



United Nations Development Programme
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY



FAX COVER SHEET

Date: November 23, 1998

To: Mr. Kenneth King
Assistant CEO, GEF

Fax No.: (202) 522 3240

From: Mr. Rafael Asenjo
Executive Coordinator, UNDP-GEF

Fax No.: (1 212) 906 6998

Pages: 50
(including this one)

Subject: Submission of Medium Size Project Brief titled: "Harnessing multi-stakeholder mechanisms to promote global environmental priorities at the national level"

Enclosed is a project brief for *Harnessing multi-stakeholder mechanisms to promote global environmental priorities at the national level* submitted to UNDP by the *Earth Council*. Please note that the project has been endorsed by the GEF national operational focal points from Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Philippines and Uganda. The GEF focal point endorsement from Burkina Faso is forthcoming. In addition to the GEF focal points, the proposal has also been endorsed by the NCSDs from Philippines, Mexico and Uganda and by the Private Sector Foundation in Uganda.

In accordance with the operational guidance for the preparation and approval of medium-sized projects, the brief was submitted on October 16, 1998 to the GEF Secretariat for action by the Chief Executive Office (CEO). It was simultaneously circulated to UNEP/GEF, World Bank/GEF, STAP and the Biodiversity and Climate Change Convention Secretariats for comment. We have received comments from the GEF Secretariat and the World Bank. Enclosed are the revised proposal and a note on how Secretariat and World Bank comments have been addressed. We understand that the Secretariat will recommend to the CEO that the revised project be submitted to the Council for approval.

We look forward to receiving the CEO's decision but understand that the project will not be formally approved, even if the CEO has endorsed it, until the Council has reviewed it for a 15-day period.

Thank you and best regards.

Cc: M. Ramos, C. Cruz (GEF Secretariat)

Encl.: Note on how GEF Secretariat and World Bank comments have been addressed in the proposal.
Revised proposal titled: "Harnessing multi-stakeholder mechanisms to promote global environmental priorities at the national level".

Response to GEF Secretariat Comments on MSP titled "Harnessing multi-stakeholder mechanisms to promote global environmental priorities"

(Note GEFSEC comments are in italics.)

A. Major Issues

1. Additional transparency in the budget is needed. Project proposers will separate administrative costs of the project from other costs currently included in this area (e.g., technical assistant)

Following the guidelines provided in the MSP Kit, the budget has been presented in two ways:

- (i) By project activity. The estimate by project activity precedes the description of each activity.
- (ii) By inputs into the project (personnel, subcontracts, training and such). The inputs budget is presented on page 13.

However, in order to make clear the breakdown between in-country and Earth Council coordinated expenditures by each input category, the budget in the proposal has been modified as follows (see page 14, paragraph 50 of the proposal):

INPUTS	TOTAL	IN COUNTRY	EARTH COUNCIL COORDINATED*
PDF	25,000		25,000
PERSONNEL	230,000	130,000	100,000
SUBCONTRACTS	110,000	110,000	
TRAINING	220,000	220,000	
EQUIPMENT	15,000	15,000	
TRAVEL	50,000	20,000	30,000
EVALUATION MISSION	30,000		30,000
Follow-up: preparation of long-term proposal	40,000		40,000
MISCELLANEOUS	30,000	20,000	10,000
PROJECT TOTAL (PDF+ PROJECT COSTS)	750,000	515,000	235,000

* The figures indicated in this column reflect resources that will go towards project activities that are directly coordinated by the Earth Council without necessarily being spent on Earth Council staff. For example, the entire cost of evaluation missions goes towards Earth Council coordinated activities, given that guidance, oversight and monitoring is one of their primary responsibilities.

2. The names of the national/local organizations supported in country should be included specifically. An annex with a brief description of these institutions would be helpful.

The main objective of the project is to provide support and build capacity within existing NCSDs to integrate global environmental priorities into development planning and policy-making. Therefore, the primary focus of the capacity building activities is the NCSD in each country. Annex A1 through A6 provide relevant information for each country including the institutions that will be the main focus (the NCSD) and those that will be encouraged to participate in workshops and various forums that are to be organized to promote the Integrative Sustainability Planning approach. This information is under the *Institutional Participation* section. However, a review of the annexes has shown that those for two countries, namely Costa Rica and Mexico, were included in the opening paragraphs instead of in a separate

section. For Costa Rica the NCSD is called CONADES: Consejo Nacional de Desarrollo Sostenible; and for Mexico it is through the Mexican Council for Sustainable Development as also indicated in the opening paragraph of Annex A-3. This has been corrected in the draft (see page 17, para 4 and page 22, para 5).

Given that the NCSDs are the leitmotif of the project their participation is assured. The participation of the other listed institutions is, however, only indicative at this stage. These institutions will most likely be involved once the project gets off the ground. However no formal agreement has been made with them as yet, in order not to build false expectations.

3. *Regarding potential areas of duplication, the draft will: (a) include text that specifically identify the projects with potential duplication (e.g., Small Grants Programme, GEF Enabling Activities, National communications Support Programme, GEF Country Workshops, etc.); (b) text to clarify that the national assessments (biodiversity and climate change strategies) focus not on the strategies themselves, but in the manner in which the NCSDs are involved in the formulation of these strategies.*

As regards on-going GEF activities in the 6 countries, Annexes A1 through A6 identify GEF projects in each country under the section *Other GEF Activities*. The GEF Small Grants Programme was mentioned only in some country annexes. The revised proposal has been corrected appropriately (see Annexes A1 through A6 under section on Institutional Participation). The project is proposing something very different from the immediate focus of the on-going GEF projects in the prototype countries. It will be focusing on how to better engage an existing structure or mechanism (namely the NCSDs) to fulfill the objective of including global environmental priorities while they implement their mandate of integrating national environmental issues, and social and cultural concerns into development planning. Therefore, while other GEF projects are dealing with a global environmental concern within a specific geographic area, the project approach is to further global environmental objectives by influencing national policy making through multi-stakeholder NCSDs. A perfect example is what is being proposed in the Philippines, which is to take as a starting platform a medium-term Philippine Development Plan (1999-2004) and to integrate global priorities therein. A similar approach is to be followed in the other countries, for example in Uganda it is called "Vision 2025" as indicated in annex A5.

The focus of the project is also different from that of the Enabling Activities and the Communications Support Programs. While the long-term objective of both is to see global environmental priorities being reflected in individual country planning exercises or in other words to internalize in some sense global environmental problems, this MSP is looking at how multi-stakeholder NCSDs can more effectively be involved in achieving this objective.

The above clarifications have been made in the proposal (see paras 8 and 9).

4. *Regarding OP fit, the proposal will: (a) provide examples of the "substantive issues" that would be discussed in the planning sessions of the NCSDs, and the type of issues that could emerge as "gaps" regarding the global environment; and (b) outline the expected key globally significant issues that are likely to be presented.*

The global environmental issues that emerge as "gaps" and that NCSDs choose to focus on forms an integral part of the first two activities to be undertaken by the project, namely Activity 3.1 and 3.2. Therefore part of the ISP approach is to use a participatory process in identifying the main issues and is one of the outputs of the process rather than a predefined input. However, the fit with GEF Operational Programs can be woven into this process by including this information in the *Basic Information Briefings* (page 7 and 8) to be organized under Activity 3.2. This clarification has been made in the draft proposal (see para 23).

5. *The role of the GEF National Focal Point should be given greater relevance in defining and driving the agenda for whatever country level effort is undertaken through the project.*

-4-

The GEF operational focal points have been an important part of the project development process and their continuing involvement is very important to its success. They will play an important direction-setting role and this is mentioned under Activity 3.5 that relates to the overall guidance and oversight aspects. The draft proposal has been revised to highlight this role better (see para 36).

6. Please (a) make sure to delete the reference to GEF on top of page 11; (b) clarify if our understanding is correct regarding the Earth Council contribution of US\$1 million towards project activities worldwide. If this is the case, it should be reflected as part of the baseline in the project; (c) before conducting "global overlays" are there sustainable development national plans which could serve as baseline; (d) potential of cross-fertilization between countries? At the moment, the Earth Council would go to individual countries one by one and NCSDs may need to talk directly to exchange experiences. A para on this issue may be helpful in the text.

The reference to GEF on top of page 11 has been removed.

The Earth Council's contribution towards strengthening multi-stakeholder NCSDs in general is estimated at US\$ 3 million over the next 3 years and this constitutes the baseline. This explanation is provided in para 43.

There are existing development plans in the prototype countries and the project approach is to use these as a starting platform. The Philippines and Uganda are good examples. This clarification has been made under para 12.

The role of the information and education and communication materials in engendering cross-fertilization among prototype countries is clarified in para 31 and in paragraph 37, 8th bullet.

**Response to World Bank Comments on MSP titled
"Harnessing multi-stakeholder mechanisms to promote global environmental priorities"**
(*Note: Comments made by the World Bank are in italics.*)

1. Absorptive capacity of countries to integrate yet another strategy and process into their planning process? How do existing NCSDs address global environmental priorities at present in their planning process?

