



## PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR)

for the project:

### Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Management in Priority Socio-ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes

**FY19**

*July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2019*

#### Executing Partners



UNITED NATIONS  
UNIVERSITY

**UNU-IAS**

Institute for the Advanced Study  
of Sustainability



<b>Project Title:</b>	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Management in Priority Socio-ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes		
<b>Country(ies):</b>	Global	<b>GEF ID:</b>	5784
<b>GEF Agency(ies):</b>	CI-GEF Project Agency	<b>Duration In Months:</b>	48
<b>Other Executing Partners:</b>	Conservation International Japan (CI-Japan), Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability	<b>Start Date:</b>	9/1/2015
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Biodiversity	<b>Actual Project Close Date:</b>	8/30/2019
<b>GEF Grant Amount:</b>	USD 1,909,000	<b>Date of Last Steering Committee Meeting:</b>	May 14, 2018
<b>Expected Co-financing:</b>	USD 6,350,000	<b>Mid-Term Review-Planned Date:</b>	Waived
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	USD 8,324,000	<b>Mid-Term Review-Actual Date:</b>	Waived
<b>Co-financing Realized as of June 30, 2019:</b>	USD 7,408,735.91	<b>Terminal Evaluation-Planned Date:</b>	3/31/2019
<b>Date of First Disbursement:</b>	9/1/2015	<b>Terminal Evaluation-Actual Date:</b>	5/18/2019
<b>Disbursement as of 30 June 2019:</b>	USD 1,909,000.91 as of Feb 5, 2019	<b>PIR Prepared by:</b>	Yoji Natori and Devon Dublin (CI-Japan)
<b>Actual Expenditures as of 30 June 2019:</b>	USD 1,686,766 as of Mar 31, 2019	<b>CI-GEF Program Manager:</b>	Orissa Samaroo

The CI-GEF Project Agency Project Implementation Report (PIR) is composed of five sections:

- Section I: Project Implementation Progress Status Summary:** provides a brief summary of the project as well as the implementation status and rating of the previous and current fiscal years;
- Section II: Project Results Implementation Progress Status and Rating:** describes the progress made towards achieving the project objective and outcomes, the implementation rating of the project, as well as recommendations to improve the project performance, when needed;
- Section III: Project Risks Status and Rating:** describes the progress made towards managing and mitigating project risks, the project risks mitigation rating reassessment as needed, as well as recommendations to improve the management of project risks;
- Section IV: Project Environmental and Social Safeguards Implementation Status and Rating:** describes the progress made towards complying with the Environmental & Social Safeguards and the Plans prepared during the PPG phase, the safeguard plans implementation rating, as well as recommendations to improve the project safeguards;
- Section V: Project Implementation Experiences and Lessons Learned:** describes the experiences learned by the project managers and the lessons learned through the process of implementing the project; and

## **SECTION I: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS STATUS SUMMARY**

### **PROJECT SUMMARY**

The objective of the GEF-Satoyama Project is to mainstream conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services, while improving human well-being in selected priority Socio-Ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes (SEPLS). While protecting pristine natural areas and other high conservation value areas continue to be important, global conservation of biodiversity will not be achieved without the sustainable management of areas in which people and nature interact. Production landscapes and seascapes refer to the space in which primary industry activities (agriculture, forestry and fisheries) take place in general. Such landscapes and seascapes are important as buffers to and provide vital connection between protected areas. They are also important for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in their own right. Among the production landscapes and seascapes, those that integrate the values of biodiversity and social aspects harmoniously with production activities, such that production activities support biodiversity and vice versa, are referred to as the socio-ecological production landscapes and seascapes (SEPLS). This project intends to address the barriers that SEPLS faces globally, such as insufficient recognition of their values and dynamic nature and weak governance, and to contribute to the achievement of multiple Aichi Biodiversity Targets and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

### **PRIOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION STATUS**

The GEF-Satoyama Project was formally launched on September 1, 2015 with an Inception Workshop where a Memorandum of Understanding was signed between Conservation International Japan (CI Japan), United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS) and Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) to form the Executive Team of the project, serving as the steering committee. The Executive Team consists of two units: 1) the Executive Unit is the decision-making body of the project and approves annual workplans and budgets; and 2) the Working Unit prepares and executes the annual workplans and budgets as the project's secretariat. A project website was launched to communicate project activities to external audiences. In addition, a project factsheet was published in English, French and Spanish and widely distributed. The Executing Agency sought to put mechanisms in place for the smooth monitoring and evaluation of all aspects of the project as well as taking advantage of opportunities for capacity building relevant to grant management. The Executive Unit held eight meetings to approve the workplan and budget and to receive updates from the Working Unit while the Working Unit held 20 meetings for updates and strategy discussions. Subgrantees reported their status, including the matters regarding the social and environmental safeguards, through quarterly reports. Four subgrantees (FFI, FIDES, TERI and WCS) extended their project terms into Year 4 to ensure that the project interventions would remain with the communities. All grievances were resolved at the local level, except the persistent one in Mauritius. Amplification activities included presentations and discussion with relevant stakeholders at international fora, such as those of CBD meetings, ADB annual meetings, IPSI events and 6<sup>th</sup> GEF Assembly.

#### **Component 1, "On-the-ground demonstration". Enhancing livelihood, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services through investing in demonstration projects.**

To identify on-the-ground demonstration activities, the project implemented three calls for proposals, one for each of three Target Geographies: Indo-Burma, Tropical Andes and Madagascar and the Indian Ocean Islands Biodiversity Hotspots. The call for proposals lasted an average of 49 days and were widely advertised in each region. A total of 130 proposals were received and 19 preselected. The Executing Agency conducted site visits to preselected projects to observe and collect additional information on the project proponents and evaluate landscapes/seascapes. In total, 10 site-based projects from 10 different countries were selected. Grant agreements were completed for all 10 subgrantees and environmental and social safeguard screening processes finished, and the incorporation of safeguard recommendations into the subgrant project workplans done. The Executing Agency took an active part in assisting the subgrantees to meet the safeguards that were triggered for their respective projects. The Executing Agency has been actively monitoring the progress of the subgrantees and providing the necessary support they need. Grantees have been working to reduce the threats to threatened species in their SEPLS while securing sustainable livelihoods for the communities that dwell there. Some grantees have been actively documenting traditional knowledge that is crucial for the sustained culture of their SEPLS.

**Component 2, "Knowledge generation". Improving knowledge generation to increase understanding, raise awareness and promote mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes.** IGES conducted case studies to address three themes: 1) value recognition of SEPLS; 2) protection and utilization of traditional knowledge; and 3) improvement of governance

in SEPLS. Regarding the global mapping of SEPLS of global conservation priority (priority SEPLS), difficulties were the broad definition of SEPLS used under the Satoyama Initiative.

**Component 3: “Capacity Building.” Improving inter-sectoral collaboration and capacities for maintaining, restoring and revitalizing social and ecological values in priority SEPLS**

A gender mainstreaming workshop and a public forum conservation, Resilience & Natural Disasters was held in Tokyo in September 2017 and May 2018 respectively. In addition, several outreach activities were conducted at the 9th International Forum for Sustainable Asia and the Pacific (ISAP) in July 2017, gender mainstreaming workshop September 2018, SBSTTA-21 in December 2017, SGP China Landscape Approach workshop in March 2018, ADB Civil Society Forum in May 2018 and IPSI Case study workshop in May 2018. Several outreach activities were conducted at SBSTTA-19 in November 2015 and SBSTTA-20 in April 2016. However, two main FY16 capacity building activities were rescheduled for FY17 due to the postponement of the IPSI Global Assembly (IPSI-6) from March 2015 to January 2016 and a grievance situation (see details under Section IV of this report) during the preparation of the Regional Workshop for Latin America in Peru in June 2016. Alternatively, three regional trainings were planned and executed (Indo-Burma - Thailand, July 2016; Tropical Andes - Ecuador, October 2016; Madagascar and the Indian Ocean Islands - Madagascar, August 2016). In addition, several outreach activities were conducted at the 8th International Forum for Sustainable Asia and the Pacific (ISAP) in July 2016, IUCN WCC in September 2017, CBD COP 13 in December 2016, COMDEKS Global Workshop in January 2017, IPSI Regional meeting in April 2017, and ADB Civil Society Forum in May 2017.

