



# REQUEST FOR CEO APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable management in priority Socio-ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes (SEPLS)			
Country(ies):	Global	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	5784
GEF Agency(ies):	CI	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Other Executing Partner(s):	Conservation International Japan (CI-Japan), Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability	Submission Date:	07/27/2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration (Months)	48 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Project Agency Fee (\$):	171,810
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul>		

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>2</sup>

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
(select) BD-2	Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks.		GEF TF	1,909,000	6,350,000
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
<b>Total project costs</b>				1,909,000	6,350,000

### B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

**Project Objective: To mainstream conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services, while improving human well-being in priority Socio-Ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes (SEPLS)**

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Enhancing	TA	<b>Outcome 1.1:</b>	<b>Output 1.1.1:</b> At least	GEF TF	1,046,258	1,815,000

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

<p>livelihood, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services in priority SEPLS through investing in demonstration projects</p>		<p>Effective conservation management in selected priority production landscapes and seascapes achieved</p> <p><i><b>Indicator 1.1:</b> Number of hectares of land/sea benefiting from conservation management with project support.</i></p> <p><b>Outcome 1.2:</b> Site-level conservation status of globally threatened species Improved</p> <p><i><b>Indicator 1.2:</b> Number of IUCN threatened species (CR, EN and VU) occurring in project sites that can be scientifically argued that their statuses have improved or can be expected to improve at the end of the project</i></p> <p><b>Outcome 1.3:</b> Traditional knowledge benefiting and being protected in conservation measures</p> <p><i><b>Indicator 1.3:</b> Number of measures (policies and projects) by all stakeholders that are newly established or improved with information on traditional knowledge/practices, as demonstrated in IPSI Collaborative Activities and case</i></p>	<p>10,000 ha of production landscapes and seascapes are under effective management, with positive influence on additional 50,000ha of protected areas nearby through connectivity, buffers or enhanced ecological sustainability provided in target landscapes and seascapes.</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

		<i>studies.</i>				
<p><b>Component 2:</b> Improving knowledge generation to increase understanding, raise awareness and promote mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes</p>	TA	<p><b>Outcome 2.1:</b> Global knowledge on SEPLS for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into primary production enhanced</p> <p>Indicator 2.1:</p> <p><i>a: (Policy uptake): Number of policies, regulations or plans of governmental and non-governmental stakeholders at various levels that refer to SEPLSb. (Referencing) Number of citations of knowledge products, e.g., peer-reviewed journal articles, other forms of publication and supporting tools</i></p>	<p><b>Output 2.1.1:</b> Priority SEPLS around the world identified and mapped based on criteria developed from existing studies and methods.</p> <p><b>Output 2.1.2:</b> Knowledge products (including the analysis of SEPLS cases around the world, toolkits, and policy analysis related to the development, implementation and management of sustainable SEPLS) developed and disseminated through the global knowledge management platform, relevant international fora (such as CBD and IUCN), and Component 3 workshops.</p>	GEF TF	288,633	1,000,000
<p><b>Component 3:</b> Improving inter-sectoral collaboration and capacities for maintaining, restoring and revitalizing social and ecological values in priority SEPLS</p>	TA	<p><b>Outcome 3.1:</b> Capacity of multi-sectoral stakeholders, including national and international decision-makers and practitioners and under-represented groups, to collaborate and mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable management increased</p> <p>Indicator 3.1</p> <p><i>a. Number of organizations/agencies</i></p>	<p><b>Output 3.1.1:</b> At least 500 stakeholders with increased awareness for mainstreaming the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in landscapes and seascapes through regional and global workshops (IPSI activities) and those conducted by and with partners (Association ANDES, SCBD and COMDEKS)</p> <p><b>Output 3.1.2:</b> All workshops are conducted in gender-sensitive</p>	GEF TF	421,906	3,330,000

		<i>that have expressed interest and demonstrated actions in SEPLS.</i>	manner and ensure that 40-50% of the participants are women.			
		<i>b. Number of policies of various levels and stakeholders established or improved</i>	<b>Output 3.1.3:</b> At least 50 stakeholders, including 2 practitioners/representatives from each of the subgrant project implementers under Component 1 trained in promoting mainstreaming of the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes and ecosystem services, while improving human wellbeing, including through the use of the “Indicators for Resilience in SEPLS”			
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
Subtotal					1,756,797	6,145,000
Project management Cost (PMC) <sup>3</sup>				GEF TF	152,203	205,000
<b>Total project costs</b>					1,909,000	6,350,000

### C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	Conservation International	Cash	205,000
GEF Agency	Conservation International	In-Kind	765,000
GEF Agency	Conservation International	In-Kind	650,000

<sup>3</sup> PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

Other Multilateral Agency (ies)	United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS)	Cash	4,000,000
Other Multilateral Agency (ies)	Institute of Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)	In-kind	200,000
Others	Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity	In-kind	300,000
Others	Association Andes	In-kind	130,000
Other Multilateral Agency (ies)	United Nations Development Programme	In-kind	100,000
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>6,350,000</b>

**D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>**

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
CI	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Global	1,909,000	171,810	2,080,810
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				<b>1,909,000</b>	<b>171,810</b>	<b>2,080,810</b>

<sup>1</sup> In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

<sup>2</sup> Indicate fees related to this project.