The rationale for the project stems from the fact that in over 70 countries in the world there exist multi-stakeholder planning structures, namely NCSDs, that are mandated by the Rio Principles and Agenda 21. The success of these mechanisms in integrating ecologically and socially sustainable development into national policy and decision-making has varied across countries – with some being more successful than others. The varying degree of success has been a function of the mandate, composition and character of individual NCSDs. In fact some NCSDs have not only made significant headway in integrating national environmental issues, and social and cultural concerns into development planning and policy making, but have also taken important steps toward including global environmental priorities in this process. The Philippines being the first that comes to mind. For instance, with respect to integrating global environmental issues the Philippines Council for Sustainable Development was instrumental in the promulgation of regulations governing CO₂ emissions. In terms of addressing national environmental concerns in development policy and planning the PCSD played an important role in promoting improvements in the government's environmental clearance processes for investment projects.

Clearly, the mechanisms or the structures that are best placed strategically to integrate environmental issues (local and global), and socio-cultural concerns into development planning and policy-making exist in several developing countries in the form of NCSDs. The project proponent sees this as an opportunity. In order to fully realize their potential they need additional support targeted specifically to integrating global environmental priorities. In terms of improving the effectiveness of NCSDs in general and promoting the active involvement of a broad-based group of stakeholders, the Earth Council, UNDP, UNEP and national governments have already invested and continue to invest resources to this end. This constitutes the baseline for the project with the incremental investment going specifically to address the integration of global priorities by applying an Integrative Sustainability Planning (ISP) approach. The project will not, therefore, be over-burdening the planning processes in countries by creating a new structure or mechanism or strategy. On the contrary, the project's objective is to engage more actively an existing structure or mechanism in six prototype countries to fulfill the objective of including global environmental priorities while they implement their mandate of integrating national environmental issues, and social and cultural concerns in development planning. Also, these structures are the result of a momentum that built up over several years and are now officially recognized entities.

2. How have the ongoing climate change and biodiversity enabling activity processes attempted to do this already? What assurances are there that these activities are not duplicative and are in response to demand-driven real gaps?

The Enabling Activities are aimed at helping countries prepare their national communications to the global conventions and the Communications Support Program at providing additional technical support to countries in completing the communication, the principal objective being to internalize global priorities into national-level planning and decision making. The long-term objective of the MSP is the same, however the focus is more on the most effective means to engage existing NCSDs in striving towards the same objective, or in other words focusing more on the political process. The idea is not to duplicate an ongoing biodiversity strategy planning exercise but to support multi-stakeholder NCSDs in including global priorities while they implement their mandate of integrating national environmental issues, and social and cultural concerns in development planning. Moreover, the active involvement of the NCSDs in the project development stage exhibits the demand for such an initiative in the selected countries.

3. How were prototype countries selected?

The complexities of the involved issues and processes, as well as the limited time frame and resources, dictate that the project be limited to a few countries. The six countries have been chosen based on the diversity and relative maturity of their NCSDs or similar entities, their openness to multi-stakeholder participation and process, and their interest in being part of the project. Their vast ecological diversity would also enrich cross-fertilization of experiences, and ensure replicability of approaches that will be developed by the project.

This clarification has been made in the proposal under para 13.

4. Why can't global priorities as a whole be integrated simultaneously into the planning process?

The end goal is to integrate simultaneously global priorities as a whole into the planning process by building the capacity of NCSDs to apply the highly participatory integrative planning approach. However, given the limited time frame and resources and in order to come up with good illustrative examples of the process, it is more feasible to select a priority area to demonstrate how this goal can be achieved.

This clarification has been made in the proposal under para 26.

5. How does the project complement Japanese support to strengthening the NCSD Secretariat structure?

As highlighted in the proposal NCSDs have generated mixed experiences in furthering their mandate. There is clearly a need to strengthen the NCSDs in fulfilling their mandate of including national environmental issues and social and cultural concerns into national planning through a broad-based participatory approach. The Earth Council, along with other donors such as Japan, the Dutch and Swedish governments and UNDP-SEED, will be investing in activities to achieve this end. This constitutes the baseline. GEF resources will be targeted specifically at enhancing NCSD capacities to include global priorities in their work see paragraphs 43 and 44.

6. How will the project measure its contribution to GEF Operational Program objectives?

The contribution towards achieving GEF Operational Program objectives can be made a part of the monitoring and evaluation framework to be developed under Activity 3.3 (page 9). The Monitoring and Evaluation framework can be designed to not only measure progress of NCSDs in applying the ISP approach to a global environmental concern, but also progress towards GEF Operational Program objectives. The relevant GEF operational program will depend on the priority issue selected by each prototype country.

This clarification has been made in the draft proposal under paragraph 29. 4th bullet.

7. Does the project actually propose to execute specific project activities through GEF focal points?

The GEF focal points have played an important part in identifying the need for this initiative and in developing the project. They will continue to play an important direction-setting, guidance and oversight role. Their involvement in an oversight role, along with the Earth Council, is particularly important in ensuring that activities fit with the GEF operational programs and to identify and benefit from synergies between this initiative and other GEF-funded projects and programs in the country.

This clarification has been made in the proposal under paragraph 36.

8. Detailed budget by activity.

-7-

See response above to GEFSEC comment on the budget.

9. GEF focal point endorsement letters.

At the time the proposal was circulated to GEFSEC and the Implementing Agencies we had only received the GEF focal point endorsement letter from one country. The cover transmittal note did indicate that other letters are expected and that approval will be contingent on this. We have now received endorsement letters from all countries (attachments to proposal) except Burkina Faso, and this too is expected soon.

10. The project component on increasing public awareness of global environmental priorities appears to fit within GEFSEC's ongoing effort to develop an action plan, based on the recent outreach information paper to Council. More detail will be useful on the types of tool kits, practical guides and monographs that will be prepared by this project.

The information, education and communication tools and materials that are to be prepared under Activity 3.5 of the project are meant for training purposes and to be practical and easily accessible for the main types of stakeholders that form part of the NCSDs. They will facilitate exchange of experiences and best practices on how NCSDs can use the Integrative Sustainability Planning approach to include global environmental priorities while they implement their mandate to integrate national environmental issues and social and cultural concerns into planning and policy-making. For example, one of the first materials that will need to be produced is a detailed description of the ISP process itself, using existing studies and materials but put into a language adapted for training purposes. Given the broad-based nature of the NCSDs, these materials will be accessible to a wide range of people in these countries therefore resulting in increased public awareness of global environmental priorities. This clarification has been made under paragraph 16.

MEDIUM SIZE PROPOSAL - PROJECT SUMMARY

IDENTIFYING	
<p>1. <u>Project name</u>: Harnessing multi-stakeholder mechanisms to promote global environmental priorities at the national level.</p>	<p>2. <u>GEF Implementing Agency</u>: UNDP</p>
<p>3. <u>Countries in which the project is being implemented</u>: Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Burkina Faso, Uganda, and Philippines.</p>	<p>4. <u>Country eligibility</u>: All participating countries have ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.</p>
<p>5. <u>GEF focal areas</u>: Biodiversity and Climate Change (including land degradation as it applies to these focal areas).</p>	<p>6. <u>Operational program</u>/Short-term measure: Operational Programs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.</p>
<p>7. <u>Project linkage to national priorities, action plans, and programs</u>: All of the participating countries have established officially recognized multi-stakeholder NCSDs or similar entities in response to Agenda 21 and the Rio Principles. The NCSDs are multi-sectoral catalysts for policies that integrate economic, environmental and social goals across sectors and agencies. At the same time, all of the participating countries have ratified the Global Conventions on Biodiversity and Climate Change and are preparing strategies and action plans on how global environmental priorities can be addressed at the national level. The project will work in the 6 participating countries to develop and promote an integrative sustainability planning approach within existing NCSDs that links the former to the latter, and exemplifies the integration of national commitments under global conventions into national sustainable development planning.</p>	
<p>8. <u>GEF national operational focal point and date of country endorsement</u>: (See attached endorsement letters)</p>	
PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES	
<p>9. <u>Project rationale and objectives</u>: The project <u>rationale</u> stems from the observation that multi-stakeholder planning structures (NCSDs and similar entities) that exist in over 70 countries and were mandated by the Rio Principles and Agenda 21 are not integrating global environmental priorities into national sustainable development planning. The project <u>objective</u> is to develop and promote, as a prototype, an integrative sustainability planning approach (herein called ISP) within NCSDs and similar entities that integrates global environmental priorities into national sustainable development planning.</p>	
<p>10. <u>Project outcomes</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) A tested ISP approach through multi-stakeholder NCSDs. (ii) Strengthened multi-stakeholder NCSDs in each prototype country vis-à-vis their global environmental priorities. (iii) Information, education and communication (IEC) strategies and materials. 	<p><u>Indicators</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) A manual that synthesizes the process, conclusions and results of the ISP approach in the six countries for replication purposes. (ii) Multi-stakeholders that are aware of and act upon to advance the global environmental priorities in their respective countries. (iii) Guidelines and lessons-learned materials presented in tool-kit format.

