GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

Naoko Ishii
CEO and Chairperson

January 22, 2015

Dear Council Member,

The UNEP as the Implementing Agency for the project entitled: ***Yemen: Support to the Integrated Program for the Conservation and Sustainable Development of the Socotra Archipelago***, has submitted the attached proposed project document for CEO endorsement prior to final Agency approval of the project document in accordance with the UNEP procedures.

The Secretariat has reviewed the project document. It is consistent with the project concept approved by the Council in June 2013 and the proposed project remains consistent with the Instrument and GEF policies and procedures. The attached explanation prepared by the UNEP satisfactorily details how Council's comments and those of the STAP have been addressed.

We have today posted the proposed project document on the GEF website at www.TheGEF.org for your information. We would welcome any comments you may wish to provide by February 19, 2015 before I endorse the project. You may send your comments to gcoordination@TheGEF.org .

If you do not have access to the Web, you may request the local field office of UNDP or the World Bank to download the document for you. Alternatively, you may request a copy of the document from the Secretariat. If you make such a request, please confirm for us your current mailing address.

Sincerely,

pr / Naoko Ishii
Chief Executive Officer and Chairperson

Attachment: GEFSEC Project Review Document
Copy to: Country Operational Focal Point, GEF Agencies, STAP, Trustee

REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: **Support to the Integrated Program for the Conservation and Sustainable Development of the Socotra Archipelago**			
Country(ies):	Yemen	GEF Project ID:[1]	5347
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	1083
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) / Environment Protection Authority (EPA) Senckenberg Society for Nature Research, Germany (SGN)	Submission Date:	27/11/2014
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multifocal Area (BD and LD)	Project Duration(Months)	48
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): ➢ For SFM/REDD+ ☐ ➢ For SGP ☐ ➢ For PPP ☐	n/a	Project Agency Fee ($):	461,183

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK[2]

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount ($)	Cofinancing ($)
BD 1	Outcome 1.1	New protected areas (marine/coastal: 5, ≥ 4,100 ha; terrestrial: 3, ≥ 2,500 ha) and coverage (2,151,418 ha) of unprotected ecosystems (terrestrial and marine)	GEF TF	1,070,000	4,940,000
BD 1	Outcome 1.2	Sustainable financing plans (1)	GEF TF	467,625	902,000
BD 2	Outcome 2.3	Policy and regulatory frameworks (to manage invasive alien species) for production sectors	GEF TF	1,450,000	4,500,500
LD 3	Outcome 3.2	Integrated Land Management Plans developed and implemented	GEF TF	1,866,941	4,700,021
		Total project costs	GEF TF	4,854,566	15,042,521

[1] Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.
[2] Refer to the Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework when completing Table A.

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: Strengthen governmental and non-governmental capacities sustainably to manage and protect the Socotra Archipelago WHS through BD conservation, IAS management and SLM

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount ($)	Confirmed Cofinancing ($)
1 BD Conservation and PA Management	GEF TF	1.1 A BD-PAM strategy is developed, incl. an updated conservation data baseline and a revised Conservation Zoning Plan (CZP	1.1.1 The existing PAs and their management are evaluated. 1.1.2 Baseline studies and analyses on BD and PA conducted. 1.1.3 Revision of the Conservation Zoning Plan (CZP).	GEF TF	1,193,500	3,740,000
		1.2 The BD-PAM strategy is operational, incl. improved management and expansion of the PA network, and coordinated with the integrated conservation management framework (ICMF, see 4.1.3)	1.2.1 Management plans of existing and new PAs reviewed/developed and implemented. 1.2.2 Special management plans aimed at targeted terrestrial and marine species conservation and resource management developed and implemented.			
2 IAS Management	GEF TF	2.1 A community-based management strategy to control IAS in the Socotra WHS is devised, incl. an updated IAS data baseline.	2.1.1 All existing invasive and potentially invasive species are identified, including their direct or potential impacts on PA and BD management and ecosystem services. 2.1.2 A community-based IAS management strategy is developed, incorporating guidelines for policy, legal and institutional frameworks.	GEF TF	1,167,500	3,300,500
		2.2 The IAS management strategy is operational and coordinated with the integrated conservation management framework (ICMF, see 4.1.3).	2.2.1 Pathways for IAS are identified and measures for priority prevention and control are developed and implemented.			
3 SLM	GEF TF	3.1 A community-based strategy for SLM in the Socotra	3.1.1 Land degradation status and threats of current land management	GEF TF	1,190,066	3,500,021

		WHS is devised, underpinned by an SLM data baseline 3.2 The SLM management strategy is operational and coordinated with the integrated conservation management framework (ICMF, see 4.1.3).	are identified and mapped, including existing or projected impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services. 3.1.2 A community-based SLM strategy developed, incorporating guidelines for policy, legal and institutional frameworks. 3.2.1 Priority sustainable land management measures developed and implemented.			
4 Enabling Environment	GEF TF	4.1 Institutional, organizational and individual capacities are strengthened to better manage the environment on Socotra.	4.1.1 A strategic capacity development plan (CDP) for environmental management is prepared. 4.1.2 An ecosystem services framework informs management and sustainable financing schemes. 4.1.3 Recommendations for an integrated conservation management framework (ICMF) for the Socotra WHS are developed (closely linked to the BD-PAM, IAS and SLM strategies and the capacity development plan). 4.1.4 Capacity development measures implemented for key administrative partners. 4.1.5 Special programmes for long-term enhancement of policing and academic capacities planned and launched. 4.1.6 Field schools for community-based environmental management are established and operational. 4.2.1 An information	GEF TF	1,082,500	3,902,000

		4.2 Information and knowledge supports environmental management.	management strategy is developed. 4.2.2 A communication and awareness strategy is developed. 4.2.3 Results-based project management and M&E is established.			
		4.3 A suite of financing mechanisms sustains the implementation of the Integrated Conservation Management Framework (ICMF) of the Socotra WHS in the long-term.	4.3.1 A comprehensive Socotra WHS sustainable finance plan is developed. 4.3.2 A Socotra Trust Fund is established. 4.3.3 At least two local income generating mechanisms are developed.			
			Subtotal		4,633,566	14,442,521
			Project management Cost (PMC)[3]	GEF TF	221,000	600,000
			Total project costs		4,854,566	15,042,521

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

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the projeSct with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount ($)
Bilateral Aid Agency	GIZ, Germany	In-kind	7,500,000
National Government	EPA, Yemen	In-kind	4,500,000
Others	Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh (RBGE/CMEP), UK	In-kind	1,015,000
Local Government	Governorate of Hadramaut, Yemen	In-kind	500,000
Local Government	Local District Councils Socotra, Yemen	In-kind	500,000
GEF Agency	UNEP/DEPI/TEU	In-kind	300,000
Foundation	Senckenberg Society for Nature Research, Germany	In-kind	200,000
Others	Institute of Evolutionary Biology (CSIC-UPF), Spain	In-kind	181,151
Others	CABI	In-kind	150,000
Others	La Sapienza University, Rome, Italy	In-kind	116,370
Others	Mendel University, Brno, Czech Republic	In-kind	80,000
Total Co-financing			15,042,521

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in $)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)[2]	Total c=a+b
UNEP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Yemen	2,987,625	283,824	3,271,449

[3] PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

UNEP	GEF TF	Land Degradation	Yemen	1,886,941	177,359	2,044,300
Total Grant Resources				**4,854,566**	**461,183**	**5,315,749**

[1] 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.
[2] Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount ($)	Cofinancing ($)	Project Total ($)
International Consultants	615,000	930,000	1,545,000
National/Local Consultants	375,000	658,000	1,033,000

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[4]

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

The analysis provided in the PIF is still valid. During the PPG, relevant information was updated and amended through intensive stakeholder consultations. For further detail, please refer to the ProDoc, Sections 2.4 and 3.6.

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

The targeted GEF FA outcomes and outputs remain unchanged from the PIF.

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

No changes to the PIF

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

The baseline provided in the PIF is mostly still valid, although some parameters changed during the course of the PPG. For further detail please consult the ProDoc, Section 2.

A.4.1 Project intervention strategy

During the PPG phase, national, local and community stakeholders were consulted on the Project's implementation strategy and were invited to join an inclusive stakeholder workshop (ref. to ProDoc App 19). Together with the GEF review process and the STAP comments, they provided a very good backdrop to re-evaluate on-the-ground needs and expectations and to revise the implementation strategy for more reliability, feasibility and sustainability.

Stakeholder feedback and STAP comments on the need to take into account local governance and participation and the incorporation of livelihood aspects led to a strengthened Component 4 (enabling environment), which now provides the setting to support the sectoral components on PA management (1), IAS (2) and SLM (3) through community-based approaches, capacity development, institutional strengthening and coordination, policy integration

[4] 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.

and sustainable financing. Component 4 now also includes the old PIF Component 5, which addressed knowledge management and M&E.

While the wording for Components 1-3 was modified, the underlying assumptions and the ensuing implementation strategy did not change. Please refer to Annex B for the detailed responses to GEF review and STAP comments

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:

A tabular summary of the incremental reasoning for the proposed project is presented below, based on the baseline analysis and the elaboration of the intervention strategy detailed in the ProDoc Sections 2 and 3. It compares the likely outcomes of the current baseline (business as usual scenario) with the expected outcomes of the alternative scenario (with project interventions), thus distilling environmental benefits at global and national levels that can be attributed to the project as its incremental contribution. For further detail on the expected global environmental benefits, please refer to the ProDoc Section 3.1.