**F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:**

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants			0
National/Local Consultants			0

**G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No**

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

**A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>4</sup>**

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS,

<sup>4</sup> For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.N/A

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

The project will contribute to the GEF focal area objective and outcome through the mainstreaming of conservation and sustainable management of biodiversity and ecosystem services, while improving human well-being in socio-ecological production landscapes and seascapes. Through the provision of grants, the proposed project will support national governments, civil society organizations, community-based organizations and research institutions to develop SEPLS demonstration projects for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. The wide range of mainstreaming circumstances that the project is expected to encounter—both directly through its demonstration efforts and indirectly through its knowledge exchange roles—will allow it to generate and share important lessons and approaches to inform future work under BD-2. The added values to the mainstreaming initiatives that GEF and other partners are engaged in include innovation derived from the nexus of traditional knowledge and modern science, protection and use of traditional knowledge, and platform for sharing the knowledge generated. Conversely, the platform being strengthened by the project will strongly enable the dissemination of lessons from other BD-2 projects through the activities of knowledge generation and dissemination aspects of the Project. This cross-fertilization represents an important benefit from the perspective of GEF.

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage: N/A

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

During the PPG phase, the list of baseline projects was updated to include other ongoing and planned initiatives that the project will build on.

- Updated activities related to the International Partnership for the Satoyama Initiative (IPSI), including **Case Study Workshops**, an initiative started to make the best use of IPSI's intellectual assets, case studies submitted by the members, and to encourage further accumulation of high quality case studies.
- Two new UNU-IAS Policy reports on SEPLS—"Relevance to the Green Economy Agenda" and "Indicators of Resilience in SEPLS"—along with a March 2013 Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) report on "Mainstreaming sustainable use of biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes".
- **Community Development and Knowledge Management for the Satoyama Initiative (COMDEKS)**. A global program working through UNDP's GEF-financed Small Grants Programme (SGP), COMDEKS provides small grants to local community organizations to develop sound biodiversity management and sustainable livelihood activities in order to maintain, rebuild, and revitalize SEPLS. Operational in 20 countries, this five-year program (2011-2016) is funded by Japan Biodiversity Fund.

While there are a few funding sources for activities relevant to SEPLS only a limited number exist exclusively for mainstreaming biodiversity considerations into broader agendas. The Satoyama Development Mechanism (SDM) with a modest budget of USD100,000 annually focuses on small-scale initiatives generating local and national benefits of resource management and not necessarily aiming at generating global biodiversity benefits. Under current SDM funding guidelines, projects are selected annually, and a maximum USD10,000 grant is given per project. COMDEKS delivers funds to community-level projects in 20 countries. Although COMDEKS is focused on SEPLS, broader mainstreaming and amplification to countries and contexts outside those in the program is limited. The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) through its competitive grant program also invests a portion of its resources in improving management of production landscapes for biodiversity interests. Experiences from CEPF have not been translated in the context of the Satoyama Initiative, although there is high potential for synergies.

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

**Incremental Costs.** The total cost of the baseline is estimated at USD 8.2 million which includes USD 4 million for COMDEKS, USD 0.2 million that supports work for Indicators of Resilience and USD 4 million financing for IPSI

through UNU-IAS (Table 1 and 2). Under the GEF Alternative, the project builds on the baseline and conduct activities that bring additional co-financing of USD 6.25 million from partners.<sup>5</sup> The GEF grant is USD 1.909 million, which will be used to support site-based projects that demonstrate the utility of the Satoyama Initiative in mainstreaming conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in projection landscapes and seascapes (i.e., sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes) leading to global environmental benefits, as well as global outreach of the knowledge generated from the project. The project receives in-kind contribution from COMDEKS. This will strengthen the synergies of this project with COMDEKS, which has been investing in SEPLS in 20 countries. Also, collaboration with partner institutions (Secretariat of CBD, Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, Association ANDES), though co-financing, and other form of collaboration with Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) will enable increased impact of the project. The total cost of the GEF Alternative is USD 12.359 million. Thus, the incremental cost of the project is USD 4.159 million.

Table 1. Incremental Cost Assessment Summary

---

<sup>5</sup> Total co-financing to the project is USD6.35. It is listed as USD6.25 for the discussion here as USD0.10 is accounted for under COMDEKS

