



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY  
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

Naoko Ishii  
CEO and Chairperson

January 22, 2015

Dear Council Member:

UNDP as the Implementing Agency for the project entitled: *Argentina: Mainstreaming Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Production Practices of Small Producers to Protect the Biodiversity of High Value Conservation Forests in the Atlantic Forest, Yungas and Chaco*, has submitted the attached proposed project document for CEO endorsement prior to final approval of the project document in accordance with UNDP procedures.

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

We have today posted the proposed project document on the GEF website at [www.TheGEF.org](http://www.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,

Naoko Ishii  
Chief Executive Officer and Chairperson

Attachment: GEFSEC Project Review Document

cc: 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](http://TheGEF.org)

## **PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION**

Project Title: Mainstreaming sustainable use of biodiversity in production practices of small producers to protect the biodiversity of high value conservation forests in the Atlantic Forest, Yungas and Chaco			
Country:	Argentina	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	5338
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4829
Other Executing Partner:	Secretariat for Environment and Sustainable Development (SAyDS)	Submission Date:	Dec. 19, 2014
GEF Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	60
Name of Parent Program	NA	Project Agency Fee (\$):	438,900

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

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-2	Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation	Output 2.1. Policies and regulatory frameworks (at least two at the provincial level) for production sectors. Output 2.2. National and sub-national land-use plans (from 0 to > 50% of small producers present sustainable management plans with non-timber forest products at the farm level covering 200,000 hectares) that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation	GEFTF	4,620,000	23,687,400
<b>Total project costs</b>				<b>4,620,000</b>	<b>23,687,400</b>

## **B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK**

**Project Objective:** Strengthening the management framework for sustainable use of biodiversity<sup>3</sup> to increase the protection of high conservation-value forests in Argentina

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co financing \$
1. Sustainable use models of native forest biodiversity in areas of high conservation-value in 3 ecosystems	TA	High conservation value forest protected through development and application of sustainable use of non-timber forest products NTFP, measured by: – Area (ha) of forest with benefits for the sustainable use of biodiversity in areas Sustainable Management	1.1 <b>Technical bases consolidated for sustainable-use of biodiversity</b> in areas of restricted use as defined by the Forest Law (Category II – yellow areas) in selected forest landscapes of 3ecosystems and 3 Provinces: – Technical limits for NTFP harvesting/carrying capacity, and harvesting seasons	GEF TF	1,951,300	7,593,410

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

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

<sup>3</sup> The project will emphasize non timber forest products (NTFP) defined as *all the goods of biological origin (other than timber, fuelwood, and charcoal) and the services provided by forests, other forest areas and trees outside forests.*

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co financing \$
		<p>Plan (SMP) areas – Level II (i.e., landscape level): a) Atlantic Forest (Misiones Province): from 0 ha to 40,000 ha; b) Yungas (Jujuy Province): from 0 ha to 60,000 ha; c) Chaco (Salta Province): from 0 ha to 100,000 ha.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Continued presence (% occurrence) of key animal species at the site level: a) Atlantic Forest (40,000 ha): 5 species, (intervention sites: % occurrence is maintained or increased; in control sites: % occurrence decreases; b) Yungas (60,000 ha): 8 species (intervention sites: the presence of key species is maintained; control sites: absence of key species) ;c) Chaco (100,000 ha): 4 species (intervention sites: % occurrence is maintained or increased; control sites: % occurrence decreases).</li> <li>– % of SMP that include NTFP: a) Jujuy Province: from 0 to &gt; 50% of small producers present SMP with NTFP; b) Misiones Province: from 0 &gt; 50% of small producers present SMP with NTFP; c) Salta Province: from 0 &gt; 50% of small producers present SMP with NTFP.</li> <li>– Change in the ecosystem health index (ISEARL)<sup>4</sup> for the project landscapes: a) Atlantic Forest: from 0.61 to &gt; 0.7; b) Yungas: from 0.48 to &gt; 0.7; c) Chaco: from 0.44 to &gt; 0.7.</li> <li>– Coverage of forests in Category II in SMP Areas – Level II: a) Atlantic Forest: 0.77%; b) Yungas: 0.55%; c) Chaco: 0.76%</li> </ul> <p>Note: Control Sites (without</p>	<p>(systematization of information and traditional knowledge on species currently used; bio-ecological studies and development of harvesting models for potential species)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Geo-referenced data-base of native species and NTFP potential as an input for the approval/oversight/evaluation system of new management plans (under output 3.2).</li> </ul> <p><b>1.2 Replicable and sustainable production models at farm level for different biodiversity-based products.</b> This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Comparative studies of land use alternatives existing in target landscapes and in terms of socio-economic and biodiversity benefits</li> <li>– Assessment of the cost-benefit of different small farmers biodiversity based production</li> <li>– Validated proposals for diversified production models at farm level (NTFP, agro-forestry systems, fauna etc.).</li> </ul> <p><b>1.3 Small farmers technical information and capacities improved for developing and implementing management plans for sustainable use of biodiversity under the Forest Law:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Small farmers (2,000 producers/users) trained on the environmental /social/economic benefits and best production practices for NTFP sustainable-use (best practice manuals; dissemination/ awareness building; training)</li> <li>– Management plans developed that incorporate biodiversity based production models alongside sustainable agroforestry &amp; implemented under the forest law</li> <li>– Technical assistance for implementation of the management plans.</li> </ul>			

<sup>4</sup> ISEARL: Ecosystem Health Index Adjusted to Real Local Conditions.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co financing \$
		project intervention): % of forest cover decreases according to the annual deforestation rates for each province <sup>5</sup> : a) Atlantic Forest: 0.75%; b) Yungas: 0.46%; c) Chaco: 0.73%.				
2. Markets and financing mechanisms to ensure economic and social sustainability of Sustainable Management of the native forest	TA	<p>Viability and sustainability of NTFP increased as an alternative production and livelihood option as measured by:</p> <p>Seven (7) categories of NTFP products incorporated into a upgraded “Native forests” brand; improved traceability system (SICMA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– At least 20 species<sup>6</sup> incorporated into the “Native forests” collective brand.</li> <li>– Producers (including women producers) in three ecoregions with Social Tax certification<sup>7</sup> to formally access the NTFP markets: a) Atlantic Forest (Misiones Province, Department of San Pedro): from 39 (30 men and 9 women) to 350 (175 men and 175 women); b) Yungas (Jujuy Province, Department of Valle Grande): from 1 (men) to 450 (225 men and 225 women); c) Chaco (Salta Province, Department of Rivadavia): from 96 (66 men and 30 women) to 600 (300 men and 300 women).</li> <li>– Change in the flow of financing (USD) for sustainable use initiatives measured by the increase in approved management plans that include the sustainable use of NTFP: a) Misiones Province (Atlantic Forest): from \$0 to \$30,000; b) Jujuy (Yungas): from \$0 to \$30,000; c) Salta (Dry</li> </ul>	<p><b>2.1 Value chains improved for 7 biodiversity based product-categories</b> (food products, alternative medicine products, artisanal crafts, dyes, fauna [non-food], tar [multiple uses], and ornamental products).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Supply-chain gaps identified and constraints removed to increase efficiencies and equity</li> <li>– Increased access to markets by improved links of producers with buyers; expanded information on market potentials and requirements (e.g., sanitary restrictions) to improve the supply/demand equation</li> <li>– Consumers aware and informed on sustainable use of biodiversity (products; values; additional benefits, etc.)</li> </ul> <p><b>2.2 Access to financing increased for commercialization and technical assistance of biodiversity products</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Capacity building of small producers to access existing sources including Forest Law subsidies and credit for agroforestry</li> <li>– Mainstreaming of technical knowledge and best practices in existing agricultural grant programs and rural credits</li> </ul> <p><b>2.3 Community-organization improved for biodiversity based products and marketing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Targeted capacity program for community organizations and cooperatives in target landscapes for biodiversity based production and organizational skills</li> </ul>	GEF TF	1,300,000	7,566,760

<sup>5</sup> Cumulative rate of deforestation over a 5-year period.

<sup>6</sup> Selected through a feasibility analysis performed during the PPG and categorized as a “safe investment.”

<sup>7</sup> The Social Tax is an optional tax regime created with the objective of facilitating and promoting the incorporation into the formal economy persons in a situation of social vulnerability.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co financing \$
		<p>Chaco): from \$0 to \$30,000.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Estimated proportion<sup>8</sup> of average annual gross income for small producers (Family Farm Nuclei [NAF]) (including women producers) as a result of the sale and sustainable use of the NTFP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Misiones Province (Atlantic Forest): from 15% to between 35% and 45% (proportion of women in the NAF is maintained at 0.50);</li> <li>b) Jujuy Province (Yungas): from 15% to between 35% and 45% (proportion of women in the NAF is maintained at 0.51);</li> <li>c) Salta Province (Chaco): from 25% to between 35% and 45% (proportion of women in the NAF is maintained at 0.50)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	(management, negotiation, marketing training; access improved to market information and needs)			
3. Governance framework at national and provincial levels for sustainable management of NTFP of native forests landscapes	TA	<p>Strengthened regulatory, oversight and planning of NTFP management increases sustainability at scale, measured by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Proposals submitted regarding types of new and/or reformed policies or regulations that promote and/or facilitate the sustainable use of biodiversity in 4.4 million ha: From 0 to having a protocol for sustainable management of the NTFP adopted by the Forest Unit for 3 ecoregions, and updates made in at least one province that increase the proposed requirements (improving sustainability).</li> <li>– Change in the capacity of civil society organizations (CSOs)<sup>9</sup> and the provincial governments to implement and monitor the sustainable use of BD in landscapes as measured by the project's Capacity Scorecard:</li> </ul>	<p><b>3.1. Regulatory framework and safeguards optimize sustainable use management to conserve biodiversity at landscape level:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Proposals for regulations on harvesting limits, best practices, and oversight mechanisms that take into account forests of high value for conservation of biodiversity</li> <li>– Proposal for a minimum standards law on sustainable-use of biodiversity in production landscapes (complementary to Forest Law)</li> <li>– Proposals for formal agreements between owners of lands with biodiversity conservation value and small producers to guarantee access to lands for harvesting of NTFP</li> <li>– Strengthening of inter-institutional coordination mechanisms (CONADIBIO) for development of regulations and coordination of policies</li> </ul>	GEF TF	1,000,000	7,374,830

<sup>8</sup> The baseline data will be validated during project implementation.

<sup>9</sup> Baseline scores for CSOs will be established during the first year of the project.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co financing \$
		<p>a) CSOs: i) Salta Province (Chaco): baseline + up to 30%; ii) Jujuy Province (Yungas): baseline + up to 30%; c) Misiones Province (Atlantic Forest): baseline + up to 30%;</p> <p>b) Provincial governments: i) Salta Province (Chaco): from 29.4% to 59.4%; ii) Jujuy Province (Yungas): from 35.3% to 65.3%; iii) Misiones Province (Bosque Atlántico): from 41.2% to 71.2%.</p> <p>– Persons/officials trained in the Application of the Forest Law:</p> <p>a) Atlantic Forest: i) Misiones Province<sup>10</sup>: 44 (4 persons in the forest sector + 40 persons in the biodiversity sector);</p> <p>b) Yungas: i) Jujuy Province: 24 (4 persons in the forest sector + 20 persons in the biodiversity sector); ii) Additional province (replication of project results): 50;</p> <p>c) Chaco: i) Salta Province: 33 (13 persons in the forest sector +20 persons in the biodiversity sector); ii) Additional province (replication of project results): from 0 to 50.</p>	<p>regarding sustainable use of biodiversity</p> <p><b>3.2 Strengthened oversight of Forest Law management plans at farm level to monitor biodiversity based products in pilot provinces:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Traceability system for selected products developed and strengthened;</li> <li>– Mechanisms for M&amp;E of sustainable use plans (including staff training; improved and follow up procedures of individual plans)</li> </ul> <p><b>3.3. Landscape level implementation of sustainable-use management through:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Management plan approval systems that links numbers and location of existing plans with species and harvesting limits at landscape level (data-base, training of technicians and decision makers)</li> <li>– Guidelines for updating Provincial Native Forest Land Zoning based on potentials and limitation of sustainable use of biodiversity</li> <li>– Forest Law Provincial enforcement authorities of other provinces in 3 ecosystems strengthened through capacity building program for replication of Project results</li> </ul>			
4. Monitoring and Evaluation					148,700	0
Subtotal					4,400,000	22,535,000
Project management Cost (PMC) <sup>11</sup>				GEF TF	220,000	1,152,400
<b>Total project costs</b>					<b>4,620,000</b>	<b>23,687,400</b>

\*Because the project's actions are geographically dispersed over three ecoregions (Chaco, Yungas, and the Upper Parana Atlantic Forest) and implementation is decentralized in three provinces within the ecoregions, the project M&E will be given greater emphasis and as such is included as a fourth project component. This strategy will allow for more effective M&E of the project's benefits, including women's equal participation and the enhanced conservation of globally important biodiversity. Project M&E budgeting in a separated component resulted in a slight reduction of the funds originally estimated during the PIF stage for Component 1, which will not affect the delivery of the related project outcomes.

<sup>10</sup> Misiones is the only province that contains the Atlantic Forest Ecoregion.

<sup>11</sup> PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

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

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
Local Government	Government of Jujuy	Cash	550,000
Local Government	Government of Misiones (MERNR)	Cash	400,000
Local Government	Government of Misiones (MERNR)	In-kind	150,000
Local Government	Government of Salta (MAPS)	Cash	75,000
Local Government	Government of Salta (MAPS)	In-kind	475,000
National Government	SAYDS	Cash	19,337,400
National Government	SAYDS	In-kind	200,000
National Government	Ministry of Agriculture	Cash	2,000,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Cash	500,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>23,687,400</b>

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

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEFTF	Biodiversity	Argentina	4,620,000	438,900	5,058,900
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				<b>4,620,000</b>	<b>438,900</b>	<b>5,058,900</b>

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

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

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

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	45,000	0	45,000
National/Local Consultants	1,227,832	0	1,227,832

**G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? NA**

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

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

**A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>12</sup>**

**A.1** National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable  
No change.

**A.2** GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.  
No change.

<sup>12</sup> For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

**A.3** The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:  
No change.

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

1. The project design is closely aligned with the original PIF. The component structure remains the same with a slight adjustment in component 1 funding as the M&E component has been separated. The strengthening of this monitoring system is important given the large geographical coverage of the project and the need to ensure that monitoring of project results is undertaken uniformly throughout the different geographical areas and across the different species and production approaches thereby giving sound data to draw conclusions and to provide robust input to the regulatory framework. The outputs remain the same although Output 1.1 has had the wording adjusted to better reflect that the work to set up the technical bases for sustainable-use of biodiversity would be undertaken through the project in 3 provinces not 4. Therefore, as mentioned in PIF, the three focus provinces will be Salta, Jujuy, and Misiones, while Chaco Province will only be taken into consideration for replicating the project's successful experiences (Component 3). The overall targets and outcomes remain the same although there are some slight modifications in the way the outcomes and indicators are expressed to reflect further development of indicators, baselines and targets during the PPG phase. These changes do not represent a departure from the project's strategy as defined originally in the PIF nor will they have an impact on the funds (GEF) originally budgeted. An additional USD 2 million has been raised in co-funding to ensure delivery of outputs. During project implementation specific amounts of private sector funding that have been identified in the preparatory stage (cash and in kind) but not included in the co-funding letters, will be fully quantified along with additional resources to be levered as supply chain work progresses.

2. The Government of Argentina (GoA) has made highly significant efforts to halt deforestation through the Forest Law that restricts land-uses that degrade forests. However, in the baseline for a number of reasons it will fall short of its potential as a vehicle for introducing biodiversity-based production at scales needed to generate global environment benefits.

3. The GoA has placed high priority on poverty alleviation and sustainable production and has developed several programs that represent a robust baseline for this project, which has been estimated at US\$ 243.2 million over 5 years for the project area. The Forest Law is a key part of the baseline providing resources for the provinces to strengthen capacities to oversee and implement the law in their jurisdictions in addition to monetary compensation for land holders. Of the total baseline, US\$27.2 million will advance information and know-how on sustainable production and sustainable forest management (SFM) models. Of this, US\$ 4.4 million (Forest Law) will build capacities of small farmers but will focus mainly on agroforestry systems and selective timber extraction as information on NTFP is scarce or poorly developed. US\$3.3 million will be invested in universities and technical centers on NTFP and fauna research producing important but dispersed information with no mechanisms for transfer to decision makers and production extension services. The SAyDS will invest US\$ 2 million on a biodiversity "observatory" with information to generate data for sound decision-making and offers a vehicle for inclusion of sustainable use of biodiversity data including NTFP. The SAyDS through a World Bank loan will set up training centers for SFM and presents an opportunity to upscale and replicate information on NTFP and other biodiversity uses. It will also develop community skills for participatory SFM for small scale producers with no legal land tenure and indigenous peoples. This will provide a foundation for landscape level approaches needed to ensure sustainable use of biodiversity within ecological limits.

4. Financial support for rural production activities is estimated at US\$177.8 million of which US\$100 million is from the Forest Law with 90% for large and medium farmers and 10% key-marked for small-scale farmers. To date the allocation for small scale farmers has been under-subscribed but could be levered for NTFP and other sustainable-use with high biodiversity benefits particularly in small holdings located near the larger remaining forest blocks in the yellow zone. US\$77.8 million will be available from the MAGyP programs for on-the-ground investment to small-scale producers that could potentially have a decisive role in supporting the uptake of techniques and practices for NTFP and guiding more sustainable production practices in areas already cleared. For governance, US\$38.2 million baseline investment will support provinces for Forest Law oversight. In the first years of the Law these resources have been spent on infrastructure; equipment; staffing and building capacity to review and approve management plans for large



and medium farmers. The provinces are now looking to expand capacities to support small-scale farmers and include new approaches and this presents an opportunity for advancing sustainable-use of biodiversity including NTFP.

5. Without the GEF investment Forest Law subsidies are likely to be used by landowners for permitted land uses on the areas already cleared on their farms and also will be supported by agricultural programs that promote more traditional agriculture. Restrictions on deforestation will limit production to the small areas previously cleared, reducing revenue, and increasing the likelihood of illegal encroachment into forested areas. When small producers do use subsidies for NTFP production this will have a site-specific focus without considering cumulative effects across the landscape and potential negative effects on species viability in the long term. Forest Law subsidies will provide initial incentives for a shift to NTFP but profitability and income generation will be limited by market constraints increasing the possibility of abandoning farms and immigration to cities. Also Forest Law subsidies will continue to be under-subscribed by small producers limiting their overall effect on conservation of forests. An opportunity to increase the value of the remaining forest through biodiversity based production such as NTFP would be lost and with it the chance to contribute to the conservation of the Upper Parana Atlantic Forest whilst it still has viable fragments and the Yungas whilst it is still in good conservation status.

6. The GoA promotes several programs related directly to the project but overall the different programs act in an independent and focused manner, which reduces the effectiveness of their actions. Without the GEF's participation, coordination would be difficult and the resources allocated to each program would not supplement one another efficiently.

7. Among the related programs within SAYDS, it is worth highlighting the following: a) The Social Forestry Program (PROSOBO) targeted to peasants, indigenous peoples, islanders, and small producers living in the forests. Its purpose is to provide technical and financial assistance for carrying out activities for the sustainable preservation, restoration and harnessing of native forests and the biodiversity of their ecosystems; b) The Program on the Protection of Wild Fauna Habitats aimed at helping preserve the habitat of wild fauna through technical, logistical and financial support to existing or future natural protected areas owned by the province or municipality; c) The National Program for the Sustainable Use and Management of Wild Species seeks to reappraise ecosystems by using wild fauna to avoid its replacement by intensive production systems and, in turn, benefit local communities who have historically used these resources; d) The National Program for the Conservation of Endangered Species carries out actions to preserve endangered species and their habitats, raising awareness among the public at large and stakeholders on the status of these species, bring about a decrease in hunting pressure, outline strategies for preserving their habitats, carry out activities to rescue and reintroduce animals into the wild environment, study proposals and others; e) the National Program for Flora Management has the purpose of carrying out coordinated actions for the comprehensive management of flora at the national level; f) The Native Forest and Biodiversity Component within the Project on Sustainable Management of Natural Resources aims, among other objectives, at the participatory formulation of an Investment Project for the sustainable management and protection of native forests and their biodiversity to be implemented by the National Government; g) The Program on Non-Timber Forest Products has among its main objectives the collection and systematization of information on NTFP from native forests, with the purpose of keeping statistics on their production; to appropriately value and appraise them as an engine of development and as an essential tool for sustainable management; and to incentivize research and management related to the above and their adequate trading.