Baseline Scenario B (Business As Usual)	**Alternative Scenario A** (with project interventions)	**Increment** **(**A – B)
Component 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Protected Area Management **Baseline:** • Existing data largely outdated, or insufficiently consolidated. • Conservation Zoning Plan outdated and in need of revision. • No BD-Protected Area Management (PAM) framework/policy available • Current level of active PAM limited. • Present number of managed PAs within network low. • Current PA committees ill-capacitated **Probable results:** • PA Zoning Plan remains defective and does not take recent changes and intl. developments into account. • Local professional capacity (EPA and local government) remains well below the required levels to manage the PA and the WHS and is still largely reliant on sporadic international support, especially on more technically complex tasks such as IAS management, conservation finance, SLM, etc. • The UNDP/GEF SGBP medium-sized project provides some initial support and baseline studies for the mainstreaming of Biodiversity conservation, WHS management, and IAS management concerns into Local Governance. • There is no integrated management authority for the Socotra WHS • Local communities remain not engaged in PA management, cannot pursue alternative livelihoods and do not understand the linkages between BD	• Relevant baseline data collected, consolidated and readily analysed. • BD-PAM strategy developed • Revised CZP gazetted and broadly communicated. • All existing management plans revised and improved. • PA management options, needs and resource requirements are analysed • Additional PAs agreed on and taken into management. • PAM plans for all PAs prepared. • Options for an integrated conservation management framework (ICMF) are considered by the relevant authorities (see Comp. 4)	**Local/national benefits:** • Relevant BD data available and accessible • Local awareness on linkages between BD conservation, PAM and alternative livelihoods • Capacities for PAM and administration strengthened **Global benefits:** • Improved knowledge on threats for globally important species • Establishment of a closer linkage between economic and ecologic incentives for conservation • Revised Conservation Zoning Plan • Management for existing WHS improved (2,151,418 ha) • The sea/coastal surface area of actively managed marine Nature Sanctuaries will be expanded by at least 4,100 ha from presently approx. 1,140 ha (720 ha sea + adjacent coastal part), raising the number of presently 3 managed NSs to 8, including a lagoon and a mangrove

conservation and their well-being • Traditional management practices disappear and become lost		• The land surface area of actively managed terrestrial Nature Sanctuaries will be expanded by at least 2,500 ha (from presently approx. 3,500 ha), raising the number of presently 2 managed NSs to 5-6
Component 2: Invasive Alien Species (IAS) Management **Baseline:** • Existing data outdated, or insufficiently consolidated. • No IAS strategy/policy available. • Very limited IAS management capacities. • Insufficient enforcement of existing legal regulations **Probable results:** • IAS management is not yet effectively addressed in terms of professional capacity, legislative tools, or operational/management arrangements –the threat of IAS remains very high and is rapidly increasing in parallel with growing external influences and uncoordinated development. • Local communities continue to import and grow IAS, not being aware of their risk potential, nor being engaged in IAS awareness campaigns and management approaches	• IAS management needs are analysed. • IAS strategy is documented, broadly communicated, and is prepared for endorsement by the relevant authorities. • IAS strategy is fully operational and implemented on Socotra Island and initiated for outer islands. • Options for an integrated conservation management framework are considered by the relevant authorities (see Comp. 4)	**Local/national benefits:** • Relevant IAS awareness and data available and accessible • Economic impacts of IAS estimated and communicated to local stakeholders **Global benefits:** • IAS management framework and strategy fully operational • IAS management integrated into other sectoral policies and into PAM and SLM • Local communities contribute actively to IAS management • IAS management contributes to conservation of globally important BD
Component 3: Sustainable Land Management (SLM) **Baseline:** • Existing data and management concepts in need of updating and review. • No SLM strategy/policy available. • Very limited capacities for sustainable land management. • Insufficient local implementation of national strategies and policies in relation to SLM **Probable results:** • Collaboration between relevant entities of the GoY as well as among donor-funded projects remains sub-optimal and is hampering the development of an integrated sustainable land use plan for the Socotra WHS • EPA/GIZ “Conservation and Sustainable use of Biodiversity” program, addresses local community needs and promoting sustainable uses of Biodiversity (e.g. ecotourism), but does not cover land degradation, soil erosion, IAS management, PA management. • Traditional management practices disappear and become lost	• SLM management needs are analysed. • SLM strategy is prepared for endorsement by the relevant authorities, documented and broadly communicated • SLM strategy is fully operational and implemented on at least 10% of agricultural land, at least 10% of grazing land and at least 5% of forest land • Options for an integrated conservation management framework are considered by the relevant authorities (see Comp. 4).	**Local/national benefits:** • Detailed information on SLM captured and made available locally and nationally **Global benefits:** • Community-based SLM strategy tested and implemented • SLM practices integrated into other sectoral policies and into PAM and IAS management

Component 4: **Enabling Environment** **Baseline:** • Lack of adequate capacities to manage the Socotra WHS for conservation and sustainable development. • Insufficient coordination among governmental and parastatal agencies and other stakeholders. • Unsatisfactory environmental awareness among stakeholders. • Insufficient management of existing and new data and knowledge. • Missing access to and lack of analytical tools for data. • Insufficient governmental funding for Socotra WHS management across all involved agencies. • Failure of previous donor interventions to leave a sustainable foot-print, and to establish cost-recovery and financing mechanisms. **Probable results:** • Technical, managerial, administrative and institutional capacities for PA, IAS, SLM and integrated WHS management remain limited at local and national levels, albeit rising pressures on the island • Despite improved presence of GOY entities in the WHS, environmental concerns are losing out against developmental interests • Community stakeholders remain decoupled from environmental awareness and management efforts	• Capacity development strategy is fully operational. • An ecosystem services framework informs management and sustainable financing schemes • Main agencies agree on co-management plan (integrated conservation management framework (ICMF). • ICMF is considered by the relevant authorities • Database operational and analytical tools and interfaces available. • Awareness levels of critical stakeholders commensurate with the challenges. • M&E system operational. • Trust Fund (TF) management plan agreed upon • Initiatives launched for STF replenishment. • At least two individual financing schemes established	**Local/national benefits:** • Capacity needs assessed and capacity development plan agreed by all stakeholders • Awareness strategy and campaign for PAM, IAS and SLM • Administrative and technical training programmes, incl. on enforcement and academia • Increased data and knowledge on ecosystem services, tools and models • Two income generating schemes functional **Global benefits:** • Establishment of a closer linkage between economic and ecologic incentives for conservation • Ecosystem services methodologies support the project's strategies and sustainable funding mechanisms. • BD conservation, IAS and SLM are integrated into sectoral policies and strategies • Sustainable Finance Plan for the WHS adopted • Socotra WHS Trust Fund established, providing sustainable finances for its management
M&E and Project Management	• Effective cooperation to achieve project outputs in accordance with established standards of monitoring, evaluation and active participation of key stakeholders in project activities	**Local/national benefits:** • Improved stakeholder cooperation and awareness of cooperation opportunities **Global benefits:** • Integrated conservation framework with community-based approaches • Best case scenarios and examples of integrated resource management for scale-up and replication particularly in SIDS

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:

The risk analysis provided with the PIF is still fully valid.

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

No changes to the PIF. For further detail, please consult the ProDoc Section 2.7.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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

The project implementation strategy is built on community-based and participatory approaches, as resource users whose livelihoods depend on the services the ecosystem provides, have to be involved in the management and decision-making when it comes to PA, IAS or sustainable land management. Community-based field schools will allow for discussion and testing of novel approaches to Socotra, particularly with regard to IAS and SLM, and the stakeholders will be involved in data gathering and information provision, to be brought together in a publicly accessible database. For further detail, please refer to the ProDoc, especially Sections 3.3, 3.10 and 5.

The below table characterises the specific entry points and different and complementary roles various stakeholder groups and political actors are expected to assume during project implementation. Managing the consultative and participatory processes will be a dynamic exercise, and the below table does not intend to pre-empt the stakeholder set-up.

Stakeholder project roles and contributions according to different categories

Category	Stakeholders	Roles and Contributions
Central government and sub-ordinate executive parastatal agencies (ministries, authorities (partly with local branches), boards etc.)	Environment Protection Authority, Ministries of Transport, Planning and International Cooperation, Agriculture and Irrigation, Water and Environment, Oil and Minerals, Local Administration, Interior, Public Works, Culture and Tourism, Fish Wealth, 'Education, Water and Environment Advisory Office to the President of Yemen	The central government represented by several key ministries and their subordinate technical (executive) agencies (i.e. their local branches which serve both the central and provincial level, see below) will play a major role in the Project. Besides EPA as EA, a core group of them will partake closely in steering and overseeing the Project implementation and thus be members of the PSC. Others will be members of the SAG and the STF Boards (where appropriate) through which they can influence the Project's course. All of them will be concerned with issues of developing, implementing or mainstreaming policies and strategies through the regular vertical and horizontal governance procedures, which will be supported by the 'I-SEA of ICMF' process cycle (see Section 3.3, Output 4.1.3). All of them will significantly contribute to the baseline investment on which the GEF contribution will build upon. This will include, e.g.: Staff, infrastructure, equipment and operations (underlying most contributions per se); National and local level governance processes, e.g. on land-use and development planning, including relevant legal and policy expertise; National and local level data collection and analysis on environmental parameters, biodiversity and natural resources, social and demographic parameters etc.; National and local level executive and operational support.
Sub-central governmental bodies (regional, governorate, district,	Governorate of Socotra Council/Administration and Ministries'/Executive Agencies' local branches (Socotra, serving both the central and provincial level),	The provincial/district government will play a major role in the Project and partake closely in steering and overseeing the Project implementation and thus be members of the PSC and the Boards of the STF. Local branches of certain executive/technical agencies (or of ministries, as appropriate, the pattern is inconsistent), and municipal and parastatal bodies, i.e. the academic institutions and corporations

