THE GEF SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME

COMMUNITY ACTIONS FOR GLOBAL IMPACT

# SGP Country Programme Strategy for utilization of OP5 grant funds

**Country:** **SLOVAKIA**

**Resources to be invested:** **US$** 1.2 million (1:1 co-financing to GEF fund)[1]

Country Programme Strategy (CPS) document serves as a framework for the country programme operations and provides a programmatic guidance for development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the Global Environment Facility's (GEF) Small Grants Programme (SGP) in Slovakia. The strategy sets basic project eligibility criteria and specifies types of projects to be funded through the programme. This document is designed to integrate the GEF focal area strategies, along with the national environmental priorities of Slovakia responding to the requirements of global environmental conventions (UNFCCC, UNCBD, UNCCD, POPs), as well as documents audience related to national development and poverty reduction. The CPS identifies the strategic results to be addressed by the country programme during the fifth GEF Operational Phase (January 2011 - June 2014). The target addressed in this document is the project proponents (NGOs, CBOs and community groups), central, regional and local government bodies, bilateral and multilateral donors, private sector, National Steering Committee and the SGP country programme team.

**December 2011**

[1] The level of SGP OP5 resources is an estimated total of the GEF core grant allocation, anticipated STAR resources, as well as other sources of third party co-financing.

## 1. SGP country programme - summary background

### 1. 1 Results achieved

GEF SGP in Slovakia is operational since March 2009, opening the first call for proposals in October 2009. Within the 4th operational phase of GEF, SGP in Slovakia was funded from RAF allocation from climate change portfolio.

**By 31. December 2010, GEF SGP in Slovakia funded 10 planning grants worth $ 22,313 and 23 projects worth $942,830**. Average amount per project was 29,855 USD. The priority focal area of SGP Slovakia was Climate Change and on the project level it was possible to support initiatives leading to energy efficiency, usage of renewable energy sources, sustainable transport and initiatives related to other GEF focal areas, if they contributed to the main thematic focus Climate Change Mitigation.

| Priorities | Number of Projects | Grant Amount in USD |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Removing barriers to **energy efficiency (EE)** and energy conservation. | 3 (9*) | 182,623 |
| 2. Promoting the adoption of **renewable energy sources (RES)** by removing barriers and reducing implementation costs. | 13(15**) | 502,798 |
| 3. Promoting environmentally **sustainable transport**. | 1 | 30,500 |
| 4. **Cross-cutting issues** related to energy, climate change and integrated ecosystem management. | 6 | 249,222 |

*6 projects from priority 2 (usage of RES) lead also to energy efficiency in form of cofinancing
** 2 projects from priority 4 (cross-cutting) lead to priority 2

GEF SGP strived to involve marginalized and vulnerable groups into the project preparation and implementation and thus create enabling environment for their social inclusion at the local level. The most vulnerable group, facing the risk of poverty, included the **Roma minority and long term unemployed**. In some cases it was not possible to include such groups into the project activities, however, GEF SGP supported projects which implemented activities having socio-economic benefits on local communities, ie. creating opportunities for savings and employment.

| Targeted beneficiaries | No. of projects |
|---|---|
| Roma minority | 5 |
| long term unemployed | 5 |

The main goal of SGP in Slovakia wass to decrease GHG emissions. It is estimated that by implementation of the projects, there will be **894 t of CO2 emissions reduced per year**, **85,253 USD saved on operational costs per year** and **91 workplaces created** by the projects**. Another important phenomenon of each project was creation of strong partnership** of different partners. At least municipality, local people and NGOs were all involved on implementation of projects. This is very important not only to gain greater local ownership, but also to ensure further replication of demo interventions.

Since start-up of the programme, there were number of attempts undertaken to ensure donors contribution on the programme level. SGP succeeded to mobilize 100,000 USD from Ekofond/SPP**.** On project level, projects themselves were successful in rising cofunding. It was due to the fact, that number of grantees were NGOs with broad portfolio with which they could combine SGP activities. The strongest sources of cofunding came from municipalities almost in every project. This is very good sign, because it shows, that municipalities have trust in NGOs work and understand them as real partners for solving local problems.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Total Amount in Grants** | **942,830 USD** |
| **Total Amount of Co-financing** | **1 528 539 USD** |
| Total Amount of Cash Co-financing | 1 307 675 USD |
| Total Amount of In-Kind Co-financing | 220 864 USD |

In 5th Operational Phase (GEF-5), SGP in Slovakia will be funded from CORE resources of the Global Programme and thus will seek transformative changes at the global level through policy influence, partnership development, knowledge generation and sharing that seek to upscale and replicate the innovative demonstration of SGP activities, leading to global environmental benefits.

## 1.2 Key baseline considerations

Slovak Republic has experienced transformational and restructuring processes since 1990s. This process was connected with a reduction in economic activities, as well as restructuring of industry and changes in agriculture, forestry and tourism. Such changes have had both positive and negative impacts on the environment in Slovakia. On one hand, there was a decrease in energy consumption. On the other hand, the changing consumption behaviour of inhabitants with regard to waste generation, increased motorisation, land use changes, and others has caused negative impacts on the environment in Slovakia.

Since 1990, **the main changes observed in Slovakia have been migration of the rural population to urban areas which determined land use changes, a significant increment of new forests and an increase in built-up areas**. Urban sprawl took place in the surroundings of large cities, due to the development of new houses, commercial and industrial sites, and at the expense of arable land. Such changes cause **losses of soil as a non renewable and food source, biodiversity decrease and decrease of carbon sinks**.

### 1.2.1. Biodiversity

While the share of protected areas in Slovakia was only 23 % in 1995, in 2009, protected areas cover 36 % of the territory. This increase was mainly due to the implementation of Natura 2000. The protection of rare plants, animals and habitats, minerals and fossils is also secured outside those areas, i.e. in the whole country. **However,** despite a significant growth in the area of protected sites during the last 20 years, the state of nature and biodiversity is not adequate for surface protection against increasing extreme climate events (drought, floods, wind), global warming, **abandonment of traditional management of meadows and pastures, expansion of invasive plants, fragmentation of habitats**, etc. **Partial monitoring of selected plant and animal species show that most species suffer from a decrease in population size and area of distribution**.

**I**n the past, nature conservation was characterised by a **passive approach, sometimes having a negative impact on some species and habitats which require active management.** Even if there is generally a positive approach of the general public to nature conservation in Slovakia, the **involvement of land owners, land-users, inhabitants** of a region and other stakeholders (e.g. hunters, foresters, farmers) in the active protection of the natural values in the region, it **is still insufficient**.

The trend in deterioration of the status of populations was recorded particularly in aquatic and wetland species (e.g. fish, amphibians, reptiles) and habitats which depend on regular mowing and grazing (e.g. *Spermophylus citellus*, order *Maculinea* and some plant species) proving the endangerment of these habitats as well. Temperature oscillations within the year also negatively influence the aquatic and wetland natural habitats and river ecosystems. The impact of the construction of hydroelectricity power plants on the river continuum is also significant. **The most endangered are halophyte habitats, caused by the fall of groundwater level, abandonment of traditional management and by secondary succession.** Negative influence is also caused by tourism development resulting in the fragmentation and urbanisation of natural habitats and industrial development resulting in the deterioration of the quality of air, water and soil.