<b>Baseline</b>	<b>GEF Alternative</b>	<b>Increment</b>
<p><b><i>Funding for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services in priority SEPLS</i></b></p> <p>Limited funds focus on promising small-scale initiatives generating local and national benefits, not necessarily aiming at generating global biodiversity benefits. Limited possibilities of mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services.</p>	<p>Grants and assistance focused on larger-scale biodiversity conservation mainstreaming in production landscapes and seascapes in globally important biodiversity areas</p>	<p>Demonstration of role and values of SEPLS for conservation</p> <p>Effective conservation of 10,000ha selected production landscapes and seascapes in biodiversity hotspots, with benefits for additional 50,000ha and 20 globally threatened species</p> <p>Mainstreaming of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into plans/policies, with strengthened traditional knowledge systems</p>
<b>USD 4.400 million</b>	<b>USD 6.974 million</b>	<b>USD 2.574 million</b>
<p><b><i>Knowledge generation and management to increase understanding, raise awareness of and promote mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes.</i></b></p> <p>Limited technical and training content, and scope for influencing stakeholders to mainstream and improve management</p>	<p>Analytical work and knowledge products to define SEPLS and global distribution of high value SEPLS.</p> <p>Comprehensive analyses of key environmental issues facing SEPLS</p> <p>Best practices, guidelines and other tools based on synthesis of broader experiences from the project and elsewhere</p>	<p>New tools to assist stakeholders in mainstreaming and planning</p> <p>Information, techniques and tools for stakeholders to enhance and mainstream conservation into SEPLS and broader agenda</p>
<b>USD 1.000 million</b>	<b>USD 1.547 million</b>	<b>USD 0.547 million</b>
<p><b><i>Inter-sectoral collaborations and capacities to maintain, restore and revitalize social and ecological values in priority SEPLS</i></b></p> <p>Global and regional meetings generally limited to sharing experiences. Limited opportunities to engage and mainstream at national levels.</p>	<p>Multi-sector stakeholder engagement at international and national levels on mainstreaming in SEPLS</p> <p>Training for mainstreaming and sustainable management in production landscapes and seascapes.</p>	<p>Stakeholders with improved skills and knowledge for mainstreaming biodiversity.</p> <p>Enhanced collaboration among stakeholders for SEPLS.</p> <p>Recognition of values of SEPLS in government leading to national policies fostering sustainable land and resource use.</p>
<b>USD 2.800 million</b>	<b>USD 3.838 million</b>	<b>USD 1,0380,938 million</b>



TOTAL USD 8.200 million	USD 12,359 million	USD 4.159 million
<b>Global Environmental Benefits</b>		
<p>On-the-ground impacts, as well as uptake of lessons learned and best practice from SEPLS continue, but are limited due to size and nature of grant giving.</p> <p>Knowledge capture and generation is constrained by limited strategic and analytical frameworks and resources, which affect efforts to build capacity and foster collaboration.</p> <p>Promotion of SEPLS continues but lacks strong “proof of concept” limiting replication and adoption.</p>	<p>Demonstrated roles and values of SEPLS in conservation and development strategies</p> <p>Improved knowledge products and management based on global learning in production landscapes and seascapes</p> <p>Increased capacities and inter-sectoral collaboration for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable management in production landscapes and seascapes.</p>	<p>Improved conservation of 60,000ha, including connectivity/buffers for protected areas, and globally threatened species in global biodiversity hotspots</p> <p>Replication and adoption of SEPLS management approaches around the world with stronger and more strategic “proof of concept”</p> <p>Broader and strengthened support for, plus contributions to achieving Aichi Biodiversity Targets.</p>

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

Multi-sector Stakeholder Engagement. The risk of low levels of engagement by important stakeholders, particularly government, about mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable management in production landscapes and seascapes is rated as low/medium. Mitigation measures include maintaining communication with key stakeholders locally (mainly through the organizations implementing subgrant projects) and internationally at venues of IPSI, CBD, and other opportunities. The global consolidation workshop is planned to be organized in close coordination with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, which has strong convening power for national focal points.

Continued Global Networks and Platforms. The risk that key networks, particularly IPSI, become unsustainable and result in limited global venues and platforms for knowledge, collaboration and promotion about SEPLS is rated at low. IPSI, whose secretariat is hosted within UNU-IAS, has mainly been supported by financial resources from the Government of Japan. The project will aim to help diversify funding sources, while generating and delivering outcomes that are useful for the objectives of the individual members (and other stakeholders), so that there will be incentives for them to contribute financially. Increasing the profile and awareness of SEPLS’ importance will also enable partners’ resource mobilization efforts.

Soliciting Subgrant Project Proposals. The risk that expressions of interest, and full proposals will not meet the requirements of the project for demonstrating approaches for enhancing, restoring or revitalizing priority SEPLS is rated as low/medium. Measures to address this risk include selecting to work in areas with existing investment for conservation from international body. As a result, there will be organizational and technical capacity to absorb and address project requirements. The project will communicate the request for EOIs to as wide an audience as possible using networks such as those of IPSI and CEPF, as well as other avenues. The window for submitting EOIs will be six weeks, allowing plenty of time for interested applicants to address the requirements, which will be laid out clearly in the request. Those selected will be asked to prepare full proposals, in coordination with the Executive Team, and will essentially comprise the final cohort of subgrant projects.

Delay in Selection of Subgrant Projects. The risk of delaying the selection of subgrant projects is rated as medium. It is important to have participation from selected subgrantees at the first workshop in Cambodia, which include training on the use of the Indicators for Resilience, the monitoring tool for the subgrant projects. Time spent on transaction of the

contracts is the major risk factor. The mitigation measure include the production of Project Document early so that it can be approved, leaving sufficient time for the subgrant project selection as described above.

Table 2. Project Risk Assessment and Mitigation Planning

<b>Project Outcome/s</b>	<b>Risks</b>	<b>Rating (Low, Medium, High)</b>	<b>Risk Mitigation Measures</b>
Outcomes 1.1., 1.2., 2.1.,	<b>Degradation of adjacent protected areas impacts sustainability and value of SEPLS within broader landscape</b>	Low/Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstration of more sustainable land use methods within SEPLS, and increased awareness of values of ecosystem services from adjacent PAs, will contribute to reduced pressure on latter</li> <li>• Demonstration and knowledge components will increase understanding of drivers affecting both SEPLS and PAs, as well as alternatives</li> </ul>
Outcomes 1.1., 1.2., 1.3.,	<b>Lack of land tenure policies in potential grant sites that block implementation of sustainable SEPLS management</b>	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project will work closely with government agencies and stakeholders in the subgrant project sites, as well as supporting grantees facing land tenure issues.</li> <li>• Subgrant project proposals will need to undergo safeguard screening to identify and address key issues as needed, including access restriction and indigenous peoples.</li> </ul>

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives:

There are several ongoing projects that cover the same region and thematic area as this project that are funded by GEF. Effective linkages and coordination with them will enhance the project outcomes. See table below for detailed descriptions.