**CURRENT PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION STATUS (FY19)**

At the close of the reporting period, a review of the project’s objective indicators revealed that most of them were met. With the extension of the period of performance, it is anticipated that the indicators will be fully met within that time. Subgrantees reported their status, including the matters regarding the social and environmental safeguards, through quarterly reports. FFI extended their period of performance to further monitor the alternative livelihood projects in the communities and to enable more dialogue to establish FCZs in the Lenya area with 3 local communities. All grievances were resolved at the local level, except the persistent one in Mauritius that is expected to be resolved at the grassroots level with through the work of the local cooperative. In terms of the overall project governance, the Working Unit held five meetings for updates and strategy discussions. The main feature of this fiscal year was the Consolidation Workshop which was successfully held in August 2018 allowing for grantees to exchange ideas, discuss lessons learned and examine common challenges they face to sustainably manage the SEPLS in their project site. This also and was the main the Amplification activities conducted during FY19 included presentations and discussion with relevant stakeholders at international fora, such as those of CBD and IPSI events.

**Component 1, “On-the-ground demonstration”. Enhancing livelihood, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services through investing in demonstration projects.**

The Executing Agency has been actively monitoring the progress of the subgrantees and providing the necessary support they need. Grantees have been working assiduously to reduce the threats to threatened species in their SEPLS while securing sustainable livelihoods for the communities that dwell there. Some grantees have been actively documenting traditional knowledge that is crucial for the sustained culture of their SEPLS.

**Component 2, “Knowledge generation”. Improving knowledge generation to increase understanding, raise awareness and promote mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes.** IGES conducted case studies to address three themes: 1) value recognition of SEPLS; 2) protection and utilization of traditional knowledge; and 3) improvement of governance in SEPLS. An issue brief was developed which included inputs that were gathered from the Consolidation Workshop in August 2018. The issue brief was translated into Spanish and French. The mapping work was completed in FY19 with inputs that could be useful for the future of the IPSI and CBD’s post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Regarding the global mapping of SEPLS of global conservation priority (priority SEPLS), the data analysis was conducted, and results presented at the Association of American Geographers Annual Meeting from April 3-7, 2019. A publication in a peer reviewed journal on the mapping results will be done.

**Component 3: “Capacity Building.” Improving inter-sectoral collaboration and capacities for maintaining, restoring and revitalizing social and ecological values in priority SEPLS.** Amplification activities were held at the CBD’s Regional Consultation Workshop on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework for Asia and the Pacific from January 28-31, 2019. A side event organized by the UNU-IAS presented the work of IPSI and its collaborative activities and initiatives which included the GEF-Satoyama Project. A presentation on geographic analysis of the global distribution of SEPLS will be made at the Association of American Geographers Annual Meeting from April 3-7, 2019. The Fifth Satoyama Initiative Thematic Review workshop was held from May 28-30, 2019 which saw the participation of representatives from EPCO and TERI.

### Summary of Project Ratings

PROJECT PART	PRIOR FY18 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	CURRENT FY19 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING <sup>1</sup>	RATING TREND <sup>2</sup>
OBJECTIVE	S	S	Unchanged
COMPONENTS AND OUTCOMES	S	HS	Unchanged
RISKS	S	HS	Improving
ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS	HS	HS	Unchanged

<sup>1</sup> **Implementation Progress (IP) Rating:** Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more details about IP rating, please see the Appendix I of this report

<sup>2</sup> **Rating trend:** Improving, Unchanged, or Decreasing

## **SECTION II: PROJECT RESULTS IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS STATUS AND RATING**

This section describes the progress made towards achieving the project objective and outcomes, the implementation progress rating of the project, as well as recommendations to improve the project performance. This section is composed four parts:

- a. Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Objective: this section measures the likelihood of achieving the objective of the project
- b. Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Outcomes (by project component)
- c. Overall Project Results Progress Rating, and
- d. Recommendations for improvement

### **a. Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Objective:**

This part of the report assesses the progress in achieving the objective of the project.

<b>PROJECT OBJECTIVE:</b>	To mainstream conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services, while improving human well-being in selected priority Socio-Ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes (SEPLS)
---------------------------	---

OBJECTIVE INDICATORS	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>3</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
<p><b>Indicator a:</b> Number of policies, regulations, or plans governing sectoral and land-use activities that integrate biodiversity conservation &amp; sustainable use in production landscapes and seascapes as a result of participation in project activities.</p> <p>Target: 3 policies, regulations, or plans governing sectoral and land-use activities will show integration of biodiversity conservation &amp; sustainable use in production landscapes and seascapes as a result of project activities.</p>	17 policies, regulations, or plans are completed (2 in Peru, 4 in Comoros, 2 in Mauritius, 2 in Myanmar, 3 in Ecuador, 1 in Seychelles, 1 in India, 2 in Colombia); and 2 under development (1 in India and 1 in Thailand).	<b>CA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Amazonicos por la Amazonía (AMPA )</b> Peru, has completed research by a sociologist and anthropologist in the project site to produce a strategy of gender mainstreaming in the development of sustainable landscapes. This strategy will be used by AMPA in collaboration with the provincial authorities of Bolivar to enhance sustainability efforts in the Alto Huayabamba Conservation Concession (APCC). AMPA and the Ministry of the Environment of Peru signed an agreement on May 21, 2019 to conserve the Amazon which includes the Alto Huayabamba Conservation Concession. The agreement is to strengthen institutional cooperation to develop strategies for natural resource use, ecosystem services, fight against deforestation, zoning for economic and ecological activities, mitigation and adaptation of climate change and determining appropriate financial instruments.</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

OBJECTIVE INDICATORS	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>3</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Dahari</b> has initiated the signing of agreements with four Livingstone Fruit bat roost site owners of Adda, Kowé, Moya, Ouzini and Kangani. These agreements were duly recognized by the mayors of Adda and Moya with a potential to be expanded to include more land owners that houses such roosts.</li> <li>• <b>EPCO</b> has facilitated the establishment of a local cooperative made up of residents and fisherfolk of Cite La Chaux. This development is expected to fuel a bottom-up approach in favor of a more enabling political climate that would see policies supporting community-based coastal conservation measures. In addition, a Global Strategic Plan and a Strategic Plan for Mariculture were developed.</li> <li>• <b>Fauna and Flora International (FFI)</b> Myanmar, is working closely with the fisheries department and has successfully enacted legislation at the municipal level for the recognition of Fisheries Conservation Zones (FCZ) in the parliaments of Indawgyi and Putao with the rules already being implemented in collaboration with the Department of Fisheries. Other provincial parliaments are expected to adopt this policy in the future.</li> <li>• <b>Fundación para la Investigación y Desarrollo Social (FIDES)</b> Ecuador, has developed a business plan for salt producers, a security protocol for Playa de Oro and an environmental plan for salt producers.</li> <li>• <b>Green Islands Foundation (GIF)</b> Seychelles, facilitated a signed agreement by 13 fishers' representatives on 13 threatened species. The agreement was subsequently presented by GIF and the fishers' representatives to the Seychelles Fishing Authority to be promulgated into law. GIF joined the national</li> </ul>

OBJECTIVE INDICATORS	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>3</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
			<p>committees that will oversee the realization of a national fisheries plan in 2019.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Inter Mountain Peoples' Education and Culture in Thailand (IMPECT)</b> Thailand, is working closely with representatives of the Board of Cabinet Resolution of Recovering Karen Livelihood of August 3, 2010 in the practical implementation of this resolution.</li> <li>• <b>The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI)</b>, India has drafted a state policy document on Community Conserved Areas (CCAs) and it is currently pending adoption at the Nagaland government. The Tizu Valley Biodiversity Conservation and Livelihood Network was formed which is made up of Ghukhuyi, Sukhai and Kivikhu. People's Biodiversity Registers, under the National Biodiversity Law, were published for these Communities.</li> <li>• <b>Universidad Industrial de Santander (UIS)</b> initiated the FINCO ("farms as a learning institution") movement with three pioneering farms where the farms are treated as a source of learning exchange through scientific, economic and social analysis (<a href="https://finco.pasoeco.co/">https://finco.pasoeco.co/</a>). This is expected to expand in other regions of Colombia through funding obtained from the SGP. A community tourism plan has been put in place for Germania with a route that includes farms in the area.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicator b:</b> Status of livelihoods and scenarios facing local communities, including indigenous peoples, women and other vulnerable groups in the project, as a result of more sustainable flows of ecosystem good and services.</p> <p>Target: An upward trend will be seen in the status of livelihoods of local communities/SEPLS residents, including</p>	<p>Per assessments by the "Indicators of Resilience in SEPLS":  3 projects reported improvements in livelihoods.  4 projects reported decline in livelihoods.  3 projects reported no change.</p>	<p><b>CA</b></p>	<p>Subgrantees utilized the Indicators of Resilience in SEPLS, which contain a set of livelihood indicators, at the beginning and at the end of the subgrant projects to assess their landscapes. A comparison between the initial and final evaluations taking into account the 5 indicators under the "Livelihoods and Wellbeing" section demonstrated that stakeholders involved in the project perceived improvements in three project sites (Comoros, India and Colombia) while there was no significant difference in three</p>