8. The MAGyP supports various rural development programs of which three are important to this project - Inclusive Rural Development (PRODERI); Rural Areas Development (PRODEAR) and Family Agriculture Development (PRODAF). Collectively these support small producers through improving productivity and income generation to reduce pressure on agricultural expansion and forestland. An Agricultural Services Program (PROSAP) focuses on improving rural infrastructure of small and medium farmers, improved irrigation and drainage infrastructure, rural electricity and small and medium agribusinesses. It includes actions providing direct benefits for optimizing the current use of agricultural lands, including the management and conservation of natural resources, improvements in irrigation and drainage infrastructure, rural electrification and agri-businesses. Likewise, INTA, a decentralized government agency under MAGyP, carries out research and technological innovation in value chains, regions, and territories for improving the country's competitiveness and sustainable rural development. Its efforts aim at innovation as the engine for development and at integrating capabilities to generate knowledge and technologies and support the sector through extension, information, and communication.

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: NA

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:

9. Risks that could hinder achievement of the project’s objective and the measures for their mitigation are provided below.

Risk	Rating	Risk Mitigation Strategy
Financing shortfalls and risk associated with potential harvest failures may undermine the uptake and sustainability of biodiversity production models by small producers	Medium	The Project will work with the Forest law to increase the flow of funding from existing resources for sustainable-use that are currently undersubscribed. The level of Forest Law subsidies are attractive for small scale producers and will minimize the risk perceived from biodiversity based production. The Law is expected to continue at least at the same level for small producers as a Government priority. The project will also promote a law on Minimum Standards for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity, to supplement Law 26,331 with regard to the allocation of resources for the sustainable production of biodiversity in high-value conservation areas. It will also work with existing agriculture subsidies and credit for small farmers to incorporate NTFP production increasing finance availability. Markets and supply chains work is designed to increase revenues from NTFP and complement income which will also mitigate this risk. The sustainable use law to be proposed will identify further financial resources that can be allocated to NTFP.
Local communities and key stakeholders are unwilling to adopt proposed biodiversity based production models and practices; or restrictions of access to private properties interferes with uptake of models in stakeholders with no land tenure.	Low / Medium	The Forest Law restriction of land use in certain forest categories provides the basis on which the project will build. Currently farmers in the yellow zone need to change their production practices by law. For small producers the subsidy from the law is significant and the project will work to develop biodiversity-based production options and access to these resources, which are attractive. This will be complemented by building capacities for implementation and leveraging additional income from improved access to markets and optimizing supply changes to increase producer participation in profit-making biodiversity production still more attractive. Awareness-raising, training, and dissemination activities will demonstrate the environmental, social, cultural, and economic benefits of sustainable use, enabling uptake at scale. Strengthening the regulatory framework will further promote the adoption of best practices. Similarly, the project will promote dialogue, consensus and interinstitutional coordination between key stakeholders (e.g., provinces, private owners, indigenous communities, etc.) to facilitate project interventions in the field.
Lack of political will and weak coordination to mainstream sustainable use in institutional reduces effectiveness of project results.	Low / Medium	The provinces are mandated to implement the Forest Law in their territories and resources in the baseline are available for building their capacities in this arena and resources for compensation to landowners are available. There are also resources available to compensate landowners. The project will remove current barriers that have constrained the use of these resources for biodiversity-based production through developing management instruments (best practices, safeguards, monitoring) and increasing capacities for improving biodiversity-based production through Forest Law resources. It will develop awareness raising and dissemination programs to help mainstream SFM and NTFP into existing support to small scale producers. Different government institutions will be involved in project development and of a participation plan to engage stakeholders. Strengthening of inter-institutional coordination mechanisms will also contribute to risk reduction. Mitigation measures to reduce the risk related to the coordination within and between sectors and ministries include the following: First, the project will strengthen the interinstitutional coordination mechanisms of the CONADIBIO, a forum for different stakeholders (public and private) who are either directly or indirectly involved in the conservation, use, and/or access to biodiversity build consensus regarding the development and implementation of biodiversity policies. Government members of CONADIBIO include the SAyDS, MAGyP, INTA, and SENASA, among others. Business sector members include chambers of commerce, business/trade organizations, and NGOs related to the objectives of the CBD, as well as representatives of indigenous communities and academia. More specifically, specific agreements and collaboration mechanisms will be defined for the implementation of the actions requiring the participation of private and public sectors,

Risk	Rating	Risk Mitigation Strategy
		government, and civil society. Second, CONABIDIO, through its sub-commission on Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity, will be part of the project's advisory committee whose role will be to provide technical support to the project and facilitate interagency coordination as defined in the project management arrangements. Third, the MAGyP will play a central role in the project as co-financier and the implementation of programs such as PRODERI, PROSAP, PRODAF, and PRODEAR, directed towards promoting small-scale agriculture and improving farmers' income to reduce pressures on forests due to agricultural expansion. Through these programs and joint action with the MAGyP, the project will further ensure the effective coordination with the agricultural sector, including CSOs, and increase in market demand for biodiversity-based products.
Changes in local, provincial or national government authorities could bring about a change in the policies to promote sustainable use, or the promotion of economic activities countering sustainable use.	Medium / Low	There will be ongoing awareness raising and dissemination programs, providing local knowledge, by ensuring the participation of institutions and organizations identified as key actors. The consolidation of inter-institutional coordination mechanisms for sustainable use will help not to generate incentives contrary to project objectives. Additionally, the UNDP office in the country will maintain the different members of local, provincial or national governments informed on the progress, outcomes and outputs, by using different resources (for instance, the project's Steering Committee, processes for the transfer of knowledge and lessons learnt, field visits, among others) so as to keep their interest in the project and highlight its social and environmental benefits.
Increased vulnerability of ecosystems due to climate change	Low	Climate change will be introduced as a variable in the development of sustainable use models. The project's strategy is based on sustainable management of forests in ecological corridors increasing connectivity between forest remnants, which will contribute to increased resilience to climate change.

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

10. Coordination with existing projects and activities will be achieved as follows:

11. UNDP/UNEP-GEF *Establishment of Incentives for Conservation of Globally Important Ecosystem Services*: During the PPG phase, meetings were held between the two project teams to discuss mechanisms for effective coordination. It was discussed that during implementation coordination between the two projects will happen through monthly meetings that are held in the Chaco and Atlantic Forest ecoregions as part of the SAYDS regular institutional programming, and where the two projects will be implemented. In addition, these monthly meetings will allow exchanging information and lessons learned, including the development of indicators to assess the status of biodiversity conservation in the two ecoregions. With regard to this, the baseline information about biodiversity conservation included in the project proposed herein was obtained from information already developed under the Conservation Incentives project. In addition, the project proposed herein will make use of proposals and results for monitoring biodiversity and land use change in the two shared ecoregions that was also developed under the Conservation Incentives project.

12. WB-GEF *Rural Corridors and Conservation of Biodiversity*: Coordination between the two projects will happen within the framework of CONADIBIO (which includes both the SAYDs and the National Parks Administration [NPA]); particularly with regard to actions planned for the Chaco ecoregion, which is shared by the two projects as part of their intervention areas. Although the Rural Corridors project, which has the NPA as the executing agency, has not yet begun implementation, it is anticipated that both projects will coordinate actions for the consolidation of biological corridors, specifically the Chaco corridor. The Rural Corridors project was reviewed by SAYDS and special attention will be paid to connectivity zones to achieve complementarities between the GEF initiatives. As a step in this direction, the prioritization of sites that was completed during the PPG phase for project proposed herein made use of the approach proposed by the Rural Corridors project.

13. *Sustainable Forest Management in the Transboundary Gran Chaco Americano Ecosystem* UNDP/UNEP – (Argentina [SAyDS], Bolivia, and Paraguay): Coordination between the two projects will happen through monthly meetings that are held in the Chaco ecoregion as part of the SAYDS regular institutional programming. These meetings will provide the opportunity to exchange views and lessons learned on the sustainable production and use of

biodiversity-based products. For example, activities will be developed jointly by the two projects to establish collection centers for brea gum and for its incorporation into the Argentinian food code (Law 18.284), which will provide certification as a safe product for human use and added value. Similarly, workshops will be held jointly for the exchange of knowledge regarding the sustainable use of biodiversity-based products and to define strategies for reaching consensus among stakeholders (government, indigenous and small-producers associations, etc.) regarding production activities and the sustainable use of native forests.

14. The Regional Gran Chaco project focuses primarily on promoting improved livestock and agricultural production practices; in addition it promotes the diversification of production through alternative uses of the forest. In this regard, the GEF project proposed herein will complement the sustainable management activities developed by the Gran Chaco project, specifically in the provinces for replication of project results (Component 2), including improved access to markets and new production options for biodiversity-based products (food and alternative medicinal products, crafts, natural dyes, non-food fauna, brea gum, and ornamental products): a) development of value chains; b) access to financing for marketing and technical assistance; and c) strengthening community management and organizational skills.

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

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

#### ***Stakeholder Participation during Project Preparation***

15. During the project's PPG phase, key stakeholders participated in the project's planning and design workshop, as well as in different working sessions and meetings. These participation fora included the following: a) PPG Inception Workshop; and b) Project's Results Framework Workshop (logical framework). Additionally, during the PPG phase the project team, UNDP Country Office staff, and SAYDS staff held several individual meetings and consultations with key national, provincial, and local stakeholders. A description of the workshops held during the PPG phase follows.

16. PPG Inception Workshop. The Inception Workshop took place in Buenos Aires on May 21, 2014. The objectives of this workshop were to: a) help the PPG project team and other stakeholders reinforce their knowledge and take ownership of the project goals and objectives; b) ensure the PPG project team and other stakeholders clearly understand the objective of the PPG phase, as well as their roles to successfully carry out PPG activities; c) reinforce the commitment and interest of the main stakeholders in the PPG phase (including potential project co-financiers); and d) validate the PPG Work Plan.

17. Participants in the PPG Inception Workshop included representatives of the different SAYDS areas, such as the Under-Secretary of Environmental Policy and Planning, the coordinator of the Social Forestry Program (PROSOBO), the coordinator of the NTFP program, and representatives of the Wild Fauna Directorate and of the National Advisory Committee on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use (CONADIBIO). The workshop was also attended by representatives from other government agencies, namely the Technical Coordinator of the Program for Reinforcing Local Productive Systems, Secretariat for SMEs and Regional Development, Ministry of Industry; representatives of the Under-Secretariat of University Policy Coordination and Management, Ministry of Education; Director of the Argentinian Traditional Crafts Market (MATRA), within the National Directorate of Cultural Industries, Ministry of Culture; the Director of Family Agriculture Programs and Projects, Under-Secretariat of Family Agriculture, Argentinian Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries; and CONICET representatives. The provincial governments participated through representatives of the Environmental Management Secretariat of Jujuy Province; representatives of the Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Production of Salta Province; and representatives of the Ministry of Ecology and Renewable Natural Resources of Misiones Province. Finally, the consultants and coordinator hired for the project's PPG stage also participated in the workshop.

18. Project's Results Framework Workshop (Logical Framework). This workshop was held in Buenos Aires on June 2, 4, and 5, 2014. The objectives of the workshop were to: a) define the project's results framework, including outputs, indicators, baseline information, goals, verification mechanisms, and assumptions; b) define project activities by output, with the pertinent description; c) define the project's budget base; and d) update the PPG Work Plan.

19. The workshop was attended by representatives of SAYDS, the UNDP Country Office and the team of PPG consultants.

### ***Stakeholder Participation Plan during Project Implementation***

20. Objectives of the Stakeholder Participation Plan: The formulation of the stakeholder participation plan has the following objectives: a) clearly identify the basic functions and responsibilities of the main project stakeholders; b) guarantee full knowledge by the stakeholders on progress and obstacles to project development, and harness the experience and skills of stakeholders to improve project actions; and c) identify key moments within the project cycle in which participation will take place. The ultimate objective of the stakeholder participation plan is the long-term sustainability of project achievements, based on transparency and effective participation.

21. During the PPG phase, different consultations were carried out with the project's relevant stakeholders. In this regard, it is worth highlighting the meetings with authorities from the provinces of Salta, Jujuy, and Misiones, and with different civil society organizations in the areas identified as a priority for project activities.

22. In the case of consultations with provincial authorities, contact was established with the main environmental authorities in each province. Meetings were held with environment authority representatives of the provinces participating in the project, with a view to presenting its objectives, jointly defining the priority lines of action, and setting the foundations for materializing agreements for provincial co-funding of the project. A meeting was held in Jujuy Province with the Director for Environmental Management and with the Director of the Biodiversity Directorate. Likewise, in Salta Province, meetings were held with the Secretary of the Environment, the Director of the Biodiversity Program and representatives of the Biodiversity, Protected Areas, and Forest Directorates. Finally, in Misiones Province, consultations were held with the Director-General for Ecology and Environmental Quality, the Director of the provincial Department for Native Forest Promotion, the Director of the provincial Department for Registry and Use of Biodiversity, the Coordinator of the Technical Unit, and the Director of the Flora Department.

23. With regard to consultations with representatives of civil society organizations, visits were carried out to the offices of these entities, with the main purpose of learning more about the problems and establishing the necessary bonds for doing joint work during the project's implementation stage. Awareness-raising activities took place on the topics to be addressed by the project, and meetings were held to hear about the needs and practices of the organizations, and discuss the scope of the proposed activities for working together during the implementation stage.

24. As a result of these consultations, relationships were established with civil society organizations in the three participating provinces. In Salta Province, meetings were held with the Civil Association Tepeyac to obtain information about their experiences on how to produce carob powder, crafts, jams and syrup, and honey; how they use different forest species as food; and with the Wichí Lewetes Kalehí Community of Los Baldes (Morillo). Likewise, consultations were held with the Santa Ana Ltd. Craft Producers Co-op, an association of female producers, to ask about the use of wild species for dyeing textiles; and with the technical team of ASOCIANA, an organization working on the production of Brea gum in the area. In Jujuy Province, meetings were held with the Association of Indigenous Producers of the High Valleys (APOVA) to look into how they produce, and to introduce the project and set the bases for linking this association to the project. Finally, in Misiones Province consultations were held with the San Pedro School of Park Rangers, the Argentine Native Forest Foundation for Biodiversity, and the San Jorge Ltda. Farming Co-op for small producers.

### Women's participation:

25. Activities connected with NTFP can be an important source of social position and confidence for women. An egalitarian culture will be fostered, promoting a pluralistic activity, and sensitizing against gender stereotypes. Furthermore, the project will encourage the participation of the different family members in the preparation of native forest management plans.

26. In the case of Wichi and Gom women living in the Chaco ecoregion, chaguar crafts are closely linked to their female identity, since it is an activity carried out exclusively by women. For some time, SAYDS, through the Social Forestry Program (PROSOBO) has been working on strengthening the communities living in the Chaco forest, holding participatory meetings with women weavers of chaguar, to upgrade their crafts, improving their production and trading

strategies. During the PPG, two workshops were held with indigenous artisan women in Salta Province, to exchange experiences and knowledge for the sustainable promotion of chaguar crafts. Furthermore, MATRA (Ministry of Culture), INTI, INAI, the Secretariat of Family Agriculture (Min. Agriculture) also participated in these workshops. The workshops helped to reinforce the bond with women artisans, thus ensuring the work to be done during project implementation. Moreover, a space was generated in which women artisans referred to the importance of upgrading their work and evidenced the need to consolidate the organization of family groups.

27. On the other hand, work will be carried out with the Santa Ana Co-op of Artisan Weavers in the Yungas ecoregion, a co-op bringing together women in Los Toldos, to promote the preservation and sustainable use of NTFP through craft production. In local culture, artisan activities are relevant among women who use natural dyes for textiles. During the preparation of the PPG, different visits were made and meetings held to introduce the project and establish the grounds for linking this co-op with the project to reinforce local development and enhance their culture.

28. Furthermore, a workshop was organized for production, industrialization and trading of brea gum (*Cercidium praecox*), with the participation of experts in the matter from governmental and non-governmental organizations, and the presence of mostly women (technicians and researchers) with knowledge about the sustainable use of brea gum, from extraction through to storage, processing and trading of the product.

**Summary of stakeholder functions in project implementation:**

Stakeholders	Role in the project
Argentine Environment and Sustainable Development Secretariat (SAyDS)	SAyDS is the institution at which the project will be physically located, and will mainly play a coordinating role with other entities and a managerial role during the different stages of project implementation.
Social Development Ministry	This institution will provide management tools for bringing NTFP under a “Collective Brand” as a way to develop and promote the trading of these products.
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries	This ministry will coordinate policies to develop SUBD with SAyDS, through the Under-Secretariat of Family Agriculture and UCAR (Unit for Rural Change), via programs such as PRODEAR, PRODERI or PROSAP. Furthermore, it will support the sharing, dissemination and generation of information with regard to the Sustainable Use at institutional and producer level.
Ministry of Culture	This ministry will provide management tools and logistics developed through MATRA (Argentinian Traditional Crafts Market) to achieve better access to markets for distribution and sale of NTFP.
INTA (National Institute of Agricultural Technology)	This institute – a state entity carrying out research and technological innovation in value chains, regions and territories for improving the country’s competitiveness and sustainable rural development – will provide the project with specific knowledge on the forms of production being used, alternative production techniques, sustainable productive developments, and technical knowledge for production overall. It will benefit from access to the territory and any information the project may generate on specific alternative production options.
SENASA (National Animal Health and Agri-food Quality Service)	This institution will provide the capacities for managing the inclusion of edible NTFP into the Argentinian Food Code, as a health agency whose main objective is the oversight and certification of animal and plant products and by-products, as well as their inputs.
SEPyME (Secretariat of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises)	This secretariat will provide potential lines of financing for small local producers through the “Program for Strengthening Local Productive Systems.”
APN (National Parks Administration)	This agency will provide logistics for accessing protected areas under its administration and, moreover, knowledge of the terrain and needs of the most isolated populations.
INAI (National Institute of Indigenous Affairs)	This institute, situated within the Social Development Ministry, will coordinate actions with the project, promoting meetings with different indigenous communities it works with across the territory. It will also provide information on several matters such as, the hierarchical structure of the communities, ancestral modes of production, the role of women within the community, among others.
INAES (National Institute of Associativism and Social Economics)	This institute will provide the necessary knowledge for managing the formal establishment of producer organizations and co-ops within the framework of legislation in force on the matter in Argentina.
National Institute of	This institute will support the development of value chains of NTFP that can be marketed.



Stakeholders	Role in the project
Industrial Technology (INTI)	
CENOC (National Centre of Community Organizations)	This agency will provide knowledge on the management of community organizations for capacity-building to partake in the benefits the Argentinian government grants to CSOs.
Universities: UNSa (National University of Salta), UNAM (National University of Misiones), UNJu (National University of Jujuy) and UBA (University of Buenos Aires)	These universities will provide technical and scientific knowledge to generate the necessary protocols for establishing NTFP extraction limits in the different ecoregions. In turn, it will also allow the dissemination of knowledge generated by the project through fora, talks and different presentations; and coordination with academic extension areas in each university.
Provincial governments through the following agencies: Salta (Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Production); Misiones (Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources); Jujuy (Environmental Management Secretariat)	These governments will provide political support at the provincial level for implementing the GEF project, and for mainstreaming its outcomes and management plans/projects for the sustainable use of NTFP in provincial legislation. They will also provide the necessary tools for managing and coordinating project activities with the different provincial agencies joining the project throughout its implementation.
Municipalities: Salta (Rivadavia Banda Norte), Jujuy (Valle Grande), Misiones (San Pedro)	These municipalities will participate in implementing the initiative at the local level, including awareness-raising and dissemination of the benefits brought about by sustainable use and improvements in infrastructure. Furthermore, their participation will be essential to render support to the families of small producers and reinforce their self-management capacities and their possibility to organize co-ops.

### Yungas

APOVA (Association of Indigenous Producers of the High Valleys)	This organization's role in the project will be related to the organization of the different local producers as a coordinator of its initiatives. The benefit for the organization shall lie in the resources, both material and symbolic, that the project intends to bring to local producers.
Santa Ana Co-op of Artisan Weavers	This organization will provide key information to the project from a gender perspective, on the modes and conditions of production in the area. Furthermore, it includes an important number of producers giving the project material and conceptual support. Upon project completion, the co-op will have improved the capacity for trading its products by obtaining better knowledge on the value chains. Also, it will further disseminate its products by implementing and promoting an exclusive brand (Collective Brand) and obtain a greater yield in the long term of the raw material based on sustainable production throughout time.
Association of Community Tourism of Las Queñoas (ATuCoQue)	This association's role in the project will be related to the association's capacity of conveying its principles on the sustainable use of biodiversity in native forests of the ecoregion, based on awareness-raising among visitors of the importance of responsible tourism from the environmental and social/cultural standpoints. The association will benefit from its participation in the project since communication channels and linkages with local producers will be established for learning about their form of production as a community tourism service to be offered to visitors.