### 1.2.2. Climate Change

Comparison of the trend in GDP growth and the trend in aggregated GHG emissions shows that the Slovak Republic is one of the few countries where GDP growth does not follow the trend of GHG emissions, which has been stable since 1997. This shows that decoupling is feasible. But, in international terms, the level of GHG emissions per inhabitant still remains high.The energy industry reached a 2.7 % share of the total GDP of the Slovak Republic in 2008**. Energy intensity is still 1.8 times higher than the average in EU15**, despite its continual decrease. The reason for this is the adversely **high share of energy-intensive industry in the GDP**. **Compared to other EU countries, the energy demand from industry is very high (traditionally a high proportion of the heavy industry)**. In 2008, industry's share of total energy consumption in Slovakia reached 40.4 % (the EU27 average was 27.2 %). This trend can be seen also in the indicator comparing the primary consumption of energy resources (which is approximately at the same level as 1994) with the GDP growth.

Aggregated green house gas emissions in 2007 represented 46 949 Gg (stated without LULUCF) and thus net emissions represent 43 752 Gg. The most important share on green house emissions is linked to the energy sector, representing almost an 80 % share. It is followed by the transport sector with 12% share. The industrial processes and agriculture contribute together to total greenhouse gas emissions by approximately 8 % and the waste sector contributes by 4 %. Greenhouse gas emissions from waste management activities are typically composed of methane from solid waste disposal sites or wastewater treatment and discharge. Waste processing also results in emissions of carbon dioxide, for example, from the incineration or the open burning of waste. Nitrous oxide and ammonia emissions may result from the biological treatment of solid waste or from septic tanks and latrines. As such, in much the same way as **carbon sinks within forests or soils have the potential to help reduce emissions, the waste sector also has the potential to play a role in climate change mitigation.**[2]

### 1.2.3. International Waters

Slovakia watersheds falls with 95% to the basin of river Danube and Black See. Rivers of Danube, Moravia, Ipel, Uh forms all together more than 400km borders with neighbouring countries, thus Slovak Republic has participated and participate in numerous transboundary projects.

**The groundwater quality** is, in the long-term, favourable in Slovakia. Good chemical status has been classified in 82.7 % of groundwater bodies representing 76.4 % of the total area of groundwater bodies in Slovakia. The major pollutants are sulphates, chlorides, nitrates, ammonia, pesticides, trichloroethene, and tetrachloroethylene. **Anthropogenic activities realised in river basins may result in a deterioration of** surface water quality **with detrimental effects on ecosystems.** On the basis of the preliminary evaluation of the monitoring results of surface water status performed in 2007, it is possible to state that circa 65 % have been classified as having high or good ecological status (or potential). The remaining water bodies have been classified as having worse than good status. The chemical status of surface water bodies has been evaluated on the basis of monitoring results at 67 sampling sites covering 46 surface

[2] Eurostat: A statistical guide to calculate greenhouse gas emissions, 2010 edition

water bodies in 2007. Sampling sites were situated at the localities of their assumed source and at the borders with neighbouring countries. Twenty-four surface water bodies out of the total number of 46 surface water bodies have been evaluated as failing to achieve good chemical status and 22 surface water bodies have been classified into the good chemical status class.[3]

**Socioeconomic development and climate change generate pressures causing negative effects on water quality and quantity in Slovakia. The main impact causes are agriculture, industry and urban activities.**

### 1.2.4. Land Degradation

According to current statistics on soil and land degradation in Slovakia more than 50% of agricultural land is suffering from erosion, for forest soils significantly more; about 150 k. ha of agricultural soils is polluted, from that about 30 k.ha at a level over permitted limits; about 600 k.ha of agricultural land is compacted; and at least 450 k ha of the total land area of Slovakia is seriously affected by acidification.[4] As for the carbon stocks in soil, those are found in south part of the country, with some areas in middle and north part of the country. The stocks are released as CO2 by conversion of natural land into agricultural area, especially by conversion of meadow and forest habitats into agricultural land and partly by drainage. Another releasing factor is extensive farming, intensive nutrient loading, and bad seeding procedures. On the other hand, CO2 sinks from land use change and forestry represented 4,8 Gg in 2003, which represents 10% of total GHG emissions in the country[5].

**Agriculture** - The last two decades have been characterised by a reduction in the application of agrochemicals in the production process which has had positive impacts on the environment. During the period 1990-2009, industrial fertilisers consumption decreased by 59 %, and pesticide consumption dropped by 27 %. Numbers of livestock also sharply dropped, in the case of cattle by 69 %, and pigs by 70 %. Compared to 1991, the share of the area of agricultural land by organic farming increased from 0.59 % to 7.6 %.

**Forestry** - GDP share of forestry in the total GDP since 1990 continues to decrease, remaining below 1 %. Among the biggest changes since 1990 is the progressive transfer of state ownership of forests (almost 100 % in 1990) to individuals, cities, villages, churches, etc. (with 59.1 % in 2009). Since 1990, the **continuous implementation of sustainable forest management and fulfillment of multiple functions of forest in a changing economic and social environment have been one of the main challenges to Slovak forestry**.

[3] EEA: The European State and Outlook, 2010

[4] Report on Environment, Slovak Republic, 2007

[5] It has been calculated by Gumbert (2002), that yearly sequestration potential is as follows: wetland restoration – 17 ts of CO2 per ha per year; conversion of agricultural land to meadows – 7,03 tones of CO2 per ha per year; deep tillage– 5,0 tones of CO2 per ha per year; conversion of agricultural land to forests – 2,27 tones of CO2 per ha per year.

### 2.2.5. POPs

In Slovakia there are a significant number of sources for polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins (PCDD), polychlorinated dibenzo-furans (PCDF) and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). In the case of PCBs, the Michalovce Region was contaminated by production activities of the former Chemko Strážske. Despite that the existing data revealing very high levels of dioxin emissions from incinerators, there is relatively few information about dioxins in Slovakia. The major causes of environmental POPs pollution in Slovakia include:

- Unconsolidated illegal landfills with obsolete pesticides,
- PCB Pollution in the Michalovce – Strážske Region,
- Obsolete incinerators and the aim to build new ones.

## 2.3. Major partnerships and existing sources of co-financing

In the 4th operational phase, the major partnerships started to be created with the government and key players of regional development. This will continue to be the focus in GEF 5 as well.

Existing sources of co-financing on the project level is expected to come from municipalities since cooperation between the local authorities and non-profit organizations create good opportunity for better understanding of the roles of each player in local development. In GEF-4, this trend was already proved by showing that municipalities have trust in NGOs work and understand them as real partners for solving local problems.

EU sources post high administrative burden to the grantees and thus SGP can be an opportunity to negotiate some cooperation on improvement of the distrubtion mechanisms within the country.

Private and bilateral donors are still active in Slovakia. Compared to EU funding it is a minor source of cofinancing. However, due to their flexibility and results-orientation, it is easier to open discussion for cooperation.

