

GEF-8 REQUEST FOR CEO CHILD ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GENERAL CHILD PROJECT INFORMATION	3
Project Summary	4
Child Project Description Overview	5
CHILD PROJECT OUTLINE	9
A. PROJECT RATIONALE	9
B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION	25
Institutional Arrangement and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.....	41
Table On Core Indicators	44
Core Indicators	44
Key Risks	48
C. ALIGNMENT WITH GEF-8 PROGRAMMING STRATEGIES AND COUNTRY/REGIONAL PRIORITIES	50
D. POLICY REQUIREMENTS	51
Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment:.....	51
Stakeholder Engagement	52
Private Sector	52
Environmental and Social Safeguards	53
E. OTHER REQUIREMENTS	53
Knowledge management	53
Socio-economic Benefits	53
ANNEX A: FINANCING TABLES	54
GEF Financing Table	54
Project Preparation Grant (PPG)	54
Sources of Funds for Country Star Allocation.....	55
Focal Area Elements	55
Confirmed Co-financing for the project, by name and type.....	55
ANNEX B: ENDORSEMENT	56
Record of Endorsement of GEF Operational Focal Point (s) on Behalf of the Government(s):.....	56
ANNEX C: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK.....	56
ANNEX D: STATUS OF UTILIZATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG)	63
ANNEX E: PROJECT MAP AND COORDINATES	63
ANNEX F: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS DOCUMENTS INCLUDING RATING.....	65
ANNEX G: BUDGET TABLE.....	66
ANNEX I: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS	75

General Child Project Information

Child Project Title

Honduras Mesoamerica Forest IP Project: Conserving the Intact Forests of the Honduran Moskitia

Region	GEF Project ID
Honduras	11276
Country(ies)	Type of Project
Honduras	FSP
GEF Agency(ies)	GEF Agency Project ID
IUCN	
Project Executing Entity(s)	Project Executing Type
Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SERNA)	Government
Forest Conservation Institute (ICF)	Government
National University of Agriculture (UNAG)	Government
Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)	CSO
Agency for the Development of the Mosquitia (MOPAWI)	CSO
Forests of the World	CSO
GEF Focal Area (s)	Submission Date
Multi Focal Area	6/11/2024
Type of Trust Fund	Project Duration (Months)
GET	48
GEF Project Grant: (a)	Agency Fee(s) Grant: (b)
3,519,725.00	316,773.00
PPG Amount: (c)	PPG Agency Fee(s): (d)
150,000.00	13,500.00
Total GEF Financing: (a+b+c+d)	Total Co-financing
3999998	22,963,181.87

Project Sector (CCM Only)

AFOLU

Rio Markers

Climate Change Mitigation	Climate Change Adaptation	Biodiversity	Land Degradation
Principal Objective 2	Significant Objective 1	Principal Objective 2	Significant Objective 1

Project Summary

Provide a brief summary description of the project, to offer a snapshot of what is being proposed. The summary should include: (i) what is the problem and issues to be addressed? ii) as a child project under a program, explain how the description fits in the broader context of the specific program; (iii) what are the project objectives, and if the project is intended to be transformative, how will this be achieved? and (iv) what are the GEBs and/or adaptation benefits, and other key expected results. (max. 250 words, approximately 1/2 page)

The Mesoamerican Critical Forest Biome is vital and irreplaceable; however, despite these factors, it is considered among the world's most threatened, with nearly half of the region's natural habitats being converted to agriculture or urban areas. The Moskitia Intact Forest Landscape (IFL) provides numerous benefits to local communities. Its rich biodiversity sustains traditional livelihoods such as hunting, fishing, and gathering of non-timber forest products, ensuring food security and cultural continuity for indigenous populations. Nonetheless, it faces threats from various sources, including: i) legal and illegal small- and large-scale cattle ranching; ii) agricultural expansion; iii) illegal logging and timber harvesting; iv) forest fires; v) hurricanes; vi) illegal hunting and wildlife trade; vii) illegal roads, among others. Consequently, many of the indigenous peoples, women, and youth living in the project sites also experience high rates of poverty, limited economic and educational opportunities, and rely heavily on natural resources and subsistence agriculture, making them highly vulnerable to external factors, including climate change.

The Honduras Mesoamerica Forest Child project objective is to contribute to the protection of critical forest ecosystems in Honduras, while improving the well-being of indigenous peoples by recognising their indispensable role in forest conservation. This project will target three different sites in Honduras' northeastern departments of Gracias a Dios, Olancho, and Colon, namely the Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (RPBR), Tawahka Asagni Biosphere Reserve (TABR), and the indigenous forests of Warunta.

The project aims to facilitate transformational change that supports the conservation of preserved forests in the Honduran Moskitia through a set of targeted interventions addressing the main drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. Interventions will focus on strengthening multi-level governance and policy coherence, mobilizing new and additional financing for forest conservation, enhancing regional cooperation, knowledge sharing, and awareness raising. The project also aims to support conservation led by indigenous peoples and local communities. The project's objectives will be achieved through four interlinked components as follows: 1) Enabling environment for the protection and conservation of primary forests; 2) Protection and accelerated restoration of primary forests; 3) Innovative financial mechanisms and investment; and 4) Coordinated and enhanced learning and regional collaboration.

This project is designed to deliver global environmental benefits (GEB) in biodiversity, climate change mitigation and adaptation, international waters, and land degradation and forests. Likewise, it aligns with the GEF strategy on forests^[11], embracing the vision of addressing urgent climate, biodiversity, and land degradation crises while empowering Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs). This empowerment is achieved through the maintenance, preservation, and restoration of the integrity and functioning of forest biomes. Consequently, the project promotes the integrity of Mesoamerica's critical

tropical forests, maximizing multiple global environmental benefits related to carbon and biodiversity. It does so by strengthening the protection and governance of Intact Forest Landscapes (IFLs) and addressing the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation at the landscape level.

Global Environmental Benefits (GEB)	
Biodiversity	Conservation of globally significant biodiversity.
	Sustainable use of the components of globally significant biodiversity.
Land degradation	Improved provision of agro-ecosystem and forest ecosystem goods and services.
	Mitigated/avoided greenhouse gas emissions and increased carbon sequestration in production landscapes.
	Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in productive landscapes.
	Reduced pollution and siltation of international waters.
Climate change mitigation	Mitigated GHG emissions.
	Increased adoption of innovative technologies and management practices for GHG emission reduction and carbon sequestration.
	Conservation and enhanced carbon stocks in agriculture, forest, and other land use.

[\[1\]https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2024-05/GEF-StrategyOnForests-final_0.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2024-05/GEF-StrategyOnForests-final_0.pdf)

Child Project Description Overview

Project Objective

Protection of critical ecosystems in the Moskitia region and improving the well-being of local communities.

Project Components

1 - Enabling conditions for the protection and conservation of primary forests

Component Type	Trust Fund
Technical Assistance	GET
GEF Project Financing (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
773,947.00	4,567,530.00

Outcome:

- 1.1: Strengthening local and national mechanisms to support the conservation of primary forests in the Honduran Moskitia.
- 1.2: Key national and regulatory instruments prioritize primary forest conservation in the Honduran Moskitia.
- 1.3: Improved multi sectoral platforms for forest conservation and management.

Output:

1.1.1: Awareness and advocacy plan for the protection and conservation of primary forests aimed at policy makers, sectoral entities and the private sector.

1.1.2: Strengthening local governance structures to improve the effectiveness of the protection and conservation of the primary forests of the Honduran Moskitia, through zoning and norm building processes in at least 2 of the territorial councils.

1.1.3: Strengthened agreements for cross-border protected areas collaboration.

1.2.1: Updated Sub-national policies, regulations and cross-sectoral instruments that support the protection and conservation of primary forests in the Honduran Moskitia.

1.2.2: Information to support fact-based decision making on forest conservation interventions.

1.3.1: Creation or strengthening of multi-sectoral platforms.

1.3.2: Multisectoral meetings of stakeholder groups and sectors to agree actions and goals for primary forest conservation.

2. Accelerated protection and restoration of primary forests

Component Type	Trust Fund
Technical Assistance	GET
GEF Project Financing (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
1,420,700.00	10,258,633.87

Outcome:

2.1: Improved protection of primary forests in the Honduran Moskitia, particularly within protected areas.

2.2: Increased area of OECMs that protect primary forests integrity and expand functional connectivity.

2.3: Ongoing restoration of 500 ha to increase primary forest connectivity.

Output:

2.1.1: Strengthening protected area management instruments and tools.

2.1.2: Assessment of the risk of collapse of the of lowland rainforest in Honduras

2.1.3: Information about the contribution of protected areas and indigenous peoples to conserve the primary forests of the Honduran Moskitia and advance the global biodiversity framework to support fact-based decision-making.

2.2.1: National frameworks or protocols for the implementation of OECM.

2.2.2: Establishment of an OECM zone to support the conservation of primary forests of the Honduran Moskitia.

2.3.1: Updated assessment of the restoration area in agreement with the ICTs and in the framework of the process of remediation and reclamation of areas.

2.3.2: Key priority areas for the restoration of indigenous territorial areas.

3. Innovative finance and investment

Component Type	Trust Fund
Technical Assistance	GET
GEF Project Financing (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
659,500.00	4,010,141.00

Outcome:

3.1: Increase in financial resources for the conservation of primary forests of the Honduran Moskitia.

3.2: Increase in the number of forest-friendly initiatives

Output:

3.1.1: Analysis of funding gaps and barriers to investment in primary forest landscapes and forest-linked livelihoods in RPBR, TABR and Warunta.

3.1.2: Innovative financing instruments and tools to increase investments in primary forest protection, protected areas, OECMs, and forest linked livelihoods in RPBR, TABR and Warunta.

3.2.1: Innovative mechanisms to incentivise forest-friendly endeavours.

3.2.2: Innovative business models to develop forest-friendly goods and services.