OBJECTIVE INDICATORS	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>3</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
indigenous peoples, women and other vulnerable groups in sites with investments for sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services			<p>(Myanmar, Madagascar and Thailand) and a downward trend in four (Peru, Mauritius, Ecuador and Seychelles).  The stakeholders reported upward trends presumably because of the following factors (the assessment reports listed what should be improved in the future):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Comoros – being agriculture-dependent communities, interventions to improve agriculture benefited their livelihood.</li> <li>● India – addressed the problem of limited income sources by introducing eco-tourism.</li> <li>● Colombia – agro-tourism benefited the community.</li> </ul> <p>The reasons for the downward trends as discussed among the stakeholders during the assessment workshops are listed below, which indicate that the downward trends were due to factors external to this Project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Peru - Limited access to markets and technologies.</li> <li>● Mauritius - Better access to health care needed; bad lifestyle affecting health; small businesses affected by competition; lack of motivation by community members.</li> <li>● Ecuador - Lack of payment from Socio Bosque; FARC rebels affecting security; Illegal sand extraction from the coast.</li> <li>● Seychelles – Boats licensed for artisanal fishing cannot be used for tourism, which is too restrictive to avail diverse livelihood means.</li> </ul>

OBJECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION
<b>S</b>	The GEF-Satoyama project has completed the 2 Objective Indicators. The project has resulted in the completion of 17 policies across the 10 subgrantee projects. It is noted that these policies are applicable to the project site but there are some instances where policies will be adopted at the national level (e.g in the Seychelles). For the status of the livelihoods measured through the Indicators of Resilience, the initial target was that there would be an upward trend in the livelihoods of local communities/SEPLS residents. The project has

reported that only 3/10 subgrantee sites noted an increase in livelihoods while 4/10 noted a decrease in livelihoods and 3/10 noted no change. As explained by the Executing Agency, the decrease in the status of livelihoods is due to circumstances outside the control of the project.

**b. Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Outcomes (by project component).**

This part of the report assesses the progress towards achieving the outcomes of the project.

<b>COMPONENT 1</b>	Enhancing livelihood, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services in priority SEPLS through investing in demonstration projects
<b>Outcome 1.1:</b>	Effective conservation management achieved in selected priority production landscapes and seascapes.
<b>Outcome 1.2:</b>	Improved site-level conservation status of globally threatened (critical, endangered and vulnerable) species.
<b>Outcome 1.3:</b>	Traditional knowledge benefiting and being protected in conservation measures

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>4</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
<i>Indicator 1.1.1: Number of hectares of land/sea benefiting from conservation management with project support.</i>	60,000 additional hectares (additional to what existed under the Satoyama Development Mechanism (SDM), whose figures were unknown)	4,120,359 ha. (landscape: 216,682 ha/seascape: 3,903,677 ha) This is the sum of the areas directly covered by ten subgrant projects.  Additional 1,217,970 ha of landscape received positive influence from the interventions of the subgrant projects.	<b>CA</b>	The total number of hectares covered by the 10 subgrant projects exceeds the end of project target. This is attributed to an extensive seascape in Seychelles and landscapes in Madagascar and Myanmar.  These additional hectares are the areas of indirect influence where parts of the extensive landscape benefit from the interventions made in the project site.
<i>Indicator 1.2.1: Number of IUCN threatened species (CR, EN and VU) occurring in project sites of which the habitat has been improved</i>	20 species	A total of 120 species listed on the IUCN Red List as threatened (CR, EN and VU as well as EW) occur in the project sites of ten subgrant projects.	<b>CA</b>	The total number of species known to occur in the 10 subgrant projects exceeded the end of project target. Analyses of subgrant project activities confirmed that they addressed threats to these species as identified in the IUCN Red List. Main interventions of the projects on the ground included reforestation, hunting restrictions, fishing restrictions, alternative livelihoods, improved agriculture, and anti-poaching missions.
<i>Indicator 1.3.1: Number of measures (policies and projects) by all stakeholders</i>	Three additional collaborative activities that are	2 case studies produced and 4 under development	<b>CA</b>	<b>Case Studies</b> Through the work under the GEF-Satoyama Project, two case studies were developed by CORFOPAL and FIDES and were published in the SITR4. Four

<sup>4</sup> **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>4</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
<p><i>that are newly established or improved with information on traditional knowledge/practices, as demonstrated in IPSI Collaborative Activities and case studies.</i></p>	<p>funded (future opportunities) and five additional case studies (achievement report)</p>	<p>3 collaborative activities endorsed (2 completed and 1 ongoing)</p>		<p>other case studies are being produced by CORFOPAL, EPCO, SAFE, and TERI and will be published in SITR5 later in 2019.</p> <p>These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Ensuring conservation, good governance and sustainable livelihoods through landscape management of mangrove ecosystems in Manabí, Ecuador (Jairo Díaz Obando, María Dolores Vera, Ikuko Matsumoto, Devon Dublin, Yoji Natori, Andrea Calispa) [FIDES]</li> <li>➤ Conservation on private lands integrating sustainable production and biodiversity in the Mid Dagua River Basin, Colombia (Sebastian Orjuela-Salazar, Maria Carolina Gaitán - Naranjo, Andrés Quintero-Ángel) [CORFOPAL]</li> <li>➤ The values of coastal wetlands biodiversity for sustainable economic and livelihood development at Residences La Chaux 'Barachois', Mauritius Island (Estelle Déja, Devon Dublin, Yoji Natori, Yasuo Takahashi) [EPCO]</li> <li>➤ Mainstreaming Community - Conserved Areas (CCAs) for Biodiversity Conservation in SEPLS - A Case Study from Nagaland, India (Siddharth Edake, Pia Sethi, Yatish Lele) [TERI]</li> <li>➤ Collective construction of a Governance Scheme in San Antonio's Forest (Colombia) from different nature perceptions (Andrés Quintero Ángel) [CORFOPAL]</li> <li>➤ Elucidating the direct use values of wild edible plants in the rangelands and mountainous areas of Teso-Karamoja region, Uganda (Samuel Ojelel) [SAFE]</li> </ul> <p><b>Collaborative Activities</b></p> <p>Three collaborative activities influenced by work of the GEF-Satoyama Project were developed and funded, and endorsed as IPSI Collaborative Activities.</p> <p>These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Promoting and Enhancing the Karen Indigenous Sustainable Socio-ecological Production System in Northern Thailand [IMPECT, IKAP, FPP, PASD, CI, KNCE]</li> <li>● Improvement of the livelihoods of the communities through the sustainable management of productive landscapes and biodiversity conservation in mangrove (Estuaries Chone and Portoviejo), the dry forest (Cordillera del Balsamo) and rainforest (Comune Playa de Oro) [CI, FIDES, UNDP]</li> </ul>

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>4</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SATO-YAMA -UMI Project: Environmental Education and Public Awareness on Biodiversity Conservation in Asia Pacific Region [CI, Birdlife, JEEF]</li> </ul>

COMPONENT 1 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION	RATING TREND
HS	The GEF-Satoyama project has successfully completed the indicators under Component 1. Through the subgrantees, the project exceeded the targets set for the number of hectares benefiting from conservation management and the number of species whose habitats have been improved. The project also supported 2 case studies with 4 additional case studies under development and 3 collaborative activities.	Unchanged

<b>COMPONENT 2</b>	Improving knowledge generation to increase understanding, raise awareness and promote mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes
--------------------	---

<b>Outcome 2.1:</b>	Global knowledge on SEPLS for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into primary production enhanced
---------------------	--