Table 3. Linkages and Coordination to GEF Project and other relevant projects/initiatives

<b>GEF Projects Other Projects/Initiatives</b>	<b>Linkages and Coordination</b>
<b>Community Development and Knowledge Management for the Satoyama Initiative (COMDEKS)</b>	COMDEKS is implemented through the UNDP GEF-financed Small Grants Programme (SGP). COMDEKS and this project will be complementary to one another. Both can use the IPSI platform to share results and achieve synergies within and beyond IPSI membership. The project will coordinate with COMDEKS, particularly in consolidation of findings and can help bring COMDEKS results to wider audiences as part of mainstreaming efforts.
<b>Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF; GEF ID: 2949)</b>	CEPF funds civil society organizations in biodiversity hotspot regions, working in both protected areas and production landscapes. Initiative CEPF activities are complementary to the Satoyama Initiative. Close coordination will be maintained for maximum synergies, e.g., using its network to advertise requests for EOIs, proposal reviews, identifying potential case studies for analyses.

<b>Landscapes for People, Food and Nature (LPFN; GEF ID: 4806)</b>	LPFN's lead organizer, EcoAgriculture Partners, and many of the co-organizers are members of IPSI. LPFN's focus is on agricultural systems, which is narrower than that of the Satoyama Initiative. Where activities overlap, efficient coordination will be conducted through mutual members.
<b>GEF Small Grant Program (SGP)</b>	Implemented by UNDP, SGP channel financial and technical support to community-based organizations and NGOs for sustainable development in over 120 countries. Where the projects are in production landscapes, synergies should be sought with the subgrant projects under Component 1. The funding size is smaller for SGP projects than the Component 1 grants, and thus they are expected to support different types of projects.
<b>Other GEF-funded mainstreaming projects</b>	There can be other GEF-funded projects in biodiversity mainstreaming in physical proximity to the subgrant projects under Component 1 or thematically relevant to this project. This project will seek to absorb learning and lessons from those projects through close communication with GEF Secretariat.

## **B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:**

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

Given the global and multi-disciplinary nature of the project, the project stakeholders are diverse. Most important stakeholders are described in terms of their interest/stake in the project, the influence that the stakeholder may have in the outcomes of the project, and how the project will affect stakeholders. Engagement methods and activities are as follows by Project components.

Component 1. An important feature to be demonstrated under this component will be multi-stakeholder engagement in SEPLS management. The subgrant project proponents will be responsible to effectively engage their various stakeholders, including Indigenous Peoples, in line with the guidelines given in CI's Environmental and Social Management Framework, while implementing their activities. Free, prior, informed consent procedure will be emphasized particularly when interacting with Indigenous Peoples. Communities as well as other players active in the project sites will be informed and consulted by the subgrantees using the methods as they see appropriate, and engaged in active participatory SEPLS management as determined through participatory appraisals and planning. The Executive Team will assess subgrantees' plans for stakeholder engagement and determine the appropriate methods in the full-proposal development phase as necessary.

Component 2. Relevant gatherings of experts and stakeholders will be used to collect diverse views and information to help ensure that content and products are relevant to stakeholder contexts. Such gatherings will include, but not limited to, IPSI global and regional fora, side events at CBD meetings, and sessions at IUCN World Conservation Congresses. The Executive Team will also consult with IPSI Steering Committee as needed on issues of coordination and to maximize synergies with on-going and planned IPSI work plans. Other methods for soliciting input for the development of knowledge products will include direct requests to individuals, groups and organizations, as well as broader requests through websites, list-serves, etc. Efforts will be made to engage with and gather input from relevant on-going programs, especially UNDP COMDEKS and CEPF. The project will also seek to engage CEPF grantees in the application of the Indicators of Resilience providing a larger testing ground for the toolkit.

Component 3. A number of workshops are planned to engage a wide range of stakeholders in discussion and to build key capacities for SEPLS management. These gathering will be opportunities to develop regional and global-level consensus and collaboration on thematic aspects of SEPLS management, while allowing flexibility based on different local situations. The Executive Team will work with implementing partners to ensure opportunities for participation in workshops and fora are made available to relevant stakeholders, including women and indigenous groups. Sessions with stakeholders will be carefully facilitated so that diverse perspectives are heard and fairly documented. Furthermore, these sessions will ensure a fair gender balance in participants and to the guidelines given in the project's Gender Mainstreaming Strategy and Action Plan will be followed.