municipal)	Local Councils (Districts of Hadiboh and Qalansiyah), Regional Hadramaut Government (role to be assessed), Universities of Mukallah, Sana'a, Aden, Taiz, Dhamar.	will assume a role according to their mandates and support capacities, and thus considered as members of the SAG, TAG and the STF Boards, through which they can influence the Project's course. Especially the provincial/district government will be concerned with issues of developing, implementing or mainstreaming policies and strategies through the regular vertical and horizontal governance procedures, which will be supported by the 'I-SEA of ICMF' process cycle. All of them will contribute (significant in terms of the provincial gov.) baseline investment including, staff, infrastructure, equipment and operations; Local level governance processes e.g. on land-use and development planning, including relevant legal and policy expertise; Local level political and academic data collection and analysis on environmental parameters, biodiversity and natural resources, social and demographic parameters etc.; Local level executive and operational support.
Civil society organisations (CSOs, NGOs, CBOs including Women associations)	The Socotra WHS features, besides traditional societal and religious actors such as the Sheikhs and elders, a range of community based groups that were established in recent years, partly with GEF support. These include, inter alia (compare Appendix 19, PPG Mission Report) Environmental NGOs, Fishery Cooperatives and Associations, Eco-tourism CBOs, Socotra Women Association, and not least the Management Associations for the PAs.	Community participation in steering and overseeing the Project implementation will be ensured through appointment of representatives to the PSC, and of others to the SAG, and where appropriate to the Boards of the STF through which they can influence the Project's course. This may be organised on a rotational or otherwise democratically appropriate way. Additional representatives with an activity-/site-specific stake can be invited to partake in the consultation mechanisms temporally or as guest, including dialogues with EPA and local/central government authorities and working groups. The strong partnership between the EPA and local community groups has been a key asset GEF-supported work in recent years (eventually leading to the Conservation Zoning Plan in 2000 and the establishment of the WHS in 2008), and this will be taken up and revived by this GEF project. The possible contributions of community groups are very diverse and highly critical to the success of the Project, and will encompass, inter alia, active intellectual and physical engagement, provision of traditional knowledge, crafts(wo)manship, socio-cultural information and interaction, decision-making and moderation processes and societal cohesiveness, granting of local support, tenure rights, and availing land, premises, gears/tools, and commodities. The establishment of Field Schools will be an important participatory tool to engage local communities and resource users in evaluating, approving, implementing and discussing novel approaches for community-based conservation (see Section 3.3, description of outcome 4.1)
Private Sector	Small and medium enterprises comprise both, fully private or cooperative, actors from e.g. fisheries, agriculture/livestock,	The Private Sector will primarily be engaged in a dialogue to support the environmentally friendly objectives of this project and the establishment and funding of the Socotra Trust Fund and the associated income generating mechanisms (Outcome 4.3) as a

	tourism and eco-tourism, transport, trade, construction, etc. Large enterprises at present comprise mainly actors from transport and construction, partly with vested interests from national and regional investors outside Socotra. The real estate sector attracts recently huge interest by regional investors, and the looming associated ecological, social and political effects can be severely detrimental to the WHS objectives.	pathway towards a model for green economic development for the Socotra WHS. Representatives may be invited, as guests or permanently, to the SAG, TAG, and e.g. the Boards of the STF. The possible involvement of the Private Sector in PAM will primarily focus on small and medium scale, community-based enterprises (SMEs – such as e.g. from artisanal fisheries, eco-tourism) active within the target areas. SMEs may also have a role and make active contributions in the fields of IAS (e.g. transport, trade) and SLM (e.g. marketing of products, improved supply and trade schemes) Larger investment groups at the national and regional (Arabian Gulf) level will also be involved in STF design and funding.
Donor agencies (and their programmes and projects); international conservation CSOs/NGOs & science partners	This includes international and bilateral development partners of Yemen such as UNDP, UNEP, UNESCO WHC, IFAD, Germany/GIZ, Italy, to name only the presently most active, and a broad and diverse national and international network of "Friends of Soqotra" and other partners that have been instrumental in developing the capacity of the EPA, undertaking all prior GEF projects and in achieving WHS status. These groups continue to engage mainly in research and awareness, and support to conservation and sustainable development efforts and are key stakeholders, including – inter alia - representatives from: SRI/BiK-F, CMEP/RBGE, BirdLife International, CABI and other research institutions (e.g. University of Rome, Mendel University, Sana'a University, etc.).	Participation in steering and overseeing the Project implementation will be ensured through appointment of representatives of e.g. UNEP, UNDP, FoS, and SRI/BiK-F to the PSC and the STF Boards, and of others to the SAG (and also the TAG where appropriate) through which they can influence the Project's course. This may be organised on a rotational or otherwise democratically appropriate way. Additional representatives with an activity-/site-specific stake can be invited to partake in the consultation mechanisms temporally or as guests. Thematically, these stakeholders will be involved in various biodiversity conservation elements of the project including e.g.: biodiversity and ecosystem monitoring and field research (marine and terrestrial), training and capacity development, development of incentive-based mechanisms, conservation policies and legal instruments, community involvement, outreach and awareness programmes; assessment and evaluation of the ecosystem services provided by the target protected areas; climate change modelling, land degradation/ soil erosion mapping, etc. All such contributions will be defined in detail during the Project's inception phase, and will encompass material, financial and in-kind contributions to the baseline investment (partly through staff, infrastructure, equipment and operations), as documented in Appendix 2 (Co-financing). Part of these contributions will be reciprocated by the Project through in-kind support as well as contracts for technical support pertinent to project activities. UNEP and its specialised partner agencies will, in addition to the oversight functions as GEF Implementing Agency, provide a wide range of technical in-kind contributions to the design and implementation of the project, including e.g.: linkages with parallel

		UNEP programmes of national and global nature and focusing on related issues; protected areas, conservation planning, environmental policy and climate change-related expertise; biodiversity databases, data analysis, decision-support tools and GIS systems; coastal zone management, wetlands and natural resources management, etc. The contributions of each division and UNEP partner organisations will be defined in detail during inception and when need arises during implementation of the Project. The UNDP Country Office in Yemen has accumulated significant expertise in supporting GEF and non-GEF projects in the Socotra Archipelago and mainland Yemen since 1996, and is currently engaged in the SGBP and the GEF SGP. As such the UNDP CO team will be a key partner in the design, implementation and facilitation of the Project. The UNESCO WHC is set to provide support for the development of an education, awareness and visitor centre in Socotra in collaboration with EPA and project partners. The GIZ has extensive experience in development cooperation in Yemen, and is funding a new initiative on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in Yemen with a focus on Socotra. This initiative is implemented with MWE/EPA, therefore the Project is designed and will be implemented so as to maximise synergy and coordination with the German-funded initiative. CABI will provide specific expertise on IAS management and linkages with other parallel IAS management initiatives in other parts of the world, and link up species assessments and specific experiences in Socotra to its global data management portal. CABI's century-long work on invasive species has contributed to biodiversity conservation through policy support, innovative information products, and research on biological control.
International Agreements, Conventions, Programmes and Platforms (MEAs)	Yemen has ratified and acceded to most relevant international agreements and conventions, which can be accessed to provide support, complemented by other related initiatives, (see Appendix 18) for example the Global Islands Partnership (GLISPA), SIDS networks, UN-REDD, or IPBES.	These partners will provide linkages with relevant international processes; guidance, training, awareness raising and educational materials to support the work of the EPA and assist in showcasing, sharing and disseminating the experience and achievements of the project in international fora.

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):

The Project places strong emphasis on linking its environmental management approaches with enhancing local livelihoods and socio-economic benefits for the local resource users deriving from its conservation and management activities.

Socio-economic baseline data will be incorporated into the capacity needs assessment and the capacity development strategy that particularly targets the local communities (Output 4.1.1). Ecosystem services maps will delineate trade-off analyses and vulnerability assessments, which will build the foundation for piloting sustainable financing schemes (e.g. PES, REDD+), based on local conservation efforts that also aim at diversified and/or alternative livelihoods (Output 4.1.2).

The localized Field Schools will be an implementation modality particularly aiming at introducing socio-economic incentive schemes into the Project's conservation and environmental management efforts, as novel activities will be discussed and tested in the Field Schools for further uptake and replication. Sustainable land management measures will prominently aim at enhancing local livelihoods, including through piloting e.g. production of crops, fodder and trees; home garden improvements; introduction of value chains and product branding; renewable/ alternative energy, rainwater harvesting. See ProDoc Section 3.3 on the SLM Component 3 and on Output 4.1.6 for further detail.

The strong support the Project received from community-based organisations during the PPG phase, including from women's' organisations can be seen as a confidence vote that the Project will deliver socio-economic benefits (see the letters of endorsement and support in Appendix 12).

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

The Project will work closely with existing government structures at national and archipelago level, as well as local stakeholders, including communities and community-based organisations, to better address direct and indirect drivers of ecosystem change and to jointly develop locally adapted and relevant measures that combine conservation aims with livelihood issues. More efficient and better coordinated policy responses will be developed and implemented, in order to address the prevalent challenges to the Socotra WHS.

In doing so, the Project will also link up with and build upon ongoing and relevant global initiatives and platforms. This approach is adopted to generate greatest possible synergies at the local/national and global levels, and therefore maximise cost-effectiveness. This approach will generate global benefits in terms of (a) positively contributing to the enhanced conservation status of globally important biodiversity, improved land management and ecosystem stability at large, and (b) positively contributing to the ongoing international dialogue on sustainable development challenges for SIDS. The coordinated approach among project activities at the local/national and global level, facilitated by UNEP/DEPI, the Project Steering Committee, and contributing partner organisations, will avoid duplication of activities and investment, maximise synergies with other relevant initiatives and further improve cost-effectiveness.