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>5</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
<b>Indicators 2.1.1:</b> <i>a: (Policy uptake): Number of policies, regulations or plans of governmental and non-governmental stakeholders at various levels that refer to or adopt the knowledge products from this project</i>	5 policies, regulations, plans or guidance documents	7 (2 in Peru; 2 in Myanmar; 2 in Comoros and 1 in Seychelles)	CA	<p>We considered the products of the subgrant projects as knowledge products. Following are already integrated as formal policies or regulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FFI developed Fisheries Conservation Zones (FCZ) regulations in Indawgyi and Putao, and these have been adopted by the state governments of Indawgyi and Putao through amendments to their Freshwater Fisheries Law.</li> <li>GIF developed a co-management plan to reduce the impact of artisanal fishing on threatened species which has been adopted by the Seychelles Fishing Authority to be promulgated into law through the Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture.</li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>5</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AMPA developed a strategy of gender mainstreaming in Quinoa production and this has been made a part of the management strategy of the Alto Huayabamba Conservation Concession (AHCC). Secondly, AMPA and the Ministry of the Environment of Peru signed an agreement on May 21, 2019 to conserve the Amazon which includes the Alto Huayabamba Conservation Concession. The agreement is to strengthen institutional cooperation to develop strategies for natural resource use, ecosystem services, fight against deforestation, zoning for economic and ecological activities, mitigation and adaptation of climate change and determining appropriate financial instruments.</li> <li>Following the agreements which were concluded between the subgrant project proponent in Comoros (Dahari) and the farmers who owned land with roost sites of the Livingstone's fruit bat, the mayors of Adda and Moya issued letters indicating that the initiatives forms a part of the policy of their municipalities.</li> </ul>
<i>b. (Referencing) Number of citations of knowledge products, e.g., peer-reviewed journal articles, other forms of publication and supporting tools</i>	50 citations within 3 years of publication	56	CA	Knowledge products have been produced by grantees, partners and the Executing Agency, including 80 publications and 22 videos while numerous newsletters, social media posts, infographics, brochures, posters, teaching modules, calendars, and other materials were generated. They can be found on the project's website at <a href="http://gef-satoyama.net/resources/">http://gef-satoyama.net/resources/</a> . They were cited 56 times as of April 2019.

COMPONENT 2 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION	RATING TREND
HS	The project has achieved the outcomes under Component 2. In FY19, the project successfully completed the outstanding items needed to achieve the number of citations and formally integrated policies in 4 subgrantee projects: Peru, Seychelles, Comoros and Myanmar.	Improved

**COMPONENT 3** Improving inter-sectoral collaboration and capacities for maintaining, restoring and revitalizing social and ecological values in priority SEPLS

**Outcome 3.1:** Capacity of multi-sectoral stakeholders, including national and international decision-makers and practitioners and under-represented groups, to collaborate and mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable management increased

OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS	END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>6</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
<p><b>Indicator 3.1.1:</b>  <b>a. Number of organizations/agencies that have expressed interest and demonstrated actions in SEPLS.</b></p> <p><b>b. Number of policies of various levels and stakeholders established or improved by incorporating the materials from the workshop and trainings under this project</b></p>	<p>a. additional 20 IPSI members from workshop participants</p> <p>b. 5 policies established or improved</p>	<p>a. 18 of the 63 new members of IPSI became members as a result of interactions with the GEF-Satoyama Project (2 applications submitted to the IPSI secretariat for approval at the next IPSI Steering Committee meeting)</p> <p>b. 12 project management policies established or improved by incorporating the materials from the workshop and trainings under this project.</p>	<p><b>CA</b></p>	<p>a. These are Asociación de campesinos vecinos del Parque Natural Nacional Serranía de los Yariguies [ASOCAPAYARI] (Colombia), Corporación Ambiental y Forestal del Pacífico [CORFOPAL] (Colombia), Dahari (Comoros), TERI (India), Malagasy Ministry of Environment Ecology and Forests (Madagascar), Ny Tanyntsika (Madagascar), GIF (Seychelles), Observer Ecological Consult Co., Ltd [OEC] (Taiwan), Pgakenyaw Association for Sustainable Development [PASD] (Thailand), Community Entrepreneur Development Institute [CENDI] (Vietnam), WCS-Madagascar (Madagascar), Save Aseed For The Future [SAFE] (Uganda), LEAF Co., Ltd. (Japan), Indigenous Partnership for Agrobiodiversity and Food Sovereignty [TIP] (Italy), Borneo Conservation Trust (Indonesia), Fuli Farmers Association (Taiwan), Department of Social Forestry and Forest Governance, College of Forestry and Natural Resources, University of the Philippines Los Baños (Philippines), Balipara Foundation (India).  The membership application for AMPA and EPCO have been submitted to the IPSI secretariat with approval slated for the next IPSI Steering Committee meeting in September 2019.  The Executing Agency continues to engage AGROSAVIA, FFI, and UIS to join IPSI.</p> <p>b. All 10 subgrantees implemented activities under an improved monitoring and evaluation system which includes the Indicators of Resilience and resources on gender mainstreaming which was shared with them. Apart from our subgrantees, confirmation was received that CORFOPAL and Center for Water Resources Conservation and Development [WARECOD] (Vietnam) incorporated it into the management policy of their project sites. WARECOD also translated the Indicators of Resilience into Vietnamese.</p>

<sup>6</sup> **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

COMPONENT 3 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING	JUSTIFICATION	RATING TREND
HS	The project achieved the targets set for the outcomes under this Component. For Indicator A, 18 (and 2 pending applications) new IPSI members can be directly attributed to the project. The project exceeded the target set for Indicator B: the GEF-Satoyama project has provided several trainings (e.g. Indicators of Resilience, gender mainstreaming etc) that benefited all 10 subgrantees and 2 additional organizations that were not recipients of GEF funding under this project.	Unchanged

**. Overall Project Results Rating**

**OVERALL PROJECT RESULTS IMPLEMENTATION RATING**

OVERALL RATING	JUSTIFICATION	RATING TREND <sup>7</sup>
HS	As the GEF-Satoyama project concludes, it is noted that the project has completed almost all of the defined targets. The Executing Agency, CI-Japan worked in partnership with UNU-IAS and IGES to successfully deliver the project. The Executing Agency organized the Call for Proposals which resulted in the selection the 10 subgrantees. These subgrantees were key to achieving the outcomes targets under Component 1.	Unchanged

<sup>7</sup> Rating trend: Increasing, Unchanged or Decreasing



### SECTION III: PROJECT RISKS STATUS AND RATING

#### a. Progress towards Implementing the Project Risk Mitigation Plan

This section describes the activities implemented to manage and reduce high, substantial, modest, and low risks of the project. This section has three parts:

- a. Ratings for the progress towards implementing measures to mitigate project risks and a project risks annual reassessment
- b. Recommendations for improving project risks management

#### a. Progress towards Implementing the Project Risk Mitigation and Plan Project Risks Annual Reassessment

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING <sup>8</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY18 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND <sup>9</sup>
<b>Risk 1:</b> Degradation of adjacent protected areas impacts sustainability and value of SEPLS within broader landscape	Demonstration of more sustainable land use methods within SEPLS, and increased awareness of values of ecosystem services from adjacent PAs, will contribute to reduced pressure on latter.  Demonstration and knowledge components will increase understanding of drivers affecting both SEPLS and PAs, as well as alternatives.	Sustainable land-use methods and awareness raising on ecosystem services are an integral part of most subgrant projects. The Indicators of Resilience in SEPLS, which the subgrantees are encouraged to use as for their project impact monitoring on a flexible basis and for which training is offered to all subgrantees, has an indicator that asks about the ecological interactions between different components of landscapes/seascapes. The use of this indicator will aid in raising awareness on the consequences of landscape contexts.	<b>CA</b>	The Indicators of Resilience training contributed significantly to decreasing this risk since it allowed for grantees, their partners and other stakeholders to consider the landscape beyond the specific geographic location of the project site. In addition, all subgrantees worked with their government and other local counterparts.  The selected subgrant project sites occurred in areas where the threat of degradation is negligible.	Low/Medium	Low	Decreasing
<b>Risk 2:</b> Low levels of	Maintaining communication	Government agencies are by far the most important	<b>CA</b>	In-person visits were made when the members of the Executing Agency	Low/Medium	Low	Decreasing