### Atlantic Forest of Misiones

San Pedro School of Park Rangers	This group will contribute to the project in terms of dissemination of the benefits of having sustainable biodiversity-based production and, above all, in terms of monitoring and evaluating the impact of productive practices promoted by the project. Its benefits as an institution working on conservation and the care of protected areas will be mainly related to the proliferation of connectivity corridors between the different protected areas; a connectivity that the project promotes based on the sustainable use of
----------------------------------	--

	biodiversity in the areas deemed to be at an intermediate protection level (yellow areas as per Law 26,331), and that entail in themselves an enhancement of the region's ecosystem-based benefits.
<i>Fundación Bosques Nativos Argentinos para la Biodiversidad</i> (Argentinian Native Forest Foundation for Biodiversity)	This organization's role in the project will focus on disseminating activities among local communities given its territorial proximity; and it will also advise SAyDS on the status of conservation of native forests.
San Jorge Ltda. Farming Co-op for small producers	This group's role in the project is to participate in training workshops for reinforcing production capabilities and, above all, trading NTFP.

### Dry Chaco

Indigenous Communities: Wichí Lewetes Kalehí – Los Baldes- Wichí Lewetes - La Cortada and Wichí Lewetes Letsenkwat – Pozo El Chañar	These communities' role in the project is related to the participation of community members in training workshops on the sustainable use of NTFP, and in introducing their produce into the trading chains. These communities will benefit from their participation in the project by accessing markets to sell their products (crafts, brea gum, carob powder, etc.) and by improving raw material extraction techniques and the elaboration of products
<i>Asociación Civil Unión y Progreso</i> – Paraje La Entrada	This association's role in the project will be related to its inputs in the way of knowledge on traditional productive practices, as well as on the production and trading conditions of livestock products, which will be of utmost importance for the project and provide an overview of a widespread product in the region. Furthermore, the association's members will benefit from the knowledge generated by the project on the sustainable use of NTFP, above all, with regard to alternatives, complementariness, and diversification of a monolithic production.
<i>Unión Campesina</i> (Peasants' Union)– Paraje Los Baldes	This group's role in the project is related to its contribution in the way of knowledge on traditional productive practices, as well as on the production and trading conditions of livestock products, which will be of utmost importance for the project and provide an overview of a widespread product in the region. Furthermore, the association's members will benefit from the knowledge generated by the project on the sustainable use of NTFP, above all, with regard to alternatives, complementariness, and diversification of a monolithic production.
Lhaka Honhat Association, Santa Victoria Este	This group's role in the project is related to the participation of community members in training workshops on the sustainable use of NTFP and in introducing their produce into the trading chains. These communities will benefit from their participation in the project by accessing markets to sell their products (crafts, brea gum, carob powder, etc.) and by improving raw material extraction techniques and product development.
Tepeyac Association	This association's role in the project is to generate fluent communication with the indigenous communities given its knowledge of the area and the issues present therein, and will moreover allow a better logistics of the project's activities, based on the material resources it has (facilities for organizing workshops, accommodating trainers, etc.). The association will benefit from the material and human resources the project can provide to improve existing capabilities within the association.
Social Support of the Anglican Church in the North of Argentina (ASocIANA)	This group's contribution to the project is mainly related to technical knowledge on production and trading of brea gum. Its participation in the project will mean an improvement in the trading conditions of their products through greater knowledge of the value chain. A greater dissemination of their products by implementing and promoting an exclusive brand (Collective Brand) and a greater yield in the long term of raw material based on sustainable production throughout time.
Vocational School No. 5127 "Justo Pastor Santa Cruz"	This group's role in the project will focus on disseminating sustainable techniques regarding NTFP management among local community youths. Participation in the project will benefit the school as regards its intervention capacity and the generation of projects along the line of the objectives it intends to disseminate.

29. Participation mechanisms: Three key phases have been identified for project implementation in which stakeholders will partake effectively: planning, implementation and evaluation. **Project planning** will include annual meetings with key stakeholders within the national, provincial and local governments, civil society, local communities



(including members of the Project Executive Committee) during which annual goals will be set for each project component. These annual planning meetings will also be useful for specifying the activities to be funded through each source of co-financing. **Project implementation** will take place according to annual plans to be adopted by the Project Executive Committee, made up of SAYDS, UNDP and a representative from each of the provincial environment authorities of Jujuy, Salta, and Misiones. SAYDS will be the Executing Agency. **Project evaluation** will be carried out annually with the participation of key stakeholders and will include actions at the end of each year of implementation, and before defining the project annual plan for the following year. Furthermore, project mid-term and final evaluations will take place as a part of the project cycle. Given the independent nature of these evaluations, these would be key instances during the project's life cycle, at which stakeholders can express their opinions and concerns, and evaluate whether project outcomes are being fulfilled and, if necessary, propose corrective measures.

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 GEBS:

30. Up to 1,400 small-scale producers of biodiversity-based products in the prioritized landscapes of the three ecoregions (Atlantic Forest, Las Yungas, and Chaco) in Argentina will benefit from the project. All of the local communities that will participate in the project are low-income and practice small-scale, family-based production activities (mainly subsistence agriculture and NTFP collection); the project's benefits will contribute to improving their livelihoods in an equitable manner. This will be achieved through: a) social empowerment of men and women through their participation in the development and implementation of management plans for biodiversity-based products and the marketing and sale of products with added value; b) raising awareness about the value of native forests and their associated biodiversity; c) improved income; the project will increase the proportion of average annual gross income for small producers (family farm nuclei [NAF]) (including women producers) as a result of the sale and sustainable use of NTFP from between 15%-20% to 35%-45%; d) improved food security and employment opportunities for local communities through the production and sale of biodiversity-based products (NTFP) and sustainable agriculture (including agroforestry and silvopastoral systems); e) access to Social Tax certification to formally access the NTFP markets contributing to the reduction of their socioeconomic vulnerability; f) reduced migration/displacement of local community members to urban centers and other rural areas in search of better incomes and job opportunities; and g) improved forest services that result in stable habitat for the biodiversity on which they depend, improved soil productivity, reduced soil erosion, improved water quality, increased water storage capacity, and protection against climate variability (e.g., floods, torrential rains, and extreme temperatures), among other environmental services. Through capacity development at the national and provincial levels, up-scaling of experiences and lessons learned is expected to reach 20,000 small producers in other forested areas (yellow areas/Category II, as defined by the Forest Law) of other provinces in the country.

31. Women are active in the production and use of biodiversity-based products in the three prioritized landscapes. Women will be beneficiaries of increased income from the sale of NTFP, improved food security and employment, and training activities for the production and marketing of NTFP, as well as the conservation and sustainable management of biodiversity and native forests. They will be an essential part of the development and implementation of farm-level management plans for the sustainable production of NTFP. The project will ensure that the participation of women in the family economy (NAF) is maintained in an egalitarian manner. Indicators have been included in the projects results framework (Section 3.2) to ensure the equal participation of women in the delivery of socioeconomic benefits.

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

32. This project will be implemented on the basis of a legal framework promoting sustainable management and conservation of native forests. To capitalize and optimize the cost-effectiveness relationship, the GEF scenario will help the institutional framework to be strengthened and individual capacities to be built among small producers, to increase and diversify their income by putting into practice sustainable models for NTFP production, their trading and the formulation of management plans for the sustainable use of NTFP to be presented within the framework of the Forest Law and other state agencies providing financial support to small producers, recognizing that economic viability is a key factor for ensuring the sustainability of biodiversity management in the long run. Small producers are aware of the environmental, social, and economic benefits brought about by a sustainable use of NTFP biodiversity within their

productive activities at farm level. By implementing and improving sustainable-use productive activities (Component 1) and sustainably developing the value chain of harvested NTFP (Component 2), the plan is to increase income of small producers in the long run.

33. Based on the existence of NTFP already traded in the three ecoregions, a quantitative analysis is set forth on the cost-effectiveness of the GEF scenario (project) and other options, taking into account the effect of four variables: income, employment, biodiversity conservation, and future income sustainability.<sup>13</sup>

34. Within the GEF scenario, at a cost of \$28,307,400 USD, including co-financing, small producers will include a greater variety of products into their production, increase their sales, improve the sale prices, and add value by processing products. An increase in the quantity and in prices will boost their income. The existence of success stories in the different categories of products show the economic feasibility of moving forward in this regard, and the price gap in different links of the value chain show it will be feasible to improve the distribution of income brought about by NTFP trading. Within this scenario, small producers will increase their income by a certain percentage through the sustainable exploitation of NTFP, which will account for 20% to 30% of the total income upon start-up, and for 35% to 45% upon project completion. To the above, we must add the perception of incremental income and the fact that an increase in production entails the creation of jobs, thus helping the area's population to remain there and not migrate in the quest for better employment opportunities, generating threats to biodiversity in other native forest areas. The introduction of sustainable production practices will make biodiversity conservation possible. To the extent that productive undertakings can better insert themselves into the markets, they will become economically sustainable and not require subsidies, and the producers will sustainably use biodiversity in the understanding that unsustainable practices entail a loss of access to raw material for their production.

35. An alternative scenario based on the direct granting of subsidies to small producers in an amount equivalent to the project's funds (\$28,307,400 USD.) will have a direct impact on producers' income but with no short- or long-term benefits for biodiversity. Within this scenario, the loss and degradation of forests will continue since small producers will not have an incentive for preserving biodiversity as a source of raw material to produce NTFP. Likewise, it will not imply an increase in employment because subsidies will not provide incentives for improving production. Neither will they guarantee future income sustainability since they will not foster any kind of improved productive practices. When subsidies disappear, producers will go back to their initial situation with negative consequences for Category II native forest areas.

36. The alternative of defining new conservation areas (for instance, national or provincial reserves) would entail the expropriation by the State, paying a sum of money to private landowners. Considering the number of hectares for project intervention, and the price of the hectare in each of the three ecoregions, it is estimated that the cost of these hectares is \$70,000,000 USD, over double the estimated amount for the GEF project and its co-financing. It would be necessary to also add the cost of the facilities and salaries of park rangers. This alternative would not entail any improvement in the income of small producers since they would be left without the land for their livelihood and for carrying out a productive activity. This would also entail a reduction of direct employment for such producers, for the same reason. The positive effects would be limited to biodiversity conservation and its future sustainability. After the initial expense of purchasing the land for setting up a forest reserve, maintenance expenses would be considerably lower.

37. Finally, the combination of the two alternatives to the project as mentioned above would have a minimum estimated cost of \$96,307,400 USD, over three-fold the amount estimated for the GEF project and its co-financing. It would entail an improvement in producers' income that, although displaced from the lands they currently live on, would obtain a subsidy in compensation. Biodiversity conservation and long-term sustainability would be guaranteed, too. However, this alternative would be less effective in terms of employment generation and future income sustainability.

38. In brief, the cost-effectiveness analysis submitted would be reflecting a cost-effective GEF intervention; that is to say, the cost of the positive effects attained is favorable compared with the other alternatives, none of which covers all

---

<sup>13</sup> Effectiveness is deemed to depend on three factors: efficacy (outcomes obtained under the assumption of applying the intervention in optimum conditions); coverage (intervention's capacity of reaching out to the target population), and the behaviour of potential beneficiaries and professionals with regard to fulfillment of technical recommendations. The design of this project presupposes the accomplishment of very satisfactory compliance levels with regard to all the above-mentioned factors.

of the effects. Consequently, it is considered that no alternative would present all the effects of the GEF project, and the most similar alternative as to the effects would entail a cost of three times more than the estimated cost for the GEF project, as summarized below:

	<b>GEF + co-financing</b>	<b>Direct Subsidies</b>	<b>Conservation areas</b>	<b>Subsidies + conservation</b>
<b>Cost (USD)</b>	28,307,400	28,307,400	70,000,000	96,307,400
<b>Effectiveness</b>				
Income	+	+	no	+
Direct employment	+	no	no	No
Biodiversity Conservation	+	no	+	+
Future self-sustainability	++	no	+	+

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

39. Project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) will be carried out according to the procedures established by UNDP and GEF, to be provided by the project team and UNDP-CO, with the support of the UNDP/GEF RSC, Panama City. The Project's Strategic Results Framework provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation, together with the pertinent means of verification. The M&E Plan includes the inception report, analysis of project implementation, reports on quarterly and annual analysis, mid-term and final evaluations, and audits. The following sections describe the main components of the M&E Plan and the indicative cost estimates related to follow-up and evaluation. The project's M&E Plan will be presented and adopted in the Project Inception Report, after a group discussion of indicators, means of verification, and the full definition of project staff and M&E responsibilities.

#### ***Project Start-up Phase***

40. A Project Inception Workshop (PIW) will be held within the first three (3) months after project start-up, with the participation of the full project team, counterparts, financing partners, officials from UNDP-CO, UNDP-GEF RSC and UNDP-GEF Headquarters, as pertinent. An essential objective of this PIW will be to help the project team understand and take on ownership of the project's goals and objectives, and fine-tune the preparation of the first annual work plan based on the Project Results Framework and the GEF biodiversity Tracking Tool. The above will include a revision of the results framework (indicators, means of verification and assumptions), providing additional details, as necessary, and based on this exercise, completion of the Annual Work Plan (AWP), including accurate, measurable indicators, consistent with expected project outcomes.

41. Furthermore, the purpose and objective of the PIW will be as follows: a) introduce project staff to the UNDP-GEF team that will support project implementation, namely, responsible staff at the CO and RSC; b) Details of the functions, support services and supplementary responsibilities of UNDP-CO and RSC staff with regard to the project team; c) provide an overview of UNDP-GEF reports and M&E requirements, particularly emphasizing annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) and related documents, the Annual Project Report (APR / PIR), as well as the mid-term review and final evaluation. The PIW will also provide an opportunity to inform the project team on UNDP budget planning with regard to the project, budget revisions – including provisions for an annual audit- and mandatory budget amendments.

42. The PIW will also give an opportunity for all parties to understand their roles, functions and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including report and communication lines and conflict settlement mechanisms. The Terms of Reference (ToR) for project personnel and decision-making structures will be discussed, as necessary, with a view to clarifying the responsibilities of each party during project implementation. The Inception Workshop Report is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize several agreements and plans decided upon during the meeting (see below).

### ***Monitoring responsibilities and activities***

43. A detailed schedule of project review meetings will be developed by the project's management in consultation with the project implementing partners and the representatives of stakeholders, and will be included in the Project Inception Report. The above schedule will include project follow-up and evaluation activities.

44. Daily progress supervision of project implementation will be the responsibility of the TPC. TPC will report to UNDP-CO any delays or difficulties encountered during project implementation so that appropriate support can be provided or corrective measures can be timely adopted. The TPC will fine-tune project progress and performance/impact indicators, in consultation with the full project team at the PIW, with the support of UNDP-CO and the assistance of UNDP-GEF RSC. The specific objectives for progress indicators during the first year, as well as the means of verification, will be developed at this workshop. They will be used to assess whether implementation is moving ahead at the foreseen pace and in the proper direction. Objectives and indicators for forthcoming years will be defined annually as a part of the internal evaluation and planning processes carried out by the project team. Impact indicator measurement related to global benefits will be developed in agreement with the schedules defined through specific studies which will be a part of project activities.

45. **Changes in the rate of exchange and anticipation of changes in local rates of exchange:** Potential changes in local rates of exchange due to differences in rates can increase or diminish the value in dollars (USD) of each deposit, pursuant to Chapter 5, Article 5.04 of the UNDP Financial Manual. Adjustments will be made via the budget revision, and previously informed to the steering committee members.

46. On a quarterly basis, UNDP, together with the Project Director, will carry out an analysis of how much can be covered with the available budget and available project funds (as a result of potential variations in the rates of exchange) with a view to adjusting work plans. Any necessary amendments will be made through a project revision, in agreement with the Executive Committee members.

47. Periodic monitoring of progress in project implementation will be performed by UNDP-CO, by holding quarterly meetings with the Project implementation team, or more frequently if deemed necessary. This will allow the parties to take stock of activities and solve project-related problems in a timely manner to ensure timely implementation of project activities. UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RSC, in any event, will carry out annual visits to the project field sites, or more often based on an agreement on the agenda as put forward in the Inception Report and project AOPs to evaluate project progress first-hand. Any other Executive Committee member participate in these trips, as decided by the Executive Committee. A report on field visits will be prepared by UNDP-CO and sent out to all Executive Committee members and UNDP-FMAM within a month after the field visit has taken place.

48. Annual follow-up will be performed through Executive Committee meetings. This is the highest political level meeting of the parties directly involved in project implementation. The project will be subject to revision by the Executive Committee at least once a year. The first meeting will be held after the inception workshop. The project proponent will prepare an APR/PIR and will submit it to UNDP-CO and the regional UNDP-GEF office, at least two weeks before the Steering Committee meeting for its review and comments.

49. The TPC will submit the APR/PIR to the Steering Committee, highlighting policy issues and the recommendations to be decided upon by the Committee members. The TPC will also report to the participants on any agreement reached with stakeholders during the APR/PIR preparation on how to solve operations-related problems. Independent reviews of each project component can also be performed if necessary. The Executive Committee has the authority to suspend disbursements if the project performance benchmarks are not met. Such benchmarks will be outlined by the PIW, based on the implementation rates and qualitative assessments on the degree of output achievement.

50. Final review of the Executive Committee will be held during the last month of project operations. TPC is responsible for preparing the Final Report and submitting it to UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RSC. A draft will be prepared at least two months before the Executive Committee meeting to allow its review, and will serve as a basis for discussions at the Executive Committee meeting. The final opinion of the Executive Committee will take into account

project implementation as a whole, paying special attention to whether the project has achieved its stated objectives and whether it has contributed to the broader environmental goal. It will decide whether actions are still necessary, particularly with regard to project outcome sustainability, and will act as a vehicle through which lessons learnt may be seized to nurture other projects.

### ***Project Monitoring Report***

51. The TPC, together with the enlarged UNDP-GEF team, will be charged with preparing and submitting the following mandatory reports as part of the follow-up process.

52. A **Project Inception Report** (PIR) will be prepared immediately after the PIW. It will include a detailed Annual Work Plan for the first year, divided into quarters, and depicting the activities and progress indicators which will guide the first year of project implementation. This work plan will include dates for specific field visits, and support missions by UNDP-CO or RSC or consultants, as well as the dates for meetings of the bodies in charge of making project-related decisions. The PIR report will also include a detailed project budget for the first full year, prepared on the basis of the annual work plan, and including follow-up and evaluation requirements to effectively measure project performance for the 12-month period. The PIR will moreover include a more detailed narrative on the institutional functions, responsibilities, coordination actions, and feedback mechanisms of project partners. Furthermore, a section will refer to progress made so far on the establishment of the project and start-up activities, as well as an update of changing external conditions affecting project implementation. Once the PIR has been completed, it will be sent out to counterparts that will have a month to provide comments or pose questions. UNDP-CO and UNDP-FMAM RSC will review the PIR before it is circulated.

53. In light of the similarities between APR/PIR (Project Inception Report) and the PIR (Project Implementation Review), UNDP-GEF has prepared a harmonized format for fulfilling both the following requirements:

54. The **Annual Performance Report** (APR/PIR) is a UNDP requirement and a part of the core supervision by UNDP-CO, and project follow-up and management. It is a CO self-assessment report for project management and provides inputs for the report submission process of country offices, and the Results-oriented Annual Reporting, as well as a key input for the PB Revision. An APR / PIR is prepared on an annual basis before the PB Revision, to reflect progress achieved in fulfillment of the project's annual work plan and to evaluate project performance in contributing to foreseen outcomes, through outputs and partnerships/co-ops. The APR/PIR format is flexible but must include the following sections: a) Project risks, problems, and adaptative management; b) Project progress with regard to indicators and pre-defined objectives; c) Outcome performance; and d) Lessons learnt/best practices.

55. The **Project Implementation Review (PIR)** is an annual follow-up process provided for by GEF. It has become an essential management and surveillance tool for project managers, and is the main vehicle for drawing lessons from ongoing projects. Once the project has been in place for a year, a PIR must be completed by the Country Office, together with the project's management. The PIR can be prepared at any time during the project and must be discussed at the Project's Executive Committee meeting so that it results in a PIR agreed by the project, the implementing partner, UNDP-CO, and RSC –Panama. Individual PIRs are collected, reviewed, and analyzed by RSC before they are sent to the focal area groups at UNDP-GEF Headquarters.

