economics and finance, where the national resource base is still scarce compared to the needs.

e. Non Governmental Organizations (NGO)

In Macedonia the terms “Non Governmental Associations (NGOs) and Community Based Organizations (CBOs) are officially recognized as **Associations of Citizens (AC)** regulated with the Law on Associations of Citizens and Foundations (Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia No. 31/1998). These AC are and act as legal subjects with not-for-profit, non-religious, non-political postulates and activities.

In this regard the organizations applicable to the GEF SGP are the Associations of Citizens officially registered in the Central Court Registry.

They are voluntary (though not necessarily operating only with volunteers), performing organized activities and are autonomous from the State. In most assistance programs these AC are seen to perform the two basic functions: (1) of service delivery; and (2) of advocacy.

Evidence of citizen-driven initiatives at the local level is not so difficult to be found. Citizens are more frequently uniting together with their AC usually on a local area/region to solve a problem involving their local authorities. Associations of Citizens and their members do have satisfactory capacities to plan, organize and conduct joint activities achieving in being “visible” mainly on local level, though there are evidences for successes in changing/amending national policies/legislation.

Macedonian ACs, trained by various expert institutions and donor agencies, are very good in participatory approach in designing their activities/projects. Associations of Citizens’ family is very diverse and more committed to social, voluntary actions – not ‘spoiled’ by too good access of funds. Funds are limited, rare, so more enthusiasm and commitment can be seen as replacement of financial capital. Human resources are present and are worth of support. Macedonian Associations of Citizens have the moral capital, necessary skills, good knowledge and will for cooperation with other partners with openness to work with local/national government.

The ongoing process of “decentralization from state to local level” is requiring for substantial and often mandatory participation of the local population in regulative and executive procedures primarily on local and later on national level. Thus, this is an advantageous opportunity for the Associations of Citizens to improve and enhance their absorbing and performing capacities.

For SGP Macedonia this is posing special possibilities to take its part in creating partnerships of all above mentioned stakeholders that would be leaded by the Associations of Citizens whose activities would impact for safer environment, reduced poverty and increased empowerment.

Other topics for consideration for the GEF SGP for Macedonia:

- Coalitions/Partnerships are valuable for growing the political weight of the civil society sector.
- Capable source of guidance and assistance for SGP and Associations of Citizens is in the form of 12 "NGO Support Centres"⁹.
- Citizens' Information Centres at the premises of the Local Self Governments run by the AC¹⁰

2.4. Poverty and Poverty Reduction

The GEF SGP Macedonia will support project activities that have socio-economic benefits, i.e. will involve demonstration and/or investment activities, creating conditions for local and/or regional development thus contributing to environment-friendly community income-generation. These activities should lead to economic growth and should extend into a mechanism for nailing the poverty and unemployment.

GEF SGP in Macedonia is aware that could not eradicate the poverty as such, but it will certainly strive to motivate and support local activities leading to results such as creation and maintenance of partnerships for protection of global environment and sustainable income generation thus reducing poverty.

Poverty, by its nature, is a multidimensional phenomenon. This is why efforts to reduce poverty may not rely solely on economic policies, but also on complex and coordinated measures in several areas. The process of transition in Macedonia resulted in intensive changes in the socio-economic life and the social structure of the population. The prolonged transition along with lagging economic growth to a large extent was accompanied by impoverishment and social exclusion of a significant portion of its citizens.¹¹

The process of impoverishment, which gained in intensity at the beginning of the 90's, also continued in the period 2000-2004. The human poverty index shows that, on average, 55.1% of the total population is suffering from various forms or flaws of human poverty. The high human poverty index is a result of the high rate of long-term unemployment and the high percentage of population illiterate in functional terms. The percentage of household living below the poverty line is in a constant increase, reaching 30.2% in 2003.

2.5. Indigenous Peoples and Vulnerable Groups

Indigenous Peoples are those people whose ancestors inhabited a place or country when persons from another culture or ethnic background arrived on the scene and dominated them through conquest, settlement, or other means and who today live more in conformity with their own social, economic, and cultural customs and traditions than with those of the country of which they now form a part. (Also: "native peoples" or "tribal peoples".)¹² Macedonia does not have indigenous peoples as described above.

The GEF SGP will give priority to the vulnerable groups for their inclusion in the programme either as leading or as partner stakeholder-s in the project proposals. The **vulnerable groups** in Macedonia are those particularly disadvantaged cause of a certain consequence. These are the resettled, poorest, those without legal title to assets, households headed by women, ethnic minorities. These also include other groups, such as isolated communities, the disabled or those unable to work (physically, mentally or healthy-wise), the rural elderly people, the unemployed, the resettled peoples due to natural disaster or due to the armed conflict in 2001

⁹ Founded by the FOSI-M, Swiss SDC and EU (EAR)

¹⁰ Founded by the Local Government Reform Project, USAID

¹¹ Source: MDG Report, Macedonia, 2005

¹² Source: Global Biodiversity Assessment (GBA)

2.6. Donor Programming Context

European Union: Community Assistance for Reconstruction, Development and Stabilization (CARDS) and Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance (IPA)

Past EU assistance in the area of *environment* (under **CARDS**) encompasses approximation to EU legislation, accompanying development of environmental strategy and institutional reform as well as mitigating pollution stemming from old environmental problem areas and from industrial sites. The CARDS assistance is implemented through the European Agency for Reconstruction and will be present in Macedonia until 31 December 2008 in order to complete the ongoing and future projects financed through CARDS assistance.

European Commission on 09 November 2005 issued its opinion on the candidacy of the Republic of Macedonia for EU membership recommending a "*candidate country*" status that was granted by the European Council in December 2005.

Candidate status has an important implication for pre-accession assistance, which is aimed at supporting the country's efforts to comply with the Copenhagen Criteria. As a candidate country, the Republic of Macedonia will have in principle access to all five IPA components – I) Institution Building, II) Cross-border Co-operation, III) Regional Development, IV) Human Resource Development and V) Rural Development. The last three components largely mirror the EU Structural Funds regulations, with similar requirements, in terms of sound management, to those applying to EU Member States.¹³

The European Commission has decided to create a single **Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA)** for the period covered by the next Financial Perspectives (2007-2013), adopted on 17 July 2006 so replacing the 2000-2006 pre-accession financial instruments PHARE, ISPA, SAPARD, the Turkish pre-accession instrument, and the financial instrument for the Western Balkans CARDS. IPA covers the countries with candidate status (currently Croatia, Republic of Macedonia and Turkey) and potential candidate status (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia including Kosovo according to UNSCR 1244).

Under Component 1 financial assistance will support *inter alia* the "Ability of the Country to assume the obligations of membership" that includes *environmental protection*. In this regard particular attention will be given to the incorporation of environmental protection requirements into other sectoral policies, e.g. through the development of environmental impact assessments, including compliance of agriculture and industry with key parts of the *acquis* in the environmental sector.

Under Component 2 the support will go for improving the tourism and transport infrastructure with a view to increase the conditions for the development of tourism and the protection of the environment.

Major "environmental" is Component 3, where the Government has estimated that due to a limited funding, strong coordination with other donors, to prioritise investments within a well defined strategy, in line with the National Environmental Action Plan will be necessary. Therefore, IPA assistance to the Environment sector under this component will be limited to one or two infrastructure projects.

The above priorities and objectives shall be implemented through clearly targeted investments in the environment sector, with focus on waste water treatment and solid waste management, where the impact to the population and natural environment is the greatest and where IPA funding may not substitute rather complement with funding available from other sources.

Having in mind *The Practical Guide to EC external aid contract procedures*, the Associations of Citizens are not eligible to apply to these funds; but they are eligible to various the EU Grant Programmes. This, as a co-funding possibility with GEF SGP Macedonia, will be explored in the OP3 and beyond by assessing the granting area and the Macedonian Associations of Citizens' capacities to prepare for, apply and conduct an EU funded project. As SGP Macedonia is not nor could act as a legal entity it is not eligible for EU funds. However, the "joint venture" with the UNDP CO Skopje shall be explored as a possibility to access those funds.

¹³ Source: Draft Multi-annual Indicative Planning Document (MIPD) - Republic of Macedonia, September 2006

The **bilateral funding** (mainly) in a form of technical assistance and in infrastructure support is provided by several EU member countries through their Embassies or through their international assistance agencies/ institutions offices in Macedonia. Each of the bilateral country supporters has its own strategic paper for its implementation.

British Embassy in Skopje is active in supporting NGO activities in the areas of environmental protection, social cohesion and poverty reduction. From 2006 the British Embassy is engaged as cofinancer to a SGP project in the economically and socially deprived eastern area of Macedonia in the focal area of Climate Change mitigation. There is a strong base for upscaling the results as a follow up of the activities in production of Biodiesel. The longer term results of this mutual cooperation will lead to reducing the use of fossil fuels in agriculture activities, result in job creation – poverty reduction and will be assembled in a strategic longer term partnership for joint cooperation.

Switzerland as an important bilateral donor focuses on environment and water related projects through Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs SECO. SDC (Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation) is present in Macedonia since 1996 and main priorities for the period 2005-2008 are: (1) support for the establishment of a system of governance based on democratic principles, (2) basic infrastructures and access to sustainable social services at the local level with the focus on the most vulnerable people and (3) support for sustainable economic development. Swiss also support activities in the field of improving quality of life through establishing of water monitoring network and protection of water and nature. The two projects in the Prespa Lake area, implemented by UNDP, (1) “Restoration of Golema River, Prespa Lake Watershed” and (2) “Support to extension of the solid waste management service in the rural communities of the Prespa Lake watershed”, are complementary to GEF full size project “Prespa Park”. The GEF FSP implemented by UNDP “Integrated Ecosystem Management in the Prespa Lakes Basin of Albania, Macedonia and Greece” in April 2006 was signed by the Macedonian and in September 2006 by the Albanian side. The Project Offices are in a set up process in both countries. The SGP Macedonia together with SGP Albania is cooperating with the Prespa Park Coordination Committee to conduct/ channel ways of cooperation to be agreed in the Project’s Inception Period.

The Netherlands is also an important bilateral player which in the last strategy period ranked Macedonia among its priority countries. Dutch support is targeted at agriculture, education, public finances and implementation of the Ohrid Framework Agreement and also supports business to business activities.