<sup>8</sup> **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

<sup>9</sup> **Rating trend:** Increasing, Unchanged or Decreasing

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING <sup>8</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY18 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND <sup>9</sup>
engagement by important stakeholders, particularly government, about mainstreaming biodiversity conservation	with key stakeholders locally (mainly 36 through the organizations implementing subgrant projects) and internationally at venues of IPSI, CBD, and other opportunities.	stakeholders in terms of mainstreaming biodiversity conservation. The Executing Agency has made efforts to inform the GEF OFPs and have visited them during the programmatic site visits conducted. In addition, subgrantees are in contact with relevant government agencies at local and national levels. Subgrant project proponents are engaging other key stakeholders through their interventions to mainstream biodiversity into their activities.		visited the relevant countries. Subgrantees participated in these meetings allowing for more direct and continuous contact with the government. The subgrantees proactively engaged local stakeholders.			
<b>Risk 3:</b> Key networks, particularly IPSI, become unsustainable and result in limited global venues	Help diversify funding sources, while generating and delivering outcomes that are useful for the objectives of the individual members (and other stakeholders), so that there will be incentives for them to contribute financially. Increasing the profile and	All members of the Executive Team (CI, IGES and UNU-IAS) are active members of the IPSI and its steering committee members or the secretariat. Demonstration of the value of the IPSI, by providing financial resources and useful technical, management and/or policy materials, will ensure, key networks, like IPSI, continue to exist.	<b>CA</b>	The project collaborated with the IPSI Secretariat in many aspects from sharing of information on subgrant projects to inviting organizations to join IPSI. The IPSI is likely to be maintained through 2020, so the project period is covered, although the sustainability after 2020 still need continued, proactive demonstration of the importance of IPSI.	Low	Low	Decreasing

PROJECT RISKS	PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE	MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION	PROGRESS RATING <sup>8</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION	PRODOC RISK RATING	CURRENT FY18 RISK RATING	RISK RATING TREND <sup>9</sup>
	awareness of SEPLS' importance will also enable partners' resource mobilization efforts.						
<b>Risk 4:</b> Delaying the selection of subgrant projects	The production of Project Document early so that it can be approved, leaving sufficient time for the subgrant project selection	The selection process was conducted on schedule that was backcasted from the major events to which we wanted the subgrantees to participate.	<b>CA</b>	All safeguard screening and revision of workplan were concluded to pave the way for the timely signing of the grant agreements.	Medium	n/a (Risk no longer exists)	n/a
<b>Risk 5:</b> Delays due to Natural Disasters	This is a new risk not included in the prodoc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Portfolio approach;</li> <li>Application of Indicators of Resilience</li> <li>Fundraising for affected projects</li> <li>Grant agreement amendments to facilitate meeting the project objectives</li> </ul>	<b>CA</b>	WCS project site was affected by Cyclone Eliakim in March 2018. Dahari project site in Comoros was affected by cyclone Kenneth in April 2019. The execution agency assisted WCS by granting a no cost extension and obtaining a grant of USD\$5,000 to from Global Conservation. Fund to assist in recuperation efforts.	This is a new risk not included in the ProDoc but we give it a rating of Medium	Medium	Unchanged

PROJECT RISKS MITIGATION MEASURES RATING	JUSTIFICATION	RISK RATING TREND <sup>10</sup>
<b>HS</b>	Overall, the Executing Agency has been able to manage and mitigate risks successfully. Since the project is ending, all risk mitigation measures have been completed.	Unchanged

<sup>10</sup> **Rating trend:** Increasing, Unchanged or Decreasing

## SECTION IV: PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS IMPLEMENTATION STATUS AND RATING

This section of the PIR describes the progress made towards complying with the approved Environmental and Social Safeguard plans, as well as recommendations to improve the implementation of the safeguard plans, when needed. This section is divided in three parts:

- a. Progress towards Complying with the CI-GEF Project Agency's Environmental & Social Safeguards
- b. Overall Project Safeguard Implementation Rating
- c. Recommendations

### a. Progress towards Complying with the CI-GEF Project Agency's Environmental & Social Safeguards

MINIMUM SAFEGUARD INDICATORS	PROJECT TARGET	END OF YEAR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>11</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
<b>ACCOUNTABILITY AND GRIEVANCE MECHANISM</b> 1. Number of conflict and complaint cases reported to the project's Accountability and Grievance Mechanism	[No target set]	There were no grievances reported to the Executing Agency. The grievances totaling 80 were reported at the subgrantees' level of various degrees (ranging from complaints and requests) and were brought to the attention of to the Executing Agency during site visits and via quarterly reports. It must be noted however, that the vast majority of them may not be considered grievances in the true sense but it is commendable that grantees reported on these incidences to the executing agency.	<b>CA</b>	<b>AMPA: 3</b> (entry of eight villagers into the Alto Huayabamba Conservation Concession; El Progreso settlement in the buffer zone made up of Bolivian descendants requested economic support for infrastructure; delay in the sale of quinoa produced) <b>DAHARI: Not Stated</b> (Mostly complaints are made to Dahari (sometimes to the local authority) with interests to get more benefits from the project. All discussion/meeting is documented.) <b>EPCO: 1</b> (six fishers who approached the authority with negative views were able to use their political connections to frustrate the extension of the lease of the project site) <b>FFI: 3</b> (Some villagers in one of the communities in Hponganrazi Wildlife Sanctuary did not understand nor agree with the FCZ establishment; 2 cases of illegal fishers found with illegal gear)

<sup>11</sup> **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

<p>2. Percentage of conflict and complaint cases reported to the project's Accountability and Grievance Mechanism that have been resolved</p>	<p>any grievance (100%)</p>	<p>There were no grievances reported to the Executing Agency. Of the grievances reported at the subgrantees' level of various degrees (from complaints and requests), 98.73% of them have been addressed at the local levels and resolved.</p>	<p><b>CA</b></p>	<p><b>FIDES: None reported</b>  <b>GIF: None reported</b>  <b>IMPECT: 2</b> (differences of opinion between leaders and villagers on boundary land use to develop GIS mapping; collection and selling of coffee products through village-based green market compromised by big corporate company)  <b>TERI: 1</b> (incident of illegal fishing and beetle collection)  <b>UIS: 1</b> (Mistrust and misunderstandings from a local conflict between locals and government authorities on territorial planning policies raised suspicion in the projects objectives)  <b>WCS: 68</b> (these were mainly requests made by the villagers to WCS that were recorded)  There was one "grievance" expressed by a prospective partner, Association ANDES, that did not come through the Grievance Mechanism (it went directly to the IPSI Steering Committee mailing list) caused by the misunderstanding of the wording in email communication. The issue was addressed immediately, carefully and sincerely. The case is no longer an issue between CI and ANDES. All grievances were taken care of at the local level and did not escalate to the level of the Executing Agency. The grievance in Mauritius remains unresolved but its resolution is being pursued at the grass roots level by the Cooperative Society that was established under the GEF-Satoyama Project.</p>
<p><b>GENDER MAINSTREAMING</b></p> <p>1. Number of men and women that participated in project</p>	<p>40% women participants</p>	<p>694 participants to the workshops, trainings, and side events that the Project held were 274 women (39%), 420 participants were men (61%).</p>	<p><b>CA</b></p>	<p>The gender mainstreaming workshop offered capacity building to assist the Executive Team in addressing this safeguard.</p>

activities (e.g. meetings, workshops, consultations)

Numerous workshops, meetings and consultations are also conducted by the grantees in their respective countries as well as our project partners.