<p>11. Project activities to achieve outcomes (including cost in US\$ '000):</p> <p>(i) Assessment of current national planning processes and levels of integration of global environmental priorities. (US\$80,000)</p> <p>(ii) Developing an Integrative Sustainability Planning (ISP) approach. (US\$260,000)</p> <p>(iii) Formulation of Action Plan for implementing global priorities. (US\$80,000)</p> <p>(iv) Documentation and Information, Education and Communication (IEC) materials to facilitate replication of the ISP approach. (US\$175,000)</p> <p>(v) Overall guidance, coordinating and monitoring. (US\$130,000)</p>	<p>Indicators:</p> <p>(i) By month 3, assessment reports are complete and distributed to NCSDs.</p> <p>(ii) By month 12, at least one training workshop held in each country.</p> <p>(iii) By month 15, each participating NCSD will have produced an action plan.</p> <p>(iv) By month 18, at least 100 copies of the IEC materials are prepared and ready for distribution to NCSDs, UNDP, WB, GEF and other interested parties.</p> <p>(v) By month 18, a report of the review workshop will have been prepared and distributed to the same people as in (iv).</p>									
<p>12. Estimated budget (in US\$):</p> <table> <tr> <td>GEF:</td> <td>PDF A:</td> <td>25,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Project:</td> <td>725,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">TOTAL (incl. PDF A):</td> <td>750,000</td> </tr> </table>		GEF:	PDF A:	25,000		Project:	725,000	TOTAL (incl. PDF A):		750,000
GEF:	PDF A:	25,000								
	Project:	725,000								
TOTAL (incl. PDF A):		750,000								
<p>13. Information on project proposer: Earth Council.</p>										
<p>14. Information on proposed executing agency (if different from above): Same as above.</p>										
<p>15. Date of initial submission of project concept: 19 July, 1997</p>										
<p>16. Project identification number:</p>										
<p>17. Implementing Agency contact person: Emma Torres</p>										
<p>18. Project linkage to Implementing Agency programs: UNDP-GEF is providing financial resources and technical assistance for building national capacity to respond to Global Conventions and linking global priorities to local actions through the Small Grants Programme. UNDP is also promoting capacity building for meeting the goals of Agenda 21 through several programs such as Capacity 21. The proposed project fits in with all these initiatives and could provide a means to enhance the impact of these initiatives.</p>										

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES

1.1. *Rationale*

1.1.1 Basis and mandate

1. The 1992 Rio Earth Summit stressed the urgent need to "Change Course" in order to work towards the transition to a new kind of development that is sustainable in environmental, human (social and cultural), and economic terms. This kind of development must then be translated into specific policies, legislation and actions at the local and national levels to enable nations to take full advantage of the synergies of their sectors. These synergies must be harnessed through the full and informed participation of all major actors who see the defense and pursuit of their specific interests as part of a process that contributes towards making sustainability work, which is the focus of the Earth Council Strategy.

2. However, experience has shown that the pursuit and attainment of economic, social and environmental goals do not always go hand-in-hand, and in many cases can run at cross-purposes with each other. The much-vaunted economic success stories (e.g. the NICs) do not necessarily have as impressive a record in the social or ecological aspects of their development performance. In many cases, rapid economic growth has not led to widespread improvement in human living conditions (e.g. the "jobless growth" phenomenon). For many, the approach appears to have been one of "grow now, clean up later", only to find that certain environmental damages attendant to their rapid economic growth are irreparable. The need for integrative planning that explicitly seeks to reconcile economic, social and ecological goals - be they at the domestic or global levels - within a framework of sustainability principles and values is thus quite evident.

3. Moreover, the reconciliation and harmonization of specific concerns and interests of different groups and countries will never be easy. This difficulty has been amply highlighted by the review of progress of implementation of Earth Summit agreements, the arduous negotiations on the Climate Change Convention, as well as the protracted discussions on regional and international trade agreements.

4. This dilemma underscores the need for a participatory approach in dealing with common issues and interests. Governments, scientific and academic institutions, business associations and civil society must work closely together in building on the foundations laid at Rio and in integrating global concerns in national development planning and investment programming.

5. Chapters 8 and 38 of Agenda 21 recommend the establishment of National Councils for Sustainable Development (NCSDs), to address, among other factors, the above dilemma. Since 1992, over 100 countries have established some form of NCSDs or similar entities or Agenda 21 focal points, as coordination mechanisms for implementing the Earth Summit Agreements. However, the success of these mechanisms in integrating sustainable development (SD) into

policy and decision-making varies from country to country depending on their mandate, composition and character.

6. Involvement of all major stakeholders and integration of economic, social and ecological interests and concerns were strongly re-affirmed at Rio+5 Forum and translated into specific recommendations by the Special Session of the UN General Assembly (UNGASS) in June 1997. UNGASS stressed that "economic development, social development and environmental protection are interdependent and mutually reinforcing components of sustainable development". It went on to recommend that all countries produce sustainable development plans by the year 2002 and stressed the importance of involving all the major stakeholders.

7. The Earth Council since its beginnings has accorded importance and support to multi-stakeholder NCSDs and similar entities because of their unique strategic features that make them effective mechanisms for achieving success in sustainable development efforts. They provide a venue for overcoming conflicts among various interest groups, identify opportunities and barriers to sustainable development, promote public awareness and participation, and facilitate alliances for private-public action and investments, among others. In particular, they provide an appropriate mechanism to promote the integration of global environmental priorities into national sustainable development and investment plans.

1.1.2. Need for the Project

8. Many countries are attempting to integrate global environmental concerns into national plans or have initiated a number of positive beginnings in this direction, particularly through National Environmental Action Plans (NEAPs) and more recently through Biodiversity Conservation and Climate Change Action Plans. The GEF has recently approved two new initiatives, a Biodiversity Planning Support Program and one for Climate Change. While the long-term objective of these strategies and action plans is to see global environmental priorities being reflected in individual country planning exercises, or in other words to internalize in some sense global environmental problems, this MSP is looking at how multi-stakeholder NCSDs can more effectively be involved in promoting the same objective. Obviously, a fully integrated approach is complex and difficult to apply given that it departs from the traditional sectoral orientation of past planning and programming. There is thus an urgent need to initiate and prototype such an integrative process for integrating global environmental priorities, particularly within a participatory multi-stakeholder framework such as NCSDs, where global benefits can be given a greater weight than before within national sustainability plans. This integrative planning approach will remove constraints on current planning processes that result in compartmentalized planning and development programming. It will also directly help countries to meet the UN Special Session recommendation to develop national sustainable development plans by the year 2002.

9. In addition to the above mentioned planning exercises being undertaken in different countries, the GEF is also investing in targeted projects to address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss, and climate change (see Annexes A1 to A6 for information on on-going GEF activities in the six countries). The focus of the project is different from (and complementary to) that of the on-going GEF projects in the six countries. The project will be focusing on how to better engage an existing structure or mechanism (namely the NCSDs) to fulfill the objective of

including global environmental priorities while they implement their mandate of integrating national environmental issues, and social and cultural concerns into development planning. Therefore, while other GEF projects are dealing with a global environmental concern within a specific geographic area, the project approach is to further global environmental objectives by influencing national policy making through multi-stakeholder NCSDs. A perfect example is what is being proposed in the Philippines, which is to take as a starting platform a medium-term Philippine Development Plan (1999-2004) and to integrate global priorities therein. A similar approach is to be followed in the other countries, for example in Uganda it is called "Vision 2025" as indicated in annex A5. The project, by promoting integrative sustainability planning, will result in an improved policy and institutional climate for pursuance of the GEF mandate and enhance the impact of such on-going and proposed targeted interventions. By engaging the NCSDs and improving their capacity to address global environmental concerns within national sustainability planning, the project can support the continuity of efforts initiated under targeted projects in the selected countries. The testing of this approach in the six countries will generate lessons and best practices on integrating national sustainable development objectives and policies with global environmental objectives, which can be adapted and applied in other countries.

1.1.3. The Multi-stakeholder ISP Approach

10. Integrative Sustainability Planning (ISP) is a multi-disciplinary, multi-stakeholder and multi-level approach for decision-making and direction-setting. It is a process that is based on economic, political, cultural, scientific and technological, ecological, social, and institutional parameters. This approach flows from the principles of sustainable development as embodied in the Rio Declaration and Agenda 21. It aspires to harmonize and balance environmental, economic and social objectives to guide multi-stakeholders as they coordinate and manage their efforts at conserving, protecting, carefully managing and restoring ecosystems.

11. The ISP process relies heavily on the building of lasting partnerships and cooperation across sectors and disciplines. Hence, a permanent multi-stakeholder and participatory mechanism whereby the major actors in society can agree on and work for the common good and interest, becomes a precondition for ISP's successful implementation.

1.2. *Goal*

12. To achieve effective integration of global environmental priorities into existing national sustainable development plans, programs, projects and other activities, by ensuring that these are the product of multi-stakeholder participatory dialogue and action. The six countries where project activities will take place have development plans and the project strategy is to use these as a starting platform.

13. The goal is to develop and document experiences with applying the ISP approach to better engage NCSDs in including global environmental priorities as they implement their mandate in a small set of countries. The complexities of the involved issues and processes, as well as the limited time frame and resources, dictate that the project be limited to a few countries. The six countries have been chosen based on the diversity and relative maturity of

their NCSDs or similar entities, their openness to multi-stakeholder participation and process, and their interest in being part of the project. Their vast ecological diversity would also enrich cross-fertilization of experiences, and ensure replicability of approaches that will be developed by the project.

1.3. Objectives

14. To develop and promote a participatory multi-stakeholder strategy, called herein Integrative Sustainability Planning (ISP), for pursuing sustainable development at the local, national and global levels, and thereby:

- Strengthen multi-stakeholder NCSDs' capacity to develop and adapt appropriate approaches for ISP, particularly in promoting and integrating Biodiversity and Climate Change into national sustainable development plans;
- Highlight the national benefits that accrue in the process of securing regional and global benefits, particularly in the context of environmental protection and restoration, and balancing short-term needs with long-term imperatives and goals; and
- Provide other countries a guide on the establishment and strengthening of multi-stakeholder NCSDs which can promote and formulate policies and actions for integrated sustainable development plans.