Table 4. Description of Project Stakeholders

<b>Stakeholder</b>	<b>Interests in the Project</b>	<b>Stakeholder Influence in the Project</b>	<b>Project Effects on the Stakeholder</b>	<b>Relevant Components</b>
Indigenous Peoples and/or Communities occurring in the project sites	Project activities and outcomes may improve/deteriorate their livelihood.	Their active participation and collaboration will be critical in starting the subgrant projects in the first place, and eventually achieving the subgrant projects' contribution to the project objective.	It depends on the design and mode of implementation of the subgrant projects. Positive possibilities include more resilient communities. Negative might include inflated false expectations, additional burden for comparatively small returns.	1
Subgrant project proponent	Already engaged in SEPLS-related activities; interested in expanding the ongoing activities; willing to make contribution to the Satoyama Initiative.	Their performance largely determines the performance of the project as a whole.	Financial support to their own initiatives; Improved capacity through training and workshop opportunities; exposure to external audiences.	1, 2, 3
International Partnership for the Satoyama Initiative (IPSI) Steering Committee	New funded project addressing some of the key issues identified in the IPSI Plan of Action; more proof of concept of the Satoyama Initiative.	Advice to the subject matter; support in outreach.	Facilitating some of the activities identified as priority in the Plan of Action; concrete results as proof of concept of the Satoyama Initiative.	1, 2, 3
Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) Secretariat and grantees (including CSOs)	Work in the similar themes; interested in collaboration with IPSI	Support in subgrant project selection; encourage its grantees to provide field cases for analysis and participate in the use/test of the Indicators of Resilience	Synergies and mutual improvement in activities; monitoring tool for rather intangible, yet critical elements of SEPLS (Indicators of Resilience)	1, 2, (3)
Biodiversity International	Roll-out and increased adoption of the Indicators of Resilience	Technical expertise in Indicators of Resilience at training sessions; expertise in community aspect.	Testing opportunity for the Indicators of Resilience	1, (2), 3
United Nations Development Programme	Conducting a program in the same theme, COMDEKS	Providing experiences and lessons learned from COMDEKS	Joint outreach; knowledge consolidation	2, 3

Ministry of the Environment of Japan	As a major donor to the Satoyama Initiative; success of the Initiative.	Advice on the subject matter; indirectly financially support the co-financers	Added achievements to the Satoyama Initiative	(1), 2, 3
Local to National Governments, including Operational Focal Points in Target Geographies	Results of this project will be most meaningful if they are recognized and used by governments.	Operational Focal Point sign off/support in Target Geographies.	Supporting the achievement of Aichi targets/ obligations under the UNCBD.	1
Private sector	Potential subgrant project proponent or may be involved in the subgrant project implementation	Private sector actors may bring in aspects to the subgrant projects that other actors may not bring as much, e.g., access to market, which determines sustainability of the undertaking.	Project may provide opportunity for private sector actors to get engaged in biodiversity mainstreaming in business in the context of SEPLS.	1, 2

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

Generating human well-being benefits is fundamental to the concept and effective management of SEPLS. The types of benefits vary from site to site and depend on the nature of the particular human-environment interactions, based on prior experience and analyses of SEPLS. The project will not only generate a range of well-being benefits that are demonstrated in practice, but will also articulate these benefits clearly in the knowledge products, capacity building and dissemination about SEPLS. At the site level, the subgrant projects' direct interventions are expected to result in increased sustainability of their livelihoods due to improved household and community assets, particularly natural, financial and social and human assets. Effective natural resource management results not only in improve ecosystem services that contribute to erosion control, soil fertility, water quality, pollination and carbon sequestration, but also provide wellbeing benefits, such as food, fuel, cash crops and medicinal plants for households. The use of Indicators for Resilience (training under Component 3) is expected to result in realization of the community status and strengthened resilience of the community to change. It should be noted that human well-being benefits are not necessarily shared equally or equitably within a community or even within a household. With the continued production of food and other products, linked to more effective natural resource conservation there are economic incentives for sustainable management in SEPLS. Diversified production systems, including those learned from traditional land use practices, such as multi-cropping, mixed farming, agro-forestry, will help increase the viability of economic activities and help reduce vulnerabilities to economic and natural shocks.

A focus on traditional knowledge systems and underlying social institutions, as well as exploring methods of participatory management in SELPS will contribute to improving social assets, such as relationships, networks, and mechanisms of exchange. Social assets can be effective in improving the management of common property resources that are often critical in production landscapes and seascapes. Social networks and groups often facilitate innovation and development of knowledge and sharing of that knowledge. However, social assets can be used in negative ways, e.g., exclusion of groups such as landless and women from networks and groups. These may emerge as important issues to address in the subgrant projects and the analytical studies planned in the project. The project will also have positive impacts on human assets, such as skills, knowledge and leadership for sustainable SEPLS management.

While livelihood strategies may often depend on traditional knowledge systems and strengthening these is an important feature of effective SEPLS, these systems may not always be adequate for current contexts. In keeping with the Satoyama approach, as options are considered for ways to integrate traditional systems with modern science to address current challenges, there will be opportunities for innovation and the development of skills and knowledge. By addressing specific themes under Component 2 (valuing SEPLS, traditional knowledge and effective governance) that would result in knowledge products, and disseminating them through Component 3 activities, human wellbeing benefits (primarily generated by access to relevant information) will be achieved in a broader audience.

Strategies for improving the sustainability of livelihoods in production landscapes and seascapes, will contribute to poverty alleviation and reducing rural vulnerability to a range of shocks and disturbances, including those associated with increased climate variability. SEPLS if managed effectively for their social, economic, cultural and ecological values, can be resilient areas that provide for human well-being over the long-term.