- Consolidation Workshop from August 21-24, 2018 (21 women [48%] 23 men [52%])
- Public Forum at IPSI-7 on September 30, 2018 (45 women [35%] 85 men [65%])
- Side event at IPSI-7 on October 1, 2018 (12 women [32%] 25 men [68%])
- General Assembly at IPSI-7 on October 1, 2018 (33 women [32%] 66 men [67%])
- Eastern Himalaya Naturenomics Forum on November 2, 2018 (ISAP) (36 women [40%] 53 men [60%])
- Side event at CBD COP14, on November 17, 2018 (20 women [33%] 45 men [77%])
- Side event at CBD's Regional Consultation Workshop on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework for Asia and the Pacific on January 29, 2019 (31 women [52%] 29 men [48%])
- Apprenticeship Amplification: Intervention of The Satoyama Project in The Ecuadorian Tropical Andes on March 20, 2019 (36 women [46%] 43 men [54%])
- UIS Final presentation of project event results on March 23, 2019 (26 women [51%] 25 men [49%])
- Side event at the Association of American Geographers Annual

<p>2. Number of men and women that received benefits (e.g. employment, income generating activities, training, access to natural resources, land tenure or resource rights, equipment, leadership roles) from the project.</p> <p>3. Number of strategies, plans (e.g. management plans and land use plans) and policies derived from the project that include gender considerations (this indicator applies to relevant projects)</p>	<p>40% women participants</p> <p>All subgrantee (10) projects mainstream gender in their proposed activities</p>	<p>For FY19, 2795 men (56.26%); 2170 women (43.74%)</p> <p>16</p>	<p>CA</p> <p>CA</p>	<p>Meeting on April 4, 2019 (10 women [50%] 10 men [50%])</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>India Satoyama Workshop on April 23, 2019 (4 women [20%] 16 men [80%])</li> </ul> <p>This information was reported as part of the grantee's quarterly report.</p>
<p><b>STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT</b></p> <p>1. Number of government agencies, civil society organizations, private sector, indigenous peoples and other stakeholder groups that have been involved in the project implementation phase on an annual basis</p> <p>2. Number of persons (sex disaggregated) that have been involved in project implementation phase</p>	<p>[No target set]</p> <p>40% women participants</p>	<p>Figure currently stands at 378. Government (96); Local NGOs/CSOs (90); International NGOs (21); Private Sector (46); UN Agencies (8); Universities (25); Community Groups (92)</p> <p>Executive Team (50% F7 and 50% M9):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CIJ – F5 (56%)/M4 (44%)</li> <li>IGES – F4 (57%)/M3 (43%)</li> <li>UNU-IAS – F1 (25%)/M3 (75%)</li> </ul> <p>Subgrantee Project Proponents (55% F18 and 45% M20):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AMPA - F2 (40%)/M3 (60%)</li> </ul>	<p>CA</p> <p>CA</p>	<p>This information was reported as part of the grantee's quarterly report and information received directly from the project partners.</p> <p>At the management/implementation level we have had a satisfactory number of women involved.</p>

3. Number of engagements (e.g. meeting, workshops, consultations) with stakeholders during the project implementation phase

[No target set]

- DAHARI – F3 (60%)/M2 (40%)
- EPCO – F2 (100%)/M0 (0%)
- FFI – F2 (67%)/M1 (33%)
- FIDES – F6 (60%)/M4 (40%)
- GIF – F2 (66%)/M1 (33%)
- IMPECT – F2 (29%)/M5 (71%)
- TERI – F1 (20%)/M4 (80%)
- UIS – F2 (40%)/M3 (60%)
- WCS – F4 (70%)/M2 (30%)

Cumulative list covering the entire duration of the project.

For FY19, there were 14 engagements

CA

These include:

**Meetings** (IPSI Steering Committee Meeting, IPSI-7 General Assembly, CBD COP14, Association of American Geographers Annual Meeting);

**Workshops** (Consolidation Workshop, CBD's Regional Consultation Workshop on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework for Asia and the Pacific, India Satoyama Workshop);

**Public Engagement Events** (IPSI-7 Public Forum, Eastern Himalaya Naturenomics Forum, Apprenticeship Amplification: Intervention of The Satoyama Project in The Ecuadorian Tropical Andes, UIS Final presentation of project event);

**Side Events** (CBD COP14, IPSI-7, Association of American Geographers Annual Meeting).

4. Percentage of stakeholders who rate as satisfactory the level at which their views and concerns are taken into account by the project (responsible party for measuring this indicator is CI-GEF Agency and this will be undertaken by the consultant hired by the CI-GEF Agency to conduct the MTR and Terminal Evaluation)



**INDIGENOUS PEOPLES**

1. Percentage of indigenous/local communities where FPIC have been followed and documented.

100% of the subgrantee projects will implement their stakeholder engagement plans, following Free, Prior, Informed Consent

100%

**CA**

All seven projects that triggered this safeguard have implemented and followed FPIC.

- AMPA has been following FPIC prior to the project and the players are already their partners. For the purpose of the project signed agreements were made.
- FFI is conducting FPIC in each of the communities and they also have agreements that are signed by a representative of each household in the community.
- FIDES is conducting FPIC process with the communities involved in the project with all activities being community and locally driven.
- After data collection, GIF embarked on a broad-based consultation with all stakeholders.
- IMPECT's project is a grass roots led one, by and for the Karen people. Community leaders make decisions on the basis of community discussions. IMPECT is keeping a record of such meetings.
- TERI has an entire process of engaging villagers into CCA network through FPIC, and the TERI team is documenting the meetings.
- UIS has created a document that they are following for this safeguard and have agreements that are signed by the players indicating their acceptance to be a part of the project.

<p>2. The percentage of communities where project benefit sharing have been agreed upon through the appropriate community governance mechanisms and documented</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>CA</p>	<p>This information was verified from the site visits.</p> <p>TERI and FFI have developed documents by and for the communities for the benefits to be derived through the CCAs and FCZs respectively.</p> <p>AMPA has agreements made directly with the farmers and the associations that were formed such as APRODEQUI. UIS has agreements signed directly with the farmers since most of the project site is made up of privately-owned land. This corresponds to 50% of the grantees. EPCO, FIDES, GIF, IMPECT, DAHARI and WCS are generally community based and followed established community governance mechanisms.</p>
<p><b>INVOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT</b></p>				
<p>1. Number of persons involved in voluntary resettlement</p>	<p>0 persons to be voluntarily resettled</p>	<p>DAHARI: 0 FFI: 0 GIF: 0 TERI: 0</p>	<p>CA</p>	<p>There has been no physical resettlement due to subgrant project activities.</p>
<p>2. Number of persons compensated for voluntary resettlement</p>	<p>0 persons to be voluntarily resettled so no compensation needed</p>	<p>DAHARI: 0 FFI: 0 GIF: 0 TERI: 0</p>	<p>CA</p>	<p>There has been no physical resettlement due to subgrant project activities.</p>
<p>3. Number of persons whose access to and use of natural resources have been voluntarily restricted</p>	<p>[No target set]</p>	<p>DAHARI: 4 landowners FFI: 35,500 villagers GIF: 0 TERI: 2,269 villagers</p>	<p>CA</p>	<p>For DAHARI, three landowners with a Livingstone fruit bat roosting site agreed with Dahari not to disturb the roosting site with agricultural activities. To compensate, DAHARI has provided the farmers with improved food crop varieties and capacity building in sustainable agriculture.</p> <p>The numbers from FFI represents villagers that have agreed and designated their freshwater resources as fishery conserved zones while the numbers from TERI represents villagers that have agreed and designated parts of</p>

4. Number of persons whose access to and use of natural resources have been involuntary restricted	0 persons		CA	their land as community conserved areas. There was no involuntary resettlement.
5. Percentage of persons who gave their consent for voluntary restrictions	100%	100%	CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DAHARI signed an agreement with the farmer (100%).</li> <li>• FFI signed agreements by a representative of each household in the community giving their consent (100%).</li> <li>• GIF facilitated the signing of a co-management plan by all fishing cooperatives (100%).</li> <li>• TERI signed agreements for CCAs from three villages, and work in progress with another three (100%).</li> </ul>
6. Percentage of persons who have received compensation for voluntary restrictions	100%	100%	CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DAHARI provided the farmer with improved food crop varieties and building capacity in improved sustainable agriculture and marketing techniques for improved livelihoods (100%).</li> <li>• FFI funded alternative livelihoods for projects identified by the communities that have agreed to the voluntary restrictions (100%).</li> <li>• GIF sits on the committee that will oversee the realization of a national fisheries plan in 2019 which will address compensation for voluntary restrictions in relation to the co-management plan.</li> <li>• TERI is in the process of capacity building which is laying the foundation for tourism as alternative livelihoods (100%).</li> </ul>

7. Percentage of persons who have received compensation for involuntary restrictions	0 involuntary restrictions	There were no involuntary restrictions.	CA	There were no involuntary restrictions.
--	----------------------------	---	----	---

## b. Overall Project Safeguard Implementation Rating

### SUMMARY: PROJECT SAFEGUARD IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY TYPE OF PLAN

SAFEGUARDS TRIGGERED BY THE PROJECT (delete those not applicable)	CURRENT FY19 IMPLEMENTATION RATING	RATING TREND
Accountability and Grievance Mechanisms	HS	Unchanged
Gender Mainstreaming Plan (GMP)	HS	Unchanged
Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)	HS	Unchanged
Indigenous Peoples	HS	Unchanged
Involuntary Resettlement	HS	Unchanged

### OVERALL PROJECT SAFEGUARD IMPLEMENTATION RATING

RATING	JUSTIFICATION	RATING TREND
HS	The achievements by the project in gender, stakeholder engagement and safeguards are commendable. The high number of grievances reported at the grantee level is a reflection of how well stakeholders were aware of the mechanism, and the high percentage of resolution indicated how well the system responded to grievances when they were raised. The project achieved its target for women participation and beneficiaries, and gender was further mainstreamed in 16 strategies, plans and policies. FPIC was followed when working with Indigenous Peoples. Restriction of access to natural resources were successfully negotiated and compensation provided as agreed upon. The number of stakeholders engaged was high at 378. Overall, the achievement of the targets and compliance with the safeguard policy warrants the project a HS rating.	Unchanged

## c. Recommendations

CORRECTIVE ACTION(S)	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DEADLINE
No corrective action to be taken since this was the final year of the project.		