Sweden through SIDA supports the region of the South East Europe not preferring to help an individual country on an individual issue, but environment is present in their strategic paper as one of their overall objectives: - to promote socially and environmentally sustainable development and the sustainable development of a market economy capable of generating continuous growth and reducing poverty.

In the environment area, **Germany** along with **Austria** is the largest bilateral donor mainly through KfW (for investment related activities) and **GTZ** (for non-investments).

Italy contributes to several Regional Environmental Reconstruction Programme (REReP) projects for South East Europe and may also extend concessionary credits for environmental operations.

Norway and **Finland** are supporting the local democratic and local economic development by funding projects that are run by the UNDP Macedonia.

The USA is also a significant donor through *USAID* in the fields of strengthening the in democracy development, making civil society visible, supporting social inclusion of the marginalized groups, making the decentralization process work, etc. Environment is not a priority for USAID in their presence in Macedonia in the following period but will be observed as necessary part in their field of activities for municipal development and infrastructure.

Japan Special Fund (JSF) and Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) supports investment and technical assistance projects related to water supply and environment. In 2006 they provide cofinancing to a SGP Project through Technical Assistance/ Expertise for soil decontamination in the mining area of Zlatkovica. Based on the positive results expected there are strong possibilities to strategize this cooperation through longer period of time in the near future in the focal area of Climate Change mitigation.

Loans by IFIs to public sector investments include infrastructure projects, where the greater part of the lending has been allocated to energy, transport and telecommunications. As a rule, environmental considerations are included in lending criteria, and environment is a prioritized area. Credits for environment are thus in principle available, but still loan-financed environment projects are few, due to lack of clear priorities and lack of bankable projects, institutional difficulties and strained capacity.

Besides the EU, **multilateral donors** include the World Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and a number of UN agencies of which UNDP, UNHCR and UNICEF are the most active. UNDP projects focus on the decentralisation process, economic activities, the energy and environment and security/reconciliation and help implement a number of other donors' financed activities in the local administration sector, local economic development, MDG Report, etc. UNICEF is active in a number of areas including HIV/AIDS prevention and education, while UNHCR focuses on citizenship issues and refugees and their status.

2.6.1. Opportunities for Complementarities

The possibilities of complementarities with the other donors' assistance of the GEF SGP Macedonia are obvious and will be taken into consideration when updating the CPS and when other donors are updating and/or preparing their following programmes. Development of strong and decentralized local community where the community presented through their Associations of Citizens is taking the lead in its own future, implementing co-financed projects on a local level so reducing the global environmental impact and improving/ sustaining own livelihood is a win-win situation for all donors' assistance present in Macedonia. As seen in the donors' strategic documents, the work in the field of environmental protection, for poverty reduction and for local empowerment is overriding so possibilities for co-financing or co-funding in the areas of Biodiversity conservation, protection of the International Waters and Energy (Climate Change mitigation) is more than possible.

During the first year period of SGP Macedonia, various consultations on possibilities for strategic cooperation, with thematic focus, were executed with the British Embassy in Skopje and with the Austrian Development Agency in the field of the Climate Change GEF SGP focal area. The British Embassy already acted as co-financier with the GEF SGP Macedonia in 2006 in one small scale project on production of renewable fuel sources¹⁴ in the economically deprived area of Eastern Macedonia. Positive and visible results will lead to a Strategic cooperation in the up-scaling/ replicating it in the next few years. Details for this possible cooperation (with technical and financial mutual assistance/ intervention through local activities by AC) are expected to be completed in the year 2007.

3. GEF SGP COUNTRY PROGRAMME STRATEGY

3.1. Introduction to the GEF and SGP

The Global Environment Facility (GEF), established in 1991, helps developing countries fund projects and programs that protect the global environment. GEF grants support projects related to biodiversity, climate change, international waters, land degradation, the ozone layer, and persistent organic pollutants.

GEF is an independent financial organization that provides grants to developing countries for projects that benefit the global environment and promote sustainable livelihoods in local communities.

Since 1991, the GEF has provided \$4.5 billion in grants and generated \$14.5 billion in co-financing from other partners for projects in developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

¹⁴ For more info visit: www.gefsgpmacedonia.org.mk

GEF funds are contributed by donor countries. In 2006 the approved replenished by its 177 member governments is US\$ 3.13 billion to fund operations between 2006 and 2010. GEF projects are managed by GEF Implementing Agencies: the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Bank (WB).

The GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) is implemented by UNDP on behalf of the three implementing agencies of the GEF – UNDP, UNEP, and WB – and executed by the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS). Since its inception in 1992, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Small Grants Programme (SGP) has been promoting grassroots action to address global environmental concerns. SGP aims to deliver global environmental benefits in the GEF focal areas of biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation, protection of international waters, prevention of land degradation, and elimination of persistent organic pollutants through community-based approaches. SGP is operating in a decentralized, democratic, transparent, and country-driven manner, through National Coordinators and a voluntary National Steering Committees in a growing number of countries (about 100). SGP has funded over 6,500 projects so far. In Macedonia the GEF Small Grants Programme officially started with the nomination of its National Coordinator on 1st May 2005.

GEF supported project activities in Macedonia account for the focal areas of international waters, climate change, biodiversity and multi focal area, and now in the sustainable land management area. The GEF/WB supported full size project “Lake Ohrid Management” (1999-2004) was successfully implemented where one of the components was supporting activities for raising public awareness. As a follow up another full size GEF/WB project is under preparation pending for final approval “Integrated Management of Transboundary Drim River Basin”. GEF UNDP supported the preparation of the Macedonia’s First Communication under the UNFCCC and at present is supporting the preparation of the Second Communication and National Action Plan. GEF assistance is also present through GEF/WB financing the Third Report on the Convention on Biodiversity, were previously had financed the preparation of the BSAP and the First Report. GEF UNDP together with KfW as co-financer is supporting the PDF B phase project for preparation of full size regional project “Integrated Ecosystem Management in the Prespa Lakes Basin of Albania, Macedonia and Greece”. As mentioned previously, this FSP is prepared, approved, signed and its implementation is ongoing. It is important to mention here the bond between these two lakes: Prespa Lake provides half of the total water inflow for the Lake Ohrid (UNESCO World Cultural and Natural Heritage Site from 1980). On the Prespa Lake there are very important protected areas: Ramsar site Ezerani in Macedonia, and Protected areas in Greece and Albania. Other ongoing GEF (PDF B phase) funded project is: “Development of Medium Size Project for Sustainable Land Management for Mitigating Land Degradation, Improving Ecosystem Integrity and Reducing Poverty in rural areas”.

The above mentioned completed, ongoing and planned activities where GEF is the leading source of funding, are catalysing environmental awareness to the local public to accomplish certain visible results on a local level. The GEF SGP aims to create synergies with these projects and their results. Since the GEF funded projects are in the areas where SGP will be present, SGP will continue to work with communities for global environmental benefits, improved livelihoods and strengthened empowerment.

3.2. SGP Programming ‘Niche’

GEF/SGP Macedonia programming position, having in mind the situation as presented in the country’s development programmes, would be to have **locally based activities that will produce visible and measurable results in the focal areas of:**

- a. Biological Diversity conservation: preserve the endangered and threatened species within their habitats
- b. Protection of the International Waters: reducing and/or mitigating the agricultural sources that pollute the aquatic bodies
- c. Mitigation of the effects of the Climate Change: through promoting of energy efficiency and assessing the possibilities to use renewable energy resources, and, promoting and use of alternative transport means, especially in urban areas

- d. Combating land degradation using sustainable agricultural practices, forest and orchard re-introduction and management
- e. Elimination of the use of the POPs: raising public awareness for non usage of POPs and initiating/ demonstrating examples that does not use POPs
- f. Creation of partnership between local citizens' associations and local governments to address and jointly act to solve community environmental problems

3.3. Country Program Strategy Impacts to be achieved (2005 – 2010)

3.3.1. Environment – Global Environmental Impacts

1. Biodiversity conservation

Protected globally significant ecosystems with their endemic and/or threatened biodiversity are conserved and sustainable used.

2. Climate change mitigation

Local population is aware of the adverse CC effects and possibilities to mitigate the GHG emissions using energy efficiency, the renewable energy resources and alternative transport.

3. International waters protection

Locally agriculture sourced pollutants of the waters are mitigated and/or eliminated.

4. Combating land degradation

Improve land management and sustainable use options for natural resources management and enable replication of these improvements.

5. Elimination of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)

Local population is aware of the POPs so its usage in agriculture is minimized and/ or eliminated.

3.3.2. Impacts on Poverty Reduction

GEF SGP Macedonia is aware of the present poverty situation in Macedonia, so it will emphasize the need of activities that will result in creating possibilities for local (economically, socially and environmentally deprived) population to benefit through SGP's funding and co-funding. This population can and will be able not only to protect but also to produce with SGP's assistance so to sustain the important local environmental areas/ benefits. This should be achieved through enhanced confidence in their own potential/ capabilities to benefit for themselves. Also, the knowledge gained and commodities produced should be marketable, consequently creating opportunities for employment and service/ advisory assistance. All in all, the GEF SGP supported activities will lead to improved social and economic situation on a local level. The lessons learned and knowledge gained where all local stakeholders are working as partners/ co-workers will be up-scaled and replicated so to achieve impact on poverty reduction on a national level.

3.3.3. Contribution to MDGs¹⁵

Having accepted the Millennium Declaration, the Republic of Macedonia, as a member of the United Nations, is committed to the achievements of the MDGs. GEF SGP funded activities and results achieved will directly or indirectly contribute to:

- ensuring environmental sustainability,
- fight for eradication of the most severe poverty forms,
- the promotion of gender equality,

¹⁵ First Report on MDGs, 2005

3.3.4. Empowerment Impacts

Local Associations of Citizens by leading the partnerships of the project activities funded by GEF SGP can and will build and strengthen their own capacities to manage local projects; i.e. they will have their absorbing and performing capacities to initiate, plan, design, perform, monitor and evaluate certain partnership activities, resulting in a higher self-confidence, self esteem and respect in others' input and belief in better livelihood. The long term empowerment impact will be experienced and visible associations of citizens, well established in the local community, taking part in the discussions during and in the process of decision making. Lessons learnt and knowledge gained will be country wide disseminated so the other associations could feel, learn and become convincing and influential.