Cost-effectiveness measures include:

- Building on existing programmes and grassroots efforts at the local, national and international level;
- Building on prior experience, data and knowledge generated through the broad consortium of project partners;
- Targeting an extensive range of stakeholders, including through existing local, national and international networks, so as to maximise impacts at various governmental and societal levels;
- Employing a capacity development approach that targets both local stakeholders so as to improve the notion that conservation efforts can contribute to improved and diversified livelihoods, thus instilling sustainability; and that aims at enhancing the capacities of local authorities to integrate local stakeholders in decision making processes, hence increasing policy relevance and cohesiveness;
- Forming communication and knowledge networks which create bridges between local needs and realities, translation into relevant and applicable policies. as well as uptake and replication opportunities through international fora and networks;
- Investing in pre-emptive measures, e.g. to prevent and manage the introduction of invasive alien species, rather than late and expensive solutions;
- Installing sustainable financing mechanisms that aim at ensuring that the cost associated with conserving

the Socotra WHS will be met in the long term.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	GEF Budget	Budget co-finance	Time Frame
Inception Meeting	Project Management Team (PMT)	**25,000	**40,000	Within 2 months of project start-up (Cost incorporated in project components)
Inception Report	PMT		*8,000	1 month after project inception meeting (Cost incorporated in project components)
Measurement of project indicators (outcome, progress and performance indicators, GEF tracking tools)	Socotra Project Management Unit (SPMU), PMT	*10,000	*20,000	Outcome indicators: start, mid and end of project Progress/perform. Indicators: annually (Cost incorporated in project components and management budget)
Semi-annual Progress/ Operational Reports to UNEP	Project Coordinator (PC), PMT		*5,000	Within 1 month of the end of reporting period i.e. on or before 31 January and 31 July (Cost incorporated in project components and management budget)
Project Steering Committee (PSC) meetings	PMT, UNEP Task Manager (TM)	**50,000	**80,000	Annually (physically; at least) + telephone and video conferences as needed
Reports of PSC meetings	PMT and UNEP TM	**5,000	**20,000	As per above
Technical Advisory Board (TAB) and Stakeholder Advisory Board (SAB) meetings		**25,000	**30,000	
PIR	SPMU		*5,000	Annually, part of reporting routine
Monitoring visits to field sites	SPMU, PC, UNEP TM	*25,000	*20,000	As appropriate
Mid Term Review/Evaluation	UNEP TM and EO	**30,000		At mid-point of project implementation
Terminal Evaluation	UNEP EO	**30,000		Within 6 months of end of project implementation
Audit	PMT	**14,000		Annually
Project Final Report	PMT		*5,000	Within 2 months of project completion
Co-financing report	PMT		*5,000	Within 1 month of the PIR reporting period, i.e. on or before 31 July
Publication of Lessons Learnt and other project documents	PMT	**25,000	**30,000	Annually, part of Semi-annual Reports & Project Final Report
Total M&E Plan Budget		**239,000**	**268,000**	

* Cost internalised in project components and/or management budget
** Cost budgeted separately in specific budget line

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)*
Dr. Khaled S. al-Shaibani	Chairman, EPA	Ministry of Water and Environment	02/16/2013

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
Ms Brennan Van Dyke, Director, GEF Coordination Office, UNEP	Brennan Van Dyke	27/11/2014	Edoardo Zandri, Chief, UNEP/TEU	+254 207624380	Edoardo.zandri@unep.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).

The full Results Framework is appended to the ProDoc as Appendix 4

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).

The GEF review and STAP comments to the PIF and related responses and changes to the implementation strategy are summarized below.

UNEP & PARTNERS - RESPONSE TO THE GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

GEF ID:	5347		
Country/Region:	Yemen		
Project Title:	Support to the Integrated Program for the Conservation and Sustainable Development of the Socotra Archipelago		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		BD-1; BD-1; BD-2; LD-3;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	$150,000	Project Grant:	$4,854,566
Co-financing:	$17,562,520	Total Project Cost:	$22,567,086
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavelier	Agency Contact Person:	Edoardo Zandri
This UNEP Response is dated:	15 April 2013		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
Eligibility	1. Is the participating **country eligible**?	4-11-13 Yes. Yemen is eligible for funding. Cleared		
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	4-11-13 Yes. There is LoE from the OFP for $5.48M including Agency Fees and PPG. The project is for $5.47M. Cleared		
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):			
	• the STAR allocation?	4-11-13 The STAR allocation is sufficient to cover this project. Cleared		
	• the focal area allocation?	4-11-13 The BD and LD under STAR allocation are sufficient to cover this project. Cleared		
	• the LDCF under the principle of	NA		

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

[5] Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
	equitable access			
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA		
	• focal area set-aside?	NA		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results** **framework and strategic** **objectives**? *For BD projects: Has the project* *explicitly articulated which Aichi* *Target(s) the project will help* *achieve and are SMART* *indicators identified, that will be* *used to track progress toward* *achieving the Aichi*	4-11-13 Yes. BD-1 & 2, LD 3, and Aichi Targets 1,2,4,5,6,9,11,12,13,14,18,19 and 20. Cleared		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
	target(s).			
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient **country's national strategies and plans** or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	4-11-13 As stated in the PIF, "the National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP, 1995), as well as the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP, 2004), both clearly underscore the biodiversity conservation priorities addressed in this project", and for LD, "the project is consistent with the priorities identified in NAPCD (2000), which are also reflected in Yemen's latest PRSP (2003-2005)". Cleared		
	6. Is (are) the **baseline project(s),** including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	4-11-13 The baseline projects (i.e. the projects and investments that will take place in BD and LD, whether or not this GEF project is approved, are not clearly presented in the PIF. On the one hand, the PIF cites investments at the national level for $16,500,000 for Socotra WHS (p.7) and on the other, co-financing in Table C is only $5,227,520 when adding all government contributions. It is not clear what of the proposed GEF funded activities have a baseline and which ones do not. A better geographic and thematic focus in the	Thanks. Section A.1.2 and A.1.4 are now significantly revised to provide additional detail on baselines and co-financing. This now clarifies that *all proposed GEF funded activities have some level of baseline investment.* The geographic and thematic focus is now narrowed down to the network of Nature Sanctuaries (ref. revised table B, output 1.1.1 and new Maps of the Conservation Zoning Plan now provided in the Annexes)	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
Project Design		BD and LD investments will allow a better estimation of the baseline projects and investments.	to address the review's principal comment. See also our responses below.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project** **framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	4-11-13 The project has a very lose structure. The components appeared to be stacking one on top of each other, rather than being complementary. There is no common geographic setting for the project (except the entire Socotra WHS) and that makes very difficult to understand why these components were selected. The project will greatly benefit from a narrower geographic focus, and that will facilitate visualizing tangible and measurable Global Environmental Benefits on the ground.	Thanks Components inter-relationship and geographic setting: the geographic and thematic focus is now narrowed down to the network of Nature Sanctuaries (ref. revised table B, output 1.1.1) to address the review's principal comment. The component 1 of the GEF project will specifically focus on the improved design and management of the network of Nature Sanctuaries within the WHS. The NSs represent approximately 5% of the above WHS's PA network; however their conservation will underpin the improved management effectiveness of the entire WHS, as these areas are at the core repositories of GEBs in the WHS – ref revised sections A.1.1 and A.1.3 for additional detail.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
		Component 1. 1. It is not clear how the management of the PA Network in Socotra WHS will improve with the proposed activities and outputs. Please clarify what do the following terms actually mean in reality: "Updated design of the WHS PA network" and "A unified management structure for the Socotra WHS established". Please be more specific about "improved professional capacity of national GoY entities". These outputs are fuzzy.	Component 1 Footnotes and references are now added in table B to address this point and refer to reader to additional detail in the annexes. See also clarifications below: "Updated design of the WHS PA network": Please see detailed description of component 1 in Annexes. In short: PA zoning plan was developed in 1998-2000 and approved in year 2000. Recent new BD research (incl. genetics, new surveys, CC modeling, etc.) has indicated that some very important areas were not identified in earlier studies. Thus important BD is not yet properly protected by Nature Sanctuaries. The project will address this issue, resulting in the improved design of the PA network (mainly focusing on the adjustment and expansion of Nature Sanctuaries) and this will provide better protection for hundreds of key species and critical habitats in the WHS. Increased detail on this will be provided at CEO endorsement.	This further detailed information is now provided in the narrative description