# 2. SGP country programme niche

## 2.1 Relevant Rio Conventions and relevant national planning frameworks

The following environmental conventions, ratified by the Government of Slovakia, are relevant to the GEF SGP focal areas:

Table 1. List of relevant conventions and national/regional plans or programmes

| Rio Conventions + national planning frameworks | Date of ratification / completion |
|---|---|
| UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) | 25 August 1994 |
| CBD National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) | 1998 and updated 2002 |
| UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) | 25 August 1994 |

| | |
|---|---|
| UNFCCC National Communications (1st, 2nd, 3rd) | 4th - December 2005<br>5th – February 2010 |
| UNFCCC Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMA) | NA |
| UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) | 7 January 2002 Accession |
| UNCCD National Action Programmes (NAP) | 2002 (draft only) |
| Stockholm Convention (SC) | 5 August 2002 |
| SC National Implementation Plan (NIP) | December 2006 |
| World Bank Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) | NA |
| GEF National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) | March 2005 |
| GEF-5 National Portfolio Formulation Exercise (NPFE) | NA |
| Strategic Action Programmes (SAPs) for shared international water-bodies | • Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes in 1992 and ratified in 1999<br>• Convention on Cooperation for the Protection and Sustainable Use of the River Danube (Sofia) – Law 14/1995<br>• Strategic Action Plan for the Danube river basin Bucharest 1994<br>• Convention on the protection and use of transboundary watercourses and international lakes (Helsinki) Law 30-1995 |

## 2.2 National priorities in relation to GEF-5 Strategic Priorities

SGP Slovakia niche for OP5 was established by integrating country ´s environmental priorties with GEF 5 Strategic Priorities. Those are mainly:

- In the field of **biodiversity focal area**: According to the prepared update for National strategy on biodiversity protection, the Slovak Republic plans to ensure by the year 2015, the conditions for maintenance of native species diversity, achievement of favourable species status, as well as the implementation of the research and monitoring system for protected species of European and national importance and a non-native species and, to complete the networking of the sites of Community importance proposed within the Natura 2000 network by the year 2015. Other priorities cover Conservation of biological diversity, Sustainable use of natural resources, General Measures for Conservation and Sustainable Use of natural resources and International co-operation
- In the field of **Climate Change** The Slovak Republic adopted a National Energy Efficiency Action Plan 2008-2016 (NEEAP), which sets an energy savings target

of at least 9 percent between 2008 and 2016, ie, 10.3 TWh (0.9 Mtoe), to be achieved in buildings, transport and small industries (excluding sectors under ETS). Under the Energy Efficiency Act, the country is obliged to provide threeyearly energy efficiency action plans and monitor their outcomes. In 2009, Slovakia implemented the Act on Support of Renewable Energy Sources and High Efficiency Combined Heat and Power (CHP) Generation, which targets all generation installations of up to 200 MW. By the year 2020, Slovakia aims to reach the 14 % share of gross consumption of renewable energy resources.

- In the field of **International Waters**, the main priorities for Slovakia is to ensure compliance with the EU Water Framework Directive 2000/60/ES and Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive 91/271/EHS, especially in relation to water quality management and integrated approach to the protection and rational use of waters, conservation of eco-systems and ensurance of ecological stability.
- In the field of **Land Degradation**, Slovakia´s objective in implementation of the Convention to Combat Desertification is to mitigate the effects of drought through effective action at all levels, supported by national and international co-operation and partnership arrangements.
- In the field of **POPs**, Slovak republic manages the POPs based on the National POPs Management plan, adopted by the Decree of Government of the Slovak Republic no. 415/2006. In addition, Slovakia is obliged to obey the provisions of the EU regulations, 850/2004 and 1195/2006 and provide regular reporting on POPs to European Commission and to the Stockholm Convention secretariat. The main objectives are relevant capacity strengthening of institutions, destruction of POPs and environmental awareness raising campaign for public.

**To ensure the highest efficiency of resources, SGP Slovakia intends to undertake in OP5 a multi-focal area and integrated approach.**

**2.3 Facilitation and coordination with civil society and community-based projects to help the country achieve its priorities and achieve the objectives of the global conventions**

At the community-level, global environmental issues are not naturally and easily divided amongst the GEF's identified focal areas; many environmental issues are related and inter-linked. SGP Slovakia will support a holistic, integrated approach to addressing environmental issues, supporting the needs and priorities of communities and civil society organizations (CSOs). By this, it can secure multiple environmental benefits, avoid negative impacts and future environmental investments. Slovakia, therefore, in the next programming period, will put emphasis on integrated and systemic approaches. That means that priority will be given to projects that lead into more than one focal area and to the projects that aim at transforming local people, especially marginalized and vulnerable groups into active actors for sustainable development. In addition, synergy with SFM, biodiversity, land degradation, and reduction of the vulnerability of the forest and non-forest lands due to climate change will be explored so as to generate multiple global environmental benefits as well as social and economic benefits.

In climate change focal area, the sustainability criteria will be observed to ensure that GEF support to modernization of biomass use does not undermine food security, contribute to deforestation, reduce soil fertility, increase GHG emissions beyond project

boundaries, or violate sustainability principles relating to biodiversity conservation or sustainable land and water management.

Strong objective of SGP in Slovakia will continue to be capacity development of CSOs, especially:

- engagement through consultative process;
- generation, access and use of information and knowledge;
- supporting participatory processes in policy and legislation development;
- awareness raising and support for the implementation of convention guidelines; and
- monitoring and evaluation of environmental impacts and trends.

The SGP projects in Slovakia will be community-driven, stakeholder owned, civil society led initiatives that generate local as well as global benefits, having participation, democracy, flexibility, and transparency as cornerstones of the SGP approach.

## 2.4 **Geographic focus**

The Slovak Republic is a land-locked country in the central Europe. Slovakia lies between 49°36'48" and 47°44'21" northern latitude and 16°50'56" and 22°33'53" eastern longitude. The country's area is 48,845 km² and population 5,477 mil. (July 2011 est.). Slovakia borders Poland in the north - 547 km (339.9 mi), Ukraine in the east - 98 km (60.9 mi), Hungary in the south - 669 km (415.7 mi), Austria in the south-west - 106 km (65.9 mi), and the Czech Republic in the north-west - 252 km (156.6 mi) for a total border length of 1,672 km (1,038.9 mi).[2

During GEF 5, the NSC did not select the geographic focus of the SGP programme as the country is relatively small and thus it is not feasible to split it into the priority regions. However, according to the national policy on regional disparities, the support will continue to be mainly concentrated to the locations with the lowest GDP per person generated, with higher un-employment rate and with occurrence of marginalized population remote to the centers and not eligible for the EU and National Program due to the minor scale. The awareness and education activities are expected to support also out of these regions.