3.4. Country Program Strategy Outcomes

GEF SGP focal areas and Operational Programs (OPs), conformed with national and local environmental policy papers/ priorities

ACs' capacity strengthened to identify, plan, implement and M&E projects that are eligible for SGP funding. ACs strengthened to create and maintain partnership for project implementation

GEF SGP Macedonia visible on national level

GEF SGP is accessible to vulnerable groups/ socially and economically deprived communities

Additional resources obtained/ mobilised (on programme and project level)

Monitoring and Evaluation of GEF SGP (programme and projects) is in place and on time

Biodiversity conservation: Two to three ecosystems are protected, local stakeholders are aware of their significance; additional income is generated through agro-biodiversity products and eco-tourism development. Knowledge gained and lessons learnt are circulated.

Climate change mitigation: Assessment of the potential for availability and potential usage of the renewable energy sources (wind-water-solar-geothermal) is performed, national public is aware. Two to three de-facto practices are performed. Alternative transport modes, bicycles use as a transport mean in urban areas, are in place, reducing the global GHG impact. Knowledge gained and lessons learnt are nation wide circulated.

Protection of international waters: Local stakeholders are aware of the locally sourced contaminants that pollute the waters. Practices for using 'zero' or minimum pesticides in the agriculture activities and in every day businesses are in place. Lessons learnt and knowledge gained is disseminated.

Prevention of land degradation and remediation of land degraded areas (reforestation): local population understands the need and value of the forests. Deforested areas are covered with new plantations (forests and/or orchards) and are sustainable managed; project activities replicated elsewhere in the country.

Elimination of persistent organic pollutants: Existing sources of POPs are presented and demonstrated together employing available practices for eliminating POPs on local level. The lessons learnt and knowledge gained is disseminated on a national level.

The above outcomes will assist and contribute the sustainability of the GEF SGP Macedonia in a way as leverage for co-financing and other resource mobilization. Together with the local community empowered and causes for poverty reduced, the operational results will enhance the managerial and administrative aspects of the community and of the GEF SGP Macedonia.

3.5. Project Outputs

OVERALL:

All projects funded by SGP comply with GEF OPs and national environmental policy papers/priorities

ACs do the planning, implementing and M&E projects. AC create and maintain SGP partnership

Activities and results are present in the media (newspapers, TV and radio) and through electronic tools (web sites, etc). GEF SGP Macedonia web site created and maintained

Bureaucratic requirements for preparation and submission of Proj Prop are at minimal level. Existing AC of these categories strengthened. These AC are capable of preparing and are submitting project proposals. Maximum valorisation of the in-kind contribution by these AC

Co-financing is reached at least to a ratio of 50% to 50%. In-kind contribution categorized and evaluated. Coordination with other present and possible donors established. Data base of other donors initiated/ maintained

Content relevant reporting in place and on time. M&E plans prepared and conducted (programme/ projects). Base line situations with SMART indicators created (programme/ project-s). Global data base maintained

BD: Endemic and/or threatened species are protected and sustainable managed within their ecosystems. Nature conserved areas are fully protected. Ecosystems' species are managed in a sustainable way. Locally grown or produced goods are on the market

CC: Target population is knowledgeable of the harmful CC effects and that they can act in CC mitigation on a global level. Target population is implementing energy efficiency, is using renewable energy sources and is using alternative transport methods. Two practices of EE and RE use in place and demonstrated

IW: Target population is fully aware of the severity of polluting the waters (bioaccumulation). Cleaner and safer running waters (surface waters)

LD/SLM: Institutional and human resource capacities in SLM at the municipal level and application of SLM-oriented land-use planning are strengthened. SLM practices for land registration, agriculture, forestry, and water management demonstrated. SLM best practices and socio-economic objectives mainstreamed into emerging land use planning, allocation, and management systems

POPs: Existing sources of POPs are presented and demonstrated. Available practices POPs are demonstrated on local level. Lessons learnt and knowledge gained is nationally disseminated.

3.5.1. Strategic Pipeline

“The GEF SGP aims to protect the global environment by funding community conservation and sustainable natural resource use projects. Since different local and national conditions require different kinds of interventions, project components may include one or more of the following: demonstration, capacity building, targeted research, policy dialogue and information dissemination, and raising awareness among critical constituencies.”¹⁶

The table given in the [Annex 8](#) presents the focal areas for interventions (projects-like) which might be eligible for funding. It is intended to be illustrative, not exclusive or exhaustive.

3.5.2. Local Priorities

Macedonia is in the process of decentralization, a process that is of utmost significance for enhancing democracy and bringing the government closer to the citizens. The environmental responsibilities will be, together with many others, transferred to the local governments. Environmental responsibilities provisioned into the Framework Environmental Legislations (on environment, on nature, on waste, and soon, on waters), are due as of 2006, so bringing them on the top of the lists of the local priorities. Amongst others there are obligations for issuing local environmental (a.k.a. ‘B’) permits, all types of wastes related decisions and sub-regulations, possibilities to acquire and receive permission to establish and maintain low category of protected areas, etc. LSG units also have responsibilities for enforcement of environmental legislation through building its capacities and investments.

¹⁶ UNDP GEF SGP Strategic Framework, Addendum March 2002, Chapter III

SGP will be a supporter, a promoter and an equal partner in the locally based activities that will lead the actors to strengthening their absorbing and performing capacities to cope with the decentralization process. SGP partnerships and networks created through its grassroots actions addressing environmental concerns will pose a support and can create example outline for the rest of the LSG to use and adapt.

3.5.3. Priorities between October 2005 and February 2007

- a. Building and strengthening of the Associations of Citizens' absorbing and performing capacities to respond to the GEF SGP requirements for project identification, planning, conducting, M&E
- b. Resource mobilization (co-funding/co-financing) equal to the Fund for Grants for Year 1: 2005

3.5.4. Priorities between March 2007 and February 2008

- a. Assessing the results achieved through projects of year one and year two
- b. M&E/ Reporting of the granted projects in year one with database updating
- c. Assessing the possibilities for up-scaling and/or replication of the successfully finished projects
- d. Creation of the "Partners of the SGP Macedonia"
- e. Management of the knowledge (lessons learnt and experience gained) to the stakeholders and public

3.5.5. Priorities between March 2008 and February 2010

- a. Assessing the results achieved through projects of year three and year four
- b. Evaluating impacts accomplished
- c. Preparing the project portfolio for the next SGP period according the results and impacts of previous years

3.6. Monitoring/ Evaluation and Reporting under SGP

Monitoring and Evaluation, in general and for SGP, refer to the process of overseeing and assessing the progress and accomplishments of projects and programmes. M&E are different but related activities, and the procedures normally overlap. M&E should be considered essential elements of project and programme management. The SGP believes that only **participatory** M&E allow projects to become learning processes that produce lessons that can be described and applied by project participants themselves.

Specifically, M&E activities represented through various types of Reports help SGP and its projects to maintain **accountability**, achieve **sustainability**, allow for **replicability/ upsacing**, and, provide opportunities for extracting and communicating **lessons learned**. Ideally, the results or lessons learned from M&E will be used to improve SGP and project design/ implementation, and, will enable SGP grant recipients to carry on project activities well after the grant period is over.

Monitoring will involve the collection and analysis of data about SGP projects' activities and results: transferred into easy-to-understand information. Monitoring is focus onto knowledge gained and used to correct/ adjust project implementation and management in order to achieve project objectives. Monitoring will allow project participants to keep track of project activities, to determine whether project objectives are being achieved, and to make whatever changes are necessary to improve project performance.

Evaluation considers the results and effects of a project in terms of the local and global environment and the quality of life of the participants. Through evaluation project participants and others attempt to understand and explain the effects of a project. The evaluation builds on the links among environmental problems, causes, and solutions identified in the project proposal and design. It (usually) focuses on the general and specific objectives of a project and assesses how and to what

extent they have been met. The evaluation should include an explicit appraisal of the whether the project has met its stated objectives in terms of the GEF focal area and operational program and if not, analyze the reasons. Very often the results can be visible and measurable after the project ended, so SGP will request project leaders to have this in mind when designing and implementing a SGP project.

Both monitoring and evaluation (M&E) require information about the current state of relevant features of the community or locality, usually *focusing on the environmental problem in the GEF focal area and corresponding operational program*, before project activities begin. This is called **baseline data**: normally used to identify and construct the **indicators** for project objectives and activities. Through the indicators, project progress and accomplishments can then be compared to the baseline, and hence evaluated.

SGP will thus require that each project clearly provide the necessary **base-line data**, that is, information about the state of relevant features of the community or locality, usually focusing on the problem in the GEF Focal Area and corresponding operational programs, before the project activities begin.

Indicators: Common language for remembering the characteristics of good indicators is “**SMART**” (Specific, Measurable, Appropriate, Result oriented, and Time bound). ATLAS global indicators are presented in [Annex 2](#)

Indicators should¹⁷:

- measure/assess the most important expected results of project activities and objectives, and
- be based on accessible data that can be collected by the AC and project participants.
- be *quantitative* (in terms of numbers and percentages),
- be *qualitative* (easily described in words), or a combination of (c) and (d)
- be time-specific (until when? — deadlines may need to be established),
- be independent of the objective (should not be a repetition of the objective), and
- cost-effective (the cost of collecting the data should not exceed the value of the information).

3.6.1. Monitoring Plan

Monitoring of this CPS will be conducted during the project proposal preparation, its implementation and after its conclusion, to see the results through said indicators whether achieved as planned. The monitoring will be planned in the Projects’ Work plan and Programme’s Annual Work plan, than through regular project’s site visits using Monitoring records.

Work plans: The work-plans are used as the basis for monitoring the progress of project implementation. Each GEF SGP project should include a detailed work-plan, which indicates the critical targets in implementation with the corresponding timetable, responsible actors, and indicators. The plan should indicate how information will be collected and who will be responsible for it. Formats are presented in the Guidelines, Requirements and Application Forms” (Project Work plan *and* Monitoring Schedule Format)

Site visits: The site visit will take place (if and when applicable) when the Project Concept is found eligible for GEF SGP funding to help project proponents design the full project proposal, which adequately meets the GEF SGP criteria. Subsequent (if and when applicable) site visits after the approval of the project will allow the National Coordinator and/or the members of the NSC to observe the actual implementation of the project and to confirm the information contained in the AC project progress reports. These site visits will also include meetings with relevant project stakeholders. A final site visit will be conducted upon receipt of the final project report.