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
			"A unified management structure for the Socotra WHS established": Ref new footnote in table B. this is a critical issue that is urgently required to (a) guarantee improved coordination among all stakeholders (govt. and non govt.) involved in the management of the WHS, and (b) to address one of the key comments raised by the UNESCO WHS review and ensure proper governance for and conservation of the WHS. The project will directly support the ongoing consultative efforts to establish this consultative and management body, in collaboration with GoY and building upon the efforts of the UNDP-GEF SGBP project. Additional detail and update will be provided at CEO endorsement. "improved professional capacity of national GoY entities": Ref new footnote in table B. the professional capacity of EPA staff remains well below the	of the intervention strategy, please see ProDoc Section 3.3 on Component 1 This coordinative element is now further strengthened in the updated intervention strategy, i.e. the Integrated Conservation Management Framework (ICMF) that closely links the project components on PA management, IAS and SLM with the strengthening of the Socotra enabling environment in component 4. See ProDoc section 3.3, particularly on output 4.1.3.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
			required standards to manage the WHS (in spite of significant investments in capacity development so far). The level of capacity of other GoY entities at the local level is even lower, and still much lower than EPA's. The project will support the design and implementation of training and capacity development programs for local staff of the EPA and of other GOY partners in Socotra, to enhance the level of locally available professional capacity to support WHS management and all the technical aspect covered by the GEF project (PAs, IAS, SLM, etc.). This will entail formal as well as on-the-job training activities and full detail will be provided at CEO endorsement. 2. <u>Ref. new footnote inserted in Table b:</u> The idea of a Trust Fund was already part of the first GEF project in Socotra (Socotra Biodiversity Project – 1997-2001) - Please refer to the detailed description of Component 1 in Annex 1 for additional detail on the background and history of the	The project now entails a full-fledged capacity development strategy (output 4.1.1) with various mutually enhancive outputs, targeting both the strengthening of GoY entities' capacities (outputs 4.1.4, 4.1.5) and the full engagement and training of local stakeholders and community representatives (output 4.1.6). Please refer to the respective descriptions in the ProDoc Section 3.3 for further detail.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
		2. Did the idea of a Trust Fund emerged from a preliminary scoping study or is this idea new altogether. Please elaborate. Would GEF funds be used to capitalize the fund?	concept of a Socotra trust Fund – dating back to 1997 with the first UNDP-GEF Socotra Biodiversity Project. 3. Point is well taken and this budget will be carefully re-assessed during PPG and better defined at CEO endorsement. However funding for this component is kept low and expected to be sufficient because: (a) the geographic scope for additional field research and surveys is focusing mainly on Nature Sanctuaries and not on all the WHS (but will benefit all the WHS), (b) most of underpinning BD and CC research is either already published, ongoing and largely co-funded by international research partners (c) any required new studies or surveys will be conducted with significant co-financing contributions and will thus require limited GEF support. 4. Investments in the PA themselves are significant and these are largely covered by the baseline and this is now better	The spatial scope of the project interventions are now more precisely described (cf. App 4 and ProDoc Section 3.3). In addition, a broad consortium of supporting partner organisations was brought together during the PPG phase. These partners represent most research organizations and issues delivered for Socotra and they stand ready to support new research and studies necessary to implement the project strategy.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
		3. Funding for all activities under this component may not be sufficient, unless a reduction in the geographic scope of the project is achieved.	clarified in revised section A.1.2. What improvements in the METTs scores are expected: ref new footnote added in table B. All project components (including component 1) will result in the improvement of PAMETT scores. Namely, measurable improvements are anticipated in the assessment scores for questions # 1,2,4, 5 (PA design), 7 (Management Plan), 9 (resources inventory), 10 (research), 14 (staff capacity), 15-16 (budget and budget security), 21 (links to SLM), 23-24 (local community involvement), 27 (visitor facilities), 30 (general condition of property). Additional detail and a baseline TT will be provided at CEO endorsement.	Please refer to the tracking tools in App. 15 and the related baseline analysis in ProDoc section 2.6 and how the project intends to address the prevailing gaps (Section 3.3.)
			Component 2 1. Please refer to the detailed baselines, rationale and detailed description of component 1 in revised section A.1.2 and in Annex. The GEF support will mainly focus on TA (with some	Please refer to the baseline (Section 2.6) and intervention description of component 2 (Section 3.3).

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
		4. Is it really possible to improve the management effectiveness of a PA System when there are no investments in the PA themselves? Please provide examples in the region where this has been achieved. What improvements in the METTs scores are expected?	possible very limited investment – to be defined at CEO endorsement and only if required). The necessary investment will be covered by co-financing through (a) GoY funding – ongoing EPA program, (b) GIZ program, and (c) other donors (tbd). *The significant experience accumulated so far in community-based IAS management by EPA & partners in Socotra is described in Annex 1, referenced publications (also in annex) and in revised section A.1.2,* indicates that significant impact can be achieved mainly through the provision of TA by the GEF and combined with (limited) co-financing investments. Component 3 Thanks you are correct and in fact that is the case. Very little was done so far in terms of defining a properly integrated SLM plan for Socotra. See new footnote explaining this and now inserted in table B:	During the PPG, significant substantive input and support for the IAS strategy could be summoned with the involvement of CABI, hence strengthening and focusing component 2.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
		Component 2. 1. It is not easy to visualize how a "community-based management framework to control IAS" can render tangible and measurable results on the ground with the proposed activities and budget allocation ($1.3M). How can the implementation of the proposed activities (i. identification of IAS, ii. pathways for IAS are identified and strategies for prevention and control developed and implemented, iii. development of policy and institutional environment, iv. awareness raising ad prevention and control measured mainstreamed) take place when all GEF funds are for TA and none for INV?	*The main existing initiative is the GIZ/EPA program "sustainable use of biodiversity". This is however in its very early stages and its scope and focus is being defined at the time of writing, in consultation with all partners. UNEP is in close contact with the GIZ and EPA team and full alignment and complementarity between this project component and the context of existing initiatives will be ensured during the PPG phase and clearly presented at CEO endorsement (including the definition of SMART indicators and clearly focused targets*) Component 4: training and capacity for national Yemeni professionals is critical to underpin and support the execution and long-term sustainability of all project components and delivery of GEBs This is now further clarified in the footnotes in table B and please refer to Annex 1 for the rationale and detailed description of this component, providing additional detail.	Component 3 is now implanted in the intervention strategy to both reinforce components 1 and 2 and to be strengthened by these. To receive sustainable results while introducing SLM methodologies to Socotra, a community-based approach was chosen (Field Schools) that allows for piloting a broad range of techniques and activities before scaling up. This approach pays respect to the need to a) convince the local population that SLM can be embedded in existing traditional land use and to b) deliver tangible results with the available limited project resources and time.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
		Component 3. The outcome and outputs of this component read as if nothing had been done in Socotra on SLM. This component is too wide to render tangible and measurable results on the ground within time and budget. This component needs to be framed within the context of existing initiatives, needs and priorities.	See above on clarifications provided to address this important point	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
		Component 4. A very fussy component with the potential of using financial resources and rendering no GEBs. Please provide specifics. Otherwise, this component his has a real change of overpromising and under delivering.		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
		In all. A better geographic focus is needed to improve the opportunities of delivering tangible Global Environmental Benefits.		
	8. Are **global environmental** **benefits** adequately identified, and the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the **incremental/additional** **reasoning** sound and appropriate?	4-11-13 (a) As currently presented, the GEBs of that this project aims at delivering will encompass the entire biota and renewable natural resources of the Socotra WHS, including those within the 345,350 ha of terrestrial PAs and 1,772,000 ha of marine PAs. That will be very difficult (if not impossible) to achieve within time and budget. (b) The incremental reasoning is very difficult to see, because the baseline projects are not clearly determined.	Thanks (a) see above and (i) new explanatory notes inserted in tables A and B and (ii) clarifying the much narrower geographical focus (b) see above clarifications provided on baselines in revised section A.1.2	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the **socio-economic benefits**, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery			

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
	of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?			
	10. Is **public participation**, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	4-11-13 CSOs mentioned as stakeholders. The number of biodiversity conservation elements in which they are going to participate, covers pretty much everything, making difficult to believe that this is going to happen [i.e. biodiversity and ecosystem monitoring and field research (marine and terrestrial), training and capacity building, development of incentive-based mechanisms, conservation policies and legal instruments, community involvement, outreach and awareness programs; assessment and evaluation of the ecosystem services provided by the target protected areas; climate change modeling, land degradation/ soil erosion mapping, etc.]. Not clear how all these activities will be sorted out during project preparation and how the implementation of all these activities will take place through in-kind support as well as grants. If CSOs have a concrete role to play in this	Thanks Please see revised section A.1.2 providing additional clarifications on the role of local communities as existing key partners in all aspects of EPA work in the WHS, and especially in PA management and IAS management. The role of Local community is also presented in section A.2. LC members are always consulted by the EPA and e.g. were fully involved in the design and approval of the conservation zoning plan for the WHS. This will continue to be the case and thus local CSOs will be involved in project design and execution. This general principle is outlined in section A.2 and will be further detailed at CEO endorsement.	Approaches to fully engage CSOs and CBOs in project execution and implementation were further strengthened during the PPG, among others through seeking stakeholder input in the re-formulation of the project strategy. The main methodology of engaging CBOs in PA and IAS management and SLM measures is detailed in Section 3.3 (output 4.1.6 on field schools), allowing for a piloting of diverse conservation measures at community level.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
		project, please make it explicit.		
	11. Does the project take into account potential **major risks**, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	4-11-13 The risks and management measures are well described. Nevertheless, they are so broad in scope that it is difficult to see how a $4.8 M project can resolve all of them. If the project had a narrower thematic and/or geographic scope, it would be easier to visualize more concrete risks and how this project could potentially contribute to overcome them.	Thanks The geographical focus of the project is now much narrower and focusing on the Nature Sanctuaries, and thus providing a better basis to address identified risks. A more detailed risk analysis will be provided at CEO endorsement and based on site visits and consultations with local stakeholders.	The PIF risk management description is still valid (Section 3.5). The re-organization of the intervention strategy is also in response to a broadened analysis of past interventions' successes and failures and to intensive stakeholder consultations during the PPG. These led to more realistically formulated targets and a broadened component to reinforce the enabling environment, paying tribute to generally low levels of capacity.
	12. Is the **project consistent and** **properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	4-14-13 There is a comprehensive list of ongoing initiatives that this project will need to coordinate with. Given the scope of the GEF project coordination with all these initiatives will be a daunting task. As stated before, a narrower focus would make coordination easier and doable, especially considering the relatively small size of the Project Management	Thanks Point well taken and we fully agree that this will be a daunting task. Please see section A.4 which refers to the existing MOWE/EPA's central "Socotra Conservation and Development Coordination Unit" (SCDCU, established in 2010). This important mechanism will regularly bring	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
		Cost.	together al main actors in the WHS and will support much improved coordination. It should also be noted that most actors are institutions and/or individual researchers/experts/local team that have already been working together for several years (i.e. since 1996-7 onwards), and are thus already well connected among each other. The existing FoS ("Friends of Soqotra") network also provides regular forum and a website that will greatly facilitate continuous exchange of information among all involved stakeholders at the international level.	
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. - Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if	4-14-17 Innovation: Considering the current status of the Socotra WHS and the basic nature of the proposed interventions, innovation may an important consideration. Sustainability: It is difficult to visualize	Thanks Innovation: the community-engagement aspects are quite innovative for the Arab region in particular and can generate important lessons and experiences for other sites Sustainability: the improved	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
	not, why not. - Assess the project's sustainability strategy and the likelihood project outcomes will be sustained or not based on the evidence in the literature. - Are there measures to secure the institutional and financial stability of the project? - Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention strategy and critique the plan for scaling up.	how so many activities on so many fronts could have institutional or financial sustainability. The proposed "Socotra WHS Trust Fund" could be a much needed first step. Scaling up: Most likely to the other220 islands along Yemen's 4,000 km coastline.	description of the baselines hopefully provides a better rationale for this point. And yes we fully agree that the proposed "Socotra WHS Trust Fund" is unanimously regarded as a much needed critical step to ensure long-term and predictable funding for the WHS Yes and for many other sites in the Arab region, that are already looking at Socotra as an example	
	14. Is the **project structure** sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for			