3.2.3: Project preparation mechanism to allow access to private and development financing.

4. Coordinated and improved learning and regional collaboration

Component Type	Trust Fund
----------------	------------

Technical Assistance	GET
GEF Project Financing (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
388,000.00	2,289,823.00

Outcome:

4.1 Improved national and regional coordination for primary forest

4.2: Lessons on primary forest protection and conservation models are available worldwide

Output:

4.1.1: Long-term communication plan to mobilize support for the conservation of primary forests and critical forest biomes

4.2.1: Knowledge platform on critical forest biomes

4.2.2: Lessons, forest management and governance models, and integration of IPLCs, women and rural youth into decision-making processes documented and disseminated

4.2.3: South-South cooperation/knowledge exchange with other critical forest biomes.

4.2.4: Annual regional knowledge sharing workshops.

4.2.5: Harmonized annual program planning, reporting, monitoring and evaluation.

M&E

Component Type	Trust Fund
Technical Assistance	GET
GEF Project Financing (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
110,578.00	688,895.00

Outcome:

Output:

M&E

Component Type	Trust Fund
GEF Project Financing (\$)	Co-financing (\$)

Outcome:

Output:

Component Balances

Project Components	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
1 - Enabling conditions for the protection and conservation of primary forests	773,947.00	4,567,530.00
2. Accelerated protection and restoration of primary forests	1,420,700.00	10,258,633.87
3. Innovative finance and investment	659,500.00	4,010,141.00
4. Coordinated and improved learning and regional collaboration	388,000.00	2,289,823.00
M&E	110,578.00	688,895.00
M&E		
Subtotal	3,352,725.00	21,815,022.87
Project Management Cost	167,000.00	1,148,159.00
Total Project Cost (\$)	3,519,725.00	22,963,181.87

Please provide Justification

CHILD PROJECT OUTLINE

A. PROJECT RATIONALE

Describe the current situation: the global environmental problems and/or climate vulnerabilities that the project will address, the key elements of the system, and underlying drivers of environmental change in the project context, such as population growth, economic development, climate change, sociocultural and political factors, including conflicts, or technological changes. Since this is a child project under a program, please include an explanation of how the context fits within the specific program agenda. Describe the objective of the project, and the justification for it. (Approximately 3-5 pages) see guidance here

Honduras is the second-largest country in Central America with a population of 10.433 million^[12] inhabitants and a territorial extension of 11.19 million hectares. In recent years, the GDP of the country has been growing at an average rate compared to that of the region; however, this country remains as one of the poorest and highly unequal countries in the region^[23]. The agricultural sector plays an important role in the Honduran economy. This sector is responsible for around 73% of the country's total exports and employs 30% of Honduras' workforce. However, the majority of workers in this sector are small-scale, rural-based, subsistence farmers, with a large proportion living in poverty (80% of impoverished households depend on

income from agriculture). Moreover, this sector faces significant impacts due to its exposure to external shocks, being the sector most affected by climate change^[314]. In 2019, the Global Climate Risk Index^[415] classified Honduras as the second country most affected by extreme weather events between 1998 and 2017. Overall, Honduras is highly vulnerable to the effects of climate change due to its high exposure to climate-related hazards such as hurricanes, tropical storms, floods, droughts, and landslides^[516]. Climate change poses a risk to crucial ecosystems like mangroves, coral reefs, forests, and fisheries. Moreover, Honduras grapples with the economic and social challenges associated with climate-induced disruptions, exacerbating existing vulnerabilities.

Honduras has exceptionally high biodiversity due to its tropical location, situated between two oceans, and its topographical conditions. All these factors create a wide variety of environments and habitats, encompassing eight different ecoregions and 60 terrestrial and coastal marine ecosystems. According to the Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources known as “SERNA”, the country boasts 7,524 registered species of vascular plants, 718 species of birds, 228 species of mammals, 211 species of reptiles, and 111 amphibians, 2,500 species of insects and 672 species of fish. Additionally, out of those, 131 species are included on the IUCN Red List of threatened species^[617] as critically endangered and 4 as already extinct.

Covering over 56% of Honduras’ territory, forests play a crucial role in delivering a range of environmental services and goods vital for the well-being of numerous communities residing in these areas^[718]. Nevertheless, the rate of tree cover loss is high by regional and global levels, with 12 percent lost between 2010 and 2021, driven mainly by small farmer- and commercial agriculture expansion. Tree cover loss is further affected by the 59.2 percent of rural families in Honduras who use firewood for cooking, and by illegal logging and drug production- activities^[819].

Nevertheless, the region faces threats from deforestation and forest degradation, which have accelerated in this Important Forest Landscape (IFL) in recent years. This acceleration is primarily due to shifting agriculture, commodity-driven deforestation, cattle ranching, illegal mining, organized crime, and illicit activities. These activities have increasingly occurred over the past two decades, leading to a significant loss of forest cover and jeopardizing the integrity and functioning of many forest ecosystems, both inside and outside protected areas. According to *Table 1*, the overall loss of IFL between 2000 and 2020 reached 23%, with the highest annual rate of IFL loss recorded between 2016 and 2020 at 2%. Honduras ranked as the second country with the highest IFL loss, reaching 46% over those 20 years. This rate is the second highest among the IFLs in Mesoamerica, following Nicaragua, which experienced a 54% loss in IFLs. Furthermore, these countries exhibited the same trend of increasing annual rates of IFL loss between 2016 and 2020, mirroring the Mesoamerican pattern of IFL loss.

Table 1. IFL loss between 2000 and 2020

Country	IFL extent in 2000 (ha)	IFL extent in 2013 (ha)	IFL extent in 2016 (ha)	IFL extent in 2020 (ha)	IFL area reduction 2000-2020 (%)	Average annual rate (%) of IFL losses 2000-2013	Average annual rate (%) of IFL losses 2013-2016	Average annual rate (%) of IFL losses 2016-2020
Mexico	1,499,074	1,456,957	1,430,428	1,404,675	6%	0.2%	0.6%	0.5%
Guatemala	567,951	492,289	476,603	384,695	32%	1.0%	1.1%	4.8%
El Salvador								
Honduras	676,114	481,409	461,241	352,674	48%	2.2%	1.4%	5.9%
Nicaragua	1,027,237	636,228	613,131	475,968	54%	2.9%	1.2%	5.6%
Panama	1,444,654	1,344,293	1,340,200	1,318,333	9%	0.5%	0.1%	0.4%
Subtotal IFL countries	5,220,000	4,411,175	4,321,603	3,936,346	25%	1.2%	0.7%	2.2%
Costa Rica	319,092	309,576	309,359	305,509	4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.3%
Belize	424,914	404,684	369,043	358,432	16%	0.4%	2.9%	0.7%
TOTAL, Mesoamerica	5,959,037	5,125,435	5,000,006	4,600,287	23%	1.1%	0.8%	2.0%

ILF mapping team (2020) data

This encompasses the Moskitia Intact Forest Landscape (IFL), shared by Honduras and Nicaragua, it is ranked as the second largest IFL in the Mesoamerica Critical Forest Biome (CFB). Primary forests in Honduras and the Moskitia region, are a crucial part of the Mesoamerican biodiversity hotspot, and are facing severe environmental challenges. These forests are not only vital carbon sinks but also home to a rich array of biodiversity. The Moskitia IFL is a vital ecosystem that provides a home for a wide variety of plant and animal species, including the cocobolo (*Dalbergia retusa*), Central American river turtle (*Dermatemys mawii*), keel-billed toucan (*Ramphastos sulfuratus*), white-lipped peccary (*Tayassu pecari*), harpy eagle (*Harpia harpyja*), baird's tapir (*Tapirus bairdii*), scarlet macaw (*Ara macao*), and jaguar (*Panthera onca*)^{[9][10]}. It also plays an important role in regulating the climate and preventing flooding.

According to data from Intact Forest, the Moskitia IFL lost a total of 323,440 hectares between 2000 and 2020, representing a deforestation rate of 48%^{[10][11]}. Furthermore, *Figure 1* offers a more detailed explanation of the exact zones that had been affected by the increase in deforestation. According to it, during 2016 and 2020, the Moskitia experienced higher and constant deforestation, leading to several negative consequences such as the reduction of wildlife habitat, an increase in the impact of climate change, and an elevated risk of flooding and landslides. Additionally, it undermined the livelihoods of local and indigenous communities.




Figure 1, Map of deforestation “Moskitia”

Besides deforestation and forest degradation, climate change and extreme climate events in Honduras also impact biodiversity and exacerbate social and economic problems such as food insecurity, poverty, migration, and infrastructure challenges, among others. In Honduras, including the project intervention areas, livelihood opportunities are limited, with few sources of income and food. The agricultural sector has a low adaptive capacity due to weather conditions, making it highly vulnerable. Consequently, the country faces high systemic vulnerability and significant climate risks.

Future climate projections indicate an increase in average temperatures by 1°–2.5°C by 2050 and 3°–4.3°C by 2100, a decrease in annual rainfall of 9–14 percent by 2050 and 20–31 percent by 2100, an increased frequency of extreme weather events, especially in the northeast, and a bi-coastal sea level rise of 0.4–0.86 meters by 2100. These climate projections are projected to decrease yields of maize (by 12 percent) and beans (by 32 percent) by 2050 compared to 2000. [\[11\]](#)¹² Such climatic events will directly or indirectly impact the country's environment and key sectors of its economy and society.