56. Every three months, the project team will provide to the local UNDP-CO and to UNDP-GEF RSC, Quarterly Progress Reports describing the main changes in project progress. Progress made will be supervised on the UNDP Management Platform the risks will be periodically updated in ATLAS, based on the initial risk analysis.

57. **Specific thematic reports** focused on specific topics or fields of action will be prepared by the Project team when requested by UNDP, UNDP-GEF, or the implementing partner. The request for a Thematic Report will be sent by UNDP in writing to the project team, clearly stating the topic or activities to be reported on. These reports can be used as a good exercise of lessons learnt, specific supervision of key areas, or as problem-solving exercise to evaluate and overcome any obstacles or difficulties encountered. UNDP is asked to keep their requests for Thematic Reports to a minimum amount, and when they are deemed necessary, a reasonable time will be allowed for preparation of the report by the project team.

58. The **Project's Final Report** will be prepared by the Project team during the last three (3) months of project implementation. This overarching report will summarize all project activities, achievements, and outcomes; lessons learnt; fulfilled or unfulfilled objectives: implemented structures and systems; etc. and will be the final statement on project activities during its useful life. It will also put forward recommendations for any other measure that may be necessary to guarantee the sustainability and replicability of project activities.

59. The **Technical Reports** are detailed documents covering specific areas of analysis or scientific specialties within the overall Project. As a part of the Inception Report, the project team will prepare a list of technical reports expected from the key fields of activity during the project's implementation, and the tentative deadlines for such reports. When necessary, the list of reports will be reviewed and updated, and included then in the APR/PIR. The Technical Reports can also be prepared by external consultants and must include comprehensive, specialized analysis of the research areas, clearly defined within the framework of the project and its sites. These technical reports will represent, in any case, a substantive Project contribution to specific areas, and will be used in initiatives to disseminate relevant information and the best practices at the local, national, and international levels.

**Project Publications** will be a key method for setting forth and disseminating project outcomes and achievements. These publications may be scientific or informative documents on the project's activities and achievements in the way of articles in magazines or multimedia publications, and they may be based on technical reports, according to the relevance and scientific value of the reports, or they may be summaries or compilations of a series of technical reports and other research work. The project team will determine whether any of the Technical Reports deserve to be officially published and –in consultation with UNDP, the Government of Argentina, and other stakeholder groups- will plan and produce these publications in a consistent and recognizable fashion. Project resources must be defined and allocated to these activities as pertinent and in line with the project budget.

### *Independent Evaluations*

60. The Project will be subjected to at least two independent external evaluations as follows:

61. An independent **Mid-Term Review** will be performed half-way through the project. This mid-term review will determine whether progress is being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify the need for correcting the course of action, if necessary. It will focus on efficacy, efficiency, and timeliness in project implementation; and will highlight matters requiring decisions and actions; and will speak to the initial lessons learnt from project design, implementation, and management. The outcomes of this review will be included into the second half of the project as recommendations to improve project implementation. The organization, terms of reference and the exact timing of the mid-term review will be decided upon, prior consultation among the parties to the project document. The TORs for this mid-term review will be prepared by UNDP-CO, based on guidance received from UNDP-GEF RSC. Evaluation outcomes will be uploaded into UNDP corporate systems, particularly the UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). All GEF tracking tools for the project will also be completed during this mid-term review.

62. An independent **Final Evaluation** will take place three months before the final Executive Committee meeting, and will focus on the same topics as the mid-term review. The final evaluation will also analyze the impact and sustainability of outcomes, including the project's contribution to capacity-building and the achievement of global environmental goals. The Final Evaluation should also provide recommendations on follow-up activities and request a reply from Management that should be included in PIMS and the UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). The TORs for this evaluation will be prepared in close collaboration with PEU, SAYDS, and UNDP-CO, based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF RSC. All GEF tracking tools for the project will also be completed during the final evaluation.

### *Audit Clause*

63. According to UNDP general corporate audit regulations, internal and external audits will be carried out individually by each responsible party, and the costs will be borne by the project. The audit will be performed pursuant to UNDP financial audit rules, regulations, and policies. The GoA will provide the Resident Representative with periodic, certified financial statements, and with an annual audit of such financial statements regarding the status of UNDP funds (including GEF funds) as per the procedures established in the Programming and Finance rules and regulations.

64. The Project will be subject to an audit according to the annual program established by UNDP, and will be audited at least once during its implementation. This audit must be carried out between the months of January and March, so the reports are ready before 30 April. When UNDP decides so, the audit may start in the month of October based on a preliminary Combined Delivery Report, so the auditors can analyze the different aspects of internal control and management, including the evaluation on how the implementation of the previous audit recommendations is faring. The exercise will be completed with the final CDRs and the issuance of a Final Report to be submitted by 30 April (with an opinion on the financial statements for the period 1 January – 31 December of the audited year).

65. The Project Budget must foresee the necessary resources for an institution or audit firm to carry out the audit. Fulfillment of audit recommendations will be the responsibility of the project management and will be monitored by UNDP and SECIN.

66. Additionally, spot checks will be performed, on documents randomly selected to evaluate procurement procedures, internal control soundness, and accuracy of the financial records.

67. Audits of the government Implementing Partners should be carried out preferably by the Supreme Audit Institution (SAI), or private entities, encompassing not only an analysis of financial records, legal and accounting aspects of the actions foreseen in project implementation, but also an appraisal of management in terms of outcomes according to the objectives and goals defined in the project’s design. In this regard, and especially when the project has international financing, it is recommended that the General Auditor’s Office at the national level and the Court of Auditors at provincial level carry out such audit.

68. Should a project assessment be requested, it will be necessary to justify it and propose a date for such assessment. A project assessment is only required when the partners’ protocols set forth such a requirement, for instance, in the case of GEF. However, a project assessment may be requested given the complexity or the innovative aspects of a project.

#### ***Dissemination of lessons learnt and knowledge***

69. Project outcomes will be disseminated within and outside the project’s area of intervention, through a series of existing networks and fora for exchange of information. Furthermore, the project will participate, when appropriate, in UNDP-GEF sponsored networks, organized by high-level staff working in projects sharing common traits. UNDP-GEF RSC has established an electronic platform for exchanging lessons learnt among those responsible for the project. The project will identify and participate, as pertinent and appropriate, in scientific networks and/or in any other policy-based network which can be beneficial for the project’s implementation, besides the lessons learnt. The project will identify, analyze and share lessons learnt which can be beneficial for the design and implementation of similar projects in the future. Identifying and analyzing lessons learnt is an ongoing process, and the need to communicate such lessons as one of the main project contributions is a requirement to be delivered every twelve (12) months. UNDP-GEF shall provide a format and help the project team in classifying into categories, documenting and submitting reports on lessons learnt. Specifically, the project will ensure coordination so as to avoid overlapping, share best practices, and generate knowledge outputs on best practices in the sustainable use of biodiversity.

#### ***M&E work plan and budget***

<b>Type of M&amp;E activity</b>	<b>Responsible Parties</b>	<b>Budget USD</b>	<b>Time frame</b>
Inception Workshop (IW)	National Project Coordinator (NPC) Technical Project Coordinator (TPC) UNDP	2,500	Within the first two months after project start-up, at SAyDS Hq.
Inception Report	TPC	0	Immediately after IW
Design of M&E plan for SECURE Project (inception phase).	TCP UNDP Local consultant	5,000	Inception phase
Backstopping on implementation of M&E plan	TCP UNDP International consultant	12,500	Annually

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget USD	Time frame
On-field impact monitoring including visits to field sites	TPC Ecoregional consultant (EC)	0	Continuously
Quarterly progress reports	Coordinator and Project Team	0	Quarterly
APR and PIR, Tracking Tool for biodiversity	Coordinator and Project Team UNDP Country Office UNDP GEF	0	Annually
Project Board Meetings	NPC TPC	2,500	Once a year
Advisory Committee	NPC TPC	0	Three times a year
Tripartite Committee Reviews	GEF Focal Point UNDP Country Office Project Team	0	Annually
Technical reports	TPC EC	0	As necessary
Audit	UNDP Country Office	40,000 (8,000/year)	Annually
Mid-term Evaluation	Project Team UNDP Country Office RCU UNDP/GEF Evaluation Team	36,500	Half way through the project
Lessons learned	NPC Hired consultants as needed	5,000	To be determined by Project Team and UNDP-CO
Final Evaluation	Project Team UNDP Country Office RCU UNDP/GEF Evaluation Team	44,700	Upon project completion
Terminal Report	TPC	0	At least one month before project completion
<b>TOTAL INDICATIVE COST</b> (*excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses)		148,700	


### **PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT AND GEF AGENCY**

#### **A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):**

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Graciela Conesa	GEF Operational Focal Point	SECRETARIAT FOR ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (SAYDS)	MARCH 12, 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
Adriana Dinu, UNDP/GEF Executive Coordinator		December 19, 2014	Helen Negret, Senior Technical Advisor EBD Team	+ (507) 302-4508	helen.negret@undp.org



## ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Project Objective:</b> Strengthening the management framework for sustainable use of biodiversity <sup>1</sup> to increase the protection of high conservation-value forests in Argentina	Area (ha) of forest with benefits for the sustainable use of biodiversity in SMPBN Areas – Level II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Atlantic Forest (Misiones Province): 0 ha</li> <li>– Yungas (Jujuy Province): 0 ha</li> <li>– Chaco (Salta Province): 0 ha</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Atlantic Forest (Misiones Province): 40,000</li> <li>– Yungas (Jujuy Province): 60,000</li> <li>– Chaco (Salta Province): 100,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Reports from the Forest Management Unit of SAYDS</li> <li>– Field verification reports/notes</li> <li>– Project evaluation reports: PIR/APR, Tracking Tool, mid-term and final evaluations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The current estimations of the potential of sustainable use of biodiversity are realized</li> <li>– Environmental changes are within the normal range of variability</li> </ul>
	Changes in the presence (% occurrence) of key animal species <sup>14</sup> at the site level (Atlantic Forest: 40,000 ha; Yungas 60,000 ha; Chaco: 100,000 ha)	Dry Chaco: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 4 species</li> </ul> Atlantic Forest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 5 species</li> </ul> Yungas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 8 species</li> </ul>	Dry Chaco <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 4 species (Intervention sites: % occurrence is maintained or increased; Control sites: % occurrence decreases).</li> </ul> Atlantic Forest <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 5 species (Intervention sites: % occurrence is maintained or increased; Control sites: % occurrence decreases).</li> </ul> Yungas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 8 species (Intervention sites: the presence of key species is maintained; Control sites: absence of key species)</li> </ul>	1. Scale: SMPBN Areas – Level II <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– At the farm level: biological surveys (transect) of vertebrate tracks using participatory monitoring</li> <li>– Presence/absence of animal species</li> <li>– Interview results</li> <li>– Field verification reports/notes</li> <li>– Data from the Biodiversity Information System (BIS) of the National Park Administration</li> <li>– Scientific publications/ documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Monitoring and control efforts are adequate</li> <li>– Sampling efforts are optimal</li> </ul> Environmental variability is within the normal range
	% of Sustainable Management Plans (SMP) that include NTFP <sup>15</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Jujuy Province: 0</li> <li>– Misiones Province: 0</li> <li>– Salta Province: 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Jujuy Province : &gt; 50% of small producers present SMP with NTFP</li> <li>– Misiones Province: &gt; 50% of small producers present SMP with NTFP</li> <li>– Salta Province: &gt; 50% of small producers present SMP with NTFP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Approved plans by the Forest Unit of the SAYDS.</li> </ul>	
	Change in the ecosystem health index (ISEARL)* for the project landscapes  * Ecosystem Health Index <sup>16</sup> Adjusted to Real	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Atlantic Forest: 0.61</li> <li>– Yungas: 0.48</li> <li>– Chaco: 0.44</li> </ul> Specific results from the ISEARL are presented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Atlantic Forest: &gt; 0.7</li> <li>– Yungas: &gt; 0.7</li> <li>– Chaco: &gt; 0.7</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Updated ISEARL</li> <li>– Field logbooks/notes</li> <li>– Project technical reports and/or publications</li> </ul>	

<sup>14</sup> The creation and development of the biodiversity inventory is a requirement under the Forest Law for the approval of management plans and their finance by this law.

<sup>15</sup> Approved under the guideline that includes: georeferenced database and sustainable production models to be developed by the project.

<sup>16</sup> Ecosystem Health Index for Project Landscapes is provided in Annex 8.8

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Local Conditions (ISEARL).	in Appendix 8.8.			
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Sustainable use models of native forest biodiversity in areas of high conservation-value in 3 ecosystems	Percentage of coverage <sup>17</sup> of forests in Category II in SMPBN Areas – Level II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Atlantic Forest (Misiones Province, Department of San Pedro): 0.77 %</li> <li>– Yungas (Jujuy Province, Department of Valle Grande): 0.55%</li> <li>– Chaco (Salta Province, Department of Rivadavia): 0.76 %</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Atlantic Forest: 0.77%</li> <li>– Yungas: 0.55%</li> <li>– Chaco: 0.76%</li> </ul> <p>Control Sites ( without project intervention): % of forest cover decreases according to the annual deforestation rates for each province<sup>18</sup>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Atlantic Forest: 0.75%</li> <li>– Yungas: 0.46%</li> <li>– Chaco: 0.73%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Reports of results of the spatial analysis using remote sensing tools and Geographic Information System (GIS)</li> <li>– Field verification logbooks/notes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Incentives favor the sustainable use of biodiversity by small producers</li> <li>– Improved information favors decision-making for the sustainable use of biodiversity</li> <li>– Mapping and sampling efforts are optimal</li> <li>– Positive attitudes by the producers favor the implementation of sustainable use models of native forest biodiversity</li> </ul>
<b>Outputs:</b>					
<p>1.1 Technical bases consolidated for sustainable-use of biodiversity in areas of restricted use as defined by the Forest Law (Category II – yellow areas) in selected forest landscapes of 3 ecosystems and 4 Provinces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technical limits for NTFP harvesting/carrying capacity, and harvesting seasons (systematization of information and traditional knowledge on species currently used; bio-ecological studies and development of harvesting models for potential species)</li> <li>- Geo-referenced data-base of native species and NTFP potential as an input for the approval/oversight/evaluation system of new management plans (under output 3.2).</li> </ul> <p>1.2 Replicable and sustainable production models at farm level for different biodiversity-based products. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Comparative studies of land use alternatives existing in target landscapes and in terms of socioeconomic and biodiversity benefits</li> <li>- Assessment of the cost-benefit of different small farmers biodiversity based production</li> <li>- Validated proposals for diversified production models at farm level (NTFP, agro-forestry systems, fauna etc.).</li> </ul> <p>1.3 Small farmers technical information and capacities improved for developing and implementing management plans for sustainable use of biodiversity under the Forest Law:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Small farmers (2,000 producers/users) trained on the environmental /social/economic benefits and best production practices for NTFP sustainable-use (best practice manuals; dissemination/ awareness building; training)</li> <li>- Management plans developed that incorporate biodiversity based production models alongside sustainable agroforestry &amp; implemented under the forest law</li> <li>- Technical assistance for implementation of the management plans.</li> </ul>					
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Markets and financing	Number of products incorporated into a	– 0	– 7 (one NTFP per category <sup>19</sup> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Market studies</li> <li>– Cost-benefit analyses</li> </ul>	– Stable national and international markets

**Variables related to biodiversity conservation:** Indicator 1: presence of key fauna species; Indicator 2: Net primary productivity (estimated on the basis of NDVI or SAVI, depending on bare soil cover); Indicator 3: Forest Cover

**Socio-economic Variables:** Indicator 4: Income; Indicator 5: access to services; Indicator 6: gender roles; Indicator 7: Community Organization; Indicator 8: Unemployment rates

**Integrated Variables:** Indicator 9: land use; Indicator 10: Percentage of small producers and indigenous peoples' communities owning their land and accessing funds under Law 26,336; Indicator 11:

Participation of small producers in public hearings on environmental territorial zoning as per the provisions of Law 26,331; Indicator 12: plans for non-timber forest products submitted by indigenous peoples' communities and small producers ; Indicator 13: Policies and regulatory frameworks in place regarding management plants for Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFP) with a view to achieving a Sustainable Use of Biodiversity (SUBD)

<sup>17</sup> Coverage: average for SMPBN potential areas (Level II).

<sup>18</sup> Cumulative rate of deforestation over a 5-year period.

<sup>19</sup> Sectors: food products, alternative medicine products, artisanal crafts, dyes, fauna (non-food), brea gum (multiple uses), and ornamental products

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
mechanisms to ensure economic and social sustainability of Sustainable Management of NTFPs of the native forest	“Native forests” collective brand			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Agreements/requests and purchase receipts.</li> <li>– Financing reports for the production of NTFP</li> <li>– Surveys to producers about financing, production, and income</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Interest by the NTFP producers in participating in the project</li> <li>– Sampling efforts are adequate</li> <li>– Verification processes for environmental, social, and economic stability of NTFP management of native forests are optimal</li> </ul>
	Number of species incorporated into the “Native forests” collective brand	– 0	– At least 20 species <sup>20</sup>		
	Number of producers (including women producers) in three ecoregions with Social Tax certification <sup>21</sup> to formally access the NTFP markets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Atlantic Forest (Misiones Province, Department of San Pedro): 39 (30 men and 9 women)</li> <li>– Yungas (Jujuy Province, Department of Valle Grande): one (1) (man)</li> <li>– Chaco (Salta Province, Department of Rivadavia): 96 (66 men and 30 women)</li> </ul> <p>Source: National Registry of Effectors of Local Development and Social Economy of the National Ministry of Social Development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Atlantic Forest (Misiones Province, Department of San Pedro): 350 (175 men and 175 women)</li> <li>– Yungas (Jujuy Province, Department of Valle Grande): 450 (225 men and 225 women)</li> <li>– Chaco (Salta Province, Department of Rivadavia): 600 (300 men and 300 women)</li> </ul>		
	Change in the flow of financing (USD) for sustainable use initiatives measured by the increase in approved management plans that include the sustainable use of NTFP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Jujuy (Yungas): \$0 USD.</li> <li>– Misiones (Atlantic Forest): \$0 USD.</li> <li>– Salta (Chaco): \$0 USD.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Jujuy (Yungas): \$30,000 USD</li> <li>– Misiones (Atlantic Forest): \$30,000 USD</li> <li>– Salta (Chaco): \$30,000 USD</li> </ul>		
	Estimated proportion <sup>22</sup> of average annual gross income for small producers (Family farm nuclei [NAF]) (including women producers) as a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Misiones (Atlantic Forest): 15% (proportion of women in the NAF: 0.50)</li> <li>– Jujuy (Yungas): 15% (proportion of women in the NAF: 0.51)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Misiones (Atlantic Forest): between 35% and 45% (proportion of women in the NAF is maintained at 0.50)</li> <li>– Jujuy (Yungas): between 35% and 45% (proportion of women in the NAF is</li> </ul>		

<sup>20</sup> Selected through the analysis performed during the PPG and categorized as safe investment

<sup>21</sup> The Social Tax is an optional tax regime created with the objective of facilitating and promoting the incorporation into the formal economy persons in a situation of social vulnerability.