## 2.5 SGP niche for grant-making in relation to the national priorities

Table 2. Consistency with national priorities

| OP5 project objectives | National priorities | SGP niche |
|---|---|---|
| SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 1: Improve sustainability of protected areas and community conservation areas through community-based actions | - Conservation of biological diversity<br>- Sustainable use of natural resources<br>- General Measures for Conservation and Sustainable Use of natural resources<br>- International co-operation | • Local efforts to ensure benefits for community livelihoods, contributing to long-term sustainability<br>• Provide knowledge to municipalities and stakeholders on how to pay due attention to globally significant biodiversity protection and sustainable use of land, water and biological resources in their development and spatial planning work.<br>• Engage farmers in learning and applying sustainable agricultural practices that contribute to |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | biodiversity protection and reduction of pollution of environmental media. Organic farming (OF) is identified as the most advanced technology in this regard applying best crop rotation approaches and full ban to use of chemicals. Organic farming also requires human attitude to animals which may well be combined with expanding grazing method of stock breeding.<br>• Stimulate communities to develop agro-forestry as alternative to logging and use of non-timber forest products from the wild nature.<br>• Engage communities to develop eco tourism as a way for diversification of local economy and sustainable approach to valorizing globally significant biodiversity capital of the locality. |
| SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 2: Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes and sectors through community initiatives and actions | - Conservation of biological diversity<br>- Sustainable use of natural resources<br>- General Measures for Conservation and Sustainable Use of natural resources<br>- International co-operation | detto |
| SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 3: Promote the demonstration, development and transfer of low carbon technologies at the community level | - Compliance of the Slovak Republic with provision of : "European Union Climate-Energy Package" (20% reduction in greenhouse gases by 2020 (20% reduction in greenhouse gases, 20% share of energy from the renewable sources in the EU total energy consumption and 10% share of energy from renewable sources in transport energy consumption by 2020.)<br>- Increased share of renewable energy in total electricity production to 19% in 2010, 24% in 2020, and 27% in 2030, respectively, especially biomass use for heat production and biofuels production.<br>- Security of energy | • Engage communities to start-up new small and medium enterprises utilizing contemporary energy efficient technologies and high performance buildings, appliances, and equipment.<br>• Engage small and medium enterprises to apply small scale renewable energy technologies (RET).<br>• Engage small hotel and house/apartment owners to apply energy efficiency and RET and build capacity for utilization of EU and national funds.<br>• Engage municipalities and small communities to develop and use RET for public purposes.<br>• Promote new approaches to product design and selection of materials (including in construction) as a method to reduce energy demand.<br>• Support to design of energy efficient buildings within the national conditions with the aim allow construction of new buildings with the budget equivalent to costs of the standard buildings |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | supply. | |
| SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 4: Promote and support energy efficient, low carbon transport at the community level | - Improvement of energy effectiveness and long-term achieving of energy saving.<br>- Decreasing the negative effects of the transport sector on the environment and development of public transport.<br>- Security of energy supply. | • Engage municipalities to incorporate energy efficiency and RET into their development/spatial planning, e.g. by planning for pedestrian/bicycling areas, use of electrical public transport means, etc. technical assistance in transport and urban planning, development of innovative financing mechanisms, awareness campaigns, and investments in high-performance technologies |
| SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 5: Support the conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks through sustainable management and climate proofing of land use, land use change and forestry | - Development of information sources to support strategic decision-making<br>- Identification of strategic and legislative measures<br>- Proposal and implementation of technical measures to reduce the consequences droughts and soil degradation processes<br>- Development of new information system<br>- Training and information dissemination of technical and other stakeholders | • Engage farmers to reduce generation of GHGs from agricultural practices. The objective on LULUCF during GEF-5 will be two-fold: one is to conserve, restore, enhance, and manage the carbon stocks in forest and non-forest lands, and the other is to prevent emissions of the carbon stocks to the atmosphere through the reduction of the pressure on these lands in the wider landscape. |
| SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 6: Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem and forest ecosystem services to sustain livelihoods of local communities | - Sustainable use of natural resources<br>- General Measures for Conservation and Sustainable Use of natural resources | • Engage farmers in learning and applying sustainable agricultural practices that contribute to soil fertility maintenance and reduction of pollution. Organic farming is identified as the most advanced technology in this regard applying best crop rotation approaches and full ban to use of chemicals. Organic farming also requires human attitude to animals which may well be combined with expanding grazing method of stock breeding for avoiding land degradation of semi-natural pastures.<br>• Stimulate communities to develop agro-forestry (including forestation) as means to combat land degradation and as alternative to logging and use of non-timber forest products from the wild nature. |
| SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 7: Reduce pressures at community level from competing land uses (in the wider | - To mitigate the effects of drought through effective action at all levels, supported by national and international co- | • Maintain or improve the flow of agro-ecosystem and forest ecosystem services to sustain community livelihoods.<br>• Work with community partners to reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses at the community level<br>• Provide knowledge to municipalities and stakeholders |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| landscapes) | operation and partnership arrangements | on how to pay due attention to land degradation issues (including water management) and sustainable use of land and water resources in their development and spatial planning work.<br>• Promote energy efficiency and RET<br>• Promote new approaches to product design and selection of materials (including in construction) as a method to reduce need for mining and pollution from waste. |
| SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 8: Support transboundary water body management with community-based initiatives | - Integrated approach to the protection and rational use of waters, conservation of eco-systems and ensurance of ecological stability | • Engage small settlements (below 2000 equivalent inhabitants) to apply alternative wastewater treatment technologies.<br>• Engage farmers to combine development of organic farming technology as an approach to combat water pollution from chemicals with good agricultural practices as to minimize the pollution with nitrates too.<br>• Provide active knowledge to municipalities and stakeholders on how to pay due attention to integrated water management issues in their development and spatial planning work.<br>• Promote new approaches to product design and selection of materials (including in construction) as a method to reduce pollution from waste.<br>• Engage communities in water efficiency technologies application. |
| SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 9: Promote and support phase out of POPs and chemicals of global concern at community level | - Relevant capacity strengthening of institutions<br>- Destruction of POPs<br>- Environmental awareness raising campaign for public | • Inform people on the danger of POPs<br>• Preparatory works for POPs destruction investments |
| SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 10: Enhance and strengthen capacities of CSOs (particularly community-based organizations and those of indigenous peoples) to engage in consultative processes, apply knowledge management to ensure adequate information flows, implement convention guidelines, and monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends | - Regional social cohesion<br>- Lifelong learning<br>- Investments into the social capital | • Learning and knowledge management platform establishment to share lessons learned among CBOs and NGOs |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Cross-Cutting Results: Poverty reduction, livelihoods and gender | - Reducing regional disparities<br>- Development of tourism infrastructure and products based on regional specifications, cultural heritage and natural resources | • Eco tourism development in the areas of globally significant biodiversity and priority ecosystems.<br>• Sustainable agriculture and food production in the areas of globally significant biodiversity and/or land degradation problems and priority ecosystems.<br>• Mainstreaming global environment into local development and spatial planning processes.<br>• Sustainable product design. |

## 3. Capacity development, poverty reduction and gender results for SGP (1 page max)

### 3.1 Capacity development

The scheme should continue supporting projects which are based on local sources and which include more then one focal area, as it is a clear evidence from GEF-4 that priority of cross-cutting issues can bring the biggest benefits for the scheme.

In the preparation of the projects to be funded by SGP, the SGP project team will work very closely with the civil society organizations, providing information on the relevant subjects, advice on the project design, interlinks to ongoing similar initiatives, support to negotiations with potential partners, identification of possible cofinancing and project partners. This will be done both on individual as well as corporate basis, ie. organizing stakeholder workshop(s) for potential grantees to explain the focus of the scheme, to discuss and prepare the logframe matrix for the projects, which is the key for project success.

This consultative process will be done in cooperation with NSC members, UNDP technical advisors, line ministries and other national experts. When necessary, also the business sector or other donors will be contacted with request for cooperation. In this respect, SGP will use external consultancies as deemed necessary.

The joint consultative processes will be done on regular basis in order to ensure the knowledge sits deep in minds of the proponents.