Drivers of deforestation and environmental degradation:

The effects of climate change are expected to intensify existing impacts on biodiversity, leading to increased rates of deforestation and forest degradation. These impacts are primarily driven by human activity. According to the analysis developed for this project “*Assessment of threats and levels of degradation in priority areas and ecosystems*” which supported the identification of deforestation drivers in “*The Moskitia*”, the main threats to this IFL include the expansion of cattle ranching, transportation corridors, agricultural expansion, energy production, mining, and the extraction of trees and other woody vegetation. Significant processes of forest cover loss, fragmentation, and degradation have been identified, particularly in the vicinity of the Rio Plátano Biosphere Reserve (RPBR), associated with cattle expansion. Additionally, significant processes of forest loss and degradation are observed in the Warunta, Mocorrón, and Rus regions. These activities are worsened by the participation of organized crime, engaging in illicit actions like drug and human trafficking, thereby posing a significant threat to these ecosystems.[\[12\]](#)¹³

Notably, cattle ranching is the primary driver, accounting for 90% of deforestation in Mesoamerica. In Honduras, more than 90,000 hectares of forest were affected by approximately 816 wildfires, caused by activities such as the cultivation of illegal crops and cattle ranching. [\[13\]](#)¹⁴ Meanwhile, in the Moskitia IFL, the situation is similar. Between 2000 and 2010, as much as one-third of the Moskitia experienced deforestation due to illicit activities of non-native individuals involved in unauthorized logging of valuable hardwoods and cattle ranching. According to Honduras’ Forest Conservation Institute (ICF), since 2016, the Rio Plátano Biosphere Reserve (RPBR) has lost 2,700 hectares of forest cover every year, with around 90% of those losses related to illegal cattle ranching.[\[14\]](#)¹⁵ The expansion of livestock farming has led to the displacement of indigenous communities, who have been forced off their traditional lands by non-native settlers seeking to take possession of their territory, in this process, the land underwent conversion from biodiverse forests or subsistence agriculture to sparsely stocked cattle pastures, integrating into what is known as the ‘cattle economy’.

[\[15\]](#)¹⁶ [\[16\]](#)¹⁷

The construction of new roads is a severe driver of deforestation, interconnected with cattle ranching and drug trafficking. This threat is concentrated in the northern, southern, and southwestern regions of the Moskitia, particularly around the Rio Plátano Biosphere Reserve. The presence of illicit and clandestine roads has led to a doubling of primary forest loss in Gracias a Dios between 2019 and 2021. These roads have not only fragmented the ecosystem but also potentially facilitated land colonization processes.[\[17\]](#)¹⁸ In addition to constructing illegal roads and runways, criminal groups operating in the eastern jungles of Honduras also engage in the illegal harvesting of valuable woods like mahogany and cedar, further exacerbating the rapid pace of deforestation.[\[18\]](#)¹⁹

On the other hand, agricultural productivity has been identified as a leading factor in deforestation, as farmers may expand crop areas to compensate for lost production and declining productivity. In the Río Plátano area, for example, certain lands are recognized as agricultural frontiers, where large landowners clear land for agricultural purposes, unrelated to narcotrafficking. This put increasing pressure on the indigenous communities residing there, who depend on the ecosystems to maintain their livelihoods. ^[20]

Overall, drug trafficking represents the one of the main roots of deforestation, according to a study published in 2017 in the journal *Environmental Research Letters*,^{[19]²⁰} Cocaine trafficking could be responsible for about 30 percent of deforestation in Central America, due to drug traffickers cutting down forests to create airstrips for small planes, build clandestine roads, and launder money on livestock farms. Regarding the situation in Moskitia, it parallels the Central America scenario where, about two decades ago, drug trafficking escalated due to the shift in routes in response to US drug interdiction tactics in Mexico and the Caribbean. As a result, the loss of primary forests in The Moskitia has nearly doubled between 2019 and 2021. Nowadays, projection indicates that if the rate of deforestation continues, most of the Moskitia forest and the way of life it sustains could be lost by 2050, or much sooner in many parts.^{[20]²¹}

ROOT CAUSES:

There are several interlinked causes in the project area that have led to the degradation and deforestation of the IFL. At the core of it are the poor living conditions of the rural population and the indigenous communities. In the Moskitia region, multidimensional poverty stands at 71.8%, which is above the national average of 67.2%, reflecting the limited access that the community has to basic services such as education, healthcare, and sanitation. Limited opportunities outside the exploitation of the forest resources have been created, increasing the pressure on ecosystem services and making them highly vulnerable to the effects of climate change and variability. In recent years, this has led to the population facing high food insecurity, with 43% of people lacking reliable access to affordable and nutritious food. ^{[21]²²}

Insecure land tenure has worsened the situation, with unequal distribution of land and weak enforcement of land tenure for smallholder farmers and indigenous communities. This has increased economic, political, and social power inequality, leading to disrupted livelihoods and environmental degradation. Additionally, gender inequalities exacerbate the situation for women, who are often left behind in processes related to access to land markets, forest management, and decision-making. Furthermore, despite the existence of various regional and national policies concerning forest and biodiversity conservation in Honduras, there remains a lack of strong institutional presence, enforcement of regulations, and effective local government structures. Government bodies lack sufficient financial, technical, and human resources to adequately facilitate the integration and monitoring of conservation efforts at regional, national, and local levels.

Baseline:

-

Policy and regulatory framework:

In Honduras, the Secretariat of Natural Resources and Environment (SERNA) oversees the coordinating and evaluating policies related to the environment, ecosystems, the protection of flora and fauna, the National System of Protected Areas and the National Parks System, as well as their overall coordination. However, the implementation of the corresponding norms and policies is the responsibility of the Secretariat of Agriculture and Livestock (SAG), with the support of the National Institute of Forest Conservation, Protected Areas and Wildlife (ICF).

The country has promoted multiple policies, strategies, regulatory frameworks and mechanisms to advance on the conservation and management of IFL, despite significant challenges. On an international level, the Government of Honduras has committed to a range of multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs): such as the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement; Declaration on Forests; CITES; ILO Convention 169 on Indigenous Peoples; U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples; Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources; World Heritage Convention; RAMSAR Convention; EU Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA).

On a regional level, the policy framework is guided by the Central American Commission for Environment and Development (CCAD), an integral part of the Central American Integration System (SICA). Moreover, it focuses on developing a regional environmental cooperation regime to enhance the quality of life in member states. The Critical Forest Biome of Mesoamerica Integrated project aligns with policy frameworks such as ERAM 2021-2025, ERCC, and the AFOLU 2040 Regional Initiative. The Mesoamerica project facilitates cooperation for economic and social development, employing instruments like the Master Plan for the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor 2030 and the Mesoamerican Environmental Sustainability Strategy 2020-2025. Beyond government-centric mechanisms, collaboration with indigenous peoples and forest-dependent communities involves the Mesoamerican Alliance of Peoples and Forests (AMPB) as a coordination space, and the Asociación Coordinadora Indígena y Campesina de Agroforestería Comunitaria Centroamericana (ACICAFOC), which aims to promote sustainable resource management for marginalized communities.

On a national level, Honduras has a well-developed set of national policies, institutions and initiatives supporting protection, sustainable use, and restoration of forests through mechanisms such as protected areas, indigenous lands, community forest management, biological corridors, productive landscape restoration, and micro-watersheds. Some of these laws are:

- **General Environmental Law^{[22]²³}** (1993): fostering sustainable environmental management and conservation. These include establishing a framework to guide agricultural, forestry, and industrial activities in a manner that ensures the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources and overall environmental protection.

-
- **Forestry, Protected Areas and Wildlife Law**[\[23\]](#)[\[24\]](#) (2008): Protect and conserve the country's forest resources, protected areas and wildlife, ensuring their sustainable use for present and future generations. Include the creation of a National System of Protected Areas, the regulation of the exploitation of forest resources, the protection of wildlife, the prevention of forest fires, the promotion of reforestation and the recovery of degraded areas, as well as the regulation of tourism and recreational activities in protected areas, among others.
 - **National System of Environmental Impact Assessment (SINEIA)**[\[24\]](#)[\[25\]](#) (2015): This mechanism involves a set of public and private entities, which within the framework of a scheme of maximum coordination and administrative simplification, work simultaneously and reciprocally within a hierarchical structure whose leadership is exercised by the Secretariat of Environment.
 - **National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy for the Agrifood Sector of Honduras 2015-2025**[\[25\]](#)[\[26\]](#) (2015): Strengthening the current public policy framework, incorporating appropriate and timely strategies and measures aimed at reducing socio-environmental and economic vulnerability and improving adaptive capacity, particularly of the populations, sectors and territories most exposed to climate hazards. This aims to improve environmental quality while considering the possible contribution to global mitigation.
 - **National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan**[\[26\]](#)[\[27\]](#) (2018-2022): Provide general guidance to guide the actions of the different actors towards biodiversity conservation.
 - **National Program for the Recovery of Degraded Ecosystem Goods and Services**[\[27\]](#)[\[28\]](#) (2018): Strategic Planning Instrument to comply with the General Environmental Law, with the International Commitments of the Framework Convention on Climate Change and the 20/20 Initiative, basically encouraging the Recovery of Goods and Services of Degraded Ecosystems in Honduras
 - **National Program for the Conservation of Terrestrial Ecosystems (PNCET)**[\[28\]](#)[\[29\]](#) (2021): To conserve terrestrial ecosystems inside and outside protected areas as a tool for reducing emissions from avoided deforestation and increase carbon sequestration of carbon sequestration, for climate change mitigation, ensuring the climate change mitigation, ensuring the sustainability of ecosystem goods and ecosystem services for the benefit of the population.
 - **Special Law on Forest Carbon Transactions Forest Carbon Transactions for Climate Justice**[\[29\]](#)[\[30\]](#) (2023): Establish the legal, administrative, technical and financial administrative, technical and financial for the use and distribution of the environmental, social and economic benefits and economic benefits generated from the sustainable management of forest carbon sinks results-based forest carbon sinks.
-

The current state of forests in Honduras, particularly in the Moskitia region, has been significantly shaped by historical policies and events, especially concerning the recognition of indigenous land rights. This historical context involves a long struggle by indigenous communities, including the Miskitu, Pech, Tawahka, and later the Garífuna, for legal recognition of their territories and self-governance rights.[\[30\]](#)³¹