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
	changes?			
	15. Has the **cost-effectiveness** been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?			
Project Financing	16. Is the **GEF funding and cofinancing** per component appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	4-11-13 1. Some of the co-financiers (i.e. Bilateral Aid Agencies and "Others") include multitude of individual co-financiers. How was the indicative co-financing of these clusters determined? Where all these individual co-financiers consulted on their names appearing in this PIF and then becoming accountable for bringing the co-financing if the projects gets approved? Please include only those that have been approached in one way or another. Co-financing of $17M is a high-order commitment and getting all the	Thanks Extensive consultations were held by UNEP Task Manager with all partners listed in the PIF, since 2009-10. In addition, a major international symposium on Socotra was recently held in Germany in September 2012. This provided the opportunity to present and discuss the PIF outline with the GIZ and BMU, GoY officials, EPA Socotra team, and the very broad FoS	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
		Letters of Co-financing from the 30+ individual co-financiers a nearly impossible task.	international network of experts that attended the Socotra Symposium.	
	17. At PIF: Is the amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? Any comment on the indicated amount and composition of **cofinancing**? At CEO endorsement: Has cofinancing been confirmed?	4-14-13 It is difficult to judge if the co-financing ($17.5M) will be sufficient to undertake a project with such a wider geographic and thematic scope. Cleared	Thanks Scope and baseline investments now narrowed and clarified in revised sections A.1.2 and table B, and more details is provided in annex 1.	
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	4-14-13 It is 4.5%. Cleared		
	19. At PIF, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? At CEO endorsement/	4-11-13 Yes. Cleared		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
	approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?			
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	4-11-13 No. Cleared		
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?			
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?			
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:			
	• STAP?			

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
	• Convention Secretariat?			
	• Council comments?			
	• Other GEF Agencies?			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	4-13-14 No. Please address outstanding issues. RECOMMENDATION. PLEASE SERIOUSLY CONSIDER REDUCING THE GEOGRAPHIC AND THEMATIC SCOPE OF THE PROJECT. A NARROWER FOCUS SHOULD ALLOW STRUCTURING THE PROJECT WITH COMPLEMENTARY COMPONENTS THAT TOGETHER, HAVE A BETTER CHANCE OF DELIVERING TANGIBLE AND MEASURABLE RESULTS ON THE GROUND.	Thanks The focus is now significantly narrowed to the network of Nature Sanctuaries (see above on revisions made in table a-B to clarify this point). This aspect will also be further refined and explained at CEO endorsement.	The spatial scope as well as the formulation of tangible targets led to a more realistic intervention strategy during the PPG, with a focus on community-based conservation approaches and sustainability of the interventions, among others through increased opportunities for participation, sustainable financing schemes, and more cohesive interaction among the project components.
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.			
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. At PIF, is PPG requested and approved? At CEO endorsement/			

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [5]	Response from UNEP and partners	Response from PPG team
	approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?			
	27. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?	April 14, 2013	April 15th, 2013	
Review Date (s)	First review*			
	Additional review (as necessary)			
	Additional review (as necessary)			
	Additional review (as necessary)			
	Additional review (as necessary)			

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility

(Version 5)

STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: May 08, 2013 Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking

Consultant(s):

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5347

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Yemen

PROJECT TITLE: Support to the Integrated Program for the Conservation and Sustainable Development of the Socotra Archipelago

GEF AGENCIES: UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Water and Environment (MOWE) / Environment Protection Authority (EPA); Deutsche Gesellschaft fÃ¼r Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH; UNDP

GEF FOCAL AREA: Multi Focal Area

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies): **Minor revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

The Socotra Archipelago (Yemen) is the largest, biologically most diverse island group in the Arabian Region. STAP therefore welcomes this project with its overall objective of reinforcing national capacity to manage and protect the Socotra Archipelago WHS through a sustainable land-use approach and improved management of Invasive Alien Species. Although principally a biodiversity project focussing on PAs, it draws on the LD focal area for funding of small-scale, environmentally-friendly sustainable land management activity in adjacent areas.

The proposal has a number of positive features that are scientifically and technically sound. In particular, STAP supports an â€˜umbrella' project approach bringing together SLM, IAS management, community based management of PAs, Conservation Financing Mechanisms, alternative livelihoods, and training, all as a coordinated partnership among a broad range of stakeholders, donors and GOY. STAP also appreciates the Annex 5 analysis of how the project will contribute to CBD Aichi targets. The PIF lists an impressive number of donor and scientific stakeholders, each with a specialist expertise to contribute to biodiversity conservation. The PIF is also candid about the potential difficulties of working on biodiversity issues in a country that has more high-profile development issues; and in a country where there is a lack of transparency and very limited experience of participation especially by poor local communities and women.

This last point mentioned above does, indeed, raise significant difficulties for the project which need to be addressed during the PPG period and fully elaborated in the project brief. Some of the points addressed below should ideally be in a revised PIF. GEF involvement in Socotra goes back to 1997. Since then there have been problems in building capacity and human resource capabilities, even in relatively straightforward projects. More sustained long-term financing is argued as the needed element according to the PIF. However, in STAP's view the poor performance of projects has probably been because they failed to address the major barriers to conservation in the Yemen â€“ poverty, poor livelihoods and inability to address stakeholders' needs. STAP understands that the PIF cannot at this stage detail how the project will proceed. Nevertheless, it might have been expected that the proposal would have a more robust analysis and self-evaluation of why and how previous projects have not delivered to full expectations. There are glaring gaps in information in the PIF that are made more urgent given the difficulties of working in the Yemen.

(1) Human pressures on Socotra. One of the foremost ecologists with local knowledge, Kay van Damme said in 2011[in the book Biodiversity Conservation in the Arabian Peninsula] that "An anthropogenic tsunami currently seems to be sweeping over Socotra." Allowing for a certain degree of hyperbole, it is clear that biodiversity is greatly being endangered by human pressures and that these are steadily increasing. It is strange that the proposal does not analyze this pressure in anything other than general terms. What are the population pressures, encroachment on PAs, introductions of potentially invasive species and so on? Any comprehensive strategy involving local people will have to have a full causative analysis of the political ecology and economy of Socotra in order to provide a baseline of information. There does not seem to be provision for this even in the Project Framework [In Component 1 there is mention of an output on ecosystem service assessment to be done under the management effectiveness of the PA network, but this is not what we mean here]. Ideally the change in pressure on biodiversity and implementation of sustainable practices should be tracked through the lifetime of the project â€“ see also below. STAP requests this analysis be included and that it be done by accepted political ecological analysis and/or rural sociology.

(2) Sustainable Land Management. Critical to this project will be the design and implementation of SLM for local communities, so that they not only have their livelihoods protected but also they respect the PAs and join in the effort to eradicate Invasive Alien Species. STAP notes that there are no

government agencies involved in agriculture, land use or forestry listed as involved in the project, and is worried that mistakes of the past will be re-created where ecologists attempt to run sustainable development enterprises with local people without sufficient background or experience on â€˜best practices' or analysis of livelihoods. Attention needs to be paid to issues such as soil conservation, land and water management practices and alterative livelihood promotion â€“ along with a robust form of participation, about which see below. STAP advises that lessons from other integrated conservation and development projects (ICDP) be used on which to draw lessons. A good starting might be the discussion of the conceptual flaws in the ICDP approach and their potential sustainability â€“ see Barrett, C.B. 1996. Are integrated conservation and development projects sustainable? World Development 23(7): 1073-1084. The 2009 book chapter by Andreas Kotsakis on â€˜Community participation in biodiversity conservation: localities of tension' could be another useful source. It should be noted that even INGOs such as WWF and IUCN now tread far more carefully in attempts at linking PAs and activities with local communities. STAP would have expected to see agriculture and land use partners involved in the project.

(3) Participation. The PIF mentions the need for local community participation plus also engagement more closely with women, and it also points out that there is little successful experience of promoting these aspects in the Yemen, despite previous projects that have tried. Again, the project needs to inform itself of lessons drawn from elsewhere on how local communities and gender involvement can be better assured â€“ rather than just hoped for. Such participation needs to be central to project decision-making. Participation can range from mere exchange of views right through to integral decision-making. There does have to be the local institutional structures for negotiation and discussion. The PIF is largely silent on these aspects of local governance which have proved to be crucial in other projects. Any of the standard texts on participation in the context of biodiversity conservation should be consulted and criteria be elaborated for the full project. A Nigerian example is in Eneji, VCO et al 2009. Problems of public participation in biodiversity conservation. Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal 27: 301-307.

(4) Global environmental benefits. Intended GEBs in Section A.1.5 are wholly devoted to protection of species. Not only should the project proposers look further at impact indicators in the GEF-5 Biodiversity FA Strategy, but they must also include indicators in the LD/FA Strategy. In ad dition, there should be a systematic monitoring and tracking of indicators that give good links to GEBs. In particular, STAP advises that changes in total system carbon would be an excellent cross-focal area indicator enabling the assessment of how far the project investment has benefitted both SLM and CC mitigation, not to mention its proxy link to biodiversity. Some more creative thinking on GEBs, impact indicators, tracking and monitoring should really be introduced at the PIF stage because of their central importance to the overall GEF Strategy.

Because this project is in an area of such high-value biodiversity and situated where interventions could prevent further loss of habitat and species, STAP advises that the project should proceed as Minor Revisions, and that attention must be paid to addressing the weak technical points noted above.