In order the capacity developed through this consultative process as well as through the project implementation, the SGP project team will work on:

- Promoting and replication gained knowledge through creation of knowledge platform and development of knowledge products. For this, it will cooperate closely with UNDP knowledge advisor.
- Replicating the methodology of the grant scheme into other grantmaking processes on the national level
- Creating the partnerships among the donors, proponents, experts or national institutions
- Gaining the cofinancing on the programe level

### 3.2 Poverty reduction

In OP5, GEF SGP will strive to involve marginalized and vulnerable groups into the project preparation, implementation and monitoring, thus creating enabling environment for their social inclusion at the local level. According to the National Action Plans on Social Inclusion in the Slovak Republic (2004-2006, 2006-2008 and 2008-2010), the most vulnerable group facing the risk of poverty includes the unemployed, and primarily the long term unemployed, single-parent families and families with a large number of children. Although the Roma ethnic minority is a heterogeneous group a large part of Roma belongs to the most vulnerable inhabitants of Slovakia. Their social situation has been determined by long term unemployment, dependency on social benefits a low level of education and housing. The most vulnerable group is made of Roma who face double marginalization. On the one hand they live in marginalized regions in which there is a minimal possibility of finding a job and thus extracting oneself from the social assistance system, and at the same time, they cannot be integrated into the labor market in consequence of their social exclusion, lack of adequate labor skills and qualification or discrimination. Thus, Roma population represents the segment of the society that is most likely to face multiple social exclusions, very often in combination with both direct and indirect discrimination.

### 3.3 Gender

While the Slovak Republic has adopted all relevant international conventions relating to combating the gender discrimination, (for example Slovakia became party to Convention on Elimination of Discrimination against Women on 28 May 1993), and transposed into its legal system related EU Directives[6]. However, research and surveys show that the Slovak Republic is still lagging behind in implementation of equal treatment based on gender in practice. Especially, high prevalence of stereotypes and lack of complex approach to the assessment of national, regional or local policies is often leading to indirect discrimination. The GEF SGP will strive to create equal opportunities for both genders to participate in the process of project preparation, implementation and monitoring.

## 4. OP5 country outcomes, indicators and activities

*Expected impacts of the scheme on the national level*

- *Biodiversity protection* – important ecosystems will be protected and used in sustainable manner in their natural and rural environment
- *Reducing climate change on environment* – habitants understand negative impact of climate changes and jointly implement solutions for decreasing of CO2 emissions

[6] Council Directive of 10 February 1975 on the approximation of the laws of the member states relating to the application of the principle of equal pay for men and women (75/117/EEC), Equal Treatment Directive (76/207/EEC) establishes prohibition against direct or indirect discrimination, Directive 2002/73/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 September 2002 amending Council Directive 76/207/EEC on the implementation of the principle of equal treatment for men and women as regards access to employment, vocational training and promotion, and working conditions, just to name a few

- *Protection of international waters*[7] – water pollution in Slovakia is decreased and floods prevented
- *Land degradation* –management and sustainable land use of natural resources is improved
- *Elimination of POPs* –knowledge of local habitants on negative impacts of POPs on human health is increased and solutions to decrease POPs are initiated, prepared and supported

[7] All sanctuaries of international water bodies.

Table 3. Results Framework

| SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 1: Enhanced community conservation activities to improve state of biodiversity | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Outcomes** | **Indicators** | **Means of verification** | **Activities** |
| 1. Improved sustainability of protected areas and community conservation areas through community-based actions<br>2. Mainstreamed biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in production landscapes and sectors through community initiatives and actions | • 100 hectares of community conserved areas influenced<br>• 50 hectares of protected areas influenced<br>• 50 hectares of significant ecosystems with improved conservation status<br>• 100 hectares of production landscapes/seascapes applying sustainable use practices | Progress reports, project leaflets, coverage in the media | *3-5 projects on application of sustainable agricultural practices, organic farming, agroforestry, ecotourism and awareness raising , including generation of school curricula, establishment of 3 public private partnerships for supporting benefit generation for communities, mainstreaming global environment into local development and spatial planning processes, etc..* |
| SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 2: Global environmental Benefits secured through community-based initiative and actions, especially transition toward a low-carbon development path | | | |
| **Outcomes** | **Indicators** | **Means of verification** | **Activities** |
| 3. Demonstration, development and transfer of energy efficient measures and low-GHG technologies at the community level<br>4. Increased energy efficient, low-GHG transport at the community level<br>5. Conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks through sustainable management and climate proofing of land use, | • 600 tonnes of CO2 avoided by implementing low carbon technologies per year<br>  • Renewable energy measures<br>  • Low carbon transport practices<br>  • Energy efficiency measures<br>  • Other<br>• 15 community members demonstrating or deploying low- | Progress reports, project leaflets, coverage in the media | *3-5 projects on utilizing energy efficient technologies, renewable energy sources, engaging SMEs to apply small scale renewable energy technologies, sustainable transport practices, sustainable product design and selection of materials, establishment of 3 public private partnerships for supporting benefit generation for communities, etc.* |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| land use change and forestry | GHG technologies<br>• 300 thous. USD of total value of energy, technology and transport services provided (US dollar equivalent)<br>• 50 hectares of land under improved land use and climate proofing practices<br>• 200 tonnes of CO2 avoided through improved land use and climate proofing practices per year | | |
| SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 3**:** Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem and forest ecosystem services to sustain livelihoods of local communities | | | |
| **Outcomes** | **Indicators** | **Means of verification** | **Activities** |
| 6. Maintenance or improvement in flow of agro-ecosystem and forest ecosystem services to sustain livelihoods of local communities<br>7. Reduction of pressures at community level from competing land uses (in wider landscapes) | • 100 hectares of land applying sustainable forest, agricultural and water management practices<br>• 50 hectares of degraded land restored and rehabilitated<br>• 3 communities demonstrating sustainable land and forest management practices | Progress reports, project leaflets, coverage in the media | *3-5 projects on sustainable agricultural practices, organic farming, stimulating communities to develop agroforestry, flow of agroecosystem and forest ecosystem services, creating partnerships to reduces pressures on natural resources, awareness raising on land degradation issues, promotion of energy efficiency and RET, etc.* |
| SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 4**:** Support transboundary water body management with community-based initiatives | | | |
| **Outcomes** | **Indicators** | **Means of verification** | **Activities** |
| 8. Effective and climate resilient community-based actions and practices supporting implementation of SAP regional priority actions demonstrated | • 100 hectares of river/lake basins applying sustainable management practices and contributing to implementation of SAPs<br>• 50 hectares of fishing grounds managed sustainably | Progress reports, project leaflets, coverage in the media | *3-5 projects on application of alternative wastewater treatment technologies, organic farming to reduce nitrates and chemicals, provision of active knowledge to integrated water management issues, promotion of new approaches to product design and selection of materials, engaging communities in water efficiency technologies* |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | • 2 tonnes of land-based pollution avoided | | *applications, etc.* |
| SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 5**:** Promote and support phase out of POPs and chemicals of global concern at community level | | | |
| **Outcomes** | **Indicators** | **Means of verification** | **Activities** |
| *9.* Improved community-level initiatives and actions to prevent, reduce and phase out POPs, harmful chemicals and other pollutants and manage contaminated sites in an environmentally sound manner. | • 3 tonnes of solid waste prevented from burning by alternative disposal<br>• 10 kg of obsolete pesticides disposed of appropriately<br>• 10 kg of harmful chemicals avoided from utilization or release | Progress reports, project leaflets, coverage in the media | *1 project to inform people on the danger of POPs and preparatory works for POPs destruction investments, etc* |
| SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 6**:** Enhance and strengthen capacities of community-based and non-governmental organizations to engage in consultative processes, apply knowledge management to ensure adequate information flows, implement convention guidelines, and enhance capacities of CBOs and NGOs to monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends | | | |
| **Outcomes** | **Indicators** | **Means of verification** | **Activities** |
| *10.* Capacity of CBOs and CSOs strengthened to support implementation of global conventions | • 2 NGOs/CBOs formed or registered<br>• 2 quality standards/labels achieved or innovative financial mechanisms put in place | Progress reports, project leaflets, coverage in the media | *All SGP projects will include in OP5 capacity development activities (trainings, awareness raising, participatory approaches in project monitoring and evaluation), especially focused on youth and children. 1 project will deal with learning and knowledge management platform establishment to share lessons learned among CBOs and NGOs* |
| SGP OP5 Immediate Objective 7**:** Improved local livelihoods and gender equality through SGP interventions | | | |
| **Outcomes** | **Indicators** | **Means of verification** | **Activities** |
| *11.* Poverty Reduction in local communities | • 100% of projects that include gender analysis or incorporate gender relevant elements in a positive manner<br>• 100% of projects with appropriate | Progress reports, project leaflets, coverage in the media | *All SGP projects will include in OP5 activities related to poverty reduction, livelihood and gender (activation individual and collective capacities, promotion and demonstration of alternative income generating activities to improve livelihoods, encouraging the participation/involvement of disadvantaged groups, mainstreaming* |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | gender balance of participants and target beneficiaries<br>• 100% of projects that include socioeconomic analysis<br>• 200 community members with sustained livelihood improvement resulting from SGP support | | *gender considerations in community based environmental initiatives, stimulating women participation in all SGP projects phases)* |