Key historical developments include:

- **Land Titling and Recognition Efforts:** Before 2012, the Miskitu people were granted 496 titles, covering only 21% of the Moskitia. However, between 2012 and 2015, a significant shift occurred with the issuance of 11 titles, each close to 100,000 hectares, collectively representing 79% of the land titled to indigenous peoples in the last 25 years.
- **Territorial Occupation:** The territory in question has been ancestrally occupied by indigenous groups, and the total recognized territorial space covers almost 14% of the national surface, amounting to over 1.5 million hectares.
- **Creation of Territorial Councils in 1992:** The establishment of territorial councils in 1992 was a critical milestone. This initiative was driven by the indigenous organization Masta (Mosquitia Asla Takanka or 'Unity of the Mosquitia'). Prior to this, land ownership was primarily in the form of communal fiscal private lands, with titles granted to peasant associative companies under the Agrarian Reform Law and agrarian reform cooperatives.
- **Land Restoration and Titling Process:** Two decades after the creation of territorial councils, the National Agrarian Institute (Instituto Nacional Agrario, INA) issued the first land title. The process of land restoration was furthered in 2016 through the titling of intercommunity areas of 12 territorial councils in La Moskitia.
- **Dismemberment of Protected Areas:** A notable aspect of this recognition process involves the dismemberment of the 'Río Plátano Man and Biosphere Reserve,' initially under the ownership of the INA and later the Institute of Forest Conservation, Protected Areas, and Wildlife (ICF). This dismemberment led to the transfer of lands to indigenous peoples via public deeds, acknowledging their territorial rights.

These historical policies and events have profoundly influenced the management and preservation of forests in Honduras, particularly in the Moskitia region.

Besides the establishment of protected areas, other conservation initiatives, such as the 'Other Effective Area-based Measures of Conservation' (OECMs), should be recognized by their contribution to biodiversity conservation. OECMs are areas that are achieving the long term and effective in-situ conservation of biodiversity outside of protected areas. According to the CBD, OECMs are "A geographically defined area other

than a Protected Area, which is governed and managed in ways that achieve positive and sustained long-term outcomes for the in-situ conservation of biodiversity, with associated ecosystem functions and services and where applicable, cultural, spiritual, socio-economic, and other locally relevant values". They can be designated under a range of governance regimes and implemented by a diverse set of actors.

In Honduras, there is no official policy or regulation on the definition of OECMs, but there are several potential areas that can be defined and supported.

Financial mechanisms

-

Based on the results of the analysis of the market systems/value chains, the four business ideas that align with the objective of this project, aimed at conserving and reducing the deterioration of the intact forests of The Moskitia, are: (i) Ecotourism in its various forms; (ii) Carbon credits; (iii) Souvenir handicraft products and tourist services; and (iv) Processing of edible products.

Payment for PES (Payment for Ecosystem Services) or compensation mechanisms requires strong organization and the strengthening of community-based structures to manage these types of funds. Simultaneously, regulations for both social and ecological processes, as well as reinvestment, need to be established. Moreover, while the cultivation of cocoa and the processing of timber and forest by-products have the potential to access a market and generate employment and income, they may also encourage the forest's use for production and commercialization. Therefore, if these two chains are implemented, they must be managed in an integrated manner, with specific areas designated for cocoa cultivation and the application of agroforestry systems (SAF).

The main actors in financing associated with forests and agricultural systems are:

- ICF: The ICF (Instituto Nacional de Conservación y Desarrollo Forestal, Áreas Protegidas y Vida Silvestre) is the National Institute of Conservation and Forestry Development, Protected Areas, and Wildlife in Honduras. Its primary mandate is to manage and conserve the country's forests, protected areas, and wildlife while promoting sustainable development.
- BANADESA: It is an autonomous institution that aims to promote development in the country and provide access to credit for entrepreneurs and livestock and cattle farming, among others.
- BANHPROVI: The Banco Hondureño para la Producción y la Vivienda (Honduran Bank for Production and Housing) plays a significant role in financing Honduran development by channeling funds through other financial institutions to finance growth and development in various sectors.

- FIPAH: The Foundation for Participatory Research with Honduran Women (FIPAH) is an organization dedicated to empowering Honduran women through participatory research and development initiatives. FIPAH focuses on addressing gender inequalities, promoting women's rights, and improving socio-economic conditions for women in Honduras.

Project baseline

Besides national actors, it is important to mention the role of international cooperation and its contribution as resource mobilizers, especially organizations with strong work in forest conservation, with the potential to access funds, such as the Green Climate Fund; other cooperation actors who can mobilize their own resources or from other specialized funds dedicated not only to the projection, conservation and restoration of forests and landscape.

Ongoing initiatives and investments are actively supporting the conservation of the Moskitia forests, aligning with the overarching goals of the project. Regionally, Honduras collaborates with neighbouring countries on several initiatives and projects dedicated to the conservation and sustainable management of Mesoamerican forests. These efforts encompass the Regional REDD+ Program, the 5 Great Forests of Mesoamerica initiative, and the Mesoamerican Alliance of Peoples and Forests, which champions the rights of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) and fosters community-driven forest conservation.

A number of projects have been developed at a national level, serving as a foundation for this project. For instance, the project financed by the GIZ, 'Improving the Management of Natural Resources in Indigenous Territories,' will provide valuable lessons related to enhancing the management of natural resources. This project will specifically focus on food security, income generation, and climate change adaptation in the Moskitia region. Additionally, the World Bank has provided funding of 2.72 million USD for the project 'Improving the Livelihoods of Miskito Indigenous Peoples in The Moskitia,' which commenced in 2020 and will conclude in 2024. This project will offer valuable insights into subprojects within the targeted area, aiming to promote entrepreneurship, foster innovation, and enhance social and community capabilities. Moreover, the Inter-American Foundation has provided financing of over 143,803 USD for a project aiming to improve agricultural production and rural enterprises within the Pech indigenous community.

At a local level, current projects developed by SINAPH, such as '*Support Honduras in the Conservation of Biodiversity and Protected Areas of the Honduran Atlantic Coastline*,' are aligned with this project's components and activities. They promote conservation and natural resource management measures implemented in protected areas in the department of Colón. Additionally, ICF projects in the Rio Platano Biosphere, such as '*Strengthening the Conservation Management of the Río Plátano Biosphere*' and '*Integrated Management of the Río Plátano Biosphere*,' can complement the project by improving landscape management and land governance. This includes adopting zero-deforestation approaches to livestock and coffee value chains, reducing forest fires and illegal logging, and increasing the presence of conservation institutions in the protected area.

Taken together, these advancements, initiatives, projects, and political actions align with the objectives of this IP, aiming to facilitate transformative changes in conserving and safeguarding Honduras' Moskitia IFL. The underlying threats to Honduras' forests, along with potential solutions, are pertinent not only to Honduras but also to all Mesoamerican countries, presenting significant opportunities for collaboration, partnership, and scaling up. Nevertheless, information provided by the Joint Research Centre (JRC) shows that from 2000 to 2020, the IFL in Honduras decreased by 48%, indicating that there is still much more that

needs to be done to address the underlying drivers of deforestation and forest degradation in the country and the region.

Barriers

The proposed program intervention will have to confront the following barriers that limit addressing the degradation and loss of primary forest in Honduras:

- Barrier 1. Limited capacity and support for protected area management and the implementation of other effective conservation measures based on specific geographical areas (Political)

Central American countries face substantial challenges regarding environmental governance to support forest conservation. In the case of Honduras, there is extensive regulation regarding the delimitation of protected areas, covering more than 30% of the national territory. At a national level the National Institute of Forest Conservation (ICF) administers and manages the National Protected Areas System of Honduras (SINAPH for its acronym in Spanish), which are the main body responsible for managing and ensuring the conservation of these protected areas in the country. However, it is also recognized as a weakened institution that requires strengthening in various areas, including financial resources, human capabilities, transparency, equipment and training, innovation and technology, scope and results, and administrative processes, among others.

- Barrier 2. Limited mechanisms for transboundary forest conservation (Technical)

This barrier is caused by the limited effective regional communication between authorities in Honduras and Nicaragua regarding the conservation of the Moskitia, possibly due to a lack of willingness, differing political priorities, limited budgets, varying levels of priority in relation to forest conservation, distinct legal frameworks, and cultural disparities, among other factors. There is a crucial need to integrate forest and forest management into land use planning and zoning at both regional and national levels.

- Barrier 3 – Weak local and regional governance (Institutional):

In general, forest and remote rural areas are characterized by weak institutional presence, where local authorities have limited power, leaving areas under the control of criminal groups that use violence to enforce their own rules and determine land tenure. In the case of The Moskitia, the situation has been similar, creating a need for local governments to increase technical assistance, institutional capacity, and resources. In Honduras, there is limited capacity on the ground to enforce the regulatory framework related to forest

conservation. Moreover, there is an overlap of mandates between IFC and INA in terms of protected area management that can generate a lack of coordination of functions, as well as the disproportionate management of available funds, causing some activities to be overfunded while others lack funding altogether.

- Barrier 4 – Insufficient financial resources to sustain long-term efforts to conserve and restore intact forests (Financial)

The region faces major challenges and obstacles hindering development and access to innovative financing and investments for forest conservation. Firstly, local communities inhabiting the region encounter difficulties accessing credit and financing for zero deforestation activities. Additionally, insufficient specialized technical assistance hampers the effective utilization of financial resources. Furthermore, constrained implementation and investment in sound soil management practices, coupled with the high fragmentation of landscapes, impede the effectiveness of investments in forest landscape restoration strategies. Changes in the cost-effectiveness of land, driven by real estate development under the 'Mountain View' concept, and the high rate of land leasing by farmers, diminish the incentive for forest conservation. Addressing these challenges is crucial for fostering sustainable development and facilitating access to financing and innovative investments. At a national level in Honduras, institutions and organizations that are presented in the IP lack the funds to achieve the long-term objectives of conservation and restoration.