2. EXPECTED OUTCOMES

15. The specific outcomes expected of the project are:

- A tested ISP process through a participatory multi-stakeholder mechanism for integrating global commitments and priorities into national sustainable development plans;
- Strengthened multi-stakeholder NCSDs in each prototype country vis-à-vis their commitments and responsibilities towards global environmental priorities;
- Information, education and communication (IEC) strategies and materials in each of the prototype countries, that can also serve as useful references and learning tools for other countries in their own pursuit of responding to their global commitments and issues.

16. Other country specific results are indicated in Annexes A1 to A6. An over-arching expected result is that global environmental priorities will be given prominence in each of the prototype countries, particularly by actively involving the leaders of the various stakeholders in the ISP process. The information, education and communication tools and materials that are to be prepared under Activity 3.5 of the project are meant for training purposes and to be practical and easily accessible for the main types of stakeholders that form part of the NCSDs. Given the broad-based nature of the NCSDs, these materials will be accessible to a wide range of people in these countries, therefore resulting in increased public awareness of global environmental priorities. This will be carried out in close collaboration with media specialists from each participating country's communication associations and institutes. In summary, the project will greatly help to put global environmental priorities on the public map of each participating country.

17. Project outcomes will contribute to the following strategic consideration for GEF projects highlighted in the Operational Strategy:

- National policies providing adequate incentives for development paths that are sound, from a global environmental perspective, and contribute to the effective implementation of GEF operations.
- Institutional arrangements that are supportive of global environmental protection.
- Capacity building, human resource development, and skills that are necessary to achieve global environmental objectives.
- Communications and outreach that promote better public understanding of the global environment, mobilize people and communities to protect the global environment, and build support for GEF's objectives, strategy and programs.
- Public participation and consultation with major groups, local communities, and other stakeholders at appropriate stages of project development and implementation.

3. PROJECT METHODOLOGY AND ACTIVITIES TO ACHIEVE OUTCOMES

18. Project activities may be classified into five components, namely: assessment of existing conditions; developing the ISP process; formulation of action plans; documentation and education; and over-all project coordination and monitoring. These activities are briefly described below.

3.1. Assessment of existing conditions (US \$ 80,000)

19. In preparation for the ISP process and as inputs to the action plans, the project will start with the assessment of existing conditions of planning, structure and process, as well as of capabilities of the various stakeholders. The objective is to determine where and what corrective or remedial measures are appropriate to be taken. This assessment shall be done mainly through interviews of people directly responsible and knowledgeable of the project's areas of concern. These interviews shall be complemented and supported by existing literature. This will not only enable an assessment of the planning processes at the country-level, but also assist in identifying and drawing upon repositories of knowledge at the national level for planning purposes. Activities under this initial assessment will include the following:

- Review national development plans (whether economic, physical, social or elements of sustainable development plans) and programs vis-à-vis their level of integration or adoption of commitments in international conventions on Biodiversity and Climate Change.
- Assess existing national planning processes, including national biodiversity and climate change strategies and action plans, taking into account the degree of participation of relevant sectors of society. Determine also the degree of participation and commitment of the NCSD in development planning, particularly to identify what the NCSDs lack to better integrate global environmental priorities especially regarding Biodiversity and Climate Change.

- Inventory of available information and literature from past and on-going initiatives, particularly how the GEF Enabling Activities are being integrated into the work of multi-stakeholder NCSDs and identifying what other activities are required.

3.2. Developing an ISP process (US \$260,000)

20. ISP is an integrative process in three aspects: across sectors or stakeholder groups, across disciplines, and across global and national/local environmental priorities. In all aspects, maximum flexibility must be provided to allow creative ideas and context-specific approaches to emerge and flourish, particularly in addressing the complexities of the particular topics or issues addressed by this project. Culture specific approaches are likewise necessary in building consensus among stakeholders given their varying paradigms, ideologies and perspectives. In view of this, flexibility and creativity will be the guiding principles for developing the ISP process.
21. ISP relies heavily on multi-sectoral stakeholders working together effectively. The stakeholders should be able to agree on and work for a common objective, move in one direction, and complement rather than compete with each other. To ensure that these requirements for developing an effective ISP process are met, the starting point of the project will be the conduct of at least one NCSD strategic planning and team building workshop, which will include representatives from civil society, various government departments and from the business community. Thereafter, the NCSDs shall be encouraged to hold consultation workshops and meetings among their members, among themselves, or with relevant entities, such as governments, international organizations, and technical institutions.
22. The substantive content of the strategic planning and team building workshop in each country shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
23. **Basic Information Briefings.** At least two briefings shall be provided in each country in order to harmonize the technical backgrounds and information levels of the multi-stakeholder participants. One will brief participants on the results of Activity 3.1 regarding the current situation. The other is a briefing on Biodiversity or Climate Change – according to the priority chosen by each participating country. Among others, this briefing will update participants of national commitments and responses to global conventions and also to the goals and objectives of the GEF Operational Programs that are relevant to the priority area selected by the country. These briefings, particularly the second, will be handled by technical experts from within their respective countries.
24. **Selection of priority area.** Planning conditions and global concerns of the prototype countries substantially differ. Some have a national Agenda 21 that already attempts to integrate, to varying degree, global priorities. Others have economic or physical development plans that double up as sustainable development plans. Still others are in the process of developing Climate Change and Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans.
25. Whatever the prevailing situation, the participating NCSDs will be given the leeway to determine and agree on the specific priority area - within Biodiversity or Climate Change - and to draw from the GEF enabling activities priority areas to initiate the ISP process with their

multi-stakeholders. As indicated in the Country Annexes (Annex A1 to A6), many countries have already given preliminary indication of working priority areas to be reviewed.

26. The end goal is to integrate simultaneously global priorities as a whole into the planning process by building the capacity of NCSDs to apply the highly participatory integrative planning approach. However, given the limited time frame and resources and in order to come up with good illustrative examples of the process, it is more feasible to select a priority area to demonstrate how this goal can be achieved.

27. *NCSD Work Programming.* Once the country priority area becomes clear, the NCSDs shall formulate their respective work plans for accomplishing the tasks. The work plans shall specify the activities of the NCSDs every step of the way, and their corresponding results and expected outputs. They shall also indicate the timeframe for each activity and the working groups and entities responsible for their accomplishment.

28. *Team Building and consultation workshops as required.* Depending on the requirements of the task at hand, the NCSDs may opt to invite the participation of other stakeholders such as local government officials, international organizations, technical institutions or other specific groups. The new set of members would undergo teambuilding exercises during the workshops in order to improve their personal and working relationships. This would facilitate the development of an ISP process and hasten the completion of the identified tasks for integrating global environmental priorities into national sustainability plans.

3.3. **Formulation of a multi-stakeholder Action Plan as a result of the assessment phase and above workshops and consultations: (US \$80,000)**

29. The results of the assessment of existing conditions shall guide multi-stakeholder NCSDs in the formulation of action plans, particularly to integrate those priority areas identified above into planning processes such as those being initiated in Uganda and the Philippines (see Annex A5 and A6). In all cases the Action Plans will highlight the specific measures that various stakeholders can take to pursue the country's commitments to the global environmental conventions. Among others, the plan shall have the following elements, which shall have been agreed upon by the members of the NCSDs:

- Goals and objectives, specific targets, policy directions, and strategies for achieving targets;
- Investment programs that list down projects, including possible sources of funds, that would translate the plans into tangible activities and outputs;
- Implementation mechanism and institutional support for the plans, which spell out the roles and responsibilities of the various stakeholders; and
- A framework for monitoring and evaluation of progress of NCSDs in applying the ISP approach to a global environmental concern and also progress towards GEF Operational Program objectives (the relevant GEF Operational Program will depend on the priority issue selected by each prototype country).

30. In addition, the project will develop a preliminary follow-up plan that indicates the framework and parameters for the pursuit of the project in other countries that have multi-

stakeholder NCSDs. This follow-up plan will highlight how the results of the above can be applied to other countries building on the lessons learned of the present prototype project and proposing the necessary corrections and modifications to the process and to its implementation.

3.4. Documentation, Information and Education and Communication (US \$ 175,000)

31. Documentation and education shall be the key support activities of the multi-stakeholder ISP process. They shall permeate all activities and serve as bases for most decisions in planning. Documentation and Communication materials play a critical role in the process since the six participating countries have accepted to prototype this ISP process for possible use by other NCSDs and for exchange of experiences among the six countries as well. In addition, identification of the country specific documentation and education material needs will be organized in such a way as to be directly complementary and supportive to the GEF Biodiversity and Climate Change Planning Support Programmes presently underway.

32. Therefore, documentation shall be undertaken every step of the way. Accurate and efficient recording from the very start is necessary because information and activities build upon each other. For instance, the results of the assessment will feed into the development of ISP and preparation of plans. Generated information shall be processed or synthesized before final documentation and dissemination for more effective and efficient use. It is important, for example, to document problems encountered and solutions undertaken in implementing global commitments to serve as guide or reference for others. This documented information shall be used in the production of information, education and communication (IEC) materials such as tool kits, practical guides and monographs of cases.