## 5. Monitoring & Evaluation plan

### 5.1 Monitoring & Evaluation[8] Plan

Systematic monitoring, evaluation, and reporting are necessary for program's success at both, country and global levels. The proposed monitoring and evaluation system compliments the GEF SGP general conditions on M & E, especially in respect to the participatory process that enables capacity-building and understanding of local stakeholders and applies lessons learned from project and program experiences. In GEF-5, SGP Slovakia will put special stress on Monitoring and Evaluation and capturing lessons learned in order:

- To better understand the conditions for success of projects and draw lessons from implementation experience in order to increase GEF's catalytic effect;
- To enhance impact through improved assessment of GEF's ability to deliver incremental results on the outcome level;
- To enhance adaptive management in response to changing circumstances and project risks; and
- To improve the monitoring system

**Following M&E activities will be undertaken at project level:**
Necessary input for both Monitoring and Evaluation will be at the project beginning, a baseline data that inform about the situation. Therefore, all project proposals will include a concrete monitoring and evaluation plan containing as a minimum

- baseline for the project, with a description of the problem to be addressed, with indicator data;
- SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time bound) indicators for project implementation;
- SMART indicators for results (outcomes and, if applicable, impacts);
- Project workplan with a timeschedule. The plan should indicate how information will be collected and who will be responsible for it.

[8] **Monitoring** will involve the collection and analysis of data about SGP projects' activities and results: transferred into easy-to-understand information. Monitoring is focus onto knowledge gained and used to correct/ adjust project implementation and management in order to achieve project objectives. Monitoring will allow project participants to keep track of project activities, to determine whether project objectives are being achieved, and to make whatever changes are necessary to improve project performance. **Evaluation** considers the results and effects of a project in terms of the local and global environment and the quality of life of the participants. Through evaluation project participants and others attempt to understand and explain the effects of a project. The evaluation builds on the links among environmental problems, causes, and solutions identified in the project proposal and design. It (usually) focuses on the general and specific objectives of a project and assesses how and to what extent they have been met. The evaluation should include an explicit appraisal of whether the project has met its stated objectives in terms of the GEF focal area and operational program and if not, analyze the reasons. Very often the results can be visible and measurable after the project ended, in some cases after some period after the project completion. Therefore within the GEF SGP emphasis will be given in this feature to request project leaders and stake holders to have this in mind when designing and implementing a SGP project.

During the project implementation, several types of Reports will be required to be developed by the grantees. These are Project Progress Reports, consisting of narrative report will also include an evaluation of the projects results to date, based on the projects indicators, a review of the problems and difficulties encountered and the measures undertaken for solving them. Apart from the narrative report, the reports include a financial report with an expenditures report supported by justifying documents and a cumulative report. Upon completion of the project, the grantee will prepare a Final Project Report that focuses on the relevance and performance of the project, the likelihood of its success, and lessons learned in terms of best and worst practices. This report should also contain recommendations for follow-up actions by appropriate institutions where appropriate.

**Following M&E activities will be undertaken at portfolio level:**
The NC will thoroughly review the progress reports with focus on capturing the lessons learned and review whether they are in line with the proposed work schedule and whether project fulfills set indicators. In addition, the reports shall serve as a basis for the development of corporate reports to be prepared by the NC. In order to monitor the projects progress, the NC should undertake **the site visits,** which should take place (if and when applicable) when the Project Concept is found eligible for GEF SGP funding to help project proponents design the full project proposal, which adequately meets the GEF SGP criteria. Subsequent (if and when applicable) site visits after the approval of the project will allow the National Coordinator and/or the members of the NSC to observe the actual implementation of the project and to confirm the information contained in the project progress reports. These site visits will also include meetings with relevant project stakeholders. A final site visit will be conducted upon receipt of the final project report. The visits generally include examination of books, review of activities' progress, discussion of problems or potential problems, and definition of follow-up actions. During the site visits, the NC will collect materials, information, make digital photos etc., in order to document lessons learned and to demonstrate the environmental and sustainable livelihood impacts of the GEF SGP activities. In order to assure cost efficiency, the visits will be grouped by geographical criteria.

**Following M&E activities will be undertaken at country programme level:**
There is a Logical Framework with indicators developed at the country level. Indicators should measure/assess the most important expected results of project activities and objectives. The Logical Framework at the country programme level is monitored at the end of each year with view to assess the relevance of intervention and quality of results achieved. Monitoring of the CPS will be conducted during the project proposal preparation, its implementation and after its conclusion, to see the results through said indicators whether achieved as planned. The monitoring will be planned in the Programme's Annual Work plan.

**How results will be aggregated and consolidated:**
Based on the information included in the interim reports, on the ones collected during the monitoring visits and using the data from projects' self monitoring and evaluation, the NC shall undertake a mid-term and final evaluations of the projects' portfolio and draft evaluation reports. Monitoring and evaluation contribute to knowledge building and organizational improvement. Findings and lessons should be accessible to target

audiences in a user-friendly way. It is possible that there will be hired an external evaluator to analyze the projects already implemented.

## 5.2 Local stakeholders participation

The involvement of key stakeholders at all stages of project cycle will contribute to community "ownership", will build consensus about the project's approach and promote mutual understanding of project goals. Furthermore, it should strengthen institutional capacity in the country that ensures continuation of both local and global environmental benefit generation. During preparation of the projects a joint meetings will be organized with local stakeholders to discuss the project idea and to negotiate involvement of project partners. The grantees shall have consultations with stakeholders and beneficiaries in order to describe the current state of relevant features of the community or locality, focusing on the environmental problem in the GEF focal areas before project activities begin (baseline data), and than set the projects objectives and outputs. Indicators should be developed together with those best placed to assess them, that means project's ultimate beneficiaries, local staff and other stakeholders.