- Barrier 5 – Society does not recognize, value or pay for the value of intact forests (Social)

The exceptional value of primary Mesoamerican forests and their ecosystem services often goes unrecognized. Without incentives for preservation, these forests are perceived solely for their economic value, limiting the population's willingness to recognize their ecological importance and to pay for environmental services as an appreciation of the benefits provided by forested and natural landscapes. Furthermore, there is an absence of quantification and monitoring of ecosystem and primary forests' environmental services that are not integrated into the country's national accounts system.

- Barrier 6 – Limited coordination between conservation and development initiatives (Informational)

At different levels, various initiatives aimed at contributing to forest protection and restoration are being implemented and planned. For example, the Regional Initiative AFOLU 2040, The 5 Great Forests Initiative, investments from the Forestry and Climate Change Fund, the Mesoamerican Territorial Fund, the UK's Biodiverse Landscapes Fund, the GEF Small Grants Program, and the IKI Small Grants Program, among others. The various donors and executing entities endeavour to collaborate as much as possible. However, there is no regional-level coordination mechanism in place to facilitate strategic synergies for advancing intact forest conservation, which lead to insufficient coordination between initiatives, duplication of efforts, conflicting agendas, and reduced impact.

This is coupled with poor dissemination of knowledge, characterized by limited access and capacity to extract information from existing projects and initiatives and deficiencies in effectively managing knowledge platforms. The hindered knowledge management is primarily attributed to the scarcity of trained personnel, highlighting the crucial need for continuous training initiatives and improved access to efficient platforms. Overcoming these limitations is essential for optimizing the utilization of knowledge management resources, enhancing the project's overall effectiveness, and facilitating informed decision-making processes at the regional level. However, this governance system still needs to be strengthened. There are limited technical capacity and tools, as well as intersectoral-multilevel monitoring and coordination activities with key actors working reduce threats within the reserves. There is also limited capacity of national agriculture and forestry programs to promote inter-institutional coordination and the implementation of measures aligned with conservation objectives. Therefore, there is a strong need for support related to provide capacity building of local actors and to strengthen governance systems to ensure transparency, accountability of the decision-making process and ensure conservation of forest areas.

Long term solutions

The existing baseline presents complex interactions, and without a comprehensive, multi-level intervention to address the causes and reduce pressures, it is likely that the levels of deforestation and forest degradation will increase in the Moskitia. Therefore, to improve the current situation, four major transformations need to occur:

1. Change societal attitudes about primary forests, to ensure that their intrinsic value and contributions to society are recognized, valued and paid for.
2. Change the regulatory and enforcement processes, ensuring: (i) that there is multi-sectoral policy coherence, (ii) that decisions are taken based on evidence of the societal benefits and costs of intervening on primary forests, and (iii) that government funding and green financing mechanisms effectively support forest conservation.
3. Improve land governance in the areas where primary forests are located, ensuring that rights of local communities to their lands and territories are recognized and enforceable.
4. Change the living conditions of the people who live where primary forest are located, ensuring that they can have a decent standard of living from forest positive and non-forest activities.

The long-term goal of this project is to strengthen the conservation and safeguarding of Honduras' Moskitia IFL, contributing to sustaining the livelihoods of local communities and society at large. This will be achieved by addressing current drivers of environmental degradation and promoting the protection, conservation, and

restoration of primary forests through various land uses (e.g., secondary forests, agroforestry systems, farmland), while also sustaining the livelihoods of local communities. These efforts will contribute to the conservation of globally significant biodiversity and to mitigating the impacts of global climate change.

In the mid-term, achieving this strategy involves creating enabling conditions for change, focusing on: (i) conserving existing forests; (ii) building capacities to mitigate drivers of environmental degradation by promoting forest-related livelihoods to increase economic opportunities for rural communities, including women and rural youth; (iii) strengthening local, national, and regional governance; and (iv) developing enabling conditions to sustain changes and long-term action (e.g., ensuring adequate long-term financing and raising awareness about the value of forests and their contributions).

Incremental reasoning for GEF financing

In the baseline scenario, national institutions, local governments, and civil society organizations have limited capacities and knowledge regarding the integration of conservation and natural resource management priorities into their long-term strategies, land-use zoning plans, and governance programs. Additionally, there is a lack of coordination between agencies responsible for protected areas and other organizations promoting agricultural, tourism development, and other productive activities that may impact the protection of primary forests.

GEF financing aims to address these challenges by providing evidence of the benefits of ecosystem services derived from forest conservation and restoration, considering evidence of climate change adaptation and economic development. This will increase political capital to incentivize forest conservation efforts. To achieve improved conservation and connectivity on a larger scale, GEF financing will catalyse new and additional funding for forest conservation in Honduras. This will involve innovative finance approaches working with private sector actors, as well as engagement and outreach to international providers of climate and conservation finance.

Additionally, despite efforts to strengthen incentives, policies, and regulatory frameworks, there is a need to integrate forest management into land use planning and zoning at the local, national, and regional levels. This integration will enhance coherent regulations and financing for the sustainable management of forests and protected areas. Therefore, the funding from the GEF represents an opportunity to generate innovative models of environmental governance, conservation, and finance for the Moskitia region. Integrated forest management is a well-recognized unique governance effort through which Honduras can pioneer innovative mechanisms linking forest management to the broader Central American Region. At the national level, the project will leverage and adapt existing mechanisms to enhance intersectoral regulations and policies beyond the project's target areas.

Project's objective and justification

The Honduras Mesoamerica Forest Child project is vital for the overarching goal of protecting and restoring forest landscapes, ensuring the long-term conservation of biodiversity, and supporting the livelihoods of local communities.

To achieve transformational change necessary for conserving and safeguarding Honduras' Moskitia IFL, the project focuses on safeguarding and protecting these areas, implementing effective restoration practices to maintain biodiversity, preventing fires to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions, increasing livelihood benefits for rural families to enhance their income and quality of life, and preserving ecosystem services in general. To accomplish these objectives, the project aims to strengthen national and regional governance. This involves collaborating with the Government of Honduras and other partners to enhance the capacity of national institutions for forest management and protection, supporting the development and implementation of sustainable land use practices, promoting the restoration of degraded forests, and raising awareness among the Honduran people about the importance of forests.

-
- [1] The World Bank Group (2022). *Population Honduras*. <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?locations=HN>
- [2] The World bank group (2023). *Country climate and development report Honduras*, <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/761f49d0-61dd-4807-bc02-af7cbf40c545/content>
- [3] EUCA Trade (2023). *Agriculture in Honduras*. <https://trade.ec.europa.eu/access-to-markets/en/country-assets/Sector%20Fiche%20Honduras%20Agriculture%20fv.pdf>
- [4] German Watch (2019). *Global Climate risk Index 2019*. https://www.germanwatch.org/sites/default/files/Global%20Climate%20Risk%20Index%202019_2.pdf
- [5] The World bank group (2023). *Country climate and development report Honduras* <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/761f49d0-61dd-4807-bc02-af7cbf40c545/content>
- [6] Forest of the World. (n.d). *Forest of the world in Honduras*. <https://www.forestsoftheworld.org/programme/honduras>
- [7] Linares Flavio (2023). *Deforestation-Free Palm Oil in Honduras: Challenges, Needs, and Opportunities*. <https://www.intechopen.com/chapters/88652>
- [8] The World bank group (2023). *Country climate and development report Honduras* <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/761f49d0-61dd-4807-bc02-af7cbf40c545/content>
- [9] Norman Myers et al. (2000). *Biodiversity Hotspots for conservation Priorities*, *Nature* 403. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35002501>.
- [10] Intact forest Landscape (n.d). www.intactforests.org
- [11] USAID, 2013, *Climate Change Risk Profile Honduras*, https://www.climatelinks.org/sites/default/files/asset/document/2017_USAID%20ATLAS_Climate%20Change%20Risk%20Profile_Honduras.pdf
- [12] IUCN (2024), *Assessment of the state of degradation and threats to critical forest biomes in Mesoamerica*.
- [13] Valle Kay (2022). *The deforestation in Honduras is caused by drug trafficking*. <https://dialogo-amicas.com/es/articles/honduras-enfrenta-deforestacion-causada-por-narcotrafico/#:~:text=En%202021%20m%C3%A1s%20de%2090,cr%C3%ADa%20de%20ganado%2C%20dice%20ICF>.
- [14] Montoya H (2022). *Narco-Cattle Ranching in La Mosquitia, Honduras*. <https://insightcrime.org/uncategorized/narco-cattle-ranching-honduras/>
- [15] Dittmar, V., & Asmaan, P. (2022). *Cash Cows—The Inner Workings of Cattle Trafficking from Central America to Mexico*. *Insight Crime*. <https://insightcrime.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Cash-Cows-The-Inner-Workings-of-Cattle-Trafficking-from-Central-America-to-Mexico-InSight-Crime-May-2022.pdf>
- [16] McSweeney, K., Wrathall, D. J., Nielsen, E. A., & Pearson, Z. (2018). *Grounding traffic: The cocaine commodity chain and land grabbing in eastern Honduras*. *Geoforum*, 95, 122–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.07.008>
- [17] Ernst, J. (2022). *The narco-highway creating chaos in a Honduran rainforest*. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2023/aug/17/honduras-moskitia-forest-krausirpi-narco-highway>.