<sup>22</sup> The baseline data will be validated during project implementation.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	result of the sale and sustainable use of the NTFP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Salta (Chaco): 25% (proportion of women in the NAF: 0.50)</li> </ul> <p>The proportion of annual income from NTFP is based on interviews with the Directive Unit of the Ministry of Family Agriculture Note: baseline estimates of the gross income from the NAF are approximate given the lack of accounting logs among the producers and the multi-activity approach that prevails in family-based agriculture. Baseline estimates have not been adjusted for inflation.</p>	<p>maintained at 0.51)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Salta (Chaco): between 35% and 45% (proportion of women in the NAF is maintained at 0.50)</li> </ul> <p>(in all cases the target increases until Year 4 and is maintained in Year 5)</p>		
<p><b>Outputs:</b></p> <p>2.1 Value chains improved for 7 biodiversity based product-categories (food products, alternative medicine products, artisanal crafts, dyes, fauna [non-food], brea [multiple uses], and ornamental products).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supply-chain gaps identified and constraints removed to increase efficiencies and equity;</li> <li>- Increased access to markets by improved links of producers with buyers; expanded information on market potentials and requirements (e.g., sanitary restrictions) to improve the supply/demand equation;</li> <li>- Consumers aware and informed on sustainable use of biodiversity (products; values; additional benefits, etc.)</li> </ul> <p>2.2. Access to financing increased for commercialization and technical assistance of biodiversity products</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Capacity building of small producers to access existing sources including Forest Law subsidies and credit for agroforestry;</li> <li>- Mainstreaming of technical knowledge and best practices in existing agricultural grant programs and rural credits</li> </ul> <p>2.3. Community-organization improved for biodiversity based products and marketing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Targeted capacity program for community organizations and cooperatives in target landscapes for biodiversity based production and organizational skills (management, negotiation, marketing training; access improved to market information and needs)</li> </ul>					
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Governance framework at national and provincial levels for sustainable management of NTFP of native forests landscapes	Number of proposals submitted regarding types of new and/or reformed policies or regulations that promote and/or facilitate the sustainable use of biodiversity of in 4.4 million ha.	– 0	– Protocol for sustainable management of the NTFP adopted by the Forest Unit for 3 ecoregions, and updates made in at least one province that increase the proposed requirements (improving sustainability)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Proposals/documents for new/reformed norms</li> <li>– Official bulletin and policies published</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The political willingness exists</li> <li>– Beneficiaries apply in a satisfactory manner their new knowledge and skills</li> <li>– There is stability in human resources within the CSOs and</li> </ul>

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Change in the capacity of civil society organizations <sup>23</sup> (CSOs) and the provincial governments to implement and monitor the sustainable use of biodiversity in landscapes as measured by the project's Capacity Scorecard: a) Capacity for participation; b) Capacity for the creation of, access to, and use of information and knowledge; c) Capacity for the development of strategies, policy, and legislation; d) Capacity for management and implementation; e) Capacity for monitoring and evaluation	<u>CSOs</u> - Salta (Chaco): X% - Jujuy (Yungas): X% - Misiones (Atlantic Forest): X% <u>Provincial governments</u> - Salta (Chaco): 29.4% - Jujuy (Yungas): 35.3% - Misiones (Atlantic Forest): 41.2%  The specific results of the project's Capacity Scorecard are presented in Appendix 8.9.	<u>CSOs</u> - Salta (Chaco): baseline + up to 30% - Jujuy (Yungas): baseline + up to 30% - Misiones (Atlantic Forest): baseline + up to 30% <u>Provincial governments</u> - Salta (Chaco): 59.4% - Jujuy (Yungas): 65.3% - Misiones (Atlantic Forest): 71.2%	- Updated project's Capacity Scorecard - Project evaluation reports - Databases with logs from the training events	provincial governments that benefit from the training activities
	Number of persons/officials trained in the Application of the Forest Law	<u>Atlantic Forest</u> - Misiones Province <sup>24</sup> : 0 <u>Yungas</u> - Jujuy Province: 0 - Additional province: 0 <u>Chaco</u> - Salta Province: 0 - Additional province: 0	<u>Atlantic Forest</u> - Misiones: 44 (4 persons in the forest sector + 40 persons in the biodiversity sector) <u>Yungas</u> - Jujuy: 24 (4 persons in the forest sector + 20 persons in the biodiversity sector) - Additional province: 50 <u>Chaco</u> - Salta: 33 (13 persons in the forest sector + 20 persons in the biodiversity sector) - Additional province: 50	- Databases with logs from the training events	
<u>Outputs:</u> 3.1. Regulatory framework and safeguards optimize sustainable use management to conserve biodiversity at landscape level:					

<sup>23</sup> Baseline scores for CSOs will be established during the first year of the project.

<sup>24</sup> Misiones is the only province that contains the Atlantic Forest Ecoregion.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposals for regulations on harvesting limits, best practices, and oversight mechanisms that take into account forests of high value for conservation of biodiversity;</li> <li>- Proposal for a minimum standards law on sustainable-use of biodiversity in production landscapes (complementary to Forest Law)</li> <li>- Proposals for formal agreements between owners of lands with biodiversity conservation value and small producers to guarantee access to lands for harvesting of NTFP;</li> <li>- Strengthening of inter-institutional coordination mechanisms (CONADIBIO) for development of regulations and coordination of policies regarding sustainable use of biodiversity.</li> </ul> <p>3.2 Strengthened oversight of Forest Law management plans at farm level to monitor biodiversity based products in pilot provinces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Traceability system for selected products developed and strengthened;</li> <li>- Mechanisms for M&amp;E of sustainable use plans (including staff training; improved and follow up procedures of individual plans)</li> </ul> <p>3.3. Landscape level implementation of sustainable-use management through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Management plan approval systems that links numbers and location of existing plans with species and harvesting limits at landscape level (data-base, training of technicians and decision makers);</li> <li>- Guidelines for updating Provincial Native Forest Land Zoning based on potentials and limitation of sustainable use of biodiversity;</li> <li>- Forest Law Provincial enforcement authorities of other provinces in 3 ecosystems strengthened through capacity building program for replication of Project results.</li> </ul>

**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).

Reviewer's comments	Responses	Reference
<b>Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion: April 1, 2013</b>		
<p><u>Comment 1:</u> <i>7. Are the components, outcomes, and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound, and appropriately detailed?</i></p> <p>By the time of CEO Endorsement more detail is expected on the role of the private sector in developing supply chains and market demand.</p> <p>#7 Role of private sector in supply chain development and market demand.</p>	<p>During the PPG, workshops and meetings were held with producers; consultations were made with experts; and the PPG team participated in marketing events that were instrumental in providing information regarding the problems and opportunities for sustainable use of nine biodiversity-based products (NTFP), including information regarding the role of private sectors in developing supply chains and market demand. Specific information was gathered regarding procurement of raw material, collection and transportation, processing (added value), sustainability of production, product quality, demand, and access to markets.</p> <p>In addition, the biodiversity-based products with the highest sustainable production and marketing potential were identified to provide additional information regarding their current volumes of production; demand by various production sectors, including the private sector; and current market prices. This information provides a solid base for improving supply chains and increasing access to markets by strengthening links between producers and buyers during project implementation, in which the private sector will play a central role. This role is outlined in the relevant sections of the Prodoc (see next column). Particular emphasis will be placed on the producer cooperatives and associations that constitute small and medium businesses.</p>	<p>Project Document: Section 1.5 Stakeholder analysis; Section 2.5. Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities; and Annex 8.7. Problems and Opportunities Analysis for Selected Biodiversity-based Products</p>
<p><u>Comment 2:</u> <i>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</i></p> <p>IPs, CSO, and local communities are briefly mentioned in the PIF. This is sufficient at PIF stage but further details are expected of how these groups will be engaged are expected at CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>#10 Engagement with indigenous peoples, CSOs, and local communities.</p>	<p>During the PPG a detailed stakeholder analysis was performed to identify the key local stakeholders in the three project ecoregions (Chaco, Yungas, and UPAF), including CSOs, local communities (i.e., small-scale producers and farmers) some of whom include indigenous peoples and women's organizations. The key local stakeholders are the following:</p> <p>a) Chaco: the Tepeyac Civil Association and the Kalehí Indigenous community from the Wichi indigenous group; indigenous communities: <i>Wichí Lewetes Kalehí – Los Baldes</i>, <i>Wichí Lewetes - La Cortada</i>, and <i>Wichí Lewetes Letsenkwat – Pozo El Chañar</i>; <i>Asociación Civil Unión y Progreso – Paraje La Entrada</i> and <i>Unión Campesina – Paraje Los Baldes</i>, local associations of small cattle ranchers; <i>Acompañamiento Social de la Iglesia Anglicana en el Norte Argentino</i> (ASocIANA), which works closely with indigenous communities; <i>Asociación Lhaka Honhat de Santa Victoria Este</i>, a local community association of small farmers and producers; and the Agrotechnical School No. 5127 <i>Justo Pastor Santa Cruz</i>, which provides training to local communities for the sustainable development in the Chaco region.</p> <p>b) Yungas: the <i>Asociación de Productores Originarios de Valles de Altura</i> (APOVA), which promotes rural development among small farmers and indigenous groups that practice agriculture, produce crafts, and collect NTFP; <i>Cooperativa de Tejedoras Artesanales de Santa Ana</i>, a women's organization that groups weavers engaged in the manufacture of textiles using traditional indigenous and local techniques; and the <i>Asociación de Turismo Comunitario de las Queñoas</i> (ATuCoQue), a local organization of peasants dedicated to tourism that promotes the sustainable use of biodiversity.</p> <p>c) UPAF: the <i>Cooperativa Agropecuaria para Pequeños Productores de San Jorge Ltda.</i>, an association of small producers of NTFP; and the <i>Escuela de Guardaparques de San Pedro</i>, which trains local community members in the administration, control, management, and conservation of protected areas.</p> <p>Additional information about these indigenous groups, CSOs and local communities is included in the project stakeholder analysis. A description</p>	<p>CEO Endorsement Request: Part II, Section B.1. Project Document: Section 1.5: Stakeholder analysis</p>

	of how these stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation is included in Part II, Section B.1 of this CEO Endorsement Request.	
<p><b>Comment 3:</b>  <i>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</i></p> <p>At CEO Endorsement please provide a fuller consideration of the potential risks and mitigation measures with regards to coordinating within and between sectors and ministries, as well as developing sufficient market demand for these products.</p> <p>#11 Risk and mitigation measures with regards to coordination within and between sectors and ministries.</p>	<p>Mitigation measures to reduce the risk related to the coordination within and between sectors and ministries include the following: First, the project will strengthen the inter-institutional coordination mechanisms of the National Advisory Committee for Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity (CONADIBIO), a forum through which different stakeholders (public and private) who are either directly or indirectly involved in the conservation, use, and/or access to biodiversity build consensus regarding the development and implementation of biodiversity policies. Government members of CONADIBIO include the Secretariat for Environment and Sustainable Development (SAyDS); the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Fisheries (MAGyP); the National Institute of Agricultural Technology (INTA); and the National Health and Food Quality Service (SENASA); among others. Business sector members include chambers of commerce, business/trade organizations, and NGOs related to the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), as well as representatives of indigenous peoples and academia. More specifically, specific agreements and collaboration mechanisms will be defined for the implementation of the actions requiring the participation of private and public sectors, government, and civil society. Second, CONABIDIO, through its sub-commission on Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity, will be part of the project's Advisory Committee whose role will be to provide technical support to the project and facilitate interagency coordination as defined in the project's Management Arrangements. Third, the MAGyP will play a central role in the project as co-financier and in the implementation of programs such PRODERI, PROSAP, PRODAF, and PRODEAR, which are aimed at promoting small-scale agriculture and improving farmers' income to reduce pressure on forests caused by agricultural expansion. Through these programs and joint actions with the MAGyP, the project will be able to further ensure effective coordination with the agricultural sector, including civil society organizations (CSOs), and increase the market demand for biodiversity-based products</p>	<p>CEO Endorsement Request: 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</p> <p>Project Document: Section 2.7. Risks and mitigation strategy; Annex 8.1. Risk Analysis</p>
<p><b>Comment 4:</b>  <i>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</i></p> <p>Yes, the project links to the Rural Corridors and Biodiversity Conservation, Establishment of Incentives for Conservation and the regional Gran Chaco projects. Fuller details of how this coordination will be achieved are expected at time of CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>#12 Coordination with existing projects and activities.</p>	<p>Coordination with existing projects and activities will be achieved as follows:  a) <u>UNDP/UNEP-GEF Establishment of Incentives for Conservation of Globally Important Ecosystem Services</u> During the PPG phase, meetings were held between the two project teams to discuss mechanisms for effective coordination. It was discussed that during implementation coordination between the two projects will happen through monthly meetings that are held in the Chaco and Atlantic Forest ecoregions as part of the SAyDS regular institutional programming, and where the two projects will be implemented. In addition, these monthly meetings will allow exchanging information and lessons learned, including the development of indicators to assess the status of biodiversity conservation in the two ecoregions. With regard to this, the baseline information about biodiversity conservation included in the project proposed herein was obtained from information already developed under the Conservation Incentives project. In addition, the project proposed herein will make use of proposals and results for monitoring biodiversity and land use change in the two shared ecoregions that was also developed under the Conservation Incentives project.  b) <u>WB-GEF Rural Corridors and Conservation of Biodiversity</u>: Coordination between the two projects will happen within the framework of CONADIBIO (which includes both the SAyDs and the National Parks Administration [NPA]); particularly with regard to actions planned for the Chaco ecoregion, which is shared by the two projects as part of their intervention areas. Although the Rural Corridors project, which has the</p>	<p>CEO Endorsement Request: A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF-financed initiatives</p>



	<p>NPA as the executing agency, has not yet begun implementation, it is anticipated that both projects will coordinate actions for the consolidation of biological corridors, specifically the Chaco corridor. The Rural Corridors project was reviewed by SAyDS and special attention will be paid to connectivity zones to achieve complementarities between the GEF initiatives. As a step in this direction, the prioritization of sites that was completed during the PPG phase for project proposed herein made use of the approach proposed by the Rural Corridors project.</p> <p>c) <u>Sustainable Forest Management in the Transboundary Gran Chaco Americano Ecosystem</u> UNDP/UNEP – (Argentina [SAyDS], Bolivia, and Paraguay):</p> <p>Coordination between the two projects will happen through monthly meetings that are held in the Chaco ecoregion as part of the SAyDS regular institutional programming. These meetings will provide the opportunity to exchange views and lessons learned on the sustainable production and use of biodiversity-based products. For example, activities will be developed jointly by the two projects to establish collection centers for brea gum and for its incorporation into the Argentinian food code (Law 18.284), which will provide certification as a safe product for human use and added value. Similarly, workshops will be held jointly for the exchange of knowledge regarding the sustainable use of biodiversity-based products and to define strategies for reaching consensus among stakeholders (government, indigenous and small-producers associations, etc.) regarding production activities and the sustainable use of native forests.</p> <p>The Regional Gran Chaco project focuses primarily on promoting improved livestock and agricultural production practices; in addition it promotes the diversification of production through alternative uses of the forest. In this regard, the GEF project proposed herein will complement the sustainable management activities developed by the Gran Chaco project, specifically in the provinces for replication of project results (Component 2), including improved access to markets and new production options for biodiversity-based products (food and alternative medicinal products, crafts, natural dyes, non-food fauna, brea gum, and ornamental products): a) development of value chains; b) access to financing for marketing and technical assistance; and c) strengthening community management and organizational skills.</p>	
<p><b>Comment 5:</b>  13. <i>Comment on the project’s innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assess the project’s strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assess the potential for scaling up the project’s intervention.</p> <p>Although NTFP use is widespread the commercialization of these through supply chains improvement and the development of market demand is innovative and can build on the</p>	<p>The project will work under the economic assumption mentioned in the reviewer’s comment and underpinned in the Forest Law. This law provides the resources to assist farmers change their production practices. Given this and given the studies undertaken in the PPG to identify the most economically viable species and the project work on increasing access to markets and finance mechanism, we are confident that the proposal is economically viable. During the PPG phase, an analysis was completed that identified the biodiversity-based products with the highest sustainable production and marketing potential based on information regarding current volumes of production, demand by various production sectors, and current market prices. Biodiversity-based products were classified into three categories: secure, promissory, and experimental, according to the knowledge on their biology and ecology and their access to markets. In addition, a pre-feasibility study was carried out to identify potential institutions and local agencies (Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Production of Salta, and the Micro-Business Council) and national agencies (SAyDS, MAGyP, INTA, Ministry of Social Development, Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Labor, Ministry of Tourism, Ministry of Industry and Ministry of the Economy and Finance) to assess available financing (micro-credits, subsidies, technical assistance, other) to develop value chains, and to assess access to and opening of markets to ensure the economic and social sustainability of the</p>	<p>CEO  Endorsement Request:  Project Document:  Section 2.5.  Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities;  Table 12 – Products and species with highest potential for economic viable (reliable) in well preserved native forest areas in the three ecoregions.  Table 13 – Financing</p>

<p>experience of other products such as timber. Sustainability is based around the assumption that the alternative being provided is financially more attractive to land users and that the market will support the additional costs of these improved working practices. This is underpinned by the Forest Law. The potential for scaling up is good as these are only pilot sites with supportive existing conditions; it could be replicated across other regions. Please fully examine the economic assumptions by the time of CEO endorsement.</p> <p>#13 Please fully examine the economic assumptions by the time of CEO endorsement.</p>	<p>biodiversity-based products.</p> <p>The project will work with biodiversity-based products with the highest potential (secure, based on the categories mentioned previously) and will make use of control groups (without GEF intervention) to assess the delivery of global environmental benefits based on the economic working assumption. To this end, indicators have been included in the project's results framework and the results of the analyses mentioned above have been included as part of the narrative of the project document.</p>	<p>institutions, laws, and programmes (credits and subsidies) related to NTFP production and marketing.; Annex 8.7 Problems and Opportunities Analysis for Selected Biodiversity-based Products</p>
<p><b>Comment 6:</b>  <i>17. At PIF: Is the indicated amount and composition of cofinancing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role?</i></p> <p><i>At CEO endorsement: Has cofinancing been confirmed?</i></p> <p>Cofinance is \$21,687,400 a ratio of 1:4.69, of which 97% is cash cofinance. UNDP's contribution is \$500,000 cash cofinance. In order to ensure support from the private sector it would be prudent to ensure cofinance from the private sector by time of CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>#17 Cofinance from private sector.</p>	<p>Although cofinancing from the private sector was not secured, during the PPG phase an analysis was performed to identify the biodiversity-based products with the highest sustainable production and marketing potential that allowed identifying the demand by the private sector. This analysis, together with the participation of the MAGyP as a co-financier of the project (which has close ties to the private sector), will serve as the basis for leveraging financial support from the private sector during project implementation.</p>	<p>Project Document: Section 2.5. Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities</p>
<p><b>Compilation of Comments Submitted by Council Members on the Work Program Approved by Council in June, 2013</b></p>		
<p><b>France's Comments</b></p>		
<p><b>Comment 1:</b>  We support the initiative and the project objective, but it seems that the coordination with ongoing projects in the area could be improved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Especially, the program for the conservation and sustainable management of Gran Chaco Argentina, Paraguay, Bolivia co-funded by FFEM may be considered. This project aims to reduce deforestation and</li> </ul>	<p>The GEF project proposed herein will complement the Gran Chaco Region project, in particular in aspects related to the sustainable management activities developed in the provinces for replication of project results (Component 2). This will include improved access to markets and new production options for biodiversity-based products (food and alternative medicinal products, crafts, natural dyes, non-food fauna, brea gum, and ornamental products). More specifically, the project proposed herein will complement the Gran Chaco Region project through:</p> <p>a) development of value chains for the biodiversity-based products; b) facilitating access to financing for marketing and technical assistance; and c) strengthening community management and organizational skills. In addition, activities will be developed jointly by the two projects. For example, collection centers for brea gum will be established jointly and</p>	<p>CEO Endorsement Request: A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF-financed initiatives</p>

<p>degradation of vegetation by suggesting viable alternatives to local populations to generate revenue. In order to do this, the project proposes to create a regional area of sustainable development and conservation to integrate the preservation of biodiversity in public land use policies. At the same time, carrying out and supporting pilot local economic development programs that will allow identification of activities that improve the quality of life for populations while conserving natural resources. This project is complementary to the regional project sustainable forest management in the transboundary ecosystem of the Chaco</p>	<p>project teams will work together for the incorporation of the brea gum into the Argentinian food code (Law 18.284), which will provide certification as a safe product for human use and added value. Similarly, workshops will be held jointly for the exchange of knowledge regarding the sustainable use of biodiversity-based products and to define strategies to reach consensus among stakeholders (government, indigenous and small-producers associations, etc.) about production activities and the sustainable use of native forests.</p>	
---	---	--