One of the results from the preparatory process will be agreement on the shared responsibilities for project monitoring, both from the proponents as well as from the side of the stakeholders. In addition, each project will have to establish a Project Board prior to project start up. The monitoring data will be discussed at Project Board meetings and later on reported in the progress reports which projects must submit prior to the advance payment. Usually, it is every 6 months in the project lifetime.

During the implementation process, the grantee shall involve stakeholders in a participatory self-evaluation process, both as participants and contributors and as users and beneficiaries. They have a particular responsibility in providing their views and perspectives. Periodical common meetings and site visits will be organized to assess progress, raise issues, or confirm the achievement of results, continuously providing adaptive adjustment measures in order to improve project performance.

The methods used will vary according to project specificity and complexity including stakeholders analysis, documentation review, direct observation, questionnaires, brainstorming, focus groups, SWOT analysis, photos, videos, GIS mapping etc. The recommended periodicity of these activities is at least every six months, but according to concrete project phases and evolution they may be more frequent.

Table 4. M&E Plan at the Project Level

| **SGP Individual Project Level** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **M&E Activity** | **Responsible Parties** | **Timeframe** |
| Participatory Project Monitoring | Grantees | Duration of project |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Baseline Data Collection[9] | Grantees, NC | At project concept planning and proposal stage |
| Two or Three Project Progress and Financial Reports *(depending on agreed disbursement schedule)* | Grantees, NC, PA | At each disbursement request |
| Project Workplans | Grantees, NC, PA | Duration of project |
| NC Project Proposal Site Visit *(as necessary / cost effective[10])* | NC | Before project approval, as appropriate |
| NC Project Monitoring Site Visit *(as necessary / cost effective)* | NC | On average once per year, as appropriate |
| NC Project Evaluation Site Visit *(as necessary / cost effective)* | NC | At end of project, as appropriate |
| Project Final Report | Grantees | Following completion of project activities |
| Project Evaluation Report *(as necessary / cost effective)* | NC, NSC, External party | Following completion of project activities |
| Prepare project description to be incorporated into global project database | PA, NC | At start of project, and ongoing as appropriate |

## 5.3 Country programme portfolio level

The role of National Coordinator is to ensure the logframe is designed in a way it will be possible to aggregate the data. It includes provision of methodology for calculation of indicators. Continually, s/he will aggregate the data into a national logical framework and will report at least once a year on the progress made to CPMT. One limiting factor is project duration, because many indicators are possible to calculate only within the longer timeframes, which is mainly after project implementation.

Table 5. M&E Plan at the Programme Level

| **SGP Country Programme Level** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **M&E Activity** | **Responsible Parties** | **Timeframe** |
| Country Programme Strategy Review | NSC, NC, CPMT | Start of OP5 |
| Strategic Country Portfolio Review | NSC, NC | Once during OP5 |
| NSC Meetings | NSC, NC, UNDP CO | Minimum twice per year |
| Performance and Results Assessment (PRA) of NC Performance | NC, NSC, UNDP CO, CPMT, UNOPS | Once per year |

[9] Capacity-development workshops and M&E trainings may be organized in relation to innovative techniques for community monitoring, including new technologies (i.e. GPS-enabled cameras, aerial photos, participatory GIS, etc.); as well as in response to guidelines for "climate proofing" of GEF focal area interventions; REDD+ standards; and/or other specific donor/co-financing requirements.

[10] To ensure cost-effectiveness, project level M&E activities, including project site visits, will be conducted on a discretionary basis, based on internally assessed criteria including (but not limited to) project size and complexity, potential and realized risks, and security parameters.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Country Programme Review resulting in Annual Country Report[11] | NC presenting to NSC and CPMT | Once per year |
| Financial 4-in-1 Report | NC/PA, UNOPS | Quarterly |

# 6 Knowledge Management Plan

## 6.1. Capturing good practices and lessons learned

The objective of SGP's knowledge management efforts is to leverage lessons learned from both successful and unsuccessful projects, and to replicate gained practices, technical and managerial aspects and also cultural, behavioral and motivational reasons of the stakeholders. It is based on dissemination (communication and outreach).

The knowledge[12] management plan include extracting the lessons learned by the national coordinator from the progress reports, monitoring visits and informal discussions with the grantees, civil society, government, or other relevant stakeholders and then sharing them on continuous basis with the beneficiaries to ensure that knowledge products and services are applied, used and if necessary further improved to serve for similar or different purposes. Intended beneficiaries include: Granties, project teams, CPS partners, national and local government, donors, research and educational institutions, NGOs, CBOs, experts or any interested public.

The methods addressing the Knowledge Management and transfer of knowledge and experience for GEF SGP Slovakia include:

- NSC meetings
- Web site of GEF SGP Slovak Republic and of project grantees
- Posting information through existing network/making links to different portals - environmental NGOs, Enviroportal of the Ministry of Environmental and eventually through public and private web sites
- GEF SGP regular database update,
- Blogging
- Exchange visits between the projects to exchange experience in solving same problems or to encourage grantees to adopt the necessary experience obtained in the framework of other initiatives to solve the problems in their own projects
- Creation of a "directory of expertise" among GEF SGP grantees to call upon each other for advice
- Organizing the knowledge fair with view for replicating and up-scaling

[11] The annual Country Programme Review exercise should be carried out in consultation with the national Rio Convention focal points and the associated reporting requirements.

[12] Embedded knowledge is found in: rules, processes, manuals, organizational culture, codes of conduct, ethics, products, etc. It is important to note, that while embedded knowledge can exist in explicit sources (i.e. a rule can be written in a manual), the knowledge itself is not explicit, i.e. it is not immediately apparent why doing something this way is beneficial to the organization. Tacit knowledge is found in: the minds of human stakeholders. It includes cultural beliefs, values, attitudes, mental models, etc. as well as skills, capabilities and expertise. Explicit knowledge is found in: databases, memos, notes, documents, etc. (Botha et al. 2008)

- Annual info meeting or project site visits for Donors, State Administration, Association of municipalities, Academia, Association of NGOs, Private Sector Representatives and/or media

Type of knowledge products which will be developed either directly by the projects or by the National Coordinator:

- Reports
- Handbooks,
- How-to-booklets,
- Case studies,
- Films and videos.

Dissemination of information will be further done through participation at the various workshops, individual meetings with the governments or potential donors, cooperation with universities, provision of internships and/or media campaign.

### 6.2 Policy influence of the Programme

Informing and influencing the policy is the longterm process and can be done directly within the projects or through coordination meetings (knowledge fairs) with the grantees to discuss the potential for policy influence and participation at the advisory committees of regional governments.

### 6.3 Up-scaling and replication

Replication is done through webpage and media campaigns where people can receive and replicate information. Upscaling is to be financend through EU funds, especially cross-border funding.

The replication and scale-up of good practices and lessons learned can be initiated either by SGP country office, if the information and the evaluation made so far are indicating the opportunity of such activity (i.e. similar context, similar environment issue to be addressed etc.). In this situation, organizations/stakeholders from the respective area are contacted and the opportunity/need/will for such intervention is discussed. Another approach consists of interested organizations contacting SGP and asking for support to develop similar/larger projects on a specific topic. Both approaches are to be used in SGP both on national or regional scale with view to involve grantees in these activities.