33. Education in this context takes the form of technical briefings, information exchange, experience sharing, consultation, and replication. It will rely heavily on documented information and other references. Technical support from experts will be needed, particularly in the briefings pertaining to global commitments and issues and in preparing specific background papers. As earlier indicated, educational activities would happen during planning and consultation workshops and meetings.

3.5. Over-all guidance, coordination, monitoring, and assessment (US \$130,000)

34. The over-all guidance, coordination and monitoring of project activities will be undertaken by the Earth Council, in collaboration with the secretariats of the NCSDs and GEF Operational Focal Points. These responsibilities are crucial in ensuring the success of the project. While NCSDs would have enough flexibility in accomplishing their tasks, they will need guidance from the Earth Council on the over-all project substance and process. Similarly, their activities would need to be coordinated internally, for example among national actors, and externally, among NCSDs and relevant international organizations. The Earth Council will ensure that the project progresses well, within the specified time frame and pursues its objectives and expected results.

35. The Earth Council would be assisted in its tasks by a team of experts on the technical aspects of the work; the GEF Focal Point on the setting of project direction and redirection, should it become necessary; and country coordinators and the NCSD secretariats on the

coordination, monitoring and administrative tasks. Where appropriate, the project country coordinator would be the NCSD secretariat.

36. The involvement of the GEF focal points in providing overall guidance cannot be stressed enough. Focal points have played an important part in identifying the need for this initiative and in developing the project. They will continue to play an important direction-setting, guidance and oversight role. Their involvement in an oversight role is particularly important in ensuring that activities fit with the GEF operational programs and to identify and benefit from synergies between this initiative and other GEF-funded projects and programs in the country.

37. More specifically, the main tasks of Earth Council will include the following:

- Provide participating NCSDs a project operations manual that spells out project objectives, general description of activities, expected outputs and time-frames;
- Designate in-country coordinators who, together with the GEF focal point and selected experts may serve as the project's Steering Committee in each country;
- Coordinate and prepare for activities that involve all countries, such as workshop on experience sharing;
- Assist in general advocacy, particularly addressing key decision-makers at the national and international levels;
- Closely monitor the progress of work and provide guidance on project re-direction if necessary, or on resolution of problems should they arise;
- Coordinate with GEF on project support and resources, and ensure that funds and administrative requirements of countries are efficiently provided;
- In cooperation with its coordinators, produce and disseminate IEC materials and project reports;
- Encourage cross-fertilization of ideas and experiences among the six participating countries.
- Ensure overall coordination, monitoring and assessment;
- Preparation of the follow-up proposal that builds on the present prototype project and expands its to a significant number of other multi-stakeholder NCSDs.

4. PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS AND HOW THE PROJECT EMERGED

38. The expression "Multi-stakeholder", in relation to the present ISP project, signifies those groups that have a specific stake to come together because they share a common interest and destiny. The project is anchored in the active and effective involvement of the different groups of society particularly government, business and civil society in formulating and executing sustainable development plans, programs, strategies and measures in their respective countries. The key stakeholders, therefore, are the aforementioned groupings at the national level, and the participating and benefiting countries at the national level. International organizations, such as GEF, UNDP, UNEP, UNCSD and the World Bank likewise have a stake in the project given their specific sustainable development concerns and mandates.

39. This project emerged from the recommendations of 14 sub-regional pre-consultations and the Rio+5 Forum in which some 70 NCSDs participated. It is an integral part of the Earth Council's on-going partnership program with major NGO networks, global and regional institutes, as well as with Parliamentary associations and governments.

40. The project is also a product of GEF Focal Points and NCSD secretariats of the six participating countries that have been involved in the design of this project.

5. SUSTAINABILITY ANALYSIS AND RISK ASSESSMENT

41. By engaging the formally recognized NCSDs in addressing global environmental priorities as part of national sustainable development plans, the project will be ensuring the sustainability of planning and implementation of national responses to Global Conventions. One of the risks to achieving the project objective ("to develop and promote as a prototype an integrative sustainability planning approach within NCSDs and similar entities that integrates global environmental priorities into national sustainable development planning") could be the limited involvement and interest from NCSDs. However, this risk will certainly not arise in the 6 participating countries given that the NCSDs have been involved in the design stages of the project and have expressed an active interest. (See attached letters from NCSDs in Annex C).

6. INCREMENTAL COST

The baseline

42. The project builds on and adds to a substantial level of baseline investment by the Earth Council and over 70 countries since 1993-94 in promoting the active involvement of all stakeholders in sustainable development planning processes. This project will develop an ISP approach that integrates global environmental priorities into national sustainable development planning processes. The successful development of the ISP approach in the 6 countries and subsequent replication of it will benefit the global community by ensuring integrative planning at the national level. The full project costs are therefore the incremental costs of activities to benefit the global environment.

43. Many national and international entities have invested substantial efforts and resources to this cause. The Earth Council has been among the first and a major promoter, catalyst and supporter of NCSDs. Since 1994 to date, the Earth Council has directly invested over \$2.0M (approximately half of which was provided by UNDP and UNEP) for the establishment and strengthening of multi-stakeholder mechanisms in countries worldwide. For example, some 70 NCSDs actively participated in the preparatory work and event of Rio+5. This investment is in addition to each countries' own investments for the same purposes. In the next three years, Earth Council expects these investments to reach approximately \$3.0 M. The present proposal therefore is based on significant past and on-going investments and is a result of collaborative action with NCSDs since 1994. (See Annex B for more background information on NCSDs and Earth Council involvement).

44. Specific activities being promoted by the Earth Council in collaboration with other donors and the NCSDs that address baseline concerns include:

- Establishing a minimum secretariat structure in the six prototype countries to ensure informed, effective and broad civil society participation (This is being supported by the Japan Global Fund for the Environment).
- Workshops and reporting guidelines for the multi-stakeholders in the six prototype countries to strengthen their general planning and reporting capacities. (This is being supported by the Dutch Government, Sweden and the UNDP-SEED programme)

Incremental Costs:

45. All costs related to this project are "incremental" because:

- the project builds on the baseline investments of the Earth Council and the countries themselves, particularly towards promoting the creation of and strengthening of NCSDs and similar entities since 1993-94, as well as the on-going strengthening of the NCSDs as multi-stakeholder and participatory mechanisms (*as indicated above and Annex B*)
- the results of this project will add value to the country's planning processes through their respective multi-stakeholder NCSDs.

7. PROPONENT

46. The Earth Council is an international NGO based in San José, Costa Rica. The Earth Council is promoting the operationalization of the Earth Summit agreements, primarily in collaboration with and through National Councils for Sustainable Development. (For more information on the Earth Council and its Strategic Program, see the Earth Council Web Site at: <http://www.ecouncil.ac.cr>.)

8. EXECUTING AGENCY

47. The Earth Council will be responsible for the initiation, coordination, monitoring and implementation of this project. It will coordinate the activities of the participating NCSDs, and consolidate and synthesize their outputs.

48. The Earth Council is in a unique position to promote this integrative approach on a global scale because of its sustainable development mission, wide-ranging partnerships and specific experience since 1993. Its policy directions, program objectives and activities on the ground have been centered on the recognition and strengthening of NCSDs, as multi-stakeholder and participatory mechanisms for operationalizing sustainable development.

49. The Earth Council's proactive stance in this regard is in response to the recommendation of NCSDs in the Rio+5 that the Earth Council further intensify its catalytic and lead role in strengthening NCSDs worldwide to better promote national and global sustainable development objectives. This responsibility was bestowed in recognition of the rich experience and wide exposure of the Earth Council in this area as exemplified by the following:

- Access to a active network of multi-stakeholder mechanisms in some 70 countries to promote participatory decision-making and collaborative action for sustainability;
- Access to a network of member institutes and experts as well as more than 80 special focus report writers on critical management and governance issues necessary for implementing sustainable development at all levels;

- Experience at organizing over 70 national and 11 regional consultations that involved over 6000 diverse organizations from political, economic and civil societies;
- Benefit from the special contributions of citizen groups, particularly human rights and environmental movements in former totalitarian regimes, which are building the foundations for new forms of sustainable and democratic processes.

9. BUDGET

50. The indicative project budget is outlined below:

INPUTS	TOTAL	IN COUNTRY	EARTH COUNCIL COORDINATED*
PDF	25,000		25,000
Personnel	230,000	130,000	100,000
Subcontracts	110,000	110,000	
Training	220,000	220,000	
Equipment	15,000	15,000	
Travel	50,000	20,000	30,000
Evaluation mission	30,000		30,000
Follow-up: preparation of long-term proposal	40,000		40,000
Miscellaneous	30,000	20,000	10,000
PROJECT TOTAL (PDF + PROJECT COSTS)	750,000	515,000	235,000

* The figures indicated in this column reflect resources that will go towards project activities that are directly coordinated by the Earth Council without necessarily being spent on Earth Council staff. For example, the entire cost of evaluation missions goes towards Earth Council coordinated activities, given that guidance, oversight and monitoring is one of their primary responsibilities.

10. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

51. The project duration is eighteen months with activities being sequenced as follows:

Duration of Project (in months): 18 Months							
Activities	Project Months						
	0	3	6	8	12	15	18
Assessment of current national planning processes and levels of integration of global environmental priorities	_____						
Developing an ISP process	_____						
Formulation of Action Plans	_____						
Documentation, Information, Education and Communication strategies	_____						
Evaluation and preparation of follow-up project	_____						
Overall guidance, coordination and monitoring	_____						

11. FOLLOW-UP

52. The immediate goal of the present project is to develop an ISP process within six prototype countries with their respective multi-stakeholder NCSDs. In addition, the project results, as they unfold, will be communicated to all NCSDs, through the Earth Council NCSD Bulletin and Web Sites. However, an important outcome is that the ISP process be up-scaled and replicated in some fifty other countries which have multi-stakeholder NCSDs, by incorporating the lessons-learned from the present prototype project. In order not to lose momentum, it is important to include in the present project proposal a minimum of US\$40,000 for the purpose of initiating the longer-term and more complete proposal to up-scale the ISP process within multi-stakeholder NCSDs in other countries.

ANNEX A**Examples of initial inquiries and consultations with the six participating countries**

1. The ISP process as described in the project brief will determine the actual priority areas to be discussed by each participating country's multi-stakeholders. This will become part of the outcome of the process as determined by the multi-stakeholders themselves.
2. The examples summarized below indicate the results of preliminary discussions with the GEF focal points and NCSD secretariats. They are provided as examples only to indicate possible priority areas for each country. In each case, the ISP process will link the global and national benefits and interests.

Annex A1: COSTA RICA

Costa Rican Council for Sustainable Development

1. In 1994, Costa Rica transformed its Agenda 21 Focal point and created an NCSD with 21 members, with seven from various government departments, seven from civil and academic society and seven from professional associations and the private sector. The NCSD in Costa Rica is called: CONADES: *Consejo Nacional de Desarrollo Sostenible*. Like the majority of NCSDs in the world, CONADES was set up by Presidential Decree. The new government, which was inaugurated in May of this year, has initiated a major multi-stakeholder consultation that is presently under way. It is from this consultation called "Concertacion nacional" that the actual form of the new NCSD will emerge. However, this temporary situation does not prevent the present project from going ahead as originally planned. On the contrary, the ISP process is seen as well suited and complementary to the present concertacion nacional exercise precisely because both have the same multi-stakeholders as their base and objective. In addition, the NCSD has been involved in the design of this project since its beginnings and sees its pursuit as an important bridging with the concertacion nacional and the new emerging NCSD.

General objectives

2. Because of the importance of biodiversity to the overall economy of Costa Rica, including its important tourist sector, initially the ISP process will review the forest issue as related to Biodiversity. In this regard, Costa Rica has shown remarkable efforts in the last 10 years toward stopping deforestation of natural forests as well as tree planting on areas where the original forest had been cleared long before. The latest trend shows a remarkable recovery of the forest cover, since presently over 40% of its territory includes some type of forest. Yet clearing of natural and often primary forest as well as their "highgrading" (extracting valuable timbers) is still prevalent although at a rhythm much below past decades.

3. Because of the transition phase of the NCSD in Costa Rica and the fact that the Concertacion nacional is still underway and has not presented its conclusions and recommendations, it is safe to say that the ISP methodology proposed in the project will be closely adhered to, particularly to identify a priority area within biodiversity. The example of efforts to maintain forest cover given above, because of its over-riding importance both to Costa Rica and to the GEF Enabling Activities, will form part of the ISP process to prototype the project.

Institutional participation

4. The main focal institution for project activities will be the Costa Rican NCSD, called CONADES (*Consejo Nacional de Desarrollo Sostenible*). In addition to a number of Government Departments and the stakeholders and their respective associations, at least the following Institutes will be invited to participate in various forms ranging from expert advise to preparation of tool-kits to participation in training workshops: Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza (CATIE); Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidad (INBio); Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la Agricultura (IICA); IUCN Mesoamerica; Escuela de

Agricultura de la Región Tropical Humeda (EARTH); Universidad Nacional; Universidad de Costa Rica; and the Colegio de Periodistas and the Centro Internacional de Política Económica y Desarrollo Sostenible (CIMPE)

Other GEF activities in Costa Rica

5. Costa Rica has a number of GEF projects underway or in various planning stages. These include the Biodiversity and Climate Change Enabling Activities, a World Bank-GEF project on Biodiversity Resources Development with INBio, a World Bank-GEF project to harness Wind Power near Lake Arenal, and UNDP-GEF assistance to the National System of Conservation Areas (La Amistad and La Osa). Costa Rica also participates in the GEF Small Grants Programme

Annex A2: DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

The Dominican Republic Council for Sustainable Development

1. In 1992, the President of the Dominican Republic established a multi-sectoral NCSD which groups all the main stakeholders within and outside of government. It has established a number of sub-committees and its secretariat is assured by the Planning Department ONAPLAN. The NCSD was instrumental in the countrywide process called "Proyecto Nacional Programa 21" which the present project builds on, complements and deepens.
2. The Dominican Republic has suffered great economic as well as environmental losses because of deforestation and faulty land use on steep slopes or other fragile areas. The present project will focus on integrating the global environmental priorities into national policy making, legislation and strategies, and initially will focus on Biodiversity because of its importance to the overall economy of the country and its more direct relevance to people's understanding and livelihoods.

General Objectives

3. Priority area proposed to initiate the multi-stakeholder ISP process: how to integrate into national planning an action program on forest conservation, restoration and re-forestation which highlight their biological, environmental, economic and socio-cultural benefits both national, local and global. This will be carried out through the design of clear policies and related actions towards the approval of the forest law and its integration into the national plan and the appropriate administrative structures.

Institutional participation

4. The main focal point and coordination of this project in the Dominican Republic will be the Secretaria de Estado de Recursos Naturales y Medio Ambiente (SERENAMA). In addition to a number of Government Departments and the stakeholders and their respective associations, at least the following Institutes will be invited to participate in various forms ranging from expert advise to preparation of tool-kits to participation in training workshops: the Dominican University, particularly their departments of Economics, Forestry and Agriculture; Asociacion de Periodistas de Republica Dominicana; PRONATURA; as well as IUCN Mesoamerica; Escuela de Agricultura de la Region Tropical Humeda (EARTH); and Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la Agricultura (IICA)

Other GEF Activities in the Dominican Republic

5. The Dominican Republic has one large project on *Biodiversity Conservation and Management of its Coastal Zone* and 32 small projects through the Small Grants Programme, of which 16 deal directly with forest conservation, medicinal and other tree planting for a number

of goods and services. These are all small projects at specific locations. The multi-stakeholder ISP process will complement, build on and integrate these and other similar projects into its general framework, with appropriate policies, legal measures and proposing improved administrative structures. Particular emphasis will be placed on conserving the last remnant primary forests hence preserving biodiversity, in particular endangered species, many of them endemic; and to promote integration of all GEF projects and enabling activities within an integrated policy framework.

Annex A3: MEXICO

The National, Regional and Thematic Councils for Sustainable Development

1. Shortly after the 1992 Earth Summit and in collaboration with the Earth Council, the United States of Mexico explored various approaches to suit its specific needs, Agenda 21 follow-up and for establishing multi-stakeholder councils for sustainable development. Because of the federal nature of Mexico, its size as well as the diversity of its population and resources, it was decided that an overall national council could not alone meet its needs. Therefore, Mexico set up a series of inter-locking councils. At the overall national level, the Mexican Council for Sustainable Development, herein called (MCSD), is made up of representatives from each of the four Regional Councils for S.D. The membership of MCSD is composed as follows: 7% from the Federal Government; 10% from Unions, 10% from social organizations; 12% from State governments; 12% from Private sector; 19% from NGOs and 29% from various academic and similar entities. In addition, many States have their own Councils for Sustainable Development. The Regional Councils cover the four geographic divisions called regions. Region III includes the Federal District, as well as the States of Mexico, Tlaxcala, Hidalgo, Morelos and Puebla, combining more than 60% of the Mexican population. In addition, the MCSD created ten national "thematic" Councils, including an important one related to Climate Change. These thematic councils enable the Regional Councils and the MCSD to tap and benefit from the various expertise and specialize interest groups from around the country.

Mexican Councils and Climate Change

2. Because of the strategic importance of the present GEF project and its limited resources and timeframe, the MCSD has decided that it is preferable to prototype the project within the most densely populated region, Region III, in collaboration with the resources from the Climate Change Thematic Council. In this way the ISP process can go more in-depth within a limited timeframe, serve to prototype the project for the whole country as well as benefit from the advice and inputs of representatives from all regions through the MCSD.

3. The specific purpose of this project is to integrate the global environmental priorities, initially focusing on Climate Change into the normal workings of the multi-stakeholders the various participating Councils and to develop cross-sectoral approaches to planning, policy and legal framework design and action oriented projects, including education, training and public awareness that will directly contribute to the strategies of the National Climate Change Action Plan and its implementation. This will be done in collaboration with all the various actors and stakeholders through the MCSD and the Region III Council for Sustainable Development. In addition to the methodological workshops indicated in Activity 3.2 of the project brief, a number of other specific activities are foreseen such as a seminar-workshops on: International Mechanisms for Cooperation in relation to climate change, as well as on evaluation of greenhouse gases and other emissions, and on vulnerabilities, mitigation and adaptation measures. These workshops will be organized in such a way as to be mutually reinforcing and helping the various stakeholders to reach consensus and common ground for action.