**Germany's Comments**

<p><u>Comment 1:</u></p> <p>We add for consideration that the actually involved stakeholders and institutions, especially the <i>Secretariat for Environment and Sustainable Development</i>, do not have the necessary capacities as well as the required connections to small producers. For this reason we call for the involvement of further institutions and important stakeholders related to the target group (like <i>Foro Nacional de Agricultura, Institutos de Investigación de la Pequeña Agricultura Familiar, Coordinación de Transferencia y Extensión</i> and <i>Subsecretaría de Agricultura Familiar</i>).</p>	<p>As part of the project stakeholder analysis and assessments to ensure that small-scale producers are effectively involved in the project, institutions and stakeholders related to the target group were identified. This includes the <i>Asociación de Productores Originarios de Valles de Altura (APOVA)</i>, which has close ties to the <i>Subsecretaría de Agricultura Familiar</i> of the MAGyP delegation in the Jujuy province, and that promotes rural development among small farmers and indigenous groups that practice agriculture, produce craft, and collect NTFP. In addition, the project will work closely with programs from the <i>Subsecretaría de Agricultura Familiar</i> and the <i>Unidad para el Cambio Rural</i> (The Social Forestry Program – PROSOBO; Rural Areas Development Program – PRODEAR; Inclusive Rural Development Program – PRODERI; and the Agricultural Services Program – PROSAP) to promote the development of family production units and small producers.</p> <p>In addition, the project will also work at the local level with the Ministry of Social Development on the development of the collective brand “Native Forests,” which will be a distinctive way of adding value and providing greater visibility of the biodiversity-based products. The project will also work at the local level with the Micro-Loan program for Social and Solidarity-based Economics, which is directed at men and women workers carrying out productive, commercial, or service-related undertakings at the family and/or cooperative levels.</p> <p>Finally, through the Secretariat for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SEPyME) of the Ministry of Economy’s Program for Reinforcing Local Productive Systems, the project will make use of financial incentives and will have access to technical assistance for small producers and farmers in the implementation of sustainable production practices.</p>	<p>CEO Endorsement Request: Part II, Section B.1. Project Document: Section 1.5: Stakeholder analysis</p>
<p><u>Comment 2:</u></p> <p>Furthermore a participative approach is necessary in order to achieve that the peasantry rethink their existing land-use practices. This is only possible by including other important stakeholders.</p>	<p>A detailed stakeholder analysis was completed during the project’s PPG phase to identify all of the relevant stakeholders, including indigenous groups, local CSOs, small-scale farmers/producers, and local communities living and using forest and related resources in the prioritized project landscapes. Additionally, a detailed stakeholder participation plan was developed to engage small-scale farmers and producers in the development of management plans and to build capacities for the implementation of sustainable biodiversity-based production combined with low-impact agroforestry systems near high conservation value</p>	<p>CEO Endorsement Request: Part II, Section B.1. Project Document: Section 1.5: Stakeholder analysis</p>

	<p>forests. By facilitating access to existing finance mechanisms, including agricultural subsidies and rural credit programs for NTFP, and improving supply chains and access to markets for biodiversity-friendly products, alternatives will be provided that are financially more attractive to land users than existing production activities. The project will promote the production and use the biodiversity-based products with the highest sustainable production and marketing potential to ensure that the expected socioeconomic and environmental benefits are delivered. Furthermore, an awareness-raising and information program will be implemented to enhance awareness among land and forest owners/users of the benefits of sustainable land and forest use. A description as to how these stakeholders will be engaged in the implementation of this and other project activities, with the participation and support from national- and provincial-level agencies, is included in Part II, Section B.1 of this CEO Endorsement Request.</p>	
<p><b>STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF), date of screening: April 25, 2012</b></p>		
<p><u>Comment 1:</u>  Given the existence of several PES projects in the region, it STAP suggests that during PPG, mechanisms to coordinate activities with these and seek synergies with other mainstreaming initiatives in the area be developed.</p>	<p>Please refer to the response to Comment No. 4 from the GEF Secretariat regarding how the project has established mechanisms for coordinating activities and developing synergies with other projects in the region, including PES projects.</p>	<p>CEO Endorsement Request: A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF- financed initiatives</p>
<p><u>Comment 1:</u> Further, STAP recommends that the following GEF/STAP advisory documents be considered during the development of the full project brief - Payments for Environmental Services and the Global Environment Facility Wunder et al. 2010; and Environmental Certification and the Global Environmental Facility Blackman and Rivera 2010; Experimental Project designs in the Global Environment facility Ferraro 2012</p>	<p>Thank you for your recommendation. Initial consideration was given to the suggested documents, which will be further used during project implementation. In addition, the project implementation team will follow the developments regarding PES in GEF projects with the support of the technical staff from the UNDP Country Office and the Regional Center in Panamá, as well as through UNDP-GEF sponsored networks that are organized by high-level staff working in projects sharing common traits.</p>	

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS**

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 150,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Baseline and technical analyses to further identify and cost the actions to be included in the FSP.	150,000	102,936	47,064
Analysis of national and local capacities and consultations for finalizing the FSP details and its implementation arrangements			
Development of feasibility analysis, budget and key project design elements			
<b>Total</b>	<b>150,000</b>	<b>102,936</b>	<b>47,064</b>

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



# PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

December 15<sup>th</sup>, 2014 – January 2<sup>nd</sup> , 2015

A weekly update on the GEF Program Management

## Contacts

- GEF Secretariat Staff
- GEF Agencies
- GEF Trustee Convention Secretariats

## Calendar

- Council Meeting Schedules
- GEFOP Meeting Schedules

## Communications

- Project Concepts, Proposals, Draft Documents Received
- Project Clearances, Approvals, Endorsements and Other Comments
- Introducing new staff to the GEFSEC
- Announcements

**Naoko Ishii**  
Chief Executive Officer and Chairperson  
[nishii@thegef.org](mailto:nishii@thegef.org)

**FRONT OFFICE**

**Peter Lallas**  
Advisor to the Chief Executive Officer  
[plallas@thegef.org](mailto:plallas@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 9732

**Claus Pram Astrup**  
Senior Operations Officer  
[castrup@theworldbank.org](mailto:castrup@theworldbank.org)  
+ 1 202 478 7270

**Elif Kiratli**  
Special Assistant  
[ekiratli@theworldbank.org](mailto:ekiratli@theworldbank.org)  
+202-458-2006

**Beatrice B. Owolabi-Jokoh**  
Resource Management Officer  
[bowolabi@thegef.org](mailto:bowolabi@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 4215

**Julienne Kouame**  
Program Analyst  
[jkouame@thegef.org](mailto:jkouame@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 8736

---

Mailing Address:  
**GEF Secretariat**  
1818 H Street, NW, MSN P4-400  
Washington, D.C. 20433  
+1 202 473 0508; Fax: +1 202 522 3240/3245

## POLICY AND OPERATIONS

**Elwyn Grainger-Jones**  
Director  
[egrainger-jones@thegef.org](mailto:egrainger-jones@thegef.org)  
+ 1 202 473 8782

**William Ehlers**  
Head, External Relations  
[wehlers@thegef.org](mailto:wehlers@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 9436

### Communications and Media

**Christian Hofer**  
Senior Communications Officer  
[chofer@thegef.org](mailto:chofer@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 0936

**Patrizia Cocca**  
Communications Officer and KM Coordinator  
[pcocca@thegef.org](mailto:pcocca@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 0234

**Sogdiana Azhibenova**  
Consultant  
[sazhibenova@thegef.org](mailto:sazhibenova@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 7189

**Olivier Besson**  
Program Assistant  
[obesson@thegef.org](mailto:obesson@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 8935

### Country Relations

**Henry Salazar**  
Senior Country Relations Officer  
Latin America and the Caribbean/East Europe and  
Central Asia  
[hsalazar@thegef.org](mailto:hsalazar@thegef.org)

**Susan Waithaka**  
Country Relations Officer  
Sub-Saharan Africa  
[swaithaka@thegef.org](mailto:swaithaka@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 5457

**Minna Maria Kononen**  
Country Relations Officer  
South/East Asia and The Pacific  
[mkononen@thegef.org](mailto:mkononen@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 9402

**Abeer Mohammed Abdul Kal Al Dagestani**  
Country Relations Officer – MENA Region  
[aadagestani@worldbank.org](mailto:aadagestani@worldbank.org)  
+1 202 473 2994

**Robert Schreiber**  
Program Coordinator  
[rschreiber@thegef.org](mailto:rschreiber@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 0288

**Camila Perez Gabilondo**  
ET Temporary  
[mperezgabilondo@thegef.org](mailto:mperezgabilondo@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 0895

**Nicolas Alejandro Marquez Pizzanelli**  
ET Consultant  
[nmarquez@thegef.org](mailto:nmarquez@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 9522

**Oreste Pedro Maia Andrade Junior**  
Consultant  
[omaiaandradejr@thegef.org](mailto:omaiaandradejr@thegef.org)  
+1 202 478 9387



**Christina Bogyo**  
Senior Program Assistant  
[cbogyo@thegef.org](mailto:cbogyo@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 6974

### Capacity Development/Civil Society

**Pilar Barrera**  
Operations Officer  
Civil Society Relations and Capacity Development  
[pbarrera@thegef.org](mailto:pbarrera@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 9891

**Regine Mpoyi**  
Program Assistant  
[rmpoyi@thegef.org](mailto:rmpoyi@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 2754

---

**Ramesh Ramankutty**  
Head, Corporate Operations and Financial Services  
[rramankutty@thegef.org](mailto:rramankutty@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 2725

### Operations, Budget and Finance

**Lily Uy Hale**  
Senior Operations Officer  
[lhale@thegef.org](mailto:lhale@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 0735

**Ramon Prudencio C de Mesa**  
Operations Officer  
[rmesa@thegef.org](mailto:rmesa@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 9285

**Quynh Xuan Thi Phan**  
Financial Officer  
[qphan1@worldbank.org](mailto:qphan1@worldbank.org)  
+1 202 458 4760

**Akila Nazneen**  
Financial Assistant  
[anazneen@thegef.org](mailto:anazneen@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 1760

**Amanda Olesia Adams**  
Program Assistant  
[aadams@thegef.org](mailto:aadams@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 9878

### Management Information System

**Deepak Kataria**  
Senior Business Solutions Officer  
[dkataria@thegef.org](mailto:dkataria@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 3881

**Lesly Rigaud**  
Client Technologies Officer  
[lrigaud@thegef.org](mailto:lrigaud@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 3881

**Juman Byun**  
Business Solutions Officer  
[jbyun@thegef.org](mailto:jbyun@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 7987

## Policy and Strategy Development

**Andrew Velthaus**  
Senior Policy Officer & Biodiversity Specialist  
[avelthaus@thegef.org](mailto:avelthaus@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 9073

**Yasemin Biro Kirtman**  
Senior Environmental Specialist  
[ybiro@thegef.org](mailto:ybiro@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 1550

**Sonja Sabita Teelucksingh**  
Environmental Specialist  
[steelucksingh@thegef.org](mailto:steelucksingh@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 4004

**Seo-Jeong Yoon**  
Policy Officer  
[syoon@thegef.org](mailto:syoon@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 7832

## Results-Based Management

**Omid Parhizkar**  
Operations Officer  
[oparhizkar@thegef.org](mailto:oparhizkar@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 5506

**Naiying Peng**  
Operations Analyst  
[npeng@thegef.org](mailto:npeng@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 9580

---

## PROGRAMS

**Gustavo Fonseca**  
Director,  
[gfonseca1@thegef.org](mailto:gfonseca1@thegef.org)  
+ 1 202 458 4818

**Anil Bruce Sookdeo**  
Senior Environmental Specialist  
[asookdeo@thegef.org](mailto:asookdeo@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 0683

**Astrid Hillers**  
Senior Environmental Specialist  
International Waters ( Africa)  
[ahillers@thegef.org](mailto:ahillers@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 8173

**Chibulu Luo**  
Junior Professional Associate  
[clu@thegef.org](mailto:clu@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 9212

**Christian Severin**  
Senior Environmental Specialist  
(International Waters)  
[cseverin@thegef.org](mailto:cseverin@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 2001

**Dustin S. Schinn**  
Operations Analyst  
[dschinn@thegef.org](mailto:dschinn@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 1234

**Fareeha Iqbal**  
Climate Change Specialist  
[fiqball1@thegef.org](mailto:fiqball1@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 9593

**Jaime Cavalier**  
Senior Biodiversity Specialist  
(Biodiversity/Biosafety/ABS, Land Degradation)  
[jcavalier@thegef.org](mailto:jcavalier@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 4886

**Andrew Chilombo**  
ET Temporary  
[achilombo@thegef.org](mailto:achilombo@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 9890

**Charlotte Gobin**  
Senior Environmental Specialist  
(Biodiversity)  
[cgobin@thegef.org](mailto:cgobin@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 5843

**Chizuru Aoki**  
Senior Technology Transfer Officer  
[caoki@thegef.org](mailto:caoki@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 6068

**David Rodgers**  
Senior Energy Specialist  
(Energy Efficiency, Renewable Energy)  
[drodgers@thegef.org](mailto:drodgers@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 9869

**Evelyn Swain**  
Environmental Specialist  
[eswain@thegef.org](mailto:eswain@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 1151

**Glynis Barber**  
Program Assistant  
[gbarber@thegef.org](mailto:gbarber@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 9647

**Jean-Marc Sinnassamy**  
Senior Environmental Specialist  
(Land Degradation/SFM)  
[jsinnassamy@thegef.org](mailto:jsinnassamy@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 8060

**Ian Gray**  
Senior Environmental Specialist  
(SFM/REDD+)  
[igray@thegef.org](mailto:igray@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 8718

**Kathryn Cherrie**  
Senior Program Assistant  
[kcherrie@thegef.org](mailto:kcherrie@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 1460

**Knut Roland Sundstrom**  
Climate Change Specialist  
[ksundstrom@thegef.org](mailto:ksundstrom@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 7510

**Lulwa Ali**  
Senior Environmental Specialist  
[lali1@thegef.org](mailto:lali1@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 5618

**Masako Ogawa**  
Senior Environment Specialist  
[mogawa2@thegef.org](mailto:mogawa2@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 2789

**Ming Yang**  
Senior Environmental Economist  
(Energy Efficiency)  
[myang@thegef.org](mailto:myang@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 5707

**Monica Fernandes**  
Senior Program Assistant  
[mfernandes@thegef.org](mailto:mfernandes@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 9647

**Nicole Glineur**  
Senior Environmental Specialist  
(Biodiversity/International Waters)  
[nglineur@thegef.org](mailto:nglineur@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 2512

**Robert K. Dixon**  
Advisor, Climate and Chemicals  
[Rdixon1@thegef.org](mailto:Rdixon1@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 2340

**Ibrahima Sow**  
Senior Environmental Specialist  
[isow@thegef.org](mailto:isow@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 2716

**Kettly Denis**  
Program Assistant  
[kdenis@thegef.org](mailto:kdenis@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 0825

**Leah Karrer**  
Senior Environmental Specialist  
[lkarrer@thegef.org](mailto:lkarrer@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 8364

**Mark Zimsky**  
Senior Biodiversity Specialist  
[mzimsky@thegef.org](mailto:mzimsky@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 7855

**Milena Gonzalez Vasquez**  
Junior Professional Associate  
[mgonzalezvasquez@thegef.org](mailto:mgonzalezvasquez@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 2789

**Mohamed Imam Bakarr**  
Senior Environmental Specialist  
(Land Degradation)  
[mbakarr@thegef.org](mailto:mbakarr@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 8890

**Nhu Quynh Phan**  
Program Assistant  
[nphan@thegef.org](mailto:nphan@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 4236

**Rawleston Moore**  
Senior Climate Change Specialist  
[rmoore1@thegef.org](mailto:rmoore1@thegef.org)  
+ 1 202 473 8231

**Sarah Wyatt**  
Junior Professional Associate  
[swyatt@thegef.org](mailto:swyatt@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 0534

**Saliha Dobardzic**  
Senior Climate Change Specialist  
[sdobardzic@thegef.org](mailto:sdobardzic@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 5943

**Steffen Hansen**  
Junior Professional Officer  
[shansen@thegef.org](mailto:shansen@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 8796

**Ulrich Apel**  
Senior Environmental Specialist  
[uapel@thegef.org](mailto:uapel@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 2573

**Yoko Watanabe**  
Senior Biodiversity Specialist  
[ywatane@thegef.org](mailto:ywatanabe@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 9847

**Shakil Kayani**  
Program Assistant  
[skayani@thegef.org](mailto:skayani@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 4680

**Tigest Tirfe**  
Program Assistant  
[ttirfe@thegef.org](mailto:ttirfe@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 9297

**Xiaomei Tan**  
Climate Change Specialist  
(Sustainable City, Urban & Transport)  
[xtan1@thegef.org](mailto:xtan1@thegef.org)  
+1 202 473 7448

# INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OFFICE

## Juha Uitto

Director

GEF Independent Evaluation Office

[juitto@thegef.org](mailto:juitto@thegef.org)

### Aaron Zazueta

Chief Evaluations Officer

[azazueta@thegef.org](mailto:azazueta@thegef.org)

+1 202 473 6406

### Carlo Carugi

Senior Evaluations Officer

[ccarugi@thegef.org](mailto:ccarugi@thegef.org)

+1 202 473 8154

### Anna Viggh

Senior Evaluations Officer

[aviggh@worldbank.org](mailto:aviggh@worldbank.org)

+1 202 473 8896

### Kseniya Temnenko

Knowledge Management  
Officer

[ktemnenko@thegef.org](mailto:ktemnenko@thegef.org)

+1 202 458 4908

### Jeneen Garcia

Evaluation Officer

[jgarcia2@thegef.org](mailto:jgarcia2@thegef.org)

+1 202 458 2719

### Francisco Grahammer

ET Consultant

[fgrahammer@thegef.org](mailto:fgrahammer@thegef.org)

+1 202 473 4914

### Ruben Sardon

ET Consultant

[rsardon@thegef.org](mailto:rsardon@thegef.org)

+1 202 473 1703

### David Akana

ET Consultant

[dakana@thegef.org](mailto:dakana@thegef.org)

+1 202 458 9733

### Evelyn Chihuguyu

Program Assistant

[echihuguyu@thegef.org](mailto:echihuguyu@thegef.org)

+1 202 473 0654

### Neeraj Kumar Negi

Senior Evaluations Officer

[nnegi1@thegef.org](mailto:nnegi1@thegef.org)

+1 202 473 2259

### Juan Portillo

Senior Operations Officer

[jportillo@worldbank.org](mailto:jportillo@worldbank.org)

+1 202 473 6056

### Baljit Wadhwa

Senior Evaluations Officer

[bwadhwa@worldbank.org](mailto:bwadhwa@worldbank.org)

+1 202 473 0266

### Sandra Romboli

Evaluation Officer

[sromboli@thegef.org](mailto:sromboli@thegef.org)

+1 202 458 4972

### Malac Kabir

Research Assistant

[mkabir4@thegef.org](mailto:mkabir4@thegef.org)

+1 202 473 1808

### Joshua Schneck

ET Consultant

[jschneck@thegef.org](mailto:jschneck@thegef.org)

+1 202 458 9552

### Shanna Edberg

Junior Professional Associate

[sedberg@thegef.org](mailto:sedberg@thegef.org)

### Marie-Constance Manuella Koukoui

Senior Executive Assistant

[mkoukoui@thegef.org](mailto:mkoukoui@thegef.org)

+1 202 458 9682

## ADAPTATION FUND BOARD SECRETARIAT

### **Marcia Levaggi**

Senior Program Manager

[ml evaggi@thegef.org](mailto:ml evaggi@thegef.org)

+1 202 473 6390

### **Mikko Antti Ollikainen**

Senior Environmental Specialist

[mollikainen@thegef.org](mailto:mollikainen@thegef.org)

+1 202 458 8912

### **Daouda Ben Oumar Ndiaye**

Adaptation Officer

[dndiaye@thegef.org](mailto:dndiaye@thegef.org)

+1 202 473 4611

### **Dima Shocair Reda**

Operations Officer

[dreda@thegef.org](mailto:dreda@thegef.org)

+1 202 458 5184

### **Cathryn Leigh Poff**

ET Consultant

[cpoff@thegef.org](mailto:cpoff@thegef.org)

+1 202 473 5463

### **Aya Mimura**

Program Assistant

[amimura@thegef.org](mailto:amimura@thegef.org)

+1 202 458 7347

---

## GEF DIRECTORY OF ADDRESSEES

### GEF Secretariat

**GEF Secretariat<sup>1</sup>**  
**Program Coordination Registry**  
1818 H Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20433, USA  
[gcoordination@thegef.org](mailto:gcoordination@thegef.org)

Attn: Mr. Ramesh Ramankutty  
Head, Operations and Business Strategy  
[rramankutty@thegef.org](mailto:rramankutty@thegef.org)  
+1 202 458 2725

### GEF Trustee

**International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (The World Bank) Registry**  
1818 H Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20433, USA  
[geftrustee@worldbank.org](mailto:geftrustee@worldbank.org)

Mr. Praveen Desabatla  
Team Leader, DFPTF  
[pdesabatla@worldbank.org](mailto:pdesabatla@worldbank.org)  
+1 202 458 2099

### Convention Secretariats

**UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)**  
413 rue Saint-Jacques, Suite 800  
Montreal, Quebec, Canada H2Y 1 N9  
[Secretariat@cbd.int](mailto:Secretariat@cbd.int)