### *Gender*

To ensure the inclusion of a gender perspective in the project, a Gender Mainstreaming Plan was developed (Appendix VII-b of the Prodoc). The Gender Mainstreaming Plan outlines specific actions to be taken within the project to ensure that both men and women have the opportunity to equally participate in, and benefit from, the project. Along with the stakeholder engagement plan, the plan is part of the project's commitment to equitable stakeholder participation. The plan takes into account that project activities cover a range of operational scales from communities to global agendas with components that fund field based implementation and broader knowledge management and capacity building. Given the broad scope of the project in scale and target geographical areas, the plan seeks to be practical and meaningful in terms of both proposed measures and results.

### B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

The project is cost-effective as it strategically combines the benefits of supporting site-based activities with analytical and amplification components to strengthen biodiversity conservation in SEPLS. Financing will be given for a small number of projects, but at a level reasonable (USD50,000 to USD100,000) enough to allow for partner organizations to implement comprehensive and innovative undertakings. Multi-year grants will allow sufficient time for planning, consultation, implementation, evaluation and elaboration of the experience and findings. The project will consolidate the collective knowledge drawn from the project's site-based support, knowledge management and capacity building activities, as well as that gathered via other means (workshops, case studies submitted, other initiatives) and show how it be made applicable for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in SEPLS in a global context. Cost-effectiveness will also be achieved by targeting the generation of knowledge/information contents that will be most effective for mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes, and delivery of those products to those who can make practical use of and tangible impact by them. Partnerships with global platforms, such as IPSI, and regional and global events, e.g., CBD conferences, IUCN World Conservation Congresses and relevant UN meetings will also be cost-effective venues for amplifying project impacts, reaching larger as well as more global audiences.

The proposed alternative is the most cost-effective alternative of those described in Section 3D above, going from site-based activities that generates tangible impact on the ground to the amplification arm that reaches wider policy impacts. The project demonstrates the Satoyama Initiative approach as effective and makes tangible global environmental benefits at the same time. The amplification arm of the project makes efficient use of the existing venues and networks this project enables access to.

### **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:**

Project monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with established Conservation International and GEF procedures by the project team and the CI-GEF Project Agency. The project's M&E plan will be presented and finalized

at the project inception workshop, including a review of indicators, means of verification, and the full definition of project staff M&E responsibilities (See Prodoc Section 7 Monitoring and Evaluation Plan)

**A. Monitoring and Evaluation Roles and Responsibilities**

The Project Management Unit on the ground will be responsible for initiating and organizing key monitoring and evaluation tasks. This includes the project inception workshop and report, quarterly progress reporting, annual progress and implementation reporting, documentation of lessons learned, and support for and cooperation with the independent external evaluation exercises.

The project Executing Agency is responsible for ensuring the monitoring and evaluation activities are carried out in a timely and comprehensive manner, and for initiating key monitoring and evaluation activities, such as the independent evaluation exercises.

Key project executing partners are responsible for providing any and all required information and data necessary for timely and comprehensive project reporting, including results and financial data, as necessary and appropriate.

The Project Steering Committee plays a key oversight role for the project, with regular meetings to receive updates on project implementation progress and approve annual workplans. The Project Steering Committee also provides continuous ad-hoc oversight and feedback on project activities, responding to inquiries or requests for approval from the Project Management Unit or Executing Agency.

The CI-GEF Project Agency plays an overall assurance, backstopping, and oversight role with respect to monitoring and evaluation activities.

The CI Internal Audit function is responsible for contracting and oversight of the planned independent external evaluation exercises at the mid-point and end of the project.

**B. Monitoring and Evaluation Components and Activities**

The Project M&E Plan should include the following components (see M&E Table for details):

Table 5. Project M&E Plan Summary

<b>Type of M&amp;E</b>	<b>Reporting Frequency</b>	<b>Responsible Parties</b>	<b>Indicative Budget from GEF (USD)</b>
<b><i>a. Inception workshop and Report</i></b>	Within three months of signing of CI Grant Agreement for GEF Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Team</li> <li>• Executing Agency</li> <li>• CI-GEF PA</li> </ul>	Estimated personnel expenses: USD2,000  Co-financing by Executive Team members: -Travel: in-town (<USD200 total) -Venue: One of Executive Team member's office
<b><i>b. Inception workshop Report</i></b>	Within one month of inception workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Team</li> <li>• CI-GEF PA</li> </ul>	Estimated personnel expenses: USD750/yr.
<b><i>c. Project Results Monitoring Plan (Objective, Outcomes and Outputs)</i></b>	Annually (data on indicators will be gathered according to monitoring plan schedule (See Appendix V of Prodoc)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Team</li> <li>• CI-GEF PA</li> </ul>	Estimated personnel expenses: USD2,000/yr  Subgrant project site visits: -Personnel: USD4,500/yr -Travel : USD43,000 total.