## **SECTION V: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS LEARNED**

### **1. Project institutional arrangements, including project governance**

The Executive Team continued to function as the steering committee of the project. The meetings of the Executive Unit were scheduled once annually with the main aim of approving the workplan and budget with the chair calling a meeting when the need arises. The Working Unit meetings, which were scheduled on a quarterly basis, were used to update on the progress and discuss the issues for the improvement of the project. The Working Unit meetings helped to update partners and receive inputs at the time of quarterly reports.

### **2. Capacity building**

Recognizing the existence of limitations in relation to gender mainstreaming, the CI-APFD regional point for gender mainstreaming conducted a workshop at the Consolidation Workshop in August 2018 in Mauritius which benefited the Executive Team and grantee representatives.

### **3. Implementation of safeguard policies, including gender mainstreaming, accountability and grievance mechanisms, stakeholder consultations**

The Executing Agency followed the implementation of safeguards by the subgrantees in all aspects of the activities through the quarterly report template modified in the second year. The quarterly technical reports submitted by the grantees reported directly on the safeguards. In this year the implementation of the safeguards by the grantees were evaluated in the programmatic site visits. This was done through discussions with various stakeholders involved in the project to understand the level of consultations that were conducted, finding out how aware persons are of the accountability and grievance mechanism in place, and what is being done on the ground to ensure gender mainstreaming is improved. It was found that the grantees are making diligent efforts by going at great lengths to improve on the gender mainstreaming safeguard. A mini gender mainstreaming training conducted during the Consolidation Workshop assisted in this regard.

### **4. Factors that improve likelihood of long-term sustainability of project impacts**

We brought a number of organizations to the IPSI as new members, which contributes to continuity in collaboration in the future. In addition, at international meetings, the GEF-Satoyama Project has been promoted with the view of forging further relationships that could result in sustainable management of SEPLS globally. The subgrant projects which generally are focused on self-sufficiency and enhanced livelihoods are already putting measures in place to ensure sustainability of the various projects. AMPA has facilitated the marketing of produce from the project site by having the area certified as organic with established niche markets; IMPECT has secured markets for product coming out of its project site marketed under the essence of Karen culture; TERI has established ecotourism initiatives in the project site; FFI has supported alternative livelihoods to boost the village economy; DAHARI and WCS are creating sustainability through capacity building in improved agricultural techniques; FIDES and UIS have supported community tourism and value added processing of products such as coffee, cocoa and salt; EPCO and GIF assured the sustainability of the project through the establishment and strengthening of cooperatives. Workshops in Ecuador in March 2019 and in India in April 2019 were organized to strengthen partnership in these countries.

### **5. Factors that encourage replication, including outreach, dissemination of lessons learned, and communications strategies**

The Indicators of Resilience workshops were particularly useful in this regard since it included persons that were not grantees and who returned to implement the same monitoring and evaluation of their projects on the basis of what they learned at the workshops. IGES developed two videos, an instructional and an informative video on the use of the Indicators of Resilience. Presentations were made at several international meetings as well to further disseminate information on the project. The Consolidation Workshop further encouraged replication of lessons learned. The project developed a

website, which is acting as a depository of the project achievements. Lastly, we are sharing the project achievements and lessons learned through the platform of the IPSI.

**6. Interpretation and application of GEF guidelines**

The Executing Agency assisted subgrantees in understanding the guidelines through emails and feedback on quarterly reports submitted by grantees. In the past year help was also obtained on gender mainstreaming from the APFD point for gender.

**7. Financial management and co-financing**

[Financial Management] The mechanism put in place for the approval of quarterly and annual reports, allows for good scrutiny of financial reports and wherever queries exist, clarifications are obtained from the grantees. Site visits were conducted for Tropical Andes and Madagascar and Indian Ocean Islands which allowed for financial checks to be made.

[Co-financing] The third co-financing report submitted indicates that co-financing as pledged will be surpassed by the end of the project period. Additional co-financing has been received by the Executing Agency through sponsorship to participate in several amplification activities.

## APPENDIX I: PROJECT ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING

Rating		Overdue (O)	Delayed (D)	Not started on schedule (NS)	Under implementation on schedule (IS)	Completed/Achieved (CA)
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	HS	0%		100%		
Satisfactory (S)	S	20%		80%		
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	MS	40%		60%		
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	MU	60%		40%		
Unsatisfactory (U)	U	80%		20%		
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	HU	100%		0%		

- **Highly Satisfactory:** 100% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project. The project can be presented as an example of “good practice” project,
- **Satisfactory:** 80% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project; except for only 20% that are delayed and/or overdue and need remedial action,
- **Moderately Satisfactory:** 60% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project; while 40% are delayed and/or overdue and need remedial action,
- **Moderately Unsatisfactory:** 40% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project; while 60% are delayed and/or overdue and need remedial action,
- **Unsatisfactory:** only 20% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project; while 80% are delayed and/or overdue and need remedial action, and
- **Highly Unsatisfactory:** 100% of the indicators: a) are overdue, and/or b) delayed in their implementation, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project.



INDICATORS	PROJECT TARGET	END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS	PROGRESS RATING <sup>12</sup>	COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION
<b>Output Indicator 1.1.1:</b> Insert output indicators as they appear in the ProDoc	Insert output indicator targets as they appear in the ProDoc, if available	Describe the change in the output indicator over the last year	Progress towards achieving the output	Provide a justification for the status of the indicator as needed
<b>Outcome 1.1:</b> Effective conservation management in selected priority production landscapes and seascapes achieved				
<i>Indicator 1.1.1: Number of hectares under sub-grant projects' direct intervention</i>	At least 10,000 ha of production landscapes and seascapes are under effective management.	The ten subgrant projects selected collectively directly cover 4,120,358.9 ha.	<b>CA</b>	From a proposed area of 4,176,335 ha, the figure of actual area under the direct influence of the project sites by grantees stands at 4,120,358.9 ha.
<i>Indicator 1.1.2: Number of hectares to which activities of subgrant projects bring positive influence</i>	Positive influence on additional 50,000ha of protected areas nearby through connectivity, buffers or enhanced ecological sustainability provided in target landscapes and seascapes.	The positive influence of the ten subgrant projects extends to 1,218,000.7 ha.	<b>CA</b>	From a proposed area of 1,790,530 ha, the figure under the indirect influence of the project sites by grantees stands at 1,218,000.7 ha
<b>Outcome 1.2</b> Site-level conservation status of globally threatened species Improved				