4. All three levels of the Mexican Councils have been involved in the design of this project: the MCSD, the Council for Region III and the Climate Change Council and all levels will be directly involved in its implementation and follow-up as well as benefiting from its results.

Institutional participation

5. The focal institution for project activities will be the Mexican Council of Sustainable Development. In addition to a number of Government Departments and the stakeholders and their respective associations, at least the following Institutes will be invited to participate in various forms ranging from expert advice to preparation of tool-kits to participation in training workshops: el Programa Nacional de Cambio Climático Intersectorial gubernamental (SEMARNAP); Secretaria de Energia, Comision Nacional para el conocimiento de la Biodiversidad (CONOBio); PRONATURA, UNAM, Instituto de Ecologia, IUCN Mexico, The Distrito Federal, Estado de México, de Tlaxcala, de Pueblo, de Morelos and de Hidalgo as well as the main coordination and focal support from the Secretaria de medio ambiente Recursos naturales y Pesca.

Other GEF Activities in Mexico

6. Mexico has received assistance from UNDP-GEF for implementing its Biodiversity and Climate Change Enabling Activities. The country is also implementing a number of large, medium size and small projects through the GEF Small Grants Programme. One of the larger ones, *High Efficient Lighting Project* (in areas outside region III) was recently evaluated as very successful by a GEF external evaluation team. Another medium size project deals with gas emissions from farming sources. Among the 36 small projects, 9 relate to climate change and 3 others relate to all GEF areas. However, for the most part these are taking place in locations outside area III.

7. The ISP process through this GEF-UNDP project, will help the various Mexican Councils for Sustainable Development to plan for GEF interventions and enabling activities in region III, which is the most in need and most densely populated. In particular, this process will greatly assist the MCSD to adapt its own methodology and approach to its diverse stakeholders for integrating the global environmental priorities into the national and State planning processes. The timing of this project fits well into the overall MCSD activities, particularly for increasing public awareness on global environmental priorities and their relationship with national and global benefits.

Expected Results

8. In addition to the general project results which Mexico will be party to, the following specific outcomes are expected:
- Multi-stakeholder action plans, including specific timetables, in each major area of Region III focusing on how they will contribute to the implementation of the National Climate Action Program;
 - Coordination mechanisms to better integrate the National Climate Action Program into the States sustainability planning;
 - Representatives from all stakeholders who are trained in the ISP process who can serve as trainers for their respective constituencies;
 - A user-friendly public awareness action program, initially focusing on Climate Change.

Annex A4: BURKINA FASO

The National Council for Sustainable Development

1. Burkina Faso, as a Sahel country, faces a number of problems related to the broad issue of Biodiversity, namely desertification, unsustainable land use practices, destructive dune encroachment, ground water depletion and similar problems. The present project will greatly strengthen Burkina Faso's capacities to better integrate the global environmental priorities within its national plans as well as increase the capacities of the major stakeholders to relate to, understand and act upon the countries priorities in relation to the global issues, initially focusing on those related to Biodiversity.
2. CONAGESE is the name of the Burkinabe National Council for the Management of the Environment and comes under the Ministry of Environment and Water. The Council is made up of representatives of various groups including NGOs and traditional leaders as well as receiving the technical advice from the Academic, private sector, Government and specialized NGOs. CONAGESE was initiated during the UNCED process and is the main body bringing together the various stakeholders and will coordinate their inputs into the present project. The project builds upon CONAGESE's experience with various planning mechanisms, particularly the NEAPs which have involved the various stakeholders over many years.

Project Objective

3. To increase the stakeholders capacities to understand and integrate the global environmental priorities within Burkinabe's national planning, particularly regarding strategies and actions for land management practices.
4. A deeper understanding of sustainable land use practices will foster better biodiversity conservation programs (plants and animals), and lead to the restoration of lands hence arresting desertification.

Other GEF Activities in Burkina Faso

5. GEF projects in Burkina Faso include the Biodiversity and Climate Change Enabling Activities and a full project aimed at optimizing biodiversity within wildlife ranching systems through a pilot demonstration in a semi-arid area. Burkina Faso has also participated in the GEF Small Grants Programme since 1992. This project, through its multi-stakeholder ISP approach, will complement and help better integrate and value the various GEF enabling activities, particularly by highlighting the benefits of those related to biodiversity. The present project enlarges the participation and involvement of the stakeholders in the GEF projects in Burkina Faso.

Institutional participation

6. Le Conseil National pour la Gestion de l'Environnement (CONAGESE) will be the focal point and main coordinator of this project in Burkina Faso. In addition to a number of

Government Departments and the stakeholders and their respective associations, at least the following Institutes will be invited to participate in various forms ranging from expert advice to preparation of tool-kits to participation in training workshops: the various technical committees of CONAGESE particularly related to Forestry and agriculture; the University of Ouagadougou, the Regional Agro-Meteorological Research Centre (AGRYMENT) (based in Niamey) and others.

Multi-Stakeholders and the Review of Critical issues:

7. The stakeholders will review, among other, the following critical issues:
- What are the environmental, economic and social consequences of desertification concerning loss of arable land, changes in water regimes and utilization, exodus of population;
 - How can the present measures being undertaken be better integrated within policies, legislation and management structures to mitigate desertification and increase the benefits of Biodiversity;
 - What approaches and measures are required to improve people's understanding of and commitment towards the benefits of Biodiversity.

Expected results

8. In addition to the general expected results of the prototype project, Burkina Faso expects the following results:
- guidelines for specific stakeholders on how to integrate and benefit from the global environmental priorities, particularly Biodiversity as it relates to land use and management;
 - How to approaches in tool-kit format addressed to the media, particularly written and radio, on better understanding Biodiversity and its benefits to different categories of people.

Annex A5: UGANDA

National Council for Sustainable Development

1. Uganda's constitution provides for a National Planning Authority that is in the process of being set up. In practice it plays the role envisioned for a multi-stakeholder NCSD. Currently, however, the Uganda Council for Sustainable Development functions as the Board of the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA). NEMA has a policy committee chaired by the Prime Minister and a Board made up of representatives from government departments, a research institute, the Uganda Manufacturers' Association, NGOs and from parastatals such as the Uganda Wildlife Authority.
2. The Integrative Sustainability Planning (ISP) process is timely in Uganda since processes such as the formulation of the Uganda Planning Authority and the Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA) have begun. The Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP), which is the culmination of a series of consultations with government, employer's and workers organizations, the NGO community, social researchers and academicians highlighted the importance of Biodiversity and the need for people to better understand its benefits through the conservation of soil, water, fish stock, wetlands and wildlife. In addition, Uganda is mid-way in the formulation of its Vision 2025.
3. The multi-stakeholder ISP process both complements and deepens Vision 2025 and other processes, because of its emphasis on the integrative approach and its long term perspective to build durable bridges of understanding among different stakeholders within society.
4. In addition, the initial focus on Biodiversity is important because this is close and vital to people's livelihoods and lends itself to public awareness campaigns in collaboration with NGOs and the media. There will be a focus on wetland areas for which a policy has been formulated. There are currently efforts to mitigate activities such as drainage, grazing, brick making, devegetation and sewage treatment on the draining of wetlands and an initiative is envisaged, however this initiative is at its formative stages and needs additional capacities such as data provision. This is crucial due to the large area covered by wetlands and increasing activity in wetland areas.

Specific goal

5. To place Biodiversity issues in the forefront of the implementation of the PEAP and to better integrate global environmental priorities within Vision 2025, particularly to highlight their benefits and importance to people's livelihoods.

Objectives

6. To integrate biodiversity in planning and implementing sustainable land use policies and legislation through multi-stakeholder participation and action. More specifically, to:

(i) Establish mechanisms to analyze present problems through people-centered approaches including the various stakeholders, and assist in designing short and long-term solutions. The project will serve to catalyze the work of a number of NGOs, academic institutes and private sector groups already active in the field of Biodiversity and will build on and broaden the NGO Biodiversity Strategy Workshop held last year.

(ii) Contribute to the strengthening of a user-friendly information system accessible to all the stakeholders and to the media, initially focusing on global environmental priorities.

(iii) Design, test and organize joint training programs for Government officials as well as local district leaders and various stakeholders on how to integrate global environmental priorities into the various levels of planning and implementation.

Institutional participation

7. The main focal point and coordination support will be provided by the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA). In addition to a number of Government Departments and the stakeholders and their respective associations, at least the following Institutes will be invited to participate in various forms ranging from expert advice to preparation of tool-kits to participation in training workshops, more particularly: the Ministry of Finance, Planning & Economic Development, the Private Sector Foundation, the Makerere University, particularly its Institute for Environment and Natural Resources, and its Institutes of Social Research, and Applied Statistics and Economics; the Forest Research Institute, the Mbarara Institute of Tropical Forestry, the Uganda Institute of Ecology, WWF, IUCN-Uganda, the Association of Journalists of Uganda, and others as required.

Other GEF Activities in Uganda

8. Uganda is developing a Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and requires additional capacities for its implementation. The country is also implementing two projects in the Biodiversity focal area relating to Protected Areas and one in the Climate Change focal area designed to address the energy needs of rural areas through solar photovoltaics. Uganda is also a relatively new participant in the GEF Small Grants Programme (since 1996). The present project is opportune and its approach for integrative sustainability planning directly relevant and appropriate, particularly the focus on direct involvement of the various stakeholders through the ISP process. This approach will complement, integrate and strengthen the GEF projects in Uganda.