Attn: Mr. Braulio F. de Souza Dias  
Executive Secretary  
*GEF Contact Person: Mr. Yibin Xiang*  
*Program Officer*  
[Yibin.xiang@cbd.int](mailto:Yibin.xiang@cbd.int)  
+1 514 288 2220

**UN Framework on Climate Change Convention (UNFCCC)**  
Haus Carstanjen  
Martin Luther King Strasse 8  
53175 Bonn, Germany  
[secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int)

Attn: Ms. Christiana Figueres  
Executive Secretary  
*GEF Contact Person: Mr. Yolando Velasco*  
*Manager, FTC Programme*  
[gefenabling.activities@unfccc.int](mailto:gefenabling.activities@unfccc.int)  
[gefprojects@unfccc.int](mailto:gefprojects@unfccc.int)  
+45228 815 1999

### **Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions**

UNEP International Environment House 1  
11-13 Chemin des Anémones  
1219 Chatelaine, Geneva, Switzerland

Attn: Dr. Rolph Payet  
Executive Secretary

- GEF Focal Point for project related activities and the POPs Task Force:*  
*Ms. Maria Cristina Cardenas,*  
*Branch Chief,*  
*Technical Assistance Branch,*  
[ta@brsmeas.org](mailto:ta@brsmeas.org)  
[maria.cardenas@brsmeas.org](mailto:maria.cardenas@brsmeas.org)  
+41 22 917 8635
- GEF Focal Point for Policy-related Issues, GEF Council and GEF Assembly:*  
*Mr. Frank Moser,*  
*Programme Officer,*  
*Convention Operations Branch,*  
[frank.moser@brsmeas.org](mailto:frank.moser@brsmeas.org)  
+41 22 917 8951



---

**UN Convention to Combat Desertification  
(UNCCD)**

Herrmann-Ehlers Str. 10  
D-53113 Bonn, Germany  
[secretariat@unccd.int](mailto:secretariat@unccd.int)

Attn: Ms. Monique Barbut  
Executive Secretary

*GEF Contact Person: Ms. Anja Thust*  
*Program Officer, FCMI Unit*  
[athust@unccd.int](mailto:athust@unccd.int)  
+49 228 815 2828

---

**Interim Secretariat of the Minamata Convention**

International Environment House 1  
13, chemin des Anémones  
CH-1219 Chatelaine, Geneva  
Switzerland

Mrs. Fatoumata Keita Ouane  
Head, Chemicals Branch  
[Fatoumata.Keita-Ouane@unep.org](mailto:Fatoumata.Keita-Ouane@unep.org)  
+41 22 917 8183

Mr. Jacob Duer  
Coordinator, Minamata Convention  
[jacob.duer@unep.org](mailto:jacob.duer@unep.org)  
+41 22 917 82 17

---

---

<sup>1</sup> GEF Secretariat's physical address: Presidential Plaza Building, 900 19th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20006

## STAP Panel and Secretariat

### Panel

**Rosina Bierbaum**

Chairperson

[rbierbau@umich.edu](mailto:rbierbau@umich.edu)

+1 734 763 8675

---

**Ralph E. Sims**

Panel Member on Climate Change Mitigation

[R.E.Sims@massey.ac.nz](mailto:R.E.Sims@massey.ac.nz)

+64 21 166 4555

---

**Brian Child**

Panel Member on Biodiversity

[bchild@ufl.edu](mailto:bchild@ufl.edu)

+352 392 0494

---

**Ricardo Barra**

Panel Member on Chemicals & Waste

[ricbarra@udec.cl](mailto:ricbarra@udec.cl)

56-41-2204002

---

**Annette Cowie**

Panel Member on Land Degradation

[annette.cowie@une.edu.au](mailto:annette.cowie@une.edu.au)

+61 2 677 28080

---

**Jakob Granit**

Panel Member on International Waters

[jakob.granit@sei-international.org](mailto:jakob.granit@sei-international.org)

+46 73 707 8536

---

**Anand Patwardhan**

Panel Member on Adaptation

[apat@umd.edu](mailto:apat@umd.edu)

+1 301 405 3413

---

**Michael Stocking**

Advisor to the STAP Chair

[m.stocking@uea.ac.uk](mailto:m.stocking@uea.ac.uk)

+44 1603 592 339

---

**Thomas E. Lovejoy**

Advisor to the STAP Chair

[tlovejoy@unfoundation.org](mailto:tlovejoy@unfoundation.org)

---

### Secretariat

**Thomas Hammond**

STAP Secretary

[thomas.hammond@unep.org](mailto:thomas.hammond@unep.org)

+1 202 974 1318

---

**Guadalupe Duron**

Programme Officer

[guadalupe.duron@unep.org](mailto:guadalupe.duron@unep.org)

+1 202 974 1313

---

**Robin Burgess**

Programme Assistant

[robin.burgess@unep.org](mailto:robin.burgess@unep.org)

+1 202 974 1311

---

**Christine Wellington-Moore**

Senior Programme Officer

[christine.wellington-moore@unep.org](mailto:christine.wellington-moore@unep.org)

+1 202 974 1303

---

**Lev Neretin**

Senior Programme Officer

[lev.neretin@unep.org](mailto:lev.neretin@unep.org)

+1 202 621 5020

---

**Virginia Gorsevski**

Consultant

[virginia.gorsevski@unep.org](mailto:virginia.gorsevski@unep.org)

+1 202 621 5039

---

## GEF Agency Secretariats

### **African Development Bank (AfDB) Registry**

Headquarters  
01 BP 1387 Abidjan 01  
Côte d'Ivoire  
[Gef\\_afdb@afdb.org](mailto:Gef_afdb@afdb.org)

Mr. Mahamat Assouyouiti  
GEF Coordinator  
[m.assouyouiti@afdb.org](mailto:m.assouyouiti@afdb.org)

*Copy to:*  
*Mr. Kurt Lonsway*  
*Division Manager, Environment and Climate Change*  
[k.lonsway@afdb.org](mailto:k.lonsway@afdb.org)

### **Asian Development Bank (ADB) Registry**

6 ADB Avenue  
Mandaluyong City 1550  
Metro Manila, Philippines  
[adbgef@adb.org](mailto:adbgef@adb.org)

Attn: Mr. Nessim Ahmad  
Director, Environment and Social Safeguards  
and GEF Official Focal Point  
[njahmad@adb.org](mailto:njahmad@adb.org)

*Copy to:*  
*Mr. Bruce Dunn*  
*ADB/GEF Coordinator*  
[bdunn@adb.org](mailto:bdunn@adb.org)  
+632 683 1922/ +632 683 1923

### **European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) Registry**

One Exchange Square  
London EC2A 2JN, United Kingdom  
[ebrdgef@ebrd.com](mailto:ebrdgef@ebrd.com)

Attn: Ms. Marta Simonetti  
Senior Manager  
(Multilateral Funds – Climate and Environment)  
EBRD GEF Executive Coordinator  
Donor Co-Financing – VP Policy  
[simonetm@ebrd.com](mailto:simonetm@ebrd.com)  
+ 0044 (0) 207338 7259  
+ 0044 (0) 7921 039815

### **United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Registry**

Viale Dell Terme di Caracalla  
00153 Rome, Italy  
[GEF-Coordination-Unit@fao.org](mailto:GEF-Coordination-Unit@fao.org)

Attn: Mr. Gustavo Merino  
Director, Investment Centre Division  
[TCI-Director@fao.org](mailto:TCI-Director@fao.org)  
[faogef@fao.org](mailto:faogef@fao.org)  
+3906 570 54477

*Copy to:*  
*Mr. Jeffrey Griffin*  
*Senior Coordinator - GEF*  
*Investment Center Division*  
[Jeffrey.Griffin@fao.org](mailto:Jeffrey.Griffin@fao.org)  
+3906 570 55680

## GEF Agency Secretariats cont'd

### **Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)**

#### **Registry**

1300 New York Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20577, USA

[Idb-gef@iadb.org](mailto:Idb-gef@iadb.org)

Mr. Michael Collins

GEF Coordinator

[michaelc@iadb.org](mailto:michaelc@iadb.org)

+ 1 202 623 2158

### **International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (The World Bank) Registry**

1818 H Street, NW Washington,  
D.C. 20433, USA

[wbgfoperations@worldbank.org](mailto:wbgfoperations@worldbank.org)

Ms. Karin Shepardson

GEF Executive Coordinator

[kshepardson@worldbank.org](mailto:kshepardson@worldbank.org)

+202 473 8607

### **International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) Registry**

Via Paolo di Dono, 44  
00142 Rome, Italy

[ECDmailbox@ifad.org](mailto:ECDmailbox@ifad.org)

Mr. John McIntire

Associate Vice President,  
Programme Management Department

+39 06 5459 2320

*Copy to:*

*Mr. Gernot Laganda*

*Acting Director, Environment and Climate Division*

[g.laganda@ifad.org](mailto:g.laganda@ifad.org)

*Tel: +39 06 5459 2142*

*Ms. Sheila Mwanundu*

*GEF Coordinator*

[s.mwanundu@ifad.org](mailto:s.mwanundu@ifad.org)

*Tel: +39 06 5459 2031*

*Ms. Aisha Nazario*

[a.nazario@ifad.org](mailto:a.nazario@ifad.org)

*Tel: +39 06 5459 2459*

### **United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Registry**

United Nations Avenue  
Gigiri, PO Box 30552  
00100 Nairobi, Ken ya

[Unepgef@unep.org](mailto:Unepgef@unep.org)

Local Office:

900 17th Street, NW  
Suite 506, Washington, D.C. 20006

Ms. Brennan VanDyke

GEF Executive Coordinator

Deputy Director, Office for Operations

[Brennan.VanDyke@unep.org](mailto:Brennan.VanDyke@unep.org)

+254 20 762 3993

*Copy to:*

*Ms. Kelly West*

*Senior GEF Portfolio Manager*

*Office for Operations*

[Kelly.West@unep.org](mailto:Kelly.West@unep.org)

## GEF Agency Secretariats cont'd

**United Nations Industrial Development  
Organization (UNIDO) Registry**  
Vienna International Centre  
PO Box 300  
A-1400 Vienna, Austria  
[gef@unido.org](mailto:gef@unido.org)

Mr. Juergen Hierold  
GEF Coordinator  
[J.Hierold@unido.org](mailto:J.Hierold@unido.org)  
+43 1 26026 4565

*Copy to:*  
*Ms. Anya Onysko*  
*UNIDO Liaison Officer*  
[g.onysko@unido.org](mailto:g.onysko@unido.org)  
+1 43-1-26026 3647

**United Nations Development Programme  
(UNDP) Registry**  
304 East 45th Street  
New York, NY 10017, USA  
[undpgef@undp.org](mailto:undpgef@undp.org)

Attn: Ms. Adriana Dinu  
GEF Executive Coordinator  
[Adriana.dinu@undp.org](mailto:Adriana.dinu@undp.org)  
+1 212 906 5143

## GEF Project Agency Secretariats

**Conservation International (CI) Registry**  
2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 500  
Arlington VA, 22202  
USA  
[CIGEF@conservation.org](mailto:CIGEF@conservation.org)

Ms. Lilian Spijkerman,  
Vice President Global Public Partnerships  
+ 703 341 2552  
[lspijkerman@conservation.org](mailto:lspijkerman@conservation.org)

*Copy to:*  
[osamaroo@conservation.org](mailto:osamaroo@conservation.org)

**World Wildlife Fund, Inc. (WWF-US)**  
1250 24th St, NW  
Washington, DC 20037-1193  
[WWFGEF@wwfus.org](mailto:WWFGEF@wwfus.org)

Attn: Dr. David McCauley  
Vice President, Multilateral Affairs  
[David.McCauley@wwfus.org](mailto:David.McCauley@wwfus.org)  
+1-202-495-4159

*Copy to:*  
*Mr. Hervé Lefevre*  
*Senior Director, GEF Relations and*  
*GEF Coordinator*  
[Hervé.Lefevre@wwfus.org](mailto:Hervé.Lefevre@wwfus.org)  
+1-202-459-8533

## GEF Project Agency Secretariats cont'd

---

**International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)**

Rue Mauverney, 28  
CH-1196 Gland,  
Switzerland  
[IUCNGEF@iucn.org](mailto:IUCNGEF@iucn.org)

Attn: Cyrie Sendashonga  
Global Director, Policy and Programme  
[Cyriaque.Sendashonga@iucn.org](mailto:Cyriaque.Sendashonga@iucn.org)  
+41 22 999 03 17

*Copy to:*  
*Mr. Jean-Yves Pirot,*  
*Head, GEF Coordination Unit*  
[jean-yves.pirot@iucn.org](mailto:jean-yves.pirot@iucn.org)  
+41 22 999 02 56

*Mr. Sébastien Delahaye*  
*Portfolio Manager*  
*GEF Coordination Unit*  
[Sebastien.Delahaye@iucn.org](mailto:Sebastien.Delahaye@iucn.org)  
+ 41 22 999 02 51

---

**DISTRIBUTION LIST WHEN SUBMITTING PROJECT PROPOSALS  
FOR GEF CEO APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT**

As a rule, all GEF Agencies are expected to circulate their project proposals to the GEF Secretariat, GEF Agencies, and STAP and to the relevant Convention Secretariat.

**Standard Distribution List for all projects (PIF, PPG, FSP, MSP, and EA):**

gcoordination@thegef.org  
stapsec@unep.org  
thomas.hammond@unep.org  
adbgef@adb.org  
bdunn@adb.org  
njahmad@adb.org  
gef\_afdb@afdb.org  
m.assouyouiti@afdb.org  
k.lonsway@afdb.org  
CIGEF@conservation.org  
lspijkerman@conservation.org  
osamaroo@conservation.org  
ebrdgef@ebrd.com  
simonetm@ebrd.com  
GEF-Coordination-Unit@fao.org  
faogef@fao.org  
TCI-Director@fao.org  
Jeffrey.Griffin@fao.org  
idb-gef@iadb.org  
michaelc@iadb.org  
ECDmailbox@ifad.org  
s.mwanundu@ifad.org  
a.nazario@ifad.org  
IUCNGEF@iucn.org  
Cyriaque.Sendashonga@iucn.org  
Sebastien.Delahaye@iucn.org  
jean-yves.pirot@iucn.org  
unepgef@unep.org  
Kelly.West@unep.org  
gef@unido.org  
j.hierold@unido.org  
g.onysko@unido.org  
undpgef@undp.org  
adriana.dinu@undp.org  
wbgefoperations@worldbank.org  
WWFGEF@wwfus.org  
David.McCauley@wwfus.org  
Herve.Lefeuvre@wwfus.org

**To be included in the Standard Distribution List as appropriate:**

*For Biodiversity Projects:*

secretariat@cbd.int  
yibin.xiang@cbd.int

*For Land Degradation Projects:*

secretariat@unccd.int  
athust@unccd.int

*For POPs Projects:* ta@brsmeas.org

maria.cardenas@brsmeas.org  
frank.moser@brsmeas.org

*For Climate Change Projects:*

gefprojects@unfccc.int  
gefenabling.activities@unfccc.int

*For Mercury Projects*

fatoumata.keita-ouane@unep.org  
jacob.duer@unep.org  
shelia.logan@unep.org

## SCHEDULE OF FORTHCOMING GEF COUNCIL MEETINGS

Meetings/Consultations	Spring 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016
GEF Council Consultations with Civil Society	June 1	Oct 19	June 6
GEF Council Meeting	June 2 - 4	Oct 20 -22	June 7 -9
LDCF/SCCF Council Meeting	June 4	Oct 22	June 9
GEFCSO Forum			
STAP Panel Meetings	June 1	Oct 19	June 6

### Council Work Program for June 2015

Events	June CWP
Receipt deadline for new PIF proposals for possible inclusion in the WP	March 13
Deadline for Technical Clearances from PMs/ Deadline for GEFOBS Clearances	March 30
GEFSEC Constitutes WP ( Tentative)	April 6
Draft Cover Note to GEFOP	April 17
GEFOP Meeting	April 20
Posting of Work Program	April 27
<b>Council Meeting</b>	<b>June 2 - 4</b>
Council Approval	June 4
Compilation of Council Comments	June 18

✚ Kindly see the link to the posting of the new GEF templates

[http://www.thegef.org/gef/guidelines\\_templates](http://www.thegef.org/gef/guidelines_templates)



## Requests Received from GEF Agencies

December 15 - 19, 2014

<b>GEF ID</b>	<b>IA ID</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Program Manager</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
<b><u>FAO</u></b>									
5144		MSP	POPs	CEO MSP Approval	FAO	Uruguay	Strengthening Capacities for the Sound Management of Pesticides including POPs	Anil Sookdeo	5-Dec-14
5113		FP	Climate Change	CEO endorsement of FSP	FAO	Regional (Angola, Namibia, South Africa)	Enhancing Climate Change Resilience in the Benguela Current Fisheries System	Knut Sundstrom	15-Dec-14
<b><u>IADB</u></b>									
5754		FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO PFD Clearance for WPI	IADB	Regional (Latin America and Caribbean)	IDB-GEF Climate-Smart Agriculture Fund for the Americas (PROGRAM)	David Elrie Rodgers	15-Dec-14
<b><u>IFAD</u></b>									
8005		FP	Land Degradation	CEO PIF Clearance for WPI	IFAD	Armenia	Sustainable Land Management for Increased Productivity	Ulrich Apel	12-Dec-14

GEF ID	IA ID	Type	Focal Area	Decision Sought	Proponent	Country	Project Title	Program Manager	Date Received
<b>UNDP</b>									
5184	4645	FP	Climate Change	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Sao Tome and Principe	Enhancing Capacities of Rural Communities to Pursue Climate Resilient Livelihood Options in the Sao Tome and Principe Districts of Caué, Me-Zochi, Principe, Lemba, Cantagalo, and Lobata (CMPLCL)	Rawleston Moore	11-Dec-14
5280	4965	FP	Climate Change	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Congo DR	Resilience of Muanda's Communities from Coastal Erosion, Democratic Republic of Congo	Knut Sundstrom	15-Dec-14
7993	5495	FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO PIF Clearance for WPI	UNDP	Belarus	Conservation-oriented Management of Forests and Wetlands to Achieve Multiple Benefits	Ulrich Apel	16-Dec-14
7993	5495	FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO PPG approval	UNDP	Belarus	Conservation-oriented Management of Forests and Wetlands to Achieve Multiple Benefits	Ulrich Apel	16-Dec-14
5330	4951	FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Thailand	Maximizing Carbon Sink Capacity and Conserving Biodiversity through Sustainable Conservation, Restoration, and Management of Peat-swamp Ecosystems	Ulrich Apel	16-Dec-14
5414	4570	FP	Climate Change	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Kiribati	Enhancing National Food Security in the Context of Global Climate Change	Rawleston Moore	18-Dec-14

<b>GEF ID</b>	<b>IA ID</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Program Manager</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
5467	4883	MSP	Multi Focal Area	CEO MSP Approval	UNDP	Georgia	Harmonization of Information Management for Improved Knowledge and Monitoring of the Global Environment in Georgia	Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey	18-Dec-14
5380	4648	FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Haiti	Increasing Resilience of Ecosystems and Vulnerable Communities to CC and Anthropic Threats Through a Ridge to Reef Approach to BD Conservation and Watershed Management	Rawleston Moore	19-Dec-14
5355	5259	MSP	Biodiversity	CEO MSP Approval	UNDP	Moldova	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Territorial Planning Policies and Land-Use Practices	Yoko Watanabe	19-Dec-14
<b><u>UNEP</u></b>									
5197		MSP	Multi Focal Area	CEO MSP Approval	UNEP	St. Lucia	Increase St. Lucia's Capacity to Monitor MEA Implementation and Sustainable Development	Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey	18-Dec-14
<b><u>UNIDO</u></b>									
5609		MSP	Climate Change	CEO MSP Approval	UNIDO	Gambia	Greening the Productive Sectors in Gambia: Promoting the Use and Integration of Small to Medium Scale Renewable Energy Systems in the Productive Uses	David Elrie Rodgers	12-Dec-14

<b>GEF ID</b>	<b>IA ID</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Program Manager</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
<u>World Bank</u>									
6947		FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO endorsement of FSP	World Bank	Belarus	Belarus Forestry Development Project	Ian Gray	18-Dec-14