<sup>12</sup> **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

<p><b>Indicators 1.2.1:</b> Area in ha of suitable habitat and/or population trend of the IUCN threatened species in focus</p>	<p>Known critical threats to the conservation status of IUCN threatened species are minimized or removed.</p>	<p>Threats addressed by grantees include:          AMPA: deforestation          Dahari: deforestation          EPCO: alien species invasion          FFI: overfishing          FIDES: deforestation and overfishing          GIF: overfishing          IMPECT: hunting          TERI: hunting and overfishing          UIS: deforestation          WCS: deforestation and poaching</p>	<p>CA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DAHARI has conducted reforestation exercises of 500 ha during the year which benefits lemurs and Livingstone’s fruit bat. A total of 57,477 trees have been planted so far. Monitoring is ongoing.</li> <li>• EPCO conducted renovation of 0.312 km of the barachois wall. Invasive tree species are being cut and used for crab boxes and the general coastal area is being cleaned and preserved by better aware inhabitants. In total, 416 native and endemic terrestrial plants have been planted in the area post IAS removal.</li> <li>• FFI has demarcated Fisheries Conservation Zones in their project site totaling 890.71 ha. Other FCZs are expected to be established beyond the life of the project.</li> <li>• FIDES reported 3 ha mangrove reforestation in Rio Portoviejo Estuary and 2 ha in Rio Chone with 60,000 shells of the black shell (<i>Anadara similis</i>, <i>Anadara tuberculosa</i>) with a 25% mortality rate observed. Reforestation of total of 1,454 trees including the papaya (<i>Carica papaya</i>), ovo (<i>Spondias purpurea</i>) and algarrobo (<i>Prosopis juliflora</i>), pechiche (<i>Vitex cymosa</i>), guayacán (<i>Tabebuia chrysantha</i>) plants (which are fruit trees that supply food for the Capuchin monkey) was done in a linear 3 km area.</li> </ul>
--	---	--	-----------	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMPECT has established a total of 4.5 km of fire break lines which has been maintained to date. Monitoring teams are established in each community to among other things monitor forest fire outbreaks.</li> <li>• TERI has established the Community Conservation Zones in their project site totaling 4,050 ha so far consisting of Sukhai, Kivikhu and Zunheboto. This is expected to be expanded beyond the life of the project when other villages join the CCA network.</li> </ul> <p>WCS has reported 488.4 km restoration of forest corridors in Lokaitra and Vohitaly, transplanted 23,921 plants and has maintained 34.2 ha of reforested parcels. WCS has conducted 83 patrol missions where more than 353 threats were recorded. They include 6 major pressures: forest clearing (39%), plantations (21%), illegal camp (19%), logging and collecting forest products (10%), lemur trapping (6%), and mine extraction (2%).</p>
<b>Outcome 1.3</b> Traditional knowledge benefiting and being protected in conservation measures				
<i>Indicator 1.3.1: Number of traditional knowledge and practices documented</i>	Traditional knowledge and practices documented to benefit conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in subgrant projects	Grantees have documented indigenous knowledge through print, audio, and video.	<b>CA</b>	Under this umbrella, case studies from India and Mauritius were developed in this year for publishing in the Satoyama Initiative Thematic Review. IMPECT, TERI and UIS have actively documented indigenous knowledge.
<b>Outcome 2.1:</b> Global knowledge on SEPLS for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into primary production enhanced				

<b>Indicator 2.1.1:</b> <i>Global map identifying priority SEPLS sites</i>	Priority SEPLS around the world identified and mapped based on criteria developed from existing studies and methods.	Data was analyzed to identify the areas where SEPLS can be present.	<b>CA</b>	As of this writing (July 2019), an article is under preparation for publication in a peer-reviewed journal (PLOS One).
<b>Indicators 2.1.2:</b> <i>a. Number of times the knowledge products are shared with relevant stakeholders at local, national and international fora</i> <i>b. Number of knowledge products, including peer-reviewed journal articles, and policy recommendations in other forms of publications and supporting tools</i> <i>c. Knowledge products on the approaches for the identification and/or documentation of values of SEPLS, indigenous and local knowledge and elements of good governance developed and presented to stakeholders</i>	Knowledge products (including the analysis of SEPLS cases around the world, toolkits, and policy analysis related to the development, implementation and management of sustainable SEPLS) developed and disseminated through the global knowledge management platform, relevant international fora (such as CBD and IUCN), and Component 3 workshops.	a. 17 events listed in 3.1.2. b. 59 publications and 19 videos c. 2 publications in SISTR-5.	<b>CA</b>	Knowledge products are 59 publications and 19 videos which can be found on the project's website at <a href="http://gef-satoyama.net/resources/">http://gef-satoyama.net/resources/</a> . Additionally, subgrantees developed a variety of teaching materials/modules, posters, and brochures.
<b>Outcome 3.1:</b> Capacity of multi-sectoral stakeholders, including national and international decision-makers and practitioners and under-represented groups, to collaborate and mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable management increased				
<b>Indicator 3.1.1:</b> <i>Number and attributes (affiliation, country, etc.) of participants in workshops, including co-organized events</i>	At least 500 stakeholders with increased awareness for mainstreaming the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in landscapes and seascapes through regional and global workshops (IPSI activities) and those conducted by and with partners (Association ANDES, SCBD and COMDEKS)	803 as of the end of FY18 with an additional 694 in FY19 bringing the accumulated total to 1497.	<b>CA</b>	

<p><b>Indicator 3.1.2:</b> % of women participants in workshops</p>	<p>All workshops are conducted in gender-sensitive manner and ensure that 40-50-% of the participants are women.</p>	<p><u>FY17</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IPSI Regional workshop 2017 (26% women)</li> <li>• Indicators of Resilience training (36% women)</li> <li>• CBD COP13 (20% women)</li> <li>• ADB Civil Society Forum (30% women)</li> <li>• COMDEKS global workshop (46.77% women)</li> <li>• IPSI Latin America Regional Workshop (24% women)</li> <li>• IPSI-6 symposium (33.77% women)</li> </ul> <p><u>FY18</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender mainstreaming workshop (11 women on September 6-9, 2017 [55%] 9 men [45%])</li> <li>• Public forum on conservation, Resilience &amp; Natural Disasters (11 women on May 24<sup>th</sup>, 2018 [42.31%] 15 men [57.69%])</li> <li>• Side Event at the 9th International Forum for Sustainable Asia and the Pacific on July 25-26, 2017 (ISAP) (41 women [44.09%] 52 men [55.91%])</li> <li>• SGP China Landscape Approach workshop from March 19-21, 2018 (14 women [58.33%] 10 men [41.67%])</li> <li>• ADB Civil Society Forum from May 1-6, 2018 (47 women [44.34%] 59 men [55.66%])</li> </ul>	<p><b>CA</b></p>	<p>In general, the panels are fairly gender balanced in terms of moderators and facilitators. For the Consolidation Workshop, two invitations were sent to grantees to increase the likelihood that one of the participants is female.</p>
---	--	---	------------------	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6<sup>th</sup> GEF Assembly Meeting from June 23 to 29, 2018 (13 women [54.17%] 11 men [45.83%])</li> </ul> <p><u>FY19</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consolidation Workshop from August 21-24, 2018 (21 women [48%] 23 men [52%])</li> <li>• Public Forum at IPSI-7 on September 30, 2018 (45 women [35%] 85 men [65%])</li> <li>• Side event at IPSI-7 on October 1, 2018 (12 women [32%] 25 men [68%])</li> <li>• General Assembly at IPSI-7 on October 1, 2018 (33 women [32%] 66 men [67%])</li> <li>• Eastern Himalaya Naturenomics Forum on November 2, 2018 (ISAP) (36 women [40%] 53 men [60%])</li> <li>• Side event at CBD COP14, on November 17, 2018 (20 women [33%] 45 men [77%])</li> <li>• Side event at CBD's Regional Consultation Workshop on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework for Asia and the Pacific on January 29, 2019 (31 women [52%] 29 men [48%])</li> <li>• Apprenticeship Amplification: Intervention of The Satoyama Project in The Ecuadorian Tropical Andes on March 20, 2019</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>(36 women [46%] 43 men [54%])</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UIS Final presentation of project event results on March 23, 2019 (26 women [51%] 25 men [49%])</li> <li>• Side event at the Association of American Geographers Annual Meeting on April 4, 2019 (10 women [50%] 10 men [50%])</li> </ul> <p>India Satoyama Workshop on April 23, 2019 (4 women [20%] 16 men [80%])</p>		
<p><b>Indicator 3.1.3:</b></p> <p>a. Number of persons (from Component 1 subgrantees and others) participated in the training workshops and received training on the “Indicators for Resilience in SEPLS”.</p> <p>b. Indicators for Resilience used by 9 subgrant projects and lessons compiled.</p>	<p>At least 50 stakeholders, including 2 practitioners/representatives from each of the subgrant project implementers under Component 1 trained in promoting mainstreaming of the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services, while improving human wellbeing, including through the use of the “Indicators for Resilience in SEPLS”</p>	<p>Indo-Burma: 60 Tropical Andes: 39 Madagascar and Indian Ocean Islands: 37 IUCN WCC in Hawaii: 31 IPSI Regional workshop in Malaysia: 27</p>	<p><b>CA</b></p>	<p>All ten subgrant projects are integrating the indicators in their project and have done so both at the beginning and the end of their period of performance.</p>