## 7 Resource Mobilization Plan

### 7.1. Sustainability of the SGP country programme

Apart of cash and in-kind co-financing generated on the project level, SGP Slovakia will work strongly on generating additional funds to cover the management costs of SGP. SGP can be a delivery mechanism for other programmes and projects, even for non-GEF related ones and can be utilized to deliver funds through grantmaking. SGP will offer its technical services (i.e. advising other donors and agencies on how to set up effective grantmaking or helping in the development of other projects that would involve

community-based efforts and NGO participation). However, cost recovery[13] for SGP fund delivery services will be a strict policy in the negotiation with the partner donor.

Diversification is mainly possible to EU funds with the view to advocate on positive and substantial results and to negotiate better distribution mechanisms. Cost recovery is to be done by provision of advisory services to external bodies, especially with view to setting up the schemes, selection criteria, assessment, etc.

SGP can attract these other co-financing partners by offering to add SGP funds to the donor partner's contribution resulting in more outcomes and greater impact. But it will also be important to point out that through SGP, the donor partners will be able to use an existing effective mechanism and as such they would save on time and costs as compared if they are to set up their own delivery mechanism.

### 7.2. Strategic partnerships

In OP 4, there was a strong partnership developed in GEF SGP Slovakia with municipal sector. Municipal sector was the main co-financier on the project level. This is very good sign, because it shows, that municipalities have trust in NGOs work and understand them as real partners for solving local problems. In addition, SGP succeeded to create partnership also with the private sector, both on project and programmatic level. This partnership, however, still can be further developed as there is a potential in supporting local development by private sector.

In OP 5, GEF SGP Slovakia continues to seek strategic partnerships with the following potential partners by regular meetings, participation at official and unofficial meetings, joint site visits and other possible means:

(i) national and local government agencies;
At the national level, SGP objectives are complementary with several programmes developed by the Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Regional Development, Ministry of Agriculture and with Office of Government, especially in terms of implementation of environmental policies on the local level, environmental education programmes, application of RES, protection of BD, protection of international waters, Support of EE, agroenvironmental production and sustainable forestry. SGP will offer potential cooperation focusing on targeted results and easier administration for projects implementation.

(ii) multilateral agencies or financial institutions (such as the World Bank, regional development banks, and/or other international organizations);
SGP is mainly focusing on establishing cooperation with ongoing UNDP initiatives in Slovakia where the main synergies are identified in developing sustainable social enterprises that can solve critical social problems in emerging market countries, supporting sustainable management of NGOs and building capacities of NGOs.

(iii) bilateral agencies;

[13] Time of the NC and PA, travel for M&E, communications and knowledge management, as well as use of SGP premises, utilities and equipment are all assessed and monetized.

There are two main donors based in Slovakia with which SGP can find strong linkages. It is Govt. of Norway and govt. of Switzerland. Main areas of cooperation could be support of EE, pilot actions in biodiversity protection and sustainable forest management. Additional activities could be cross-border cooperation with Ukraine, social empowerment and social businesses.

(iv) non-governmental organizations and foundations; and
Similar mission was found with Ekopolis, NPOA, Open Society Foundation and Habitat for Humanity, which support environmental and local livelihoods activities. SGP will work very closely with these organizations on joint implementation of the projects as well as joint negotiations with the state institutions on potential distribution mechanisms with the aim to transpose the SGP methodology on the national level.

(v) private sector.
In OP4, a good cooperation was established with SPP (Gas de France). It is estimated, that this cooperation will continue also in the future. In addition, several negotiations started with the banking institutions, which support implementation of EE measures or usage of RES. There also might be potential for supporting social enterprises in environmental sector.

Both modalities, the “program co-financing” and “project co-financing”, will be applied for GEF SGP in Slovak Republic also in OP5. The database of all donors contributing to GEF SGP Slovak Republic will be created and up dated regularly since the co-financing increase the project impact both to the thematic field, and empowerment and helps to create conditions for the projects sustainability. GEF SGP funding will thus be used as the seed money to mobilize and leverage additional money, and at the same time, through SGP’s built-in local empowerment process, increase grantee’s capacity to implement and manage development projects and provide them access to the donor community.

**ANNEX 1: GEF SGP OP 5 PROJECT LEVEL INDICATORS**
The following represent the core set of project level indicators for OP5:

**Biodiversity (BD)**

- Hectares of indigenous and community conserved areas (ICCAs) influenced
- Hectares of protected areas influenced
- Hectares of significant ecosystems with improved conservation status
- Hectares of production landscapes/seascapes applying sustainable use practices
- Total value of biodiversity products/ecosystem services produced (US dollar equivalent)

**Climate Change (CC)**

- Tonnes of CO2 avoided by implementing low carbon technologies
    - Renewable energy measures (*please specify*)
    - Low carbon transport practices (*please specify*)
    - Energy efficiency measures (*please specify*)
    - Other (*please specify*)
- Number of community members demonstrating or deploying low-GHG technologies
- Total value of energy, technology and transport services provided (US dollar equivalent)
- Hectares of land under improved land use and climate proofing practices
- Tonnes of CO2 avoided through improved land use and climate proofing practices

**Land degradation (LD) & Sustainable Forest Management (SFM)**

- Hectares of land applying sustainable forest, agricultural and water management practices
- Hectares of degraded land restored and rehabilitated
- Number of communities demonstrating sustainable land and forest management practices

**International Waters (IW)**

- Hectares of river/lake basins applying sustainable management practices and contributing to implementation of SAPs
- Hectares of marine/coastal areas or fishing grounds managed sustainably
- Tonnes of land-based pollution avoided

**Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)**

- Tonnes of solid waste prevented from burning by alternative disposal
- Kilograms of obsolete pesticides disposed of appropriately
- Kilograms of harmful chemicals avoided from utilization or release

**Policy Influence, Capacity Development & Innovations (all focal areas)**

- Number of community-based environmental monitoring systems demonstrated

| ***Project boards established and functional*** |
|---|

- Number of consultative mechanisms established for Rio convention frameworks

***Active discussion group created from grantees***

- Number of innovations or new technologies developed/applied

***Focus on low-cost and easy to construct technologies affordable for low income stakeholders***

- Number of local or regional policies influenced (*level of influence 0 – 1 – 2 – 3 – 4 )*

***Local policies should be influenced in area of community involvement – expected level of influence 4***
***Regional policies should be influenced in the area of regional development, especially in poor regions – expected level of influence 2***

- Number of national policies influenced (*level of influence 0 – 1 – 2 – 3 – 4 )*

***National policies should be influence in the area of distribution mechanisms for EU funds – expected level of influence 2***

**Livelihoods & Sustainable Development (all projects)**

- Number of participating community members (gender disaggregated) ***** *mandatory for all projects*
- Number of days of food shortage period reduced
- Number of increased student days participating in schools
- Number of households who get access to clean drinking water
- Increase in purchasing power by reduced spending, increased income, and/or other means (US dollar equivalent)

**Empowerment (all projects)**

- Number of NGOs/CBOs formed or registered
- Number of indigenous peoples directly supported
- Number of women-led projects directly supported
- Number of quality standards/labels achieved or innovative financial mechanisms put in place