[18] Previde, S. (2022). How 'Narco-Highway' in Honduras Became National News. *InSightCrime*. <https://insightcrime.org/news/narco-highway-honduras-national-news/>

[19] Sesnie, S. E., Tellman, B., Wrathall, D., McSweeney, K., Nielsen, E., Benessaiah, K., Wang, O., & Rey, L. (2017). A spatio-temporal analysis of forest loss related to cocaine trafficking in Central America. *Environmental Research Letters*, 12(5), 054015. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa6fff>

[20] Ernst, J. (2023). IBID

[21] The World Bank, (2023), "A commitment to sustainability in the Moskitia, Honduras, to create new livelihoods", <https://www.bancomundial.org/es/news/feature/2023/04/24/betting-on-sustainability-in-the-moskitia-honduras-to-create-new-livelihoods>

[22] [General Environmental Law - Decree No 104-93](#)

[23] [Forestry, Protected Areas and Wildlife Law](#)

[24] [National System of Environmental Impact Assessment \(SINEIA\)](#)

[25] [National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy for the Agrifood Sector of Honduras 2015-2025](#)

[26] [National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan \(2018-2022\)](#)

[27] [National Program for the Recovery of Degraded Ecosystem Goods and Services](#)

[28] [National Program for the Conservation of Terrestrial Ecosystems \(PNCET\)](#)

[29] [Special Law on Forest Carbon Transactions Forest Carbon Transactions for Climate Justice](#)

[30] International Land Coalition América Latina y el Caribe and Tenure Facility, 'Los Consejos Territoriales En La Moskitia, Honduras', 2023.

B. CHILD PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This section asks for a theory of change as part of a joined-up description of the project as a whole, including how it addresses priorities related to the specific program, and how it will benefit from the coordination platform. The project description is expected to cover the key elements of good project design in an integrated way. It is also expected to meet the GEF's policy requirements on gender, stakeholders, private sector, and knowledge management and learning (see section D). This section should be a narrative that reads like a joined-up story and not independent elements that answer the guiding questions contained in the guidance document. (Approximately 3-5 pages) see guidance here

Project interventions will focus on three sites in Honduras' northeastern departments of Gracias a Dios, Olancho, and Colón. Over 100,000 people, encompassing indigenous communities such as Mistiku, Pech, Tawahka, and Garifuna, inhabit the project site. These areas hold significance at regional, transboundary, national, and local levels due to their importance for forest ecosystems, stored carbon, globally noteworthy biodiversity, and essential ecosystem services like climate regulation and clean water provision.


The proposed project will work to facilitate transformational change that supports the conservation and protection of the Moskitia, through a set of targeted interventions that address the main threats of deforestation and forest degradation highlighted in the previous section. The Theory of change aims to achieve transformative change through the following levers of transformation:

- **Governance and policy coherence:** through inter-institutional coordination with various public and private sectors, strengthening capacity for integrated land use planning.

- **Financial leverage:** Mobilize new and additional funding for conservation of CFBs through innovative finance including blended finance, PES, carbon and biodiversity offsets.
- **Innovation and learning:** Incorporate the perception of target groups and technical indicators in the conservation of critical ecosystems into strategic planning.
- **Multi-Stakeholder dialogues:** Support high-level dialogues to both align and enhance existing programs and develop new initiatives and partnerships to enable and incentivize forest conservation; Facilitate high-level roundtables with private sector leaders to support and enable conservation and deforestation free commitments and action to boost market access and recognition of nature positive activities.

To help overcome the identified barriers, the project will follow the structure of the Mesoamerican Forest Programme and is articulated around four interrelated components focusing on: developing enabling conditions to support the conservation of primary forests (component 1), protecting and restoring primary forests (component 2), ensuring sustained long-term financing and incentivising forest-friendly efforts (component 3), and establishing a region-wide coordination mechanism to enhance complementarity and synergies between the range of ongoing initiatives and facilitate knowledge development and sharing (component 4). All this in line with an inclusive approach that includes special conditions to facilitate the access of women and youth to national and municipal programme offerings.

This project is part of a GEF regional program called Critical Forest Biomes for Mesoamerica. At the regional level, there will be a knowledge management platform that will facilitate sharing experiences between countries, prioritizing topics, and identifying and proposing actions that will enable the region to advance toward managing these critical ecosystems within the framework of its four components identified in the proposal. At the country level, Mexico, Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Panama will each have a national project, where actions will be carried out in the territory within the framework of each component and the identified national landscapes. The actions of the national projects will be implemented in each country landscape, and through component 4 (knowledge management) and the Regional Program, interactions will be promoted between the different States and national actors to increase and strengthen collaboration between countries. This collaboration aims to improve the management of these ecosystems through existing governance strategies and platforms tailored for each case.



Transformative change supporting conservation of the project landscapes, IFLs and beyond will occur through the following linked components and the referential activities:

Component 1. Strengthening enabling conditions for the protection, conservation and restoration of primary forests:

This component will facilitate advances in adopting, integrating and harmonizing policies and regulatory frameworks favourable to forest conservation and indigenous peoples' rights. This will provide innovative governance additionality by strengthening the existing multi-tier indigenous governance framework of nine indigenous territories in the IFL to prepare and implement indigenous territorial regulations, building indigenous leadership, technical and administrative capacities at the landscape, territorial, and community levels. These indigenous territorial regulations will be aligned with relevant governmental national and municipal laws, policies and regulations and will be supported by multi-stakeholder and intersectoral management committees and co-management mechanisms in protected areas. This component will also provide legal and regulatory additionality by supporting the participatory preparation and implementation of indigenous regulations, led by the indigenous territorial councils and federations, that regulate access, use, protection, control and exclusion of land and natural resources in the nine indigenous territories.

- **Outcome 1.1. Strengthening local and national mechanisms to support the conservation of primary forests in the Honduran Moskitia.**

- Output 1.1.1. Awareness-raising and advocacy plan on primary forest protection and conservation targeted at policymakers, sectoral entities, and private sector.
 - Activity 1.1.1.1. Develop and implement, with an intercultural vision, a campaign to raise awareness and advocate for the protection and conservation of indigenous lands and territories and primary forests of the Honduran Moskitia.

Aligned with Program communication strategy, this activity entails the development and execution of awareness-raising campaigns targeted at policy makers, sectoral entities, the private sector to emphasize the importance of protecting and conserving primary forests of the Honduran Moskitia. Taking into consideration the importance of IPLC in forest sustainable management and conservation the campaigns will be designed with social inclusion and intercultural strategies in mind. The campaigns will advocate the rights of indigenous peoples, to secure protection, security, collective management, and the respect of the totality of collective and titled lands of the indigenous peoples of the Moskitia as an integral part of forest sustainable management and conservation.

The campaign will also advocate for strengthening the capacities of “mobile courts” in understanding and prosecuting illicit activities related to environmental and indigenous rights violations, including mobilizing such courts to the Honduran Moskitia and training judges and attorneys on relevant environmental and indigenous law.

The advocacy campaign will be implemented with the utilization of different available media at both local (Catacama and Culmi, Sicopaulaya, Zona de Mosquitia) and national levels. This will also include the identification of specific information related to the protection and conservation of primary forests of the Honduran Moskitia. in the Honduran Moskitia to be shared at a regional level through the Regional Coordination Project.

- Output 1.1.2 Strengthening local governance structures to improve the effectiveness of the protection and conservation of the primary forests, through zoning and norm-building processes in at least 2 territorial councils of the Honduran Moskitia.
 - Activity 1.1.2.1. Support territorial and national dialogues between indigenous institutions (MASTA, UPI), municipalities, SERNA, ICF to reach agreements for territorial and forest management in the Mosquitia.

This activity will allow the establishment of a permanent dialogue between the central government including the SERNA, ICF and the IPLC governance institutions including but not limited to the MASTA, FINZMOS, Tawahka, BAMIESTA and the ITC (Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve). The project will support the development of the institutional and operational arrangements and support the meetings during the project implementation period. The dialogue platform will work as an umbrella platform for the operationalization of other project deliverables such as 2.1.1.2 and 2.1.1.3.

- Output 1.1.3: Strengthened agreements for cross-border protected areas collaboration.
 - Activity 1.1.3.1. Diagnostic report on the potential for cross-border collaboration and management with Nicaragua, as well as strengthening the dialogue between indigenous peoples of Honduras and Nicaragua, to implement forest conservation activities and achieve objectives.

The report will identify key aspects of collaboration, including needs and opportunities, and develop a pathway for collaboration between the two countries. The report will build on the work of the Bilateral Honduras-Nicaragua WCS, capitalizing on the knowledge created concerning the Moskitia ecosystems, as well as the cooperation of Indigenous peoples at a local level. The report will prioritize and provide a plan for the implementation of cross-border activities.

The activity will also support cross-border dialogue among indigenous peoples for the implementation of forest conservation activities, strengthening existing mechanisms such as the SISKrutara and the Binational Indigenous Coordination Muishka.

- **Outcome 1.2. Key national and regulatory instruments prioritize primary forest conservation of the Honduran Moskitia.**
 - Output 1.2.1. Updated Sub-national policies, regulations and cross-sectoral instruments that support the protection and conservation of primary forests in the Honduran Moskitia.
 - Activity 1.2.1.1. Promote respect for indigenous peoples' rights to collective and titled lands through updated 'life plans' and municipal policy guides.

This activity involves the preparation of Municipal land-use planning guidelines and the revision of ICTs 'life plans' to support the integration of the protection and conservation of primary forests. The plans and guidelines will serve as a framework to incorporate sustainable land-use practices that prioritize the protection and conservation of primary forests of the Honduran Moskitia. The revision will take into consideration the regional and national guidelines and will promote gender and youth integration. The development will take into account and enforce the rights and mandate of the ICTs.

- Output 1.2.2. Information to support fact-based decision making on forest conservation interventions.
 - Activity 1.2.2.1. Assessment of the contribution of the Moskitia landscape to provide habitat for endangered species, and contribution to revert the extinction risk of species extinction.

The project will support the development of an assessment of the role of primary forest from Moskitia to provide habitat for endangered species, and contribution to revert the extinction risk of species. In particular the project will support the calibration of the STAR methodology for Moskitia landscapes.