<b><i>d. GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools</i></b>	i) Project development phase; ii) prior to project mid-term evaluation; and iii) project completion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Team</li> <li>• Executing Agency</li> <li>• CI-GEF PA</li> </ul>	<i>Estimated personnel expenses: USD 0 additional (work under c. should cover this work)</i>
<b><i>e. Project Steering Committee Meetings</i></b>	Annually	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Team</li> <li>• Executing Agency</li> <li>• CI-GEF PA</li> </ul>	<i>(The Executive Team serves as the PSC) Estimated personnel expenses: USD2,000/yr Plus Executive Team members' co-financing.)</i>
<b><i>f. CI-GEF Project Agency Field Supervision Missions</i></b>	Approximately annual visits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CI-GEF PA</li> </ul>	<i>On CI-GEF PA's budget</i>
<b><i>g. Quarterly Progress Reporting</i></b>	Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Team</li> <li>• Executing Agency</li> </ul>	<i>Estimated personnel expenses: USD1,200/yr</i>
<b><i>h. Annual Project Implementation Report (PIR)</i></b>	Annually for year ending June 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Team</li> <li>• Executing Agency</li> <li>• CI-GEF PA</li> </ul>	<i>Estimated personnel expenses: USD2,000/yr</i>
<b><i>i. Project Completion Report</i></b>	Upon project operational closure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Team</li> <li>• Executing Agency</li> </ul>	<i>Estimated personnel expenses: USD2,000</i>
<b><i>j. Independent External Mid-term Review</i></b>	CI Evaluation Office Project Team CI-GEF PA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approximate mid-point of project implementation period</li> </ul>	<i>USD20,000 under PMC</i>
<b><i>k. Independent Terminal Evaluation</i></b>	CI Evaluation Office Project Team CI-GEF PA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation field mission within three months prior to project completion.</li> </ul>	<i>USD23,000 under PMC</i>
<b><i>l. Lessons Learned and Knowledge Generation</i></b>	Project Team Executing Agency CI-GEF PA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least annually</li> </ul>	<i>No additional expenses (To be part of e. and h.)</i>
<b><i>m. Financial Statements Audit</i></b>	Executing Agency CI-GEF PA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annually</li> </ul>	<i>USD4,200 annually for financial audit</i>

**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**



**A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):**  
 (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Lilian Spijkerman			Orissa Samaroo	703 341 2550	osamaroo@conservation.org

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK** (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

CI-GEF Project Results Monitoring Plan can be found in Appendix V of the Project Document

<b>Project Vision</b>	Society in harmony with nature, with sustainable primary production sector based on traditional and modern wisdom.
<b>Objective:</b>	To mainstream conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services, while improving human well-being in selected priority Socio-Ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes (SEPLS).
<b>Indicator(s):</b>	<p>a. Number of policies, regulations, or plans governing sectoral and land-use activities that integrate biodiversity conservation &amp; sustainable use in production landscapes and seascapes as a result of participation in project activities.</p> <p>b. Status of livelihoods and scenarios facing local communities, including indigenous peoples, women and other vulnerable groups in the project, as a result of more sustainable flows of ecosystem good and services.</p>

Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Project Baseline	End of Project Target	Expected Outputs and Indicators
<b>Component 1:</b> Enhancing livelihood, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services in priority SEPLS through investing in demonstration projects			
<p><b>Outcome 1.1:</b> Effective conservation management in selected priority production landscapes and seascapes achieved</p> <p><i><b>Indicator 1.1:</b> Number of hectares of land/sea benefiting from conservation management with project support.</i></p>	<p>Area supported by SDM</p> <p>Recognize these areas, but their number of hectares is not available</p>	<p>60,000 additional hectares</p>	<p><b>Output 1.1.1:</b> At least 10,000 ha of production landscapes and seascapes are under effective management, with positive influence on additional 50,000ha of protected areas nearby through connectivity, buffers or enhanced ecological sustainability provided in target landscapes and seascapes.</p> <p><i><b>Indicator 1.1.1:</b> Number of hectares under sub-grant projects' direct intervention</i></p> <p><i><b>Indicator 1.1.2:</b> Number of hectares to which activities of subgrant projects bring positive influence</i></p>

<p><b>Outcome 1.2:</b> Site-level conservation status of globally threatened species Improved</p> <p><i>Indicator 1.2:</i> Number of IUCN threatened species (CR, EN and VU) occurring in project sites that can be scientifically argued that their statuses have improved or can be expected to improve at the end of the project</p>	0	20 species	<p><b>Output 1.2.1:</b> Known critical threats to the conservation status of IUCN threatened species are minimized or removed.</p> <p><i>Indicators 1.2.1:</i> Area in ha of suitable habitat and/or population trend of the IUCN threatened species in focus</p>
<p><b>Outcome 1.3:</b> Traditional knowledge benefiting and being protected in conservation measures</p> <p><i>Indicator 1.3:</i> Number of measures (policies and projects) by all stakeholders that are newly established or improved with information on traditional knowledge/practices, as demonstrated in IPSI Collaborative Activities and case studies.</p>	2 as existing IPSI Collaborative Activities	3 additional collaborative activities that are funded (future opportunities) and 5 additional case studies (achievement report)	<p><b>Output 1.3.1:</b> Traditional knowledge and practices documented to benefit conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in subgrant projects</p> <p><i>Indicator 1.3.1:</i> Number of traditional knowledge and practices documented</p>
<p><b>Component 2:</b> Improving knowledge generation to increase understanding, raise awareness and promote mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes</p>			
<p><b>Outcome 2.1:</b> Global knowledge on SEPLS for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into primary production enhanced</p> <p><i>Indicators 2.1:</i></p>	a. 0 policies, regulations or plans that	a. 5 policies, regulations, plans or	<p><b>Output 2.1.1:</b> Priority SEPLS around the world identified and mapped based on criteria developed from existing studies and methods.</p> <p><i>Indicator 2.1.1:</i> Global map identifying priority SEPLS sites</p> <p><b>Output 2.1.2:</b> Knowledge products (including the analysis of SEPLS cases around the world, toolkits, and policy analysis related to the development,</p>