# Responses to Proponents

December 15 - 19, 2014

ID	IA ID	Type	Focal Area	Decision Sought	Proponen	Country	Project Title	Program Manage	Response Date	Remarks
<b>FAO</b>										
5113		FP	Climate Change	CEO endorsement of FSP	FAO	Regional (Angola, Namibia, South Africa)	Enhancing Climate Change Resilience in the Benguela Current Fisheries System	Knut Sundstrom	17-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO
7997		FP	Climate Change	CEO PIF Clearance for WPI	FAO	Uganda	Integrating Climate Resilience into Agricultural and Pastoral Production in Uganda, through a Farmer/Agro-Pastoralist Field School Approach	Rawleston Moore	18-Dec-14	Review Sheet sent to Agency for PIF revision
5304		FP	International Waters	CEO endorsement of FSP	FAO	Regional (Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago)	Sustainable Management of Bycatch in Latin America and Caribbean Trawl Fisheries (REBYC-II LAC)	Christian Severin	18-Dec-14	Review Sheet sent to Agency for FSP revision
<b>UNDP</b>										
5868	5399	FP	Climate Change	CEO PIF Clearance for WPI	UNEP, UNDP	Global	Expanding the Ongoing Support to Least Developed Countries (LDCs) with Country-driven Processes to Advance National Adaptation Plans (NAPs)	Knut Sundstrom	11-Dec-14	PIF cleared for WPI by CEO
5855	5236	FP	Climate Change	CEO PIF Clearance for WPI	UNDP	Mali	Flood Hazard and Climate Risk Management to Secure Lives and Assets in Mali	Knut Sundstrom	11-Dec-14	PIF cleared for WPI by CEO

ID	IA		Focal Area	Decision Sought	Proponen	Country	Project Title	Program Manage	Response	
	ID	Type							Date	Remarks
7993	5495	FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO PIF Clearance for WPI	UNDP	Belarus	Conservation-oriented Management of Forests and Wetlands to Achieve Multiple Benefits	Ulrich Apel	15-Dec-14	Review Sheet sent to Agency for PIF revision
7993	5495	FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO PPG approval	UNDP	Belarus	Conservation-oriented Management of Forests and Wetlands to Achieve Multiple Benefits	Ulrich Apel	15-Dec-14	Review Sheet sent to Agency for PPG revision
6989	5434	FP	Climate Change	CEO PIF Clearance for WPI	UNDP	Nepal	Developing climate resilient livelihoods in the vulnerable watershed in Nepal	Fareeha Iqbal	15-Dec-14	Review Sheet sent to Agency for PIF revision
5484	5229	MSP	POPs	CEO MSP Approval	UNDP	Honduras	Environmental Sound Management of Mercury and Mercury Containing Products and their Wastes in Artisanal Small-scale Gold Mining and Healthcare	Anil Sookdeo	15-Dec-14	MSP approved by CEO
8001	5430	FP	Climate Change	CEO PIF Clearance for WPI	UNDP	Chad	Community-based climate risks management in Chad	Knut Sundstrom	16-Dec-14	Review Sheet sent to Agency for PIF revision
5398	5216	FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Fiji	R2R: Implementing a “Ridge to Reef” Approach to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Sequester Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	17-Dec-14	Review Sheet sent to Agency for FSP revision
8016	5548	EA	Multi Focal Area	CEO EA Approval	UNDP	Somalia	To take stock of Somalia’s existing capacities and specific capacity needs and priorities, as it moves to implement multilateral environmental Conventions to which it is a signatory.	Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey	17-Dec-14	Review Sheet sent to Agency for EA revision (Review sheet sent to Agency)

<b>ID</b>	<b>IA ID</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Proponen</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Program Manage</b>	<b>Response Date</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
5089	4956	FP	Biodiversity	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Mexico	Strengthening Management of the PA System to Better Conserve Endangered Species and their Habitats	Mark Zimsky	18-Dec-14	FSP recommended for endorsement (Docs circulating for clearance/signature)
4737	4905	FP	POPs	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Armenia	Elimination of Obsolete Pesticide Stockpiles and Addressing POPs Contaminated Sites within a Sound Chemicals Management Framework	Lulwa Ali	18-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO
6939	5415	EA	Chemicals and Waste	CEO PIF Approval	UNDP	Guyana	Minamata Initial Assessment for Guyana	Ibrahima Sow	18-Dec-14	PIF not recommended for further development
<b>UNEP</b>										
5868		FP	Climate Change	CEO PIF Clearance for WPI	UNEP, UNDP	Global	Expanding the Ongoing Support to Least Developed Countries (LDCs) with Country-driven Processes to Advance National Adaptation Plans (NAPs)	Knut Sundstrom	11-Dec-14	PIF cleared for WPI by CEO
6983		FP	Climate Change	CEO PIF Clearance for WPI	UNEP	Mozambique	Mozambique: Building Resilience in the Coastal Zone through Ecosystem Based Approaches to Adaptation (EbA).	Saliha Dobardzic	15-Dec-14	PIF recommended for CEO approval (Technically cleared)
4886		FP	POPs	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNEP	Regional (Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Morocco, Mali, Mauritius, Senegal, Togo, Tunisia, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Congo DR)	Continuing Regional Support for the POPs Global Monitoring Plan under the Stockholm Convention in the Africa Region	Evelyn Swain	15-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO

ID	IA	Type	Focal Area	Decision Sought	Proponen	Country	Project Title	Program Manage	Response	
	ID								Date	Remarks
4894		FP	POPs	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNEP	Regional (Indonesia, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Mongolia, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam)	Implementation of the POPs Monitoring Plan in the Asian Region	Evelyn Swain	15-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO
4881		FP	POPs	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNEP	Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Jamaica, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay)	Continuing Regional Support for the POPs Global Monitoring Plan under the Stockholm Convention in the Latin American and Caribbean Region	Evelyn Swain	17-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO
5197		MSP	Multi Focal Area	CEO MSP Approval	UNEP	St. Lucia	Increase St. Lucia's Capacity to Monitor MEA Implementation and Sustainable Development	Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey	18-Dec-14	MSP recommended for CEO approval (MSP technically cleared and recommended for CEO approval)
4668		FP	POPs	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNEP	Regional (Botswana, Ethiopia, Gambia, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Mozambique, Namibia, Senegal, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe)	Demonstration of Effectiveness of Diversified, Environmentally Sound and Sustainable Interventions, and Strengthening National Capacity for Innovative Implementation of Integrated Vector Management (IVM) for Disease Prevention and Control in the WHO AFRO Region	Evelyn Swain	18-Dec-14	Review Sheet sent to Agency for FSP revision
8009		FP	Climate Change	CEO PIF Clearance for WPI	UNEP	Nepal	Ecosystem-Based Adaptation for Climate-resilient Development in the Kathmandu Valley, Nepal	Fareeha Iqbal	18-Dec-14	Review Sheet sent to Agency for PIF revision



<b>ID</b>	<b>IA ID</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Proponen</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Program Manage</b>	<b>Response Date</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
5135		FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNEP	Chile	Protecting Biodiversity and Multiple Ecosystem Services in Biological Mountain Corridors in Chile's Mediterranean Ecosystem	Ian Gray	19-Dec-14	Review Sheet sent to Agency for PIF revision
<b>UNIDO</b>										
4385		FP	POPs	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNIDO	Macedonia	Removal of Technical and Economic Barriers to Initiating the Clean-up Activities for Alpha-HCH, Beta-HCH and Lindane Contaminated Sites at OHIS	Anil Sookdeo	15-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO
5375		FP	Climate Change	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNIDO	Nigeria	Scaling up Small Hydro Power (SHP) in Nigeria	Ming Yang	16-Dec-14	Review Sheet sent to Agency for FSP revision
4602		FP	Ozone Depleting Substances	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNIDO	Azerbaijan	Initiation of the HCFCs Phase out in the Republic of Azerbaijan.	Anil Sookdeo	17-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO
4873		FP	Climate Change	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNIDO	Tanzania	Promotion of Waste-to-Energy Applications in Agro-Industries	Ming Yang	17-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO
8007		EA	Chemicals and Waste	CEO EA Approval	UNIDO	Colombia	Minamata Convention Initial Assessment (MIA) in the Republic of Colombia	Anil Sookdeo	18-Dec-14	EA approved by CEO
4790		FP	Climate Change	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNIDO	Egypt	Utilizing Solar Energy for Industrial Process Heat in Egyptian Industry	David Elrie Rodgers	18-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO

## Requests Received from GEF Agencies

December 22 - 26, 2014

GEF ID	IA ID	Type	Focal Area	Decision Sought	Proponent	Country	Project Title	Program Manager	Date Received
<b>UNDP</b>									
5088	4955	FP	Biodiversity	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Dominican Republic	Conserving Biodiversity in Coastal Areas Threatened by Rapid Tourism and Physical Infrastructure Development	Mark Zimsky	17-Dec-14
5380	4648	FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Haiti	Increasing Resilience of Ecosystems and Vulnerable Communities to CC and Anthropic Threats Through a Ridge to Reef Approach to BD Conservation and Watershed Management	Rawleston Moore	19-Dec-14
5355	5259	MSP	Biodiversity	CEO MSP Approval	UNDP	Moldova	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Territorial Planning Policies and Land-Use Practices	Yoko Watanabe	19-Dec-14
5604	5241	FP	Climate Change	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Bosnia-Herzegovina	Technology Transfer for Climate Resilient Flood Management in Vrbas River Basin	Dustin Schinn	22-Dec-14

<b>GEF ID</b>	<b>IA ID</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Program Manager</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
<b><u>World Bank</u></b>									
5905	132029	FP	International Waters	CEO endorsement of FSP	World Bank	Regional (Comoros, Mozambique, Tanzania)	First South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Governance and Shared Growth Project (SWIOFish 1)	Charlotte Gobin	22-Dec-14
4942	133803	FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO endorsement of FSP	World Bank	India	India Ecosystems Service Improvement Project	Ulrich Apel	24-Dec-14
5479	133803	FP	Land Degradation	CEO endorsement of FSP	World Bank	India	Integrated SLEM Approaches for Reducing Land Degradation and Desertification	Ulrich Apel	24-Dec-14

# Responses to Proponents

December 22 - 26, 2014

ID	IA ID	Type	Focal Area	Decision Sought	Proponen	Country	Project Title	Program Manage	Response Date	Remarks
<b>FAO</b>										
4800		FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO endorsement of FSP	FAO	Cameroon	Sustainable Forest Management Under the Authority of Cameroonian Councils	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	12-Dec-14	Review Sheet sent to Agency for FSP revision
4740		FP	POPs	CEO endorsement of FSP	FAO	Regional (Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, Chad)	Disposal of Obsolete Pesticides including POPs and Strengthening Pesticide Management in the Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS) Member States	Evelyn Swain	22-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO
<b>IFAD</b>										
8005		FP	Land Degradation	CEO PIF Clearance for WPI	IFAD	Armenia	Sustainable Land Management for Increased Productivity	Ulrich Apel	23-Dec-14	Review Sheet sent to Agency for FSP revision
<b>UNDP</b>										
5229		FP	Land Degradation	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Lebanon	Sustainable Land Management in the Qaroun Catchment	Mohamed Bakarr	16-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO
4737	4905	FP	POPs	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Armenia	Elimination of Obsolete Pesticide Stockpiles and Addressing POPs Contaminated Sites within a Sound Chemicals Management Framework	Lulwa Ali	18-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO

ID	IA		Focal Area	Decision Sought	Proponen	Country	Project Title	Program Manage	Response	
	ID	Type							Date	Remarks
5184	4645	FP	Climate Change	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Sao Tome and Principe	Enhancing Capacities of Rural Communities to Pursue Climate Resilient Livelihood Options in the Sao Tome and Principe Districts of Caué, Me-Zochi, Principe, Lemba, Cantagalo, and Lobata (CMPLCL)	Rawleston Moore	18-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO
5211	4989	FP	Climate Change	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Yemen	Integrated Water Harvesting Technologies to Adapt to Climate Change Induced Water Shortage	Saliha Dobardzic	22-Dec-14	Review Sheet sent to Agency for FSP revision
5904	5433	FP	Climate Change	CEO PIF Clearance for WPI	UNDP	Benin	Strengthening the Resilience of Rural Livelihoods and Sub-national Government System to Climate Risks and Variability in Benin	Saliha Dobardzic	22-Dec-14	PIF recommended for CEO approval (Technical clearance)
6939	5415	EA	Chemicals and Waste	CEO EA Approval	UNDP	Guyana	Minamata Initial Assessment for Guyana	Ibrahima Sow	22-Dec-14	EA approved by CEO
5089	4956	FP	Biodiversity	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Mexico	Strengthening Management of the PA System to Better Conserve Endangered Species and their Habitats	Mark Zimsky	23-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO
5330	4951	FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Thailand	Maximizing Carbon Sink Capacity and Conserving Biodiversity through Sustainable Conservation, Restoration, and Management of Peat-swamp Ecosystems	Ulrich Apel	24-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO

ID	IA ID	Type	Focal Area	Decision Sought	Proponen	Country	Project Title	Program Manage	Response Date	Remarks
8007		EA	Chemicals and Waste	CEO EA Approval	UNIDO	Colombia	Minamata Convention Initial Assessment (MIA) in the Republic of Colombia	Anil Sookdeo	18-Dec-14	EA approved by CEO
4790		FP	Climate Change	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNIDO	Egypt	Utilizing Solar Energy for Industrial Process Heat in Egyptian Industry	David Elrie Rodgers	18-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO
4877		FP	POPs	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNIDO	Serbia	Environmentally-Sound Management and Final Disposal of PCBs	Ogawa Masako	22-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO

### World Bank

6947	147760	FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO endorsement of FSP	World Bank	Belarus	Belarus Forestry Development Project	Ian Gray	23-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO
5905	132029	FP	International Waters	CEO endorsement of FSP	World Bank	Regional (Comoros, Mozambique, Tanzania)	First South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Governance and Shared Growth Project (SWIOFish 1)	Charlotte Gobin	23-Dec-14	FSP recommended for endorsement

## Requests Received from GEF Agencies

December 29, 2014 - January 2, 2015

<b>GEF ID</b>	<b>IA ID</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Program Manager</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
<b><u>FAO</u></b>									
5139		FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO endorsement of FSP	FAO	China	Sustainable Forest Management to Enhance the Resilience of Forests to Climate Change	Ulrich Apel	30-Dec-14
5288		FP	Biodiversity	CEO endorsement of FSP	FAO	Colombia	Implementing the Socio-Ecosystem Connectivity Approach to Conserve and Sustainable Use Biodiversity in the Caribbean Region of Colombia	Mark Zimsky	31-Dec-14

<b>GEF ID</b>	<b>IA ID</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Program Manager</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
<b>UNDP</b>									
4932		FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNEP, UNDP	Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Barbados, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Jamaica, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Vincent and Grenadines)	Implementing Integrated Land Water and Wastewater Management in Caribbean SIDS	Christian Severin	17-Dec-14
5348	5168	FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Cook Islands	R2R: Conserving Biodiversity and Enhancing Ecosystem Functions through a "Ridge to Reef" Approach	Nicole Glineur	18-Dec-14
5337	5165	FP	Biodiversity	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Sri Lanka	Enhancing Biodiversity Conservation and Sustenance of Ecosystem Services in Environmentally Sensitive Areas	Yoko Watanabe	19-Dec-14
5378	5187	FP	Climate Change	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Brazil	Fourth National Communication and Biennial Update Reports to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)	Rawleston Moore	19-Dec-14
7998	5409	FP	Climate Change	CEO PIF Clearance for WPI	UNDP	Yemen	Building Climate Resilience to Reduce Vulnerability in Wadis and Coastal Areas	Knut Sundstrom	29-Dec-14



<b>GEF ID</b>	<b>IA ID</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Program Manager</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
5542	5247	FP	International Waters	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Barbados, Brazil, Belize, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, Mexico, Panama, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Vincent and Grenadines)	Catalyzing Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the Sustainable Management of Shared Living Marine Resources in the Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystems (CMLE+)	Christian Severin	29-Dec-14

<b>GEF ID</b>	<b>IA ID</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Program Manager</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
<b><u>UNEP</u></b>									
4932		FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNEP, UNDP	Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Barbados, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Jamaica, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Vincent and Grenadines)	Implementing Integrated Land Water and Wastewater Management in Caribbean SIDS	Christian Severin	17-Dec-14
6990		MSP	Biodiversity	CEO PIF Approval	UNEP	Bosnia-Herzegovina	Achieving Biodiversity Conservation through Creation and Effective Management of Protected Areas, Capacity Building and Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Land Use Planning	Yoko Watanabe	30-Dec-14
6990		MSP	Biodiversity	CEO PPG approval	UNEP	Bosnia-Herzegovina	Achieving Biodiversity Conservation through Creation and Effective Management of Protected Areas, Capacity Building and Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Land Use Planning	Yoko Watanabe	30-Dec-14
<b><u>UNIDO</u></b>									
5082		FP	POPs	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNIDO	Regional (Cambodia, Lao PDR, Mongolia, Philippines, Vietnam)	Demonstration of BAT and BEP in Open Burning Activities in Response to the Stockholm Convention on POPs	Evelyn Swain	29-Dec-14

<b>GEF ID</b>	<b>IA ID</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Proponent</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Program Manager</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
<u>World Bank</u>									
5905	132029	FP	International Waters	CEO endorsement of FSP	World Bank	Regional (Comoros, Mozambique, Tanzania)	First South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Governance and Shared Growth Project (SWIOFish 1)	Charlotte Gobin	22-Dec-14

# Responses to Proponents

December 29, 2014 - January 2, 2015

ID	IA ID	Type	Focal Area	Decision Sought	Proponen	Country	Project Title	Program Manage	Response Date	Remarks
<b>UNDP</b>										
5229		FP	Land Degradation	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Lebanon	Sustainable Land Management in the Qaroun Catchment	Mohamed Bakarr	16-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO
5089	4956	FP	Biodiversity	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Mexico	Strengthening Management of the PA System to Better Conserve Endangered Species and their Habitats	Mark Zimsky	23-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO
6988	4978	FP	Climate Change	CEO PIF Clearance for WPI	UNDP	Guinea-Bissau	Strengthening the Resilience of Vulnerable Coastal Areas and Communities to Climate Change in Guinea Bissau	Rawleston Moore	29-Dec-14	PIF recommended for CEO clearance (Technically cleared)
5064	4998	FP	Climate Change	CEO endorsement of FSP	UNDP	Egypt	Grid-connected Small Scale Photovoltaic Systems	David Elrie Rodgers	29-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO
5587	5270	MSP	Climate Change	CEO MSP Approval	UNDP	Malawi	Increasing Access to Clean and Affordable Decentralized Energy Services in Selected Vulnerable Areas of Malawi	Ming Yang	29-Dec-14	MSP approved by CEO
5555	5193	MSP	Climate Change	CEO MSP Approval	UNDP	Vietnam	Local Development and Promotion of LED Technologies for Advanced General Lighting	Ming Yang	29-Dec-14	MSP sent to Agency for revision
5586	5232	MSP	Climate Change	CEO MSP Approval	UNDP	Sri Lanka	Appropriate Mitigation Actions in the Energy Generation and End-Use Sectors in Sri Lanka	David Elrie Rodgers	30-Dec-14	MSP sent to Agency for revision

ID	IA ID	Type	Focal Area	Decision Sought	Proponen	Country	Project Title	Program Manage	Response Date	Remarks
<b>UNIDO</b>										
5421		MSP	Climate Change	CEO MSP Approval	UNIDO	Cambodia	Reduction of GHG Emission through Promotion of Commercial Biogas Plants	David Elrie Rodgers	31-Dec-14	MSP sent to Agency for revision
<b>World Bank</b>										
6947	147760	FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO endorsement of FSP	World Bank	Belarus	Belarus Forestry Development Project	Ian Gray	23-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO
5905	132029	FP	International Waters	CEO endorsement of FSP	World Bank	Regional (Comoros, Mozambique, Tanzania)	First South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Governance and Shared Growth Project (SWIOFish 1)	Charlotte Gobin	23-Dec-14	FSP recommended for endorsement
5905	132029	FP	International Waters	CEO endorsement of FSP	World Bank	Regional (Comoros, Mozambique, Tanzania)	First South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Governance and Shared Growth Project (SWIOFish 1)	Charlotte Gobin	30-Dec-14	FSP endorsed by CEO
5479	133803	FP	Land Degradation	CEO endorsement of FSP	World Bank	India	Integrated SLEM Approaches for Reducing Land Degradation and Desertification	Ulrich Apel	31-Dec-14	FSP recommended for endorsement (Docs circulating for clearance/signature)
4942	133803	FP	Multi Focal Area	CEO endorsement of FSP	World Bank	India	India Ecosystems Service Improvement Project	Ulrich Apel	31-Dec-14	FSP recommended for endorsement (Docs circulating for clearance and signature)