9. Much restructuring and rebuilding have been carried out in a relatively short time. In the area of Biodiversity two examples stand out and demonstrate that people can benefit from Biodiversity: Mount Elgon National Park and Magombe Swamp in Kibale National Park.

10. In addition, a number of other GEF projects are in various stages of implementation and planning in Uganda. The present project will endeavor to complement and integrate these projects into the multi-stakeholder ISP process, initially those directly related to wetlands. Reducing Biodiversity Loss at Cross Border Sites in East Africa is a GEF-UNDP project that is especially relevant to the present project; it will serve as an important entry point for the ISP

process. Two other projects will also be given special attention: the initial implementation of the National Biodiversity and Action Plan because it is directly relevant and related, and the project to enable Uganda to prepare its first national communications in response to its commitments to the UNFCCC because of its approach to public awareness building.

11. It is within this context that the ISP multi-stakeholder process as applied in Uganda has excellent chances to complement the work already undertaken or underway and to better integrate the lessons-learned and results into national policies, planning and action plans and more importantly to integrate the global environmental priorities within Vision 2025.

Annex A6: THE PHILIPPINES

Background on Sustainable Development Planning Processes and the Philippine Council for Sustainable Development (PCSD)

1. The Philippines enjoys the distinction of being one of the first countries to establish a multi-stakeholder NCSD, immediately following the 1992 Rio Earth Summit. The Philippine Council for Sustainable Development (PCSD) has since formulated The **Philippine Agenda 21 (PA21)**, which was promulgated by President Fidel V. Ramos in September 1996. PA21 was the product of two years of intensive and extensive consultations among the key stakeholders in Philippine sustainable development: government, civil society and the private business sector. The Philippines also was the first country to propose and receive support for a major GEF project (through the World Bank) implemented by NGOs in partnership with government, through the National Integrated Protected Areas System (NIPAS) project.

2. Based on preliminary consultations with the leaders of the PCSD, their current primary concern is ensure that concrete sustainable development action agendas can be developed and implemented at the local level, through the same multi-stakeholder approach exemplified at the national level. Thus, in its application in the Philippines, the proposed project will support country's efforts to more effectively integrate global environmental priorities into both the national and local levels of planning and action.

PCSD and Climate Change and Biodiversity Concerns

3. Most of the environmental issues that have taken the limelight in recent sustainable development discussions in the Philippines broadly fall under the global priorities of biodiversity and climate change.

4. Under climate change, the PCSD was instrumental in the promulgation of regulations governing CO₂ emissions as well as promoting improvements of the government's environmental clearance process for investment projects, especially taking into account the social acceptability of such undertakings. More recently, the El Niño phenomenon has taken center stage, particularly due to its dramatic impact on agricultural and food production. Droughts in major crop-growing regions of the country have led to drastic declines in crop production, particularly of the staple grains, rice (-46%) and corn (-23%). The second quarter 1998 economic performance report shows a 7.5 percent drop in overall agricultural production compared to last year. Farm families in upland rain-fed farm areas in the southern island of Mindanao have been severely affected, having lost all sources of income, prompting the government to provide large amounts of direct food assistance. Meanwhile, the new President Estrada Administration has placed food security and agricultural development as its major focus in fighting poverty. This provides an opportunity for the PCSD to situate this critical issue within the broader context of the Framework Convention on Climate Change.

5. The PCSD has recently produced a Philippine Plan for Biodiversity that sets a national agenda on this important global environmental concern. Specific issues under this include the

reforestation program, the protection of indigenous genetic materials, and apprehensions about the Mining Code, including how it may adversely affect the integrity of ancestral lands of indigenous peoples and biodiversity therein. The last has particularly stirred much public debate, highlighting tradeoffs between the concerns of economic growth and employment generation on one hand, and environmental concerns on the other.

Institutional Participation

6. The PCSD will be the focal point for this project in the Philippines. (*See attached letter of support*) The government, civil society and business sector counterparts in the council can all work together in the pursuit of the project's objectives. Technical expertise can be easily accessed from the University of the Philippines' School of Environmental Science and Management and other units of the university, as well as many other research and academic institutions within the country. Local government units (i.e. provincial, city and municipal governments) are expected to be major participants in this project in the Philippine, along with the Department of Interior and Local Governments, the government ministry supervising the local government units.

Project Outcomes

7. While various plans are already in place at the national level, work on a Medium-Term Philippine Development Plan (MTPDP) for 1999-2004 has just been initiated. This presents an important opportunity for efforts to integrate global environmental priorities into this new Plan, which will be the development "road map" of the Estrada Administration. PCSD's participation in this planning process has been assured, and through this project, effective integration can be achieved. Equally important is the integration into local development planning of these same global environmental concerns.

8. In addition, the Philippine past experience and active participation in this project will be a potentially rich source of case materials, guidebooks and toolkits for ISP process to be replicated elsewhere. Of special interest for replicability, will be the PCSD's efforts to operationalize the multi-stakeholder ISP process at the provincial, and local levels.

Other GEF Activities in the Philippines

9. The Philippines has received support from UNDP-GEF to prepare its Biodiversity and Climate Change Enabling activities. It is also part of Small Grants Programme and is implementing several full projects. These include a project to conserve and use sustainably biodiversity in 36,000 hectares of rainforest in the Samar Islands, efforts to establish a core National Integrated Protected Area System for ten sites over seven years, and a project to meet electricity demands through geothermal power that substantially reduces GHG emissions.

ANNEX B

Background information on National Councils for Sustainable Development and similar entities (NCSDs)

(For more background information on NCSDs see the Earth Council Web Page and the Special NCSD Web Page at: <http://www.ecouncil.ac.cr> or <http://www.ncsdnetwork.org>)

Since 1992, over 100 countries have established some form of NCSDs or similar entities or Agenda 21 focal points as coordination mechanisms for implementing the Earth Summit Agreements. However, the success of these mechanisms in integrating sustainable development into decision-making varies from country to country depending on their mandate, composition and character. Some NCSDs focus only on environmental issues, while others are government coordinating bodies, yet others have broad representation from various sectors of society.

Representatives of some 67 of these NCSDs and other participants at the Rio + 5 Event in March 1997, agreed upon a clear vision of the role and character of NCSDs as multi-sectoral catalysts for policies that integrate economic, environmental and social goals across sectors and agencies.

This vision is built upon the understanding that sustainable development is everybody's concern, and making it work requires commitment from all sectors of society. Government, industry, NGOs, labor, Academic institutions, and communities all are concerned because it is the way a society lives, the way that it produces and consumes that determines whether it is sustainable. The outcome of a society's efforts to achieve sustainability depend on the choices that individuals and institutions make, and progress depends upon broad social agreement about the goals and process of change.

Every country is different, and each country's approach to sustainable development must depend on the different political, social, economic, historical and cultural circumstances of that country. Nevertheless, there is a universal need to find policies that recognize the interrelation between prosperity, environment and fairness, particularly when the divisions within society that hinder such policies are endemic.

Since then, the Earth Council has played a key role, in collaboration with its partners, initially by bringing NCSDs together by region, then, by facilitating their establishment and initial consolidation and involvement in Rio+5, CSD processes and within regional alliances, and now by strengthening their multi-stakeholder and participatory mechanisms. In this regard the Rio+5 consultative process was an instrumental turning point as documented in the Rio+5 Report entitled: "Experiences and Recommendations from National and Regional Consultations for the Rio+5 Forum". Some 67 NCSDs and similar entities reviewed their institutional frameworks, needs and country priorities in regards to operationalizing sustainable development and found that the two most important issues were informed multi-sector participation and the integration of policies and programmes within a sustainability framework.

On the basis of the NCSD Rio+5 recommendations the Earth Council has revised and updated its strategy "Making Sustainability Work" focusing on the integration of economic, social and environmental issues into sustainability plans through strengthened NCSDs

Although NCSDs are not the only instrument to promote the operationalization of sustainable development and many are still weak, they are the only officially recognized multi-stakeholder mechanism at the national level where all sectors of society can come together to focus on integrating economic, social and environmental policies and programs in a participatory manner. They appear as important today to spearhead and stimulate the integration of sustainability policies into development plans as departments of Environment were in the early 1970s.

ANNEX C**Endorsement Letters From GEF Focal Points and NCSD Secretariats**

1. Burkina Faso (forthcoming)
2. Costa Rica
 - (a) M. Sc. Carlos M. Rodriguez, Minister a.i. and GEF Focal Point , Ministry of Environment and Energy.
3. Dominican Republic
 - (a) Dr. Zoila Gonzalez de Gutierrez, GEF Focal Point, Department of Environmental Planning
4. Mexico
 - (a) Ricardo Ochoa, Director of International Finance, GEF Focal Point
 - (b) Quim. Hortensia Santiago Fragoso, Asesora de la C. Secretaria, Secretariat of the National Council on Sustainable Development
5. Philippines
 - (a) Elmer S. Mercado, Undersecretary and GEF Focal Point, Department of Environment
 - (b) Ma. Lourdes M. Lagarde, PCSD Coordinating Secretariat
6. Uganda
 - (a) C. M. Kassami, Deputy Secretary to the Treasury, GEF Focal Point
 - (b) J. Y. Okedi, Executive Director, National Environment Management Authority
 - (c) Executive Director, The Private Sector Foundation