STAP advisory response	*Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed*

1.	**Consent**	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved. Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.
2.	**Minor revision required.**	STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development. Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency: (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.
3.	**Major revision required**	STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design. Follow-up: (i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.

RESPONSES OF THE PPG TEAM TO STAP COMMENTS

STAP Comment	Comment Accepted	Actions taken during PPG phase in response to STAP	References in ProDoc
1. Proposal should have a more robust self-analysis and self-evaluation of why and how previous projects have not delivered full expectations (e.g., failing	Yes	Evaluations of former projects have been analyzed and taken into account during the preparation phase (Infield & Sharaf Al Deen, 2003, Gawler & Mashour, 2009; Peutz, 2011), including critical evaluation of the Socotra WHS, (Hawa & Abdulhalim, 2013). Furthermore, a stakeholder workshop on Socotra allowed a full interaction with local communities to include and address stakeholders' needs (PPG Mission Report) and specific	Section 2.7 Section 3.3 Introductions to Comp. 1-4; Outcome 1.1

to address major barriers to conservation in Yemen and poverty, poor livelihoods and inability to address stakeholders' needs)		requests with regards to livelihoods. Both topics were fully integrated into the overall project intervention design, with a stronger emphasis on community-based approaches, capacity development and institutional strengthening throughout Component 4. The major needs local communities expressed at the workshop were: 1. (access to) education, 2. public involvement, 3. improved livelihoods. Public engagement and education are taken as very important issues for this project and are integrated in all components through community-based approaches to PAM, IAS and SLM and through capacity development for more inclusive approaches with the authorities as well. Education is a major part of the cross-cutting Component 4 (e.g., through Field Schools and also through an academic partnering and exchange programme) and is an integral part of mainstreaming strategies of the other components (e.g., SLM Component 3). Improvement of livelihoods and analysis of interaction between biodiversity and local communities are parts of Components 1 and 3 mainly, but in fact are woven into all components.	Outcome 3.1 Outcome 4.1 Section 3.8 Section 3.10 Annex 19 (PPG Mission Report)
2. Human Pressures - What are the population pressures, encroachments on PAs, introductions of potentially invasive species and so on - need for full causative analysis of political ecology and economy. The change in pressure on biodiversity and implementation of sustainable practices should be tracked through the lifetime of the project - analysis to be included	Yes	Human pressures are taken into account and there is a need for full causative analysis of the political ecology and economy. Recent work has been incorporated into the project strategy on this subject, e.g., on land tenure and SLM (Morris, 2014). The analysis between ecology and economy is now integrated as part of Component 4, and will be fed back and added to analysis in the other components. The changes in practices for SLM (Component 3) will be tracked through the lifetime of the project by using Tracking Tools for LD/SLM and the same will be done for BD (Component 1), including IAS (Component 2) (Appendix 15). Furthermore, full outputs under Components 3 and 4 are devoted to the analysis of ecosystem services, sustainable land management and livelihoods, and the project will follow improvements, and the interaction with biodiversity (Components 1 and 2) will be fed back into improved PA and IAS management. In relation to biodiversity, the PAMETT, as part of Component 1, will allow evaluation of improvement of PA	Section 2.1 - 3 Section 2.7 Section 3.1 Section 3.3 Outcome 3.1 Outcome 3.2 Appendix 15 (Tracking Tools)

and done by accepted political ecological analysis and/or rural sociology		management throughout the project.	
3. SLM - No government agencies involved in agriculture, land use or forestry listed as involved in the project. Attention needs to be paid to soil conservation, land and water management practices and alternative livelihood promotion along with a robust form of participation. STAP would have expected to see agriculture and land use partners involved in the project.	Yes	Specific outputs and activities under Component 3 directly relate these issues now: soil conservation, land and water management practices and alternative livelihood promotion. Land use partners are involved in the project through the support by local NGOs on Socotra (e.g., Beekeepers Association, etc.). A robust form of participation for all these issues is the core of the intervention strategy, promoting community-based IAS and SLM and through the Field School approach; also relevant in the communication and education strategy (see Components 3 and 4). Background literature proposed to indicate participation in comparable situations and lessons learned, such as Eneji et al. (2009), was analysed and included. The Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MAI) has, so far, not established an outpost on Socotra, an issue that might change with the full establishment of the independent Governorate's administration. Support to and engagement with the Governor's Office's agencies and staff is part of the project's engagement strategy.	Section 3.3 Output 4.1.6
4. Participation. The project needs to inform itself of lessons drawn from elsewhere on how local communities and gender involvement can be better assured rather than just hoped for. Participation can range from mere exchange of views right through to integral decision making. The PIF is largely silent on	Yes	Public engagement and participation have been analysed during the PPG phase using evaluations of former projects (e.g., Infield & Sharaf Al Deen, 2003, Gawler & Mashour, 2009) and the application of ICDPs on Socotra (Peutz, 2011), and the difficulties of DPs in Yemen in general (UN CCA, 2011) were taken into account. Participation is envisaged as a major strategy cutting across the entirety of interventions of this project, and therefore has become a large part of local stakeholder engagement for community-based PAM, IAS and SLM. In Component 4, it is e.g. combined with education and knowledge transfer in the Field Schools (FS). Participation of local communities is vital in integral decision making, and this has been incorporated in all components	Section 2.5 Section 2.7 Section 3.3 Outcomes 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 4.2 Section 3.10 Section 5 Appendix 12

the aspects of local governance.		(e.g., Component 3 in SLM plans and meetings). Local governance is equally very important for this project, and a cross-cutting aim is to establish, together with all relevant stakeholders and authorities, including the newly instituted Governor's Office, an Integrated Conservation Management Framework (ICMF) to better govern the WHS. Yet main governance support is largely covered by another GEF intervention on Socotra implemented by UNDP, the SGBP (See Section 2.7) and the project is aimed at synergy with this and other initiatives while reducing overlap. Gender involvement is also very important, and is on the agenda for all components - the project has received the support of the Socotra Women Association and the Socotra Beekeepers Association, two of the largest NGOs on Socotra consisting of and mainly led by women (Appendix 12 – Co-financing and Support Letters).	
5. GEBs. Look further at impact indicators in GEF-5 BD FA strategy and include indicators in the LD FA strategy. Changes in total system carbon would be an excellent cross-focal area indicator enabling the assessment of how far the project investment has benefitted both SLM and CC mitigation (and proxy link to BD). More creative thinking needed on GEBs, impact indicators, tracking and monitoring.	Yes	Impact indicators of the GEF-5 FAs LD and BD are adhered to in the revised logframe formulations and are applied in the tracking tools (Appendix 15). A detailed overview of the GEBs relevant to the project and cross-references to the outputs and activities is now included in the project design (Section 3.1). A comprehensive M&E plan is devised and costed (Appendix 7). For PA management (Component 1), PAMETT (tracking tools for management evaluation, which also include impact indicator tracking) will be used. On changes in total system carbon, no data is currently available for this indicator, but it is taken into account and will be analysed with the application of the spatial tools, integrating different data layers (Components 1, 3 and 4).	Section 3.1 Appendix 4 (Results Framework) Appendix 7 (Costed M&E Plan) Appendix 15 (Tracking Tools)

COMPARISON BETWEEN PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK AT PIF AND CEO ENDORSEMENT STAGE

Component **PIF**	Component **CEO doc**	Outcome **PIF**	Outcome **CEO doc**	Comments on changes
1. Improved Management effectiveness of the Protected Areas Network in the Socotra WHS	1. BD conservation and PA Management	1.1 The management effectiveness of the existing PA network is measurably improved taking stock of recent developments in conservation science, flow of ecosystem services and climate change scenarios. 1.2 A financing mechanism to sustain the long-term conservation of the Socotra WHS is developed and operational	1.1 A BD-PAM strategy is developed, incl. an updated conservation data baseline and a revised Conservation Zoning Plan (CZP). 1.2 The BD-PAM strategy is operational, incl. improved management and expansion of the PA network, and coordinated with the integrated conservation management framework (ICMF, see 4.1.3).	Old outcome 1.1 is split into two outcomes, now incorporating a stronger strategic linkage to IAS and SLM through the development of an integrated conservation management framework, which is now covered in component 4.1. Old outcome 1.2 on sustainable financing is equally moved to component 4, also to include components 2 and 3. Component 4 is considerably re-organized and strengthened, based on stakeholder feedback and STAP comments (see under component 4 for more detail)
2. Invasive Species Management	2. Invasive Species Management	2.1 A community-based management framework to control Invasive Alien Species (IAS) in the Socotra WHS is established and operational, and (a) institutional capacity is measurably improved and (b) IAS impact on the WHS is measurably reduced - providing the basis for replication at the national and regional level	2.1 A community-based management strategy to control IAS in the Socotra WHS is devised, incl. an updated IAS data baseline. 2.2 The IAS management strategy is operational and coordinated with the integrated conservation management framework (ICMF, see 4.1.3).	Minor reformulation and stronger linkage to an integrated management approach (component 4.1).
3. Sustainable Land	3. Sustainable Land	3.1 An integrated Sustainable Land Management Strategy (SLMS supporting the development of	3.1 A community-based strategy for SLM in the Socotra WHS is devised,	Minor reformulation and stronger linkage to an