Monitoring record: After each site visit the NC (and the member-s present – as applicable) will prepare a Monitoring Record indicating the objective of the visit, observations, recommendations and actions to be taken and next steps. This report will be provided to the grantee AC (and all the members of the NSC if requested).

¹⁷ ATLAS Global Indicators are presented in [Annex 2](#)

3.7. Reporting Plan

Several types of Reports are required in the work of the SGP that needs to be developed by the grantees and the National Coordinator. The reports of the grantees shall serve as a basis for the reports to be prepared by the NC.

Project Progress Reports: These are prepared by the grantees and according the implementation of the planned and approved project activities. They consist of Narrative and Financial Part. These are SGP internal and obligatory documents available for review/ approval by the NC (and NSC when applicable).

Project Final Report: Upon completion of the project the grantee will prepare a Final Report that focuses on the relevance and performance of the project, the likelihood of its success, and lessons learned in terms of best and worst practices. This report should also contain recommendations for follow-up actions by appropriate institutions where appropriate. The final report will be provided to NSC and, upon request, can be presented to all relevant actors.

Auditing Reports: A certified local auditor will perform compliance audit to each project according the national legal auditing requirements. The financial provision for this audit should be presented in the approved project's budget.

Report on Project Evaluation and Lessons Learned: After approving the final report, the NC (and the designated NSC member-s when applicable) will prepare a Report on the project which will provide a review of the project implementation, lessons learned, potential for its replication or its upscaling. The evaluation of the project is based on the results via indicators established for the project, observations from the final site visit as well as the final report submitted by the grantee. This report, upon request, can be presented to all relevant actors.

4. BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- ❖ Second National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP), MEPP, 2005
- ❖ Report of the Republic of Macedonia on the Millennium Development Goals, Government of the Republic of Macedonia, 2005
- ❖ First national communication of the UN FCCC of the Republic of Macedonia,
- ❖ National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA) for Global Environmental Management, MEPP, 2005 (including three thematic reports: on Biodiversity, Climate Change and Land Degradation)
- ❖ Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan of the Republic of Macedonia, MEPP, 2004
- ❖ Country Study for Biodiversity of the Republic of Macedonia, MEPP, 2004
- ❖ Three Year Programme 2004–2006, on Austrian development policy, Revised Version, 2004
- ❖ EU/CARDS Assistance to the Republic of Macedonia, Multi-annual Indicative Programme 2005-2006
- ❖ Country Program Macedonia 2005-2008, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), 2005
- ❖ Country Strategy for Development Cooperation Macedonia 2003-2005, Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), 2002
- ❖ Spatial Plan of the Republic of Macedonia - Spatial planning strategy, MEPP, 2004
- ❖ GEF SGP focal areas related publications (various, 2005)
- ❖ Law on Environment, 2004
- ❖ Law on Waste Management, 2004
- ❖ Law on Nature Protection, 2004
- ❖ Final Report of the EU funded project: “Strengthening the Capacities of the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning” (2002-2004)

5. ANNEXES

5.1. Annex 1 - Map of the Republic of Macedonia



5.2. Annex 2 - The Logical Framework (2005-2010)

OUTCOMES	OUTPUTS	INDICATOR TARGETS	ASSUMPTIONS
OVERALL			
GEF SGP focal areas and Operational Programs (OPs), conformed with national and local environmental policy papers/ priorities	All projects funded by SGP comply with GEF OPs and national environmental policy papers/priorities	Number of project proposal submitted complying with Requirements Number of projects approved	Sufficient legislative and strategic provisions for GEF OPs and clearly set national and local priorities will support the preparation of adequate project proposals
ACs' capacity strengthened to identify, plan, implement and M&E projects that are eligible for SGP funding ACs strengthened to create and maintain partnership for project implementation	ACs do the planning, implementing and M&E projects AC create and maintain SGP partnership	Number of projects submitted, executed and expected results achieved Number of partners/ partnership created during and maintained after ending the project activities	Adequate numbers of AC are experienced in project cycle management, but less has managed with partners.
GEF SGP Macedonia visible on national level	Activities and results are present in the media (newspapers, TV and radio) and through electronic tools (web sites, etc) GEF SGP Macedonia web site created and maintained	Number of articles in media Number of published materials (printed/ electronic) Number of public events conducted/ participated	The media in Macedonia are interested in environmental issues, esp on AC activities; there are regular radio and TV shows on environmental issues
GEF SGP is accessible to vulnerable groups/ socially and economically deprived communities	Bureaucratic requirements for preparation and submission of Proj Prop are at minimal level Existing AC of these categories strengthened These AC are capable of preparing and are submitting project proposals Maximum valorisation of the in-kind contribution by these AC	Number of projects prepared and conducted by AC of vulnerable groups/ very poor communities Capacity and empowerment of these groups increased from level 0 to 2	Input for assistance in project proposals preparation will be much greater than the experienced AC. NC will start and experienced AC could take input later
Additional resources obtained/ mobilised (on programme and project level)	Co-financing is reached at least to a ratio of 50% to 50% In-kind contribution categorized and evaluated Coordination with other present and possible donors established Data base of other donors initiated/ maintained	Cash contribution (US\$) to GEF SGP Macedonia on programme/ project level In-kin contribution (US\$) generated and presented Meetings with other donors Data base operational (created/ maintained)	Donor dependence of the AC is highly present in Macedonia; donors are moving out from 100% single granting; this opens doors for partnership with GEF SGP Macedonia
Monitoring and Evaluation of GEF SGP (programme and projects) is in place and on time	Content relevant reporting in place and on time M&E plans prepared and conducted (programme/ projects) Base line situations with SMART indicators created (programme/ project-s) Global data base maintained	Progress reports of GEF SGP Macedonia Projects' Reports (progress, financial, final, audit) prepared and submitted, qualitative and quantitative verifiable	Reporting seems to be the "hardest" part of the Project Cycle Management to the AC meaning "what should be reported". Will be overcome by clear and simple guidelines/ Table Of Content

OUTCOMES	OUTPUTS	INDICATOR TARGETS	ASSUMPTIONS
FOCAL AREA: BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION			
Two-three ecosystems with their endemic and/or threatened biodiversity protected/ managed	Endemic and/or threatened species are protected and sustainable managed within their ecosystem-s	One-two endemic and/or threatened flora-fauna species protected within their ecosystem-s Capacity of local users to manage/ monitor own natural resources increased from grade 1 to 3	The Law on Nature Protection is under revision. The status of the responsible institutions should lead to more efficient protection and conservation
Protected ecosystems are conserved and used in a sustainable manner	Nature conserved areas are fully protected Ecosystems' species are managed in a sustainable way Locally grown or produced goods are on the market	Number of offences in the protected areas reduced (%) Number of hectares protected Number of visitors increased (%) Income increased (US\$/household)	Time needed for a legal document to be prepared and enacted for concession of AC to manage nature protected area; could be summoned by presenting it as win-win result
FOCAL AREA: CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION			
Local population is aware on the adverse CC effects Local population is aware on possibilities to mitigate the GHG emissions on a local level	Target population is knowledgeable of the harmful CC effects and that they can act in CC mitigation on a global level Target population is implementing energy efficiency, is using renewable energy sources and is using alternative transport methods Two practices of EE and RE use in place and demonstrated	Capacity/ level of awareness is increased from level 1 to 3 CO ₂ tonnes decreased by using energy efficient technologies (households KW/h conversion into CO ₂ tonnes) Number of bicycles sold Number of users of bicycles for transportation Amount of fossil fuel saved	Length of the procedure for building/ reconstruction of bicycle paths; since the LSG is in charge, it should be shorter being a partner Maintenance of the bicycle paths, but could be incorporated in the LSG budget and bicycle fees coming from fuel savings
FOCAL AREA: INTERNATIONAL WATERS			
Locally sourced water pollutants are mitigated and/or eliminated.	Target population is fully aware of the severity of polluting the waters (bioaccumulation). Cleaner and safer running waters (surface waters)	Amount of pollutants in the waters reduced (%) Income of the local population increased by selling Pest Free goods (in US\$)	Hard to find non-polluting fertilizers and pesticides; or if found they have higher cost;
FOCAL AREA: PREVENTION OF LAND DEGRADATION (SLM)			
Land and natural resources management improved with built-in sustainable measures Similar project activities and outcomes replicated elsewhere in the country	Institutional and human resource capacities in SLM at the municipal level and application of SLM-oriented land-use planning are strengthened SLM practices for land registration, agriculture, forestry, and water management demonstrated SLM best practices and socio-economic objectives mainstreamed into emerging land use planning, allocation, and management systems	Area of land: - at risk under cultivation, based on SLM principles; - over-grazed - with healthy wind breaks and efficient water use systems Number of Municipalities applying SLM-oriented land-use planning, registration, and resource use practices	Community acceptance Govt. commitment Cooperation of main stakeholders
FOCAL AREA: ELIMINATION OF PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS (POPs)			
Local population is aware of the POPs so its usage is minimized and/or eliminated.	Existing sources of POPs are presented and demonstrated Available practices POPs are demonstrated on local level. Lessons learnt and knowledge gained is nationally disseminated.	Amount and Percentage of POPs eliminated Capacity/ level of awareness on POPs is increased from level 1 to 3 at AC and local population	Not enough experts amongst AC to bare and conduct POPs 'activities'; local experts engaged will educate them

5.3. Annex 3 - Resource Mobilization Strategy

The Global Environment Facility requires that each project funded by GEF must provide a counterpart funding to cover the project's baseline costs. In the case of the SGP, given the special nature of the SGP activities which are aimed at environmental conservation interventions at the community level, the GEF Council decided that the issue of incremental costs would be handled in a way that SGP would contribute 50% of the required funding, matching the remaining 50% from other sources of funding, of which minimum 25% should be in-cash and up to 25% in-kind.