<p><i>a. (Policy uptake): Number of policies, regulations or plans of governmental and non-governmental stakeholders at various levels</i></p> <p><i>b. (Referencing) Number of citations of knowledge products, e.g., peer-reviewed journal articles, other forms of publication and supporting tools</i></p>	<p>reference the product of this project</p> <p>b. Citations: 0</p>	<p>guidance documents</p> <p>b. 50 citations within 3 years of publication</p>	<p>implementation and management of sustainable SEPLS) developed and disseminated through the global knowledge management platform, relevant international fora (such as CBD and IUCN), and Component 3 workshops.</p> <p><b>Indicators 2.1.2:</b></p> <p><i>a. Number of times the knowledge products are shared with relevant stakeholders at local, national and international fora</i></p> <p><i>b. Number of knowledge products, including peer-reviewed journal articles, and policy recommendations in other forms of publications and supporting tools</i></p> <p><i>c. Knowledge products on the approaches for the identification and/or documentation of values of SEPLS, indigenous and local knowledge and elements of good governance developed and presented to stakeholders</i></p>
<p><b>Component 3: Improving inter-sectoral collaboration and capacities for maintaining, restoring and revitalizing social and ecological values in priority SEPLS</b></p>			
<p><b>Outcome 3.1:</b> Capacity of multi-sectoral stakeholders, including national and international decision-makers and practitioners and under-represented groups, to collaborate and mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable management increased</p> <p><b>Indicator 3.1:</b></p> <p><i>a. Number of organizations/agencies that have expressed interest and demonstrated actions in SEPLS.</i></p> <p><i>b. Number of policies of various levels and stakeholders established or improved</i></p>	<p>a. current membership of IPSI (167)</p> <p>b. 0</p>	<p>a. additional 20 members from workshop participants</p> <p>b. 5 policies established or improved</p>	<p><b>Output 3.1.1:</b> At least 500 stakeholders with increased awareness for mainstreaming the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in landscapes and seascapes through regional and global workshops (IPSI activities) and those conducted by and with partners (Association ANDES, SCBD and COMDEKS)</p> <p><b>Indicator 3.1.1:</b> <i>Number and attributes (affiliation, country, etc.) of participants in workshops, including co-organized events</i></p> <p><b>Output 3.1.2:</b> All workshops are conducted in gender-sensitive manner and ensure that 40-50-% of the participants are women.</p> <p><b>Indicator 3.1.2:</b> <i>% of women participants in workshops</i></p> <p><b>Output 3.1.3:</b> At least 50 stakeholders, including 2 practitioners/representatives from each of the subgrant project implementers under Component 1 trained in promoting mainstreaming of the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services, while improving human wellbeing, including through the use of the “Indicators for Resilience in</p>

			<p>SEPLS”</p> <p><b>Indicator 3.1.3.:</b></p> <p><b>a.</b> Number of persons (from Component 1 subgrantees and others) participated in the training workshops and received training on the “Indicators for Resilience in SEPLS”.</p> <p><b>b.</b> Indicators for Resilience used by 9 subgrant projects and lessons compiled.</p>
--	--	--	---

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Review Criteria	Secretariat Comment at PIF Approval	CI-GEF Response/ Related section or paragraph in Project Document
<p>25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval</p>	<p>Appropriate procedures on coordination with GEF OFP to be clarified by learning lessons from other similar GEF projects.</p> <p>Further clarify and determine tangible indicators and targets of the project.</p> <p>Further strengthen and clarify incremental reasoning with solid baseline data and identified targets.</p> <p>Further clarification on CSO involvement, roles and responsibilities for project implementation should be made by CEO approval.</p> <p>Coordination mechanism and details, particularly with SGP, COMDEKS, and CEPF should be clarified by the time of CEO approval.</p> <p>Further details to be provided before CEO approval, particularly on the sustainability of the initiative and the components implemented by the project.</p>	<p>Clarified. See Para. 175 <b>Operational Focal Points (OFPs)</b> and Para. 68.</p> <p>See Results Framework</p> <p>See Incremental Cost Reasoning and Expected Contributions to the Baseline. Section F of the prodoc. Starting at Para 58.</p> <p>See Para 118/ Table 4 of prodoc.</p> <p>See Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Appendix VIIa of prodoc), Table 1 and Table 2 and Section 6. Implementation and Execution Arrangements for Project Management, Para 174</p> <p>For details on Sustainability, please see Section 4: Project Strategy: J - Sustainability or para 124 of prodoc</p>

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>6</sup>**

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

<b>PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 65,000</b>			
<b><i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i></b>	<b><i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i></b>		
	<b><i>Budgeted Amount</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Spent To date</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Committed</i></b>
Stakeholder consultations, safeguard plan development, Prodoc development	65,000	63,434	65,000
<b>Total</b>	65,000	63,434	65,000

<sup>6</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)