Management	Management	implementation of environmentally friendly subsistence rural 'productions sectors' (e.g. subsistence pastoralism, small family-owned date palm plantations, small household-scale vegetable gardens, etc.)- for the Socotra WHS to combat desertification and land degradation and improve and sustain traditional livelihoods in the face of climate change *(linked with EPA/GIZ "conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity" program)*	underpinned by an SLM data baseline. 3.2 The SLM management strategy is operational and coordinated with the integrated conservation management framework (ICMF, see 4.1.3).	integrated management approach (component 4.1).
4. Institutional Strengthening & Capacity Building	4. Enabling Environment	4.1 National Capacity for Integrated Strategic Programming for Environmental Protection in EPA and other government partners in the WHS is significantly increased – taking stock of lessons and achievement of prior initiatives (GEF and non- GEF) - *(linked with EPA/GIZ "conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity" program)*	4.1 Institutional, organizational and individual capacities are strengthened to better manage the environment on Socotra. 4.2 Information and knowledge supports environmental management. 4.3 A suite of financing mechanisms sustains the implementation of the Integrated Conservation Management Framework (ICMF) of the Socotra WHS in the long-term.	Based on STAP review and stakeholder comments, comp. 4 is now strengthened by merging elements of comps. 1-3 and 5 into a component that covers the enabling environment to support the long-term sustainability of measures under components 1-3. Thus, stakeholder needs can be better addressed and integrated approaches for BD, IAS and SLM be better promoted. This will be achieved through a) a strategic capacity development plan (4.1.1); b) an integrated conservation management framework (4.1.3); and c) by establishing field schools for environmental management (4.1.6) to test and implement BD, IAS and SLM measures with strong local participation and in locations as close as possible to their livelihoods. This will be underpinned by outcome 4.2, encompassing communication, information and awareness campaigns and results-based project management (old component 5.1) Outcome 4.3 picks up the old outcome 1.2, but broadens its approach to BD, IAS and SLM
5. Knowledge Management and		5.1 Costed Monitoring & Evaluation Plan developed and		Old 5.1 is now covered by 4.2.3

Monitoring & Evaluation		implemented, and lessons learned documented and widely disseminated - *(linked with EPA/GIZ "conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity" program)*		

Comparison of OUTPUTS

Outputs **PIF**	Outputs **CEO doc**	Comments on changes
1.1.1 Updated design of the WHS PA network (focusing on the network of Nature Sanctuaries – see maps in Annex 1) on the basis of recent findings and research on terrestrial and marine biodiversity and human resource use, including i.e. recent approaches in conservation genetics and spatial conservation planning, ecosystem services assessments and climate change prediction models, considering especially ecological economics, vulnerability and trade-off analysis and CC mitigation planning 1.1.2 A unified management structure for the Socotra WHS is established to reflect the changing governance structure in line with Yemen's decentralization process and addressing the recommendations of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre 1.1.3 Improved professional capacity of national GoY entities (esp. EPA staff) to support the above unified and participatory management of the WHS 1.2.1 Legal, institutional and management framework for the "Socotra WHS Trust Fund" (TF) to provide long-term financing to support the management costs of the Socotra WHS is established – taking stock of achievements and lessons from prior GEF interventions.	1.1.1 The existing PAs and their management are evaluated. 1.1.2 Baseline studies and analyses on BD and PA conducted. 1.1.3 Revision of the Conservation Zoning Plan (CZP). 1.2.1 Management plans of existing and new PAs reviewed/developed and implemented. 1.2.2 Special management plans aimed at targeted species conservation and resource management developed and implemented.	Based on stakeholder input, old 1.1.1 is now covered by different, more specific outputs on existing and new PAs, while technical details were maintained in the respective activities. Old 1.1.2 and 1.1.3 were transferred to new outputs 4.1.1, 4.1.4 (capacity development and administrative capacities) as well as 4.1.3 (integrated conservation management framework) Old outputs 1.2.1-3 now outputs 4.3.1-3

1.2.2 A pool of national, regional and international donors and key local institutions are engaged in TF design and a donor conference for the capitalization of the Trust Fund is organized 1.2.3 The Socotra WHS TF is capitalized and operational		
2.1.1 All existing invasive and potentially invasive species identified; current and potential impacts of IAS on biodiversity, integrity of the PA system, and local economy are valued, and data used as a basis to develop and implement community-based strategies for IAS management 2.1.2 Pathways for IAS are identified and strategies for the prevention and control of new infestations by potential IAS are developed and implemented 2.1.3 Enabling policy and institutional environment, including legislation and cost-recovery mechanisms (i.e. through service fees) for the management of IAS is developed/strengthened 2.1.4 Awareness levels on IAS are raised and relevant information materials on risks, economic and social impacts and management of IAS are developed and utilized by key stakeholders including local communities 2.1.5 Prevention and control measures for IAS mainstreamed in local trade, transport and travel sectors and across the production landscape	2.1.1 All existing invasive and potentially invasive species are identified, including their direct or potential impacts on PA and BD management and ecosystem services. 2.1.2 A community-based IAS management strategy is developed, incorporating guidelines for policy, legal and institutional frameworks. 2.2.1 Pathways for IAS are identified and measures for priority prevention and control are developed and implemented.	Old outputs 2.1.1-5 are maintained, though slightly reformulated in 2.1.1 – 2.1.3, with a stronger emphasis on community involvement, as per STAP review. Testing, implementation and training on IAS measures is covered by the field schools for environmental management (4.1.6) Elements of capacity development and sustainable financing are equally maintained, but re-emerge in the strengthened component 4 (4.1.1, 4.3.1-3)

3.1.1 SLM Strategy (including guidelines for policy, legal and regulatory frameworks) is developed on the basis of (a) existing extensive scientific and traditional knowledge information base, (b) data found in the existing EPA central database and Decisions Support System (DSS) for the Socotra WHS and (c) selected additional studies that may be commissioned through the GEF project if/as required (to be defined during project preparation) 3.1.2 Priority and innovative integrated sustainable land and water management measures identified in the SLM Strategy are implemented, integrated in the EPA (and other GoY departments) programs and local team structures, and lessons learned are widely disseminated (output 5.1.2). *[all interventions will be fully aligned with and complementary to EPA/GIZ-supported program "sustainable use of biodiversity"].*	3.1.1 Land degradation status and threats of current land management are identified and mapped, including existing or projected impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services. 3.1.2 A community-based SLM strategy developed, incorporating guidelines for policy, legal and institutional frameworks. 3.2.1 Priority sustainable land management measures developed and implemented.	Similar to component 2, old outputs 2.1.1-2 are maintained, though slightly reformulated, with a stronger emphasis on community involvement, as per STAP review. Testing, implementation and training on IAS measures is covered by the field schools for environmental management (4.1.6) Elements of capacity development and sustainable financing are equally maintained, but re-emerge in the strengthened component 4 (4.1.1, 4.3.1-3)
4.1.1 A Comprehensive Institutional Strengthening and associated on-the-job Capacity Building Program for local government entities and EPA is developed and implemented 4.1.2 The inter-agency coordination capacity of the EPA and local government is significantly increased, within the framework of the new "island-wide" government authority being established for the Management of the Socotra WHS – in follow-up to and consolidating the results of the former and ongoing GEF-funded projects.	4.1.1 A strategic capacity development plan (CDP) for environmental management is prepared. 4.1.2 An ecosystem services framework informs management and sustainable financing schemes. 4.1.3 Recommendations for an integrated conservation management framework (ICMF) for the Socotra WHS are developed (closely linked to the BD-PAM, IAS and SLM strategies and the capacity development plan). 4.1.4 Capacity development measures implemented for key administrative partners. 4.1.5 Special programmes for long-term enhancement of policing and academic capacities planned and launched.	Elements of the capacity development strategy now include ecosystem services (4.1.2), administrative capacities (4.1.4), enforcement/policing and academic capacities (4.1.5) as well as community-based and participatory implementation of measures for BD conservation, IAS and SLM through the field schools (4.1.6). Old outputs 5.1.1-2 were merged into component 4, now numbered 4.2.1-3. The Socotra Trust Fund for sustainable financing was initially incorporated into component 1 (1.2.1-3); it is now an integral part of the enabling environment

	4.1.6 Field schools for community-based environmental management are established and operational. 4.2.1 An information management strategy is developed. 4.2.2 A communication and awareness strategy is developed. 4.2.3 Results-based project management and M&E is established. 4.3.1 A comprehensive Socotra WHS sustainable finance plan is developed. 4.3.2 A Socotra Trust Fund is established. 4.3.3 At least two local income generating mechanisms are developed.	(comp. 4, 4.3.1-3)
5.1.1 A costed Monitoring & Evaluation Plan is developed at preparation stage, revised at project inception and (a) implemented in support of adaptive project management and (b) integrated as part of the management practices of EPA and other local government entities 5.1.2 Information materials on recent findings and lessons learned in biodiversity conservation, IAS, sustainable land management and climate change issues and good practices are developed and widely disseminated locally, as well as at national and regional level (e.g. by inclusion of in EPA's and Ministry of Education's awareness and education programs with local wildlife clubs and in school curricula at the local level)		Merged into component 4 (4.2.1-3)

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS[6]

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: USD 150,000				
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	***GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount ($)***			***In-kind contribution by project partners ($)***
	Budgeted Amount	***Amount Spent To Date***	***Amount Committed***	
1201 - Project Coordinator	22,370	25,370	4,000	4,000 (SGN)
1202 - Lead Scientific Consultant	18,000	9,000	11,000	
1203 - GEF Programming/ PPG Advisor	18,000	9,000	11,000	
1204 - Marine and Coastal BD Specialist	1,600	1,600		
1205 - Invasive Species Specialist	7,600	4,000	4,000	
1206 - Sustainable Land Management	8,000	4,800	4,700	
1208 - Sustainable Finance	3,000	2,700	2,700	
1209 - National Coordinator	4,620	0		5,000 (GIZ)
1210 - Local technical team	3,600	1,828	2,772	
1211 - Miscellaneous small tasks	3,600	15,989	1,050	10,000 (EPA)
1601 - Travel	31,370	27,322	600	
3301 - Meetings and Workshops	17,700	2,650		40,000 (FoS, Univ. Brno, Univ. Rome)
5201 - Logistics and Reporting costs	10,540	3,588	331	2,000 (SGN)
Total	**150,000**	**107,847**	**42,153**	**51,000**

[6] 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)

Not applicable