There are many other reasons for seeking co-financing, and the most important one is to achieve greater project impact through donor's financing of other key components and items that are not eligible for GEF funding, thereby increasing project sustainability as well. GEF SGP funding will thus be used as the seed money to mobilize and leverage additional money, and at the same time, through SGP's built-in local empowerment process, increase grantee's capacity to implement and manage development projects and provide them access to the donor community.

In brief, the resource mobilization is important because:

- Builds the capacity of the programme and the grantees to build partnerships and link with other than SGP funds
- Allows the programme to support "non-GEF-able" but necessary activities
- Broadens ownership of the projects and the constituency for SGP's approach
- Strengths contributions – in-cash and in-kind – from grantees themselves
- Improves identification, recording and reporting of co-financing
- Promote joint or parallel co-financing
- Leverage at project and country/global programme level

GEF SGP Macedonia resource mobilization efforts, in order to create and maintain partnerships, will target:

- Traditional bilateral donors (e.g. USAID, EC, GTZ, direct governments' assistance, etc); multilateral agencies within and outside of the UN system (e.g. UNEP, UNICEF, WFP, FAO, etc.);
- Other innovative funding sources including banks (e.g. World Bank, KfW, EBRD, etc)
- International and national charity foundations; academia (local/regional university); private sector; ACs (international and national); national and local governments; and the multinational and national private sector;

Efforts will also be made to leverage UNDP TRAC resources and government cost sharing for SGP activities and projects, not just with environment programmes, but also with the development, poverty reduction, and governance programmes. The input of the NSC members via their own contacts and networking for resource mobilization is highly desirable and is of outmost importance.

GEF SGP Macedonia will create and make it publicly available a small database of the donors that contribute to SGP activities in Macedonia and shall be updated periodically.

There are various definitions, modalities, instruments and conditionality for contributions, including: co-financing, in-cash contribution, in-kind contribution (goods and/or services), cost sharing, donations, government cost sharing, parallel financing, support costs, etc. The instruments that could be used to establish and prove the contributions to the GEF SGP are various, flexible, programme-, project-, and donor specific. Ways and instruments will be discussed and agreed among concerned partners based on the past experience that prove to be motivative and stimulative for other donors to contribute to the GEF SGP.

5.4. Annex 4 - Sustainability Program Strategy

One of the principles of the GEF SGP is that it should become as sustainable as possible after the given period of time. GEF SGP Macedonia must be an aggressive player in the protection of global environment, poverty reduction and community empowerment. Having in hand the possibilities for resource mobilization and flexibility for cooperation modalities, efforts will be engaged for GEF SGP to be perceived as a “successful story” after its inception period. Results achieved will lead to programme sustainability by reaching:

- Project ownership at participants/ community level through successful end of their efforts
- Networking creation and maintenance of the programme/ project constituencies
- Networking of the past and present SGP NSC members (as the most expert, credible and influential people in the country)
- This will have greater opportunities for linking at national, regional and global levels (communicating horizontally and vertically) on environmental issues accomplishing sustainable development
- Production oriented projects with marketing, financing, and partnerships with the private sector
- Establishing of guidelines for sheltering communities’ interests

5.5. Annex 5 - Knowledge Management Strategy

Knowledge Management (KM) processes aim to facilitate the flow of knowledge and experiences. **Knowledge** is experiences gained, the ideas, the skills, the way of thinking, good/bad practices, the lessons learnt, while the **management** of the knowledge is documentation/ systematic arrangement of the knowledge for reference and use.

KM is serviceable tool for M&E and tool for empowering the communities; it is based on dissemination (communication and outreach).

The objective of SGP's knowledge management efforts is to leverage lessons learned from both successful and unsuccessful projects, and to replicate good practices. Intended beneficiaries include project teams, CPS partners, governments, donors and international NGOs for:

- Analysis and codification of lessons learnt through generation of knowledge products and services
- Knowledge dissemination through existing SGP and other mechanisms
- Knowledge uptake to ensure that knowledge products are applied, used and further improved

For GEF SGP Macedonia everybody is target group, since it is for and by the local people being visible, involved and impacting on national and global level (governments, media, donors, private sector, national and international donor and foundations, academia, other AC, public, etc).

Knowledge gained through projects’ implementation will be transformed through: (i) handbooks, (ii) how-to-booklets, (iii) case studies, (iv) films and videos. This will then be disseminated through lessons learned meetings among practitioners so to determine the good practices and strategies (i.e. "what works") and to compare and share practices. The expertise of a practitioner is not only technical, managerial and entrepreneurial; it is also cultural, behavioural and motivational. SGP Macedonia will ask for continuous learning and knowledge sharing with other grantees (one possibility is being organized in 'knowledge network' among past and current grantees)to:

- Share best practices and lessons learned
- Document best practices distributed
- Create a "directory of expertise" among GEF SGP grantees to call upon each other for advice
- Websites and e-groups for regional groupings
- Designate sub-national focal persons

Knowledge management is one of the key activities of the GEF SGP Macedonia so it will: acquire, select, adapt and disseminate the knowledge gained through internet, website-s, existing environmental portal (ex.: <http://www.eko.net.mk>), other portals, through public presentations (as organizer and/or as guest), using all media (printed, audio and visual) when and as applicable. Projects proposed for granting will be required to have a component for demonstration and knowledge dissemination. The applicants will be required to be available for further and follow up availability of experience/ lessons learnt exchange to other applicants.

GEF SGP Macedonia will insist on accessibility of information to all, as and when applicable if specific requirements are present. Non-accessibility of a given interested party to certain instrument (tool) will not be a barrier for that party for not to reach the knowledge needed.

Regular short “press releases” will be prepared and disseminated in electronic and/or printed form by the grantees for updating the public on the past (successes, awards, recognitions, etc), present and future activities with info how and where detailed info is obtainable.

5.6. Annex 6 - Relevant Environmental Conventions, Treaties and Trilateral/ Bilateral Agreements (Macedonia)

General

Ratified:

- ❖ Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context (Espoo, February 1991); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 44/99)
- ❖ Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 40/99)
- ❖ Energy Charter Protocol on Energy Efficiency and Related Environmental Aspects; Law on Ratification of the final document of the European Conference on Energy Charter (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 16/98)

Signed:

- ❖ Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment; signed in May 2003, in Kiev, Ukraine
- ❖ Protocol on Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers; signed in May 2003, in Kiev, Ukraine

Nature

Ratified:

- ❖ Convention on Biological Diversity (Rio); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 54/97)
- ❖ Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitats (Ramsar); Decree on Ratification (“Official Gazette of the SFRY” No. 9/77)
- ❖ Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (Bonn); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 38/99)
- ❖ Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 49/97)
- ❖ Convention for the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage; (“Official Gazette of SFRY” No. 56/74”)
- ❖ Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (Washington); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 82/99)
- ❖ European Convention for the Protection of Vertebrate Animals Used for Experimental and other Scientific Purposes; Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 13/02)
- ❖ Protocol of Amendment to the European Convention for the Protection of Vertebrate Animals Used for Experimental and other Scientific Purposes; Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 13/02)
- ❖ European Landscape Convention (Florence, 2000); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 44/03)
- ❖ Agreement on the Conservation of Bats in Europe (London, 1991); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 38/99)
- ❖ Amendment of the Agreement on the Conservation of Bats in Europe; Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No.13/02)
- ❖ Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Water birds (the Hague); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 32/99)

Signed:

- ❖ Cartagena Protocol on Bio-safety to the Convention on Biological Diversity (Cartagena Protocol); signed on 26.07.2000 (ratification procedure is in progress)
- ❖ Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation and Management of the Middle-European Population of the Great Bustard (Otis Tarda); signed on 07.11.2000 in Amman, Jordan

Atmosphere

Ratified:

- ❖ Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer (Vienna, March 1985); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of SFRY” No. 1/90), succeeded by the Republic of Macedonia on 10.03.1994

- ❖ Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (Montreal, September 1987); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of SFRY” No. 16/90), succeeded by the Republic of Macedonia on 10.03.1994
- ❖ The Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (London); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 25/98)
- ❖ The Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (Copenhagen); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 25/98)
- ❖ The Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (Montreal); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 51/99)
- ❖ The Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (Beijing, 1991); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 13/02)
- ❖ United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (New York, 1992); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 61/97)
- ❖ Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change; Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 49/04)
- ❖ Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (Geneva, 1979); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of the SFRY” No. 11/86), succeeded by the Republic of Macedonia on 17.11.1991
- ❖ Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution on Long-Term Financing of the Co-operative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-Range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP, Geneva 1984); Law on ratification (“Official Gazette of SFRY” No.2/87), succeeded by the Republic of Macedonia on 17.11.1991
- ❖ Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants; signed in Stockholm, Sweden, on 22.05.2001, Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 17/2004)

Signed:

- ❖ Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs); acceded in Aarhus, June 1998
- ❖ Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution on Heavy Metals; acceded in Aarhus, June 1998

Waste

Ratified:

- ❖ Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal; Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 49/97)
- ❖ Amendment to the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal, Amendment to Annex I, Annex VIII and Annex IX (Kitchen, Malaysia, 23-27 February 1998); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 49/04)

Soil

Ratified:

- ❖ United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa; Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 13/02)

Nuclear Safety

Ratified:

- ❖ Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident (1986); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of SFRY” No. 15/89), succeeded by the Republic of Macedonia on 20.09.1996
- ❖ Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material (1979); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of SFRY” No. 9/85), succeeded by the Republic of Macedonia on 20.09.1996
- ❖ Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency; Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of SFRY” No. 4/91), succeeded by the Republic of Macedonia on 20.09.1996
- ❖ Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage; Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of SFRY” No. 5/77), succeeded by the Republic of Macedonia on 08.04.1994
- ❖ Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of SFRY” No. 10/70), succeeded by the Republic of Macedonia on 30.03.1995

- ❖ Agreement for the Application of Safeguards in Connection with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, including Small Quantities Protocol; Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 13/02)
- ❖ Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty; Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No.7/00)
- ❖ Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA); “Official Gazette of SFRY” No. 1/58, succeeded by the Republic of Macedonia on 17.09.1991
- ❖ European Agreement Concerning International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (1957); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of SFRY” No. 59/72), succeeded by the Republic of Macedonia on 17.11.1991

Trilateral Agreements

Signed:

- ❖ Declaration on the creation of the Prespa Park and the Environmental Protection and Sustainable Development of the Prespa Lakes and their Surrounding; signed on 02.02.2000, in Germanos, Greece

Bilateral Agreements

Ratified:

- ❖ Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Macedonia and the Government of the Republic of Croatia on Cooperation in the Field of Environmental and Nature Protection (Zagreb, 01.03.2002); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 13/03)
- ❖ Agreement on Cooperation in the Field of Environmental and Nature Protection between the Government of the Republic of Macedonia and the Government of the Russian Federation (Moscow, 27.01.1998); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 16/98)
- ❖ Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Macedonia and the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on Cooperation in the Field of Environment (Belgrade, 19.07.2002); Law on Ratification (“Official Gazette of RM” No. 13/03)

Signed:

- ❖ Agreement between the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Macedonia and the Ministry of the Environment and Waters of the Republic of Bulgaria on Cooperation in the Field of Environmental Protection (Sofia, 09.06.2000);
- ❖ Memorandum of understanding concerning Cooperation in the Field of Environmental Protection and Sustainable Development between the Macedonian Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning and the Albanian Environmental Agency (Pogradec, Albania, 07.09.2000)
- ❖ Memorandum of understanding and cooperation in sustainable development and the environment between Macedonia and Greece, i.e. Memorandum of understanding and cooperation in sustainable development and the environment between the Party of the Second Part to the New York Interim Accord, of September 13, 1995 and The Party of the First Part to the above Interim Accord (Skopje, 04.09.2000)
- ❖ Letter of Intent between Republic of Macedonia and Province of Low Austria on Establishment of Friendship and Cooperation in the Field of Environmental Protection (St. Pelten, 06.11.2000)
- ❖ Agreement between the Government of Switzerland represented by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation and the Macedonian Government represented by the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning concerning the River Monitoring System in Macedonia (Skopje, 16.02.2001)
- ❖ Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Macedonia and the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Albania for the Protection and Sustainable Development of Lake Ohrid and its Watershed (Skopje, 17.06.2004)
- ❖ Protocol on Cooperation in the field of Environmental Protection between the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning of the Republic of Macedonia and Ministry of Environment of the Czech Republic (Prague, Czech Republic, 17.06.2004)
- ❖ Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation of the European Vultures: Black Vulture (*Aegypius monachus*); Bearded Vulture (*Gypaetus barbatus*); Griffon Vulture (*Gyps fulvus*) and Egyptian Vulture (*Neophron percnopterus*) between Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning of the Republic of Macedonia and The Consortium of NGOs consisting of Frankfurt Zoological Society (FZS); Black Vulture Conservation Foundation (BVCF); Foundation for Conservation of Bearded Vulture (FCBV); BirdLife International (BirdLife); Royal Society for Protection of Birds/BirdLife in United Kingdom (RSPB) and Ligue pour la Protection des Oiseaux/BirdLife in France (LPO) (Skopje, 17.06.2003)

5.7. Annex 7 - List of Indicators for SGP Global Impact Reporting

Note: *For each project, the relevant environmental, poverty reduction, and empowerment indicators will be selected from the list below as per project objectives and design. As the list represents the most important indicators the SGP has identified for its global reporting, the list therefore also serves to guide project design and development. The data resulting from the monitoring and measurement of these indicators from all projects in all participating countries will eventually be aggregated and analyzed through case studies, portfolio reviews and ex-post studies to produce reports of the programme's impact at the global level.*

Not all SGP projects and grantees would be able to monitor and measure all the indicators as listed particularly in small, very focused, and simple projects by community-based organizations. Identification and monitoring of indicators will have to be very selective. Furthermore, surrogate measures will be used and then translated/computed into the values indicated in this list as they are inputted in the SGP global database and submitted in annual reports. In certain cases, the SGP Central Programme Management Team (CPMT) focal area specialists would have to implement thematic case studies to assess the impact of such projects.

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS

Biodiversity (BD)

1. Number of globally significant species protected by project.
2. Hectares of globally significant biodiversity area protected or sustainably managed by project.
3. Number of innovations or new technologies developed/applied.
4. Number of local policies informed in biodiversity focal area
5. Number of national policies informed in biodiversity focal area

Climate Change (CC)

1. Tonnes of CO₂ decreased or avoided by energy efficient and renewable energy technologies or applying environmentally sustainable transport practices introduced by SGP Project
2. Number of innovations or new technologies developed/applied
3. Number of local policies informed in climate change focal area
4. Number of national policies informed in climate change focal area

International Waters (IW)

1. Hectares of globally significant international water body or marine and coastal protected area sustainably managed or protected by SGP project
2. Hectares of fishing grounds or marine protected areas sustainably managed by project
3. Pollution discharge into International Water reduced
 - a. Kilogram (Kg) of Nitrogen (N) discharge into International Water reduced
 - b. Kilogram (Kg) of Phosphorus (P) discharge into International Water reduced
 - c. Gram per liter (g/L) of solids reduced
4. Number of innovations or new technologies developed/applied
5. Number of local policies informed in international waters focal area
6. Number of national policies informed in international waters focal area

Land Degradation (LD)

1. Hectares of degraded land restored by project
2. Hectares of land sustainably managed by project
3. Tons of soil erosion prevented
4. Number of innovations or new technologies developed/applied
5. Number of local policies informed in land degradation focal area
6. Number of national policies informed in land degradation focal area

Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)

1. Reduction in the amount released into the environment or elimination of POPs through the SGP Project:
 - a. WHO-TEQ (Toxic Equivalency)/year reduction into the environment or elimination of U-POPs namely Dioxins, Furans and PCBs (Poly-chlorinated biphenyls) through the SGP project
 - b. Grams/year of Hexachlorobenzene (HCB - C₆H₆) eliminated or release into the environment prevented
 - c. Kilogram (Kg) of Heptachlor (C₁₀H₅Cl₇) eliminated or release into the environment prevented
 - d. Kilogram (Kg) of Aldrin (also called Aldrec, Aldrex, Drinox, Octalene, Seedrin with chemical formula C₁₂H₈Cl₆) eliminated or release into the environment prevented
 - e. Kilogram (Kg) of Dieldrin (also called Alvit, Octalox, Quintox with chemical formula C₁₂H₈Cl₆O) eliminated or release into the environment prevented
 - f. Kilogram (Kg) of DDT (C₁₄H₉Cl₅) eliminated or release into the environment prevented
 - g. Kilogram (Kg) of Endrin (C₁₂H₈Cl₆O) eliminated or release into the environment prevented
 - h. Kilogram (Kg) of Chlordane (C₁₀H₆Cl₈) eliminated or release into the environment prevented
 - i. Kilogram (Kg) of Mirex (C₁₀H₁₂) eliminated or release into the environment prevented
 - j. Kilogram (Kg) of Toxaphene (C₁₀H₁₀Cl₈) eliminated or release into the environment prevented
2. Number of innovations or new technologies developed/applied
3. Number of local policies informed in POPs focal area
4. Number of national policies informed in POPs focal area

Poverty Reduction Indicators

1. Total monetary value (US dollars) of ecosystem goods sustainably produced and providing benefit to project participants and/or community as a whole (in the biodiversity, international waters, and land degradation focal areas as appropriate)
2. Total monetary value (US dollars) of clean energy services provided to project participants and/or community as a whole (in the climate change focal area)
3. Increase in household income by increased income or reduced costs due to SGP project
4. Number of households who have benefited¹⁸ from SGP project
5. Number of individuals (gender disaggregated) who have benefited from SGP project

Empowerment Indicators

1. Number of CBOs/NGOs participated/involved in SGP project
2. Number of CBOs/NGOs formed or registered through the SGP project
3. Number of women participated/involved in SGP project
4. Number of indigenous people participated/involved in SGP project
5. Number of value added labels/certifications/quality standards received or achieved
6. Innovative financial mechanisms put in place through SGP project
7. Number and type of support linkages established with local governments/authorities
8. Number and type of support linkages established with national government institutions
9. Total additional in cash or in kind support obtained for new initiatives and opportunities through SGP project (in US dollars)
10. Total additional in cash or in kind support obtained for sustaining, up-scaling, and replicating SGP supported project (in US dollars)

¹⁸ Benefits are defined as any increase in material and spiritual wealth, food security, clean energy sources, health, education, and other conditions of well-being received by the community.

5.8. Annex 8 - Kinds of possible project activities (not as only one individual exclusive activity) which might be eligible for funding under GEF SGP Macedonia

It is intended to be illustrative, not exclusive.

“The GEF/SGP aims to protect the global environment by funding community conservation and sustainable natural resource use projects. Since different local and national conditions require different kinds of interventions, project components may include one or more of the following: demonstration, capacity building, targeted research, policy dialogue and information dissemination, and raising awareness among critical constituencies.”

—UNDP GEF SGP Strategic Framework, Addendum March 2002, Chapter III

Biodiversity Conservation Focal Area:¹⁹

Projects will be funded that support or promote the conservation and sustainable use and management of biodiversity in ecosystems (including agrobiodiversity and agroecological systems). The operational programs are restricted to in situ conservation activities and the conservation of the genetic variability of wild relatives of domesticated species.

Projects should be located in areas that contain globally significant biodiversity.

- Is the ecosystem or constituent species threatened or at risk?
- Is it a “hot spot” (areas under threat that have exceptional concentrations of species unique to the area)?
- Is there a significant presence of endemic species?
- Is the site rich in species?
- Does it contain habitats that are important to migratory species?
- Does it fall under international treaties, laws, agreements or conventions, such as the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), IUCN Red Data Book on threatened species, Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention), Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, etc.?

Operational Program 1:

Arid and Semi-Arid Ecosystems

Projects will focus on the conservation and sustainable use of endemic biodiversity in dry-land ecosystems including grasslands, and in Mediterranean-type ecosystems, where biodiversity is threatened by increased pressure from more intensified land use, drought, and desertification.

Potential eligible activities:

- prevention and control of land degradation through development of sustainable use methods for biodiversity conservation
- demonstration of community-based approaches to the conservation of natural habitats and ecosystems in and around conservation areas, including protected areas
- strategic interventions to rehabilitate degraded areas in and around communities, e.g., restoration of native fodder species/vegetative cover which are crucial to pastoral economies
- capacity-building efforts that promote the preservation and application of traditional and indigenous knowledge and practices relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity/agrobiodiversity

Operational Program 2:

Freshwater Ecosystems

Projects will concentrate on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in freshwater ecosystems.