○ **Outcome 1.3 Improved multisectoral platforms for forest conservation and management**

- Output 1.3.1. Creation or strengthening of multi-sectoral platforms.
 - Activity 1.3.1.1. Strengthen the AFOLU national roundtable to integrate consideration at Moskitia level for coordination and funding.

The project will strengthen the National AFOLU roundtable in Honduras. The project will ensure that the national level agenda is shared and debated as part of the Moskitia coordination platform (product 4.1.1) and finance coalition (product 3.1.4), to ensure intersectoral dialogue and coordination also takes place in the Moskitia.

- Output 1.3.2. Multisectoral meetings of stakeholder groups and sectors to agree actions and goals for primary forest conservation.
 - Activity 1.3.2.1. Develop and implementation monitoring of affirmative action protocols to include rural women and youth in programme implementation plans and decision-making processes.

This activity entails the development of protocols designed to actively incorporate women and rural youth into the implementation plans of forest conservation programs. These protocols will outline specific strategies and mechanisms for ensuring the meaningful participation of women and rural youth in decision-making processes related to forest conservation. By developing inclusive protocols, the aim is to create opportunities for women and rural youth to contribute their perspectives, insights, and expertise to the planning and execution of forest conservation initiatives. This activity seeks to promote gender equality, social inclusion, and youth empowerment within the context of forest conservation, ultimately enhancing the effectiveness and sustainability of conservation efforts. In addition, the project will monitor the implementation of the protocols for the duration of the project implementation period.

- Activity 1.3.2.2. Implement Free Prior and Informed Consultation (FPIC) during project implementation

This activity involves the implementation of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) protocols, during project implementation. This activity involves the implementation of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) protocols, the implementation of FPIC for at least 4 indigenous peoples (i.e. Miskitu, Tawahka, Pech and

Garifuna), verifying the implementation of the minimum requirements to be fulfilled and monitoring the implementation of FPIC.

Component 2. Accelerated protection and restoration of primary forests:

This component aims to accelerate the protection and restoration of the primary forest in the area of The Moskitia, addressing the lack of capacity and resources used for protected areas and OECM (Other Effective Conservation Measures). By doing this, it is expected to improve the management of those areas, increase the ecosystem monitoring programs, and invest in enhancing the livelihoods of local communities.

The project will highlight the influence and roles of key stakeholders, aiming to increase and strengthen multi-sectoral capacities to ensure their ability to deal with the deforestation drivers.

- **Outcome 2.1. Improved protection of primary forests in the Honduran Moskitia, particularly within protected areas.**
 - **Output 2.1.1. Strengthening of protected area management tools and instruments of CTIs and state government institutions.**
 - **Activity 2.1.1.1. Updating and strengthening the implementation of the management plans of the Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve and the Tawahka Asangni Reserve by reactivating the co-management of the communal and titled lands of the ICTs**

The activity will support the updating of the Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve and the Tawahka Asangni Reserve management plans and strengthen their implementation by providing key equipment and capacity building. The process will reactivate the co-management of the communal and titled lands of the ICTs.

- **Activity 2.1.1.2. Support the state government and the ICTs in the development of at least 4 territorial land reclamation protocols for the for the reclamation of indigenous people's land in the project area.**

The activity will support the development of at least four land reclamation protocols tailored to the ICTs. This effort will receive support from IUCN and WCS, along with guidance and assistance from territorial councils. Through ongoing dialogue facilitated by activity 1.1.2.1, state government institutions and ICTs will collaborate to formulate a strategy and mechanisms for the restoration of indigenous lands indigenous and/or other areas in coordination with indigenous peoples within the project area.

- Activity 2.1.1.3 Develop institutional and operational arrangements for a corps of indigenous community rangers integrated into the ICT and training of the rangers.

The project will support the development of the institutional and operational arrangements for an indigenous community forest guard body. The guards' body will be embedded in the ICT and will help the implementation of the 'life plans' elements that support forest sustainable management and conservation.

- Output 2.1.2. Assessment of the risk of collapse of the of lowland rainforest in Honduras

- Activity 2.1.2.1. Assessing the risk of collapse of lowland rainforests in Honduras.

This activity involves preparing a comprehensive national regional assessment of the risk of collapse and extension of critical Mesoamerican Forest biomes, integrating analysis of emissions associated with deforestation, biological effects such as biome changes, and economic value chain impacts, while incorporating relevant information from the project area. By conducting this assessment, the aim is to holistically evaluate the current threats and vulnerabilities facing critical forest biomes in the Mesoamerican region. This assessment will not only consider factors such as deforestation rates, habitat fragmentation, and species loss. Furthermore, it will assess the biological effects, such as potential changes in biomes, and evaluate the economic impacts across value chains associated with forest ecosystems. By integrating data and insights from the project area, the assessment will provide valuable information to inform conservation strategies and prioritize interventions aimed at safeguarding Mesoamerican Forest biomes.

- Output 2.1.3 Information of the contribution of protected areas and indigenous peoples to the conservation of primary forests and the advancement of the global biodiversity framework to support fact-based decision making.
 - Activity 2.1.3.1 Identify and evaluate the contribution of indigenous peoples and protected areas in reversing the risk of collapse of lowland rainforests in Honduras and the extinction of species.

The objective is to enhance the availability and accessibility of biodiversity-related data, particularly concerning the contribution of protected areas and indigenous peoples to the conservation of primary forests (GBF target 1) and how the conservation of this habitat contributes to reduce species extinction risk (GBF target 4). The project will support the collection of data in pilot areas during the implementation period of the project. This pilot initiative aims to demonstrate the value of utilizing comprehensive biodiversity information for fact-based decision-making processes. By strengthening the linkages between biodiversity data and

decision-making, this activity seeks to advance the global biodiversity framework and support evidence-based conservation strategies in the Moskitia.

In this activity, the project will use and calibrate the Species Threat Abatement and Recovery (STAR) assessment approaches to assess the contribution of primary forest protection to reduce species extinction risk, to inform conservation management plans in the project intervention area and to support the monitoring of threats based on global data layers (e.g., Global Forest Watch, NASA GEDI, NASA/USGS Landsat, and NASA/NOAA VIIRS, Smart-fire).

- **Outcome 2.2. Increased area of OECM's that protect primary forests integrity and expand functional connectivity.**
 - Output 2.2.1: National frameworks or protocols for the application of the OECM.
 - Activity 2.2.1.1 Contribute to the finalization of the policy framework for OECMs in Honduras, building on the work already developed by SERNA and IUCN.

The Project will contribute in the finalization of the policy framework for the OECMs in Honduras. The project will support the finalization of the framework ensuring alignment with the previous worked developed by SERNA and the regional IUCN framework.

- Output 2.2.2. Establishment of an OECM zone to support the conservation of primary forests of the Honduran Moskitia.
 - Activity 2.2.2.1. Identification and characterization of the Warunta area as a potential OECM area in the Moskitia.

This activity involves identifying potential OECM sites in Moskitia. By conducting a comprehensive assessment of suitable areas, including those within the project area, stakeholders aim to identify sites where OECMs can effectively protect primary forest integrity and enhance functional connectivity. This initial step is crucial for informing subsequent actions and interventions aimed at expanding OECMs. An initial analysis of potential OECM sites were conducted during project design. IUCN will also guidance for OECM will be applied with ad-hoc support from the regional level.

- Activity 2.2.2.2. Delimitation, zoning and defining land use standards for OECM Warunta.

The project will support the identification of the physical boundaries of the proposed OECM and the characterization of the areas that are included in it, in terms of land use management. Through the above the activity will support formalization of one OECM and support the land councils of Finzmos, Bakinasta, Katinasta and Bamiasta in the delimitation, zoning and definition of regulations governing the use, access, control and protection of natural resources, as well as the definition of governance models for the indigenous territory of Warunta.

- **Outcome 2.3: Ongoing restoration of 500 ha to increase primary forest of the Honduran Moskitia connectivity.**
 - Output 2.3.1: Updated assessment of the restoration area in agreement with the CTIs and in the framework of the process of remediation and reclamation of areas.
 - Activity 2.3.1.1. Develop an updated assessment of local priority areas for forest restoration according to the ICF Methodology and the Restoration Opportunity Assessment Methodology (ROAM) in agreement with and reaching the free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples.

This activity involves developing an updated evaluation of priority areas at the local level for the restoration of forests using the Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology (ROAM). Stakeholders will utilize ROAM and/or the ICF methodology to assess and prioritize areas with the highest potential for restoration within Moskitia and Honduras. By conducting this evaluation, stakeholders will identify key restoration opportunities based on ecological, social, and economic criteria, taking into account factors such as biodiversity value, connectivity, and stakeholder engagement. This assessment will guide decision-making and planning processes for restoration efforts, ensuring that resources are allocated effectively to maximize the ecological and socio-economic benefits of restoration activities.

- Output 2.3.2: Key priority areas for the restoration of indigenous territorial areas.
 - Activity 2.3.2.1. Support pilot community-based restoration (including agroforestry, sustainable timber, community nurseries and gardens, etc.) under local community management with the active participation of women and young people.

The project will support restoration of 500 ha from local communities, including agroforestry, sustainable timber, community nurseries, and gardens, under local community management with active participation of women and youth. The project will support with technical assistance with forestry technicians to make management plans. These projects will restore degraded landscapes and enhance ecosystem connectivity while promoting gender and youth inclusion. By actively involving women and youth in the management and

implementation of restoration activities, this activity ensures their meaningful participation in decision-making processes and empowers them to contribute to the restoration of Mesoamerican primary forests of the Honduran Moskitia. Through this activity, key priority areas for community restoration are identified and addressed, furthering the goal of increasing Mesoamerican primary forest connectivity.