Potential eligible activities:

- development of integrated management plans for communities and localities in coastal, lacustrian, and riverine areas
- creation of community-based livelihood alternatives to relieve pressure on conservation and protected areas which conserve freshwater biodiversity
- creation of community-based livelihood alternatives that rehabilitate populations of endemic species in those areas

¹⁹ Please see “Designing GEF Biodiversity Projects,” UNDP/GEF Working Paper, available through the UNDP/GEF Intranet.

<p>Operational Program 3:</p> <p>Forest Ecosystems</p> <p>Projects will support sustainable community-based activities in forest conservation areas, including protected areas, and those that demonstrate and apply sustainable use methods in forestry as part of integrated land management in agricultural and forest landscapes, focusing primarily on tropical and temperate forest ecosystems areas at risk.²⁰</p>	<p>Potential eligible activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • community-led (participatory research) inventories of forest biodiversity and traditional/indigenous sustainable knowledge and use of those resources • establishment of community sustainable development projects around protected areas • creation of participatory schemes for natural resource management by local and indigenous communities, including techniques to conserve wild relatives of domesticated plants and animals for the sustainable use of biodiversity • provision of alternative livelihoods for local and indigenous communities residing in buffer zones of globally significant biodiversity areas • promotion of sustainable production and use of non-timber forest products • development of environmentally sustainable ecotourism schemes with local participation and management
<p>Operational Program 13:</p> <p>Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Important to Agriculture</p> <p>Projects will promote the positive effects and mitigate the negative effects of agriculture practices on biological diversity in agro ecosystems and other ecosystems; the conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources of actual and potential value for food and agriculture; and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of the use of genetic resources of biological diversity important to agriculture.</p> <p>Resources:</p> <p><u>Operational Program 13: Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Important to Agriculture</u> http://www.gefweb.org/Operational_Policies/Operational_Programs/OP_13_English.pdf</p> <p>GEF South Africa Conservation Farming Project http://www.nbi.ac.za/consfarm/cfindex.htm</p> <p>GEF In-situ Conservation of Native Landraces and their Wild Relatives in Vietnam Project http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=1307</p> <p><u>Agro ecology</u> http://www.agroecology.org/</p> <p>Provides a useful glossary of agro ecological terms: http://www.agroecology.org/glossary/index.htm</p>	<p>Potential eligible activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable management and use of biodiversity important to agriculture, including plants, animals, insects, and micro-organisms, and the wild relatives of domesticated plants and animals and their gene pools.²¹ • In-situ conservation of plant and animal agrobiodiversity through community seed banks and community biodiversity registers. • Improved effectiveness of traditional farming systems for conservation of crop <i>landraces</i>²² of local and global importance for food security and biodiversity. • Establishment and community co-management of protected areas that contain important pools of wild relatives of crops and breeds. • Conservation of Gramineae, and other neglected crop and fodder species, and associated insects and arthropods for sustainable agro ecological development.

²⁰ However, please note the restriction in Paragraph 36 of the "GEF Corporate Business Plan FY00-FY02": "Among key strategic issues needing attention, the role of the GEF in sustainable forest management is key. In accordance with the OP, GEF would support sustainable forest uses. The one current exception would be sustainable logging, because the scientific debate on that matter is still ongoing. So far, the relevance of sustainable logging to conservation objectives remains very much open to question, and the GEF will need to consider seek advice from STAP. In the meantime, projects on sustainable logging will not be supported by GEF."

²¹ "Several regions – known as *Vavilov Centers of Diversity* after N.I. Vavilov, the Russian botanist who first described the pattern – have been identified as locations of highly diverse crop genetic resources. The centers of crop genetic diversity – including the Mediterranean, the Mexican highlands, Central China, and the Northern Andes – are characterized by a long agricultural history, ecological diversity, mountainous terrain, cultural diversity, and a lack of heavy forest cover. These centers may or may not be located where the crop was first domesticated; wheat and barley were domesticated in southwest Asia, but a current center of their varietal diversity is in Ethiopia; the tomato originated in northwest Peru, but the greatest domestic varietal diversity is in Mexico." Source: <http://www.wri.org/biodiv/foodcrop.html>.

²² Landraces, also called farmers' varieties, are locally-adapted strains of a species bred through traditional methods of directed selection. Landraces are farmer-developed varieties of crop plants adapted to local environmental conditions and to community uses (like specific recipes, home storage) and cultural practices.

Biodiversity as Related to Land Degradation Issues:

The GEF/SGP will fund activities that

- Protect biodiversity and promote sustainable use in arid, semi-arid and Mediterranean-type ecosystems, and
- Prevent deforestation and promote sustainable use and sustainable management of forests in order to conserve their biodiversity.

Climate Change Focal Area:

GEF/SGP projects will contribute to removing the cultural, institutional, technical, and economic barriers and promote dissemination of accessible, sustainable, climate-friendly technologies and measures throughout a locality or region. They will primarily involve building local capacity; raising public awareness of climate change and energy conservation and efficiency issues; and demonstrating and disseminating appropriate technologies and measures. The projects may also aim to reduce the cost of suitable technologies for communities by supporting applied and participatory research and development.

Operational Program 5:

Removing Barriers to Energy Conservation and Energy Efficiency

Potential eligible activities:

- participatory, community-based assessments of local energy use, resources, and alternatives
- energy audits of homes, public buildings, hotels, and factories linked to advocacy and training about energy efficient responses
- capacity-building and awareness-raising activities about climate change and its repercussions at the local level, incorporating local knowledge about climatic history and patterns
- capacity-building and awareness-raising activities about energy efficiency
- advocacy to remove subsidies to inefficient and polluting sources of energy

Operational Program 6:

Promoting the Adoption of Renewable Energy by Removing Barriers and Reducing Implementation Costs

Potential eligible activities:

- demonstration projects involving the introduction of appropriate, renewable solar technologies at the community level: solar pumps for water purification and irrigation, as well as solar energy for cooking, heating, and electricity
- demonstration projects involving wind-generated energy for community and municipal needs
- biogas demonstration projects in appropriate contexts where there are incentives for sustainability
- collaborative community/academic research and development in order to produce low-cost, sustainable energy options

Operational Program 11:

Promoting Environmentally Sustainable Transport

Projects will focus on reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from ground transport sources by removing barriers to the development and adoption of appropriate technologies and transport modalities, and promoting their use.

Resources:

Operational Program 11: Promoting Environmentally Sustainable Transport

http://www.gefweb.org/Operational_Policies/Operational_Programs/OP_11_English.pdf

Sustainable Transport Action Network for Asia and the Pacific, the Sustran Network

<http://www.geocities.com/sustranet/>

Potential eligible activities:

- **Promotion and advocacy** of modal shifts to more efficient, less polluting forms of public and freight transport through traffic management, avoidance, and use of cleaner fuels, especially in small and medium-sized towns.
- **Campaigns to promote non-motorized transport** (pedestrian, bicycle, roller blades, human-powered scooters), through, for example, safe bicycle routes, better pedestrian facilities, parking areas convenient to public transport, etc.
- **Capacity building** for community and neighbourhood participation in policy formulation and design of urban and peri-urban public transportation systems.
- **Training and capacity building for CBO and NGO** participation in the establishment of ground transport emissions standards and monitoring of those emissions.

<p>Institute for Transportation and Development Policy http://www.itdp.org/ST/ International Bicycle Fund http://www.ibike.org/ GEF Gdansk (Poland) Cycling Infrastructure Project http://www.gefweb.org/Documents/MediumSized_Project_Proposals/MSP_Proposals/Poland_MSP_Gdansk_Cycling.pdf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support and advocacy for development and demonstration of fuel cell²³ or battery operated 2-and-3 wheelers for more than one (1) person. <p>Activities <i>not</i> eligible for GEF/SGP support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CNG (Compressed Natural Gas) or LPG (Liquefied Petroleum Gas) buses, taxis, 3-wheelers or scooters (no global benefits because GHG emissions are not affected).²⁴
---	---

Climate Change as Related to Land Degradation Issues:

The GEF/SGP will fund activities such as

- rural renewable energy projects (solar, wind, and biomass energy for lighting, water heating, cooking, and water pumping),
- bio fuel activities that restore degraded land, and
- biomass cover in order to produce, harvest, and utilize biomass in sustainable ways.

International Waters Focal Area

GEF/SGP grants will fund projects involving communities proximate to threatened water-bodies and trans-boundary threats to their ecosystems. Priority is placed on the threat posed to international waters by land-based sources of surface and groundwater pollution that degrade the quality of international waters. This means preventing the release of persistent toxic substances and heavy metals that cannot be neutralized by freshwater ecosystems, or that accumulate in living organisms.

High priority is also placed on:

- abatement of common contaminants such as nutrients, biological contaminants, or sediments that endanger species or threaten ecosystems;
- prevention and control of ecological degradation of critical habitats (such as wetlands, shallow waters) that sustain biodiversity; and
- management of unsustainable use of water resources resulting from over-fishing, excessive withdrawal of freshwater, and resource extraction.

Operational Program 8:

Water body based Program.

Projects address the priority transboundary environmental concerns that exist in a specific water body, such as a transboundary river basin or a large water ecosystem.

Potential eligible activities:

- support for capacity-building and technical assistance for species and habitat conservation in fishing and coastal communities faced with biodiversity loss of river, and lake species
- provision of sustainable technical and livelihood alternatives in situations of excessive over-fishing and water resource extraction
- small-scale demonstrations of approaches to reducing transboundary pollutant flows at the local level
- projects which test approaches to implementing existing Strategic Action Programmes (SAPs) and National Strategic Action Programs (NAPs) at the local level

Operational Program 9:

Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area

These projects involve the integration of land and water resource management as a means of addressing the degradation of international waters. They **can involve** other GEF focal areas as well as the crosscutting issue of land degradation (desertification and deforestation).

Potential eligible activities:

- participatory inventories and community use assessments of unique or endangered coastal biodiversity in a joint biodiversity/international waters multiple focal area project
- development of integrated freshwater basin-coastal area management to address the causes and sectoral activities that endanger the wetlands that serve as nursery areas
- capacity-building and technical assistance to combat salinization of coastal soils from over-use of freshwater and groundwater from transboundary aquifers for

²³ Fuel-cells combine hydrogen and atmospheric oxygen to produce electricity and distilled water (H₂O) with zero GHG emissions.

²⁴ Some CNG conversions will reduce GHG emissions, but unintended or accidental leakages that emit GHG cancel out and even *increase* emissions, or system-wide issues erase any global benefit. Motorized rickshaw CNG conversions are a case in point. It is recommended that SGP National Steering Committees have members, or access to resource people, who can knowledgeably evaluate potential OP 11 project ideas.

	<p>irrigation and household consumption (applicable in border towns and regions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • projects which test approaches to implementing existing Strategic Action Programmes (SAPs) and National Strategic Action Programs (NAPs) at the local level
<p>Operational Program 10:</p> <p>Contaminant-based Program</p> <p>This program includes activities that demonstrate ways of overcoming barriers to the adoption of best practices to limit contamination of international waters.</p>	<p>Potential eligible activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • community initiatives to eliminate the causes of land based sources of pollution, particularly Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), nutrients and certain metals • reduction of agricultural run-off in the form of chemical fertilizers and pesticides • reduction of industrial waste dumping by promoting reuse and recycling

Multiple Focal Area Operational Program

Operational Program 12:

Integrated Ecosystem Management

Projects will support community-based activities that demonstrate integrated approaches to ecosystem and natural resource management. Project components must cover two or more GEF focal areas in an integrated manner:

- Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity
- Protection of international waters
- Mitigation of climate change

Opportunity:

Because of its scope covering two or more GEF focal areas and one or more ecosystems, OP 12 provides an opportunity to scale up SGP projects to GEF medium-sized projects.

Resources:

Operational Program 12. Integrated Ecosystem Management

http://www.gefweb.org/Operational_Policies/Operational_Programs/OP_12_English.pdf

International Development Research Center

<http://www.idrc.ca/>

GEF Projects: LAC Integrated Silvo-Pastoral Approaches to Ecosystem Management

<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=947>

and Integrated Ecosystem Management in Four Representative Landscapes of Senegal

<http://www.gefonline.org/projectDetails.cfm?projID=933>

Potential eligible activities:

- Integrated micro-watershed management that encompasses biodiversity conservation and carbon sequestration (carbon sinks) through *conservation farming* by small farmers.²⁵
- Integrated management of wetland habitats that protects terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity through soil and water conservation practices such as conservation farming.
- Promotion of biodiversity-friendly land and resource use to ensure ecological services,²⁶ that integrates set-asides for biodiversity protection, compatible agro-forestry and silvo-pastoral systems, and ecological restoration of degraded pasture and farm lands.
- Reduction of negative impacts to international waters from wastewater discharges, conserving biodiversity in coastal ecosystems, and potentially increasing the sequestration of greenhouse gases in terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems.
- Protection and sustainable use of critical dryland and wetland habitats associated with transboundary water basins and shared watersheds.

²⁵ Conservation farming helps to decrease levels of atmospheric carbon and increase the carbon stored in soils and organic matter through:

- I. Minimum tilling conserves organic matter, stabilizes the soil structure, and reduces erosion while increasing levels of organic carbon in the soil.
- II. Returning organic matter to the soil enhances its fertility, improves its water-holding capacity, and stimulates
- III. plant growth.
- IV. Using existing standing crops as mulch and animal wastes as fertilizer reduces input costs of fertilizer.
- V. Restoring degraded lands increases biological diversity and enhances ecological processes and resilience of ecosystems.

Source: GEF South Africa Conservation Farming Project (www.nbi.ac.za/consfarm/cfindex.htm)

²⁶ Ecological services provided by well-functioning ecosystems include air and water quantity, quality, and purification; waste detoxification; climate regulation through mitigation of droughts and floods; soil fertility and nutrient cycling; pollination and seed dispersal; and pest control.

Operational Program 14:**Reducing and Eliminating Releases of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)**

Under POP-1 Targeted (foundational) capacity building SGP supports:

- Projects for awareness rising among different stakeholders with a special emphasis on groups living in and around ecologically sensitive areas and SGP priority areas based on country programme strategy (CPS).
- Projects on management and dissemination of information on integrated management of POPs, including best management practices.

Under POP-2 Implementation of Policy/Regulatory Reforms and Investments, SGP can support:

- Activities that are defined in the NIP which are suitable for NGOs or CBOs to implement.

SGP projects that can be supported under POP-2 include:

- Promoting and demonstrating ecological and sustainable farming in all its varieties of approaches, but especially focusing on innovative and indigenous approaches, resulting in very much lesser use, or no use at all, of POPs pesticides.
- Generating local and alternative business opportunities, clean production facilities and income generation initiatives such as promoting and supporting the production, sourcing, substitution, marketing, sale, and use of more benign substitutes for POPs containing products or POPs producing processes.
- Generating local and alternative business opportunities, clean production facilities and income generation initiatives such as promoting and supporting the production, sourcing, substitution, marketing, sale, and use of more benign substitutes for POPs containing products or POPs producing processes.
- Reducing, reusing, and recycling the amount of medical, municipal, and industrial wastes being generated and incinerated towards reduction of dioxin and furan emissions.
- Local development, sale, and use of non-DDT and non-POPs pesticide alternative approaches to malaria and other vector borne disease control as well as termite extermination.
- Publicly disseminating local inventories of POPs in humans, wildlife and the environment, including their uses, releases, and stocks of POPs, in order to empower local communities to influence government policy, and document violations of the Stockholm Convention.
- Monitor and help enforce illegal cross-border trafficking of POPs containing substances through community action and community radio networks.

Under POP-3 Demonstration of Innovative and Cost-Effective Technologies and Practices SGP can support:

- Demonstration of innovative and cost-effective technologies and alternative practices at the community level including small scale technologies for disposal of products, phase-out of PCBs and any other POPs, alternatives to DDT, and alternatives to other POPs subject to specific exemptions under the Stockholm Convention, and practices with multi-focal area benefits such as integrated pest management.
- Projects that replicate and demonstrate experience gained in the International Waters focal area in addressing POPs.

SGP projects that can be supported under POP-3 include:

- Promoting and demonstrating ecological and sustainable farming in all its varieties of approaches, but especially focusing on innovative and indigenous approaches, resulting in very much lesser use, or no use at all, of POPs pesticides.
- Generating local and alternative business opportunities, clean production facilities and income generation initiatives such as promoting and supporting the production, sourcing, substitution, marketing, sale, and use of more benign substitutes for POPs containing products or POPs producing processes.
- Reducing, reusing, and recycling the amount of medical, municipal, and industrial wastes being generated and incinerated towards reduction of dioxin and furan emissions.
- Local development, sale, and use of non-DDT and non-POPs pesticide alternative approaches to malaria and other vector borne disease control as well as termite extermination.

Operational Programme 15:

Land Degradation Focal Area and Sustainable Land Management (LD/SLM):

The objective of the Operational Programme on Sustainable Land Management (OP 15) is to mitigate the causes and negative impacts of land degradation on the structures and functional integrity of ecosystems through sustainable land management practices as a contribution to improving people's livelihoods and economic wellbeing. Projects must be consistent with the specific guidance given by the GEF for activities under its SLM programme in a country that is eligible for GEF support, and must strive to develop policies, regulations, and structures such as improved land tenure systems and pricing systems to appropriately value renewable natural resources, including water, to encourage efficient and sustainable use and management.

SLM-1 Capacity building

- Capacity building at the local, national and regional levels is aimed at creating the appropriate enabling environment and institutional capacity to support sustainable land management. Capacity building can have a wide range of objectives and activities. In SGP, where most projects involve the local communities, the capacity building focus of projects needs to be defined (or redefined, as the case may be) with the local community, their customary institutions and community based organisations. While larger projects often aim at "country-driven priorities", in SGP, community driven priorities must be supreme. Building capacity should be based on the potential of the local community in question, such as updating local traditional knowledge and indigenous science and technology on irrigation, sustainable forest management, traditional management systems of mobile pastoralists for rangelands, identification and sustainable use of medicinal plants, water harvesting and watershed management, biodiversity-based handicrafts, community conserved areas, living sustainable with the desert and rehabilitation of local technology, science and customary natural resource management institutions.

SLM-2 Implementation of innovative and indigenous land management activities

Examples could include projects in:

- Sustainable agriculture
 - Adoption of improved tillage measures that do not adversely impact the stability of soil structure;
 - Establishment of windbreaks, buffer strips, and filter strips to reduce water and wind erosion;
 - Protection from farming or rehabilitation of river or coastal wetlands to stabilize hydrologic flows;
 - Introduction of indigenous crop varieties to reduce the risks of crop losses; and
 - Improved management of agricultural wastes to improve soil and water retention
- Sustainable rangeland/pasture management
 - Strengthening of viable traditional rangeland management systems;
 - Establishment of mechanisms to help resolve wildlife-livestock-agriculture conflicts;
 - Enhancement of range management systems;
 - Introduction of indigenous plants for restoration of rangeland fire management programmes;
 - Introduction of indigenous livestock varieties to minimize loss because of their natural adaptations;
 - Establishment of windbreaks to reduce water and wind erosion;
 - Protection and/or restoration of riparian forest or woodland; and
 - Protection and/or restoration of the natural vegetation of groundwater recharge areas.
- Sustainable forest and woodland management
 - Strengthening indigenous forest/woodland management systems;
 - Use of indigenous multiple use tree species to restore degraded areas;
 - Restoration and protection of degraded ecologically sensitive areas;
 - Protection and/or restoration of riparian forest and wetlands, and groundwater recharge areas;
 - Improvement of forest health, controlling damaging invasive species, strengthening forest inventory, monitoring, assessment, and sustainable harvesting practices, establishment of community woodlots to provide fuel wood as an alternative source to natural forests and woodland; and
 - Piloting of mechanisms to compensate local communities that protect ecosystem stability, functions, and services in watersheds to ensure stable flow of high-quality water downstream.
 - Renewable energy technologies and know-how that will be alternatives to use of forest resources for fuelwood.