Component 3. Increased investment in positive forest/nature landscapes and livelihoods:

This component aims to ensure the Long-term implementation of the strategies proposed under Components 1 and 2 addressing the lack of private investment in conservation and deforestation-free supply chains, capacities and tools to assess and compare biodiversity impacts of companies, loan portfolio, limited conservation investment opportunities. This involves formulating the financing strategy for the National Environmental Incentive program, connecting forest biodiversity and water management by incorporating blended finance mechanisms, green bonds, debt-for-nature swaps, biodiversity offsets, and REDD+. This initiative aims to facilitate investment in conservation. The execution of these strategies will prioritize inclusivity, reinforcing the active involvement in decision-making and equitable distribution of benefits among local communities, indigenous peoples, women, and youth.

- **Outcome 3.1: Increased financial resources for the conservation of primary forests.**
 - Output 3.1.1: Analysis of funding gaps and barriers to investment in primary forest landscapes and forest-linked livelihoods in RPBR, TABR and Warunta.
 - Activity 3.1.1.1: Assessment of financial gaps and barriers and of the potential and possibilities for increased investment in primary forest landscapes and livelihoods related to protected areas and the Moskitia OECM delimited area.

The activity will support an in-depth analysis of the financial gaps and barriers for investments focusing on effective management of PAs, and OECMs, including forest conservation in general through ICF to ensure the safeguarding of the forest.

- Activity 3.1.1.2 Capacity building of local governance on climate in environmental and climate finance.

The project will support capacity building of local governance representatives on the potential use of the Climate and Biodiversity financing to support forest conservation and restoration.

- Output 3.1.2: Innovative financing instruments and tools to increase investments in primary forest protection, protected areas, OECMs, and forest linked livelihoods in RPBR, TABR and Warunta.

- Activity 3.1.2.1. Support the design and implementation of a payment for ecosystem services mechanism to support the contribution of ICTs to forest conservation in protected areas and the Moskitia OECM delimited area.

The project will support the development of a payments for ecosystem services scheme based on the existing national legislation and the consultation with the indigenous people's governance structures. The mechanism will support the contribution of the indigenous peoples and ICTs to forest conservation in the PAs and the OECM in Moskitia

- **Outcome 3.2: Increase the number of forest-friendly initiatives**

- Output 3.2.1: Innovative mechanisms to incentivize forest-friendly endeavors.
 - Activity 3.2.1.1. Capacity building for indigenous peoples in the legal framework linked to the forest carbon law.

This activity aims to enhance the knowledge, skills, and resources of indigenous communities within the Moskitia region by implementing capacity-building initiatives such as workshops, training sessions, and educational programs. The goal is to empower indigenous communities to gain a deeper understanding of their rights, responsibilities, and opportunities concerning forest carbon management, and to promote their active participation in decision-making processes, conservation efforts, and sustainable development practices.

- Activity 3.2.1.2 Define a negotiation protocol for indigenous peoples on issues related to carbon credits.

This activity consists of establishing a negotiating protocol tailored to address carbon credit negotiations by indigenous peoples. The protocol aims to provide a structured framework for engaging in negotiations that uphold the rights, interests and concerns of indigenous communities in the context of carbon credit transactions. It includes guidelines for initiating and conducting negotiations, outlining key principles such as transparency, inclusiveness and respect for indigenous knowledge and sovereignty.

- Activity 3.2.1.3 Support the Government of Honduras in the socialisation of the regulation of carbon credits aimed at the indigenous peoples of the Moskitia.

The project will support the Government of Honduras in the process of socializing regulations related to carbon credits. The objective is to facilitate a broad outreach effort to ensure that the indigenous peoples of the Moskitia are informed and involved in the development and implementation of regulations governing carbon credits. The socialization process will prioritize meaningful dialogue and consultation with indigenous

communities to gather their views, address their concerns, and incorporate their perspectives into the regulatory framework. By promoting transparency, inclusiveness, and respect for indigenous rights and traditional knowledge, the project aims to foster effective collaboration between the government and indigenous communities.

- Output 3.2.2: Define a negotiation protocol mechanism for indigenous peoples on the issue of carbon credits.
 - Activity 3.2.2.1. Support the establishment and development of deforestation-free value chain activities, aggregate (cocoa and non-timber products).

The project will support the establishment and development of deforestation free value chains (including but not limited to non-timber forest products; spice, seed and nut agroforestry; cacao, ecotourism). Through workshops, training sessions, and educational programs, stakeholders will enhance their understanding of climate finance mechanisms and opportunities for investment in primary forest landscapes and forest-related livelihoods. This activity aligns with Component 3's rationale by addressing barriers to investment and strengthening local capacities in accessing financial resources for forest conservation.

- Output 3.2.3: Project preparation mechanism to allow access to private and development financing.
 - Activity 3.2.3.1. Support for the development and implementation of investments through a project preparation mechanism in support of indigenous peoples' families and organizations.

The project will develop a mechanism to assist local entrepreneurs to prepare bankable business proposals to access private investment or support from development financing sources (e.g., philanthropic contributions, development banks). This will be done with the development of a Project Preparation Facility.

The project will utilize the knowledge of 3.1.2, 3.2.1, and 3.2.2 to identify the key financing sources and beneficiaries of the PPF.

Beneficiaries are expected to include i) community enterprises in the forestry, agricultural and tourism sectors, (ii) indigenous peoples' groups managing OECMs, (iii) women-led businesses and (iv) initiatives led by rural young entrepreneurs.

TA on forest positive and biodiversity outcomes of business proposal and business plans sustainability will be provided by the regional project. The national project will be supporting the development of the feasibility study and or relevant documentation for the investments.

Component 4. Fostering knowledge management, cooperation and coordination:

This component aims to promote knowledge exchange, enhance awareness, and generate evidence to support forest and biodiversity conservation within the framework of the Comprehensive Forest and Biodiversity (CFB) initiative. It aims to develop high-level events and communications to forestry and non-forest governmental audience and the civil society encompassing the dissemination of best practices for social inclusion in forest conservation and restoration processes. It will focus on strengthening local monitoring systems to track presence and threats to species at risk of extinction, building on existing dataset, citizen knowledge, and technologies. This will allow the generation of evidence and of global environmental benefits associated with Regional Biosphere Task Force (RBTF).

- **Outcome 4.1: Improved national coordination for the protection and conservation of the primary forests.**
 - Output 4.1.1: Regional long-term communication plan to mobilize support for the conservation of primary forests and critical forest biomes.
 - Activity 4.1.1.1. Generate intercultural communication material to support the implementation of the communication strategy at local and national level.

This activity focuses on generating intercultural communication material to support the implementation of the communication strategy of the national project in alignment with the Programme communication strategy. The project will develop informative and persuasive content, including publications, videos, and social media campaigns, to raise awareness and mobilize support for the conservation of primary forests and critical forest biomes. By disseminating this material through various communication channels, including websites, newsletters, and public events, stakeholders will engage diverse audiences and foster a shared understanding of the importance of forest conservation.

In plan will also take into consideration the preferred national and local means of communication (e.g. WhatsApp channels, Facebook etc.) in the implementation of communication activities.

- **Outcome 4.2: Lessons on primary forest protection and conservation models are available worldwide**
 - Output 4.2.1: Knowledge platform on critical forest biomes.

- Activity 4.2.1.1. Document and disseminate knowledge in the Project area through the Programme's knowledge-sharing platform.

The activity will support the documentation and dissemination of project and project area relevant knowledge outputs to be disseminated through the programme's knowledge platform, as well as SERNA, ICF and UICN platforms when possible.

- Output 4.2.2: Lessons learned from forest management and governance models, and integration of IPLCs, women and rural youth into decision-making processes documented and disseminated.
 - Activity 4.2.2.1. Systematize lessons learned and participate in the annual workshop to exchange lessons on models of protection and conservation of primary forests at national and regional level.

This activity involves systematizing lessons learned from forest protection and conservation models implemented in Honduras. Stakeholders will gather, analyse, and document key insights, successes, challenges, and best practices derived from the project's initiatives. By systematically organizing this information, stakeholders will create valuable resources for knowledge sharing and dissemination, facilitating the exchange of experiences and lessons learned with regional and international stakeholders.

- Output 4.2.3: South-South cooperation/knowledge exchange with other critical forest biomes.
 - Activity 4.2.3.1. Promote the active participation of Honduras in South-South exchanges with other forest biomes projects and programmes.

This activity aims to promote the active participation of Honduras in South-South exchanges with other forest biome countries. By actively engaging with counterparts from other critical forest biomes, Honduras will have the opportunity to share experiences, learn from best practices, and explore collaborative solutions to common issues. These exchanges will facilitate the transfer of knowledge, technologies, and innovative approaches, enhancing the capacity of all participating countries to address the conservation and management of primary forests effectively. Through this activity, Honduras will contribute to broader efforts aimed at promoting global cooperation and solidarity in forest conservation and sustainable development.

- Output 4.2.4: Annual regional knowledge sharing workshops.
 - Activity 4.2.4.1. Organize national knowledge-sharing workshops

Annual national knowledge sharing workshops will be organised for knowledge sharing between multi sector stakeholders (government, private sector, CSOs) involved in the project activities.

- Output 4.2.5: Harmonized annual program planning, reporting, monitoring and evaluation.
 - Activity 4.2.5.1 Prepare national inputs for Honduras into the harmonized monitoring and evaluation framework of the integrated programme.

This activity involves preparing Honduras national inputs for annual program planning, reporting, monitoring, and evaluation. Stakeholders will collaborate to gather relevant data, insights, and progress updates on forest protection and conservation initiatives in Honduras. These inputs will be compiled, analysed, and formatted to align with the requirements of annual program planning, reporting, monitoring, and evaluation processes. By ensuring the availability of accurate and comprehensive information, stakeholders will support the harmonization of program activities and facilitate effective decision-making, accountability, and learning within the project. Additionally, these inputs will contribute to the broader efforts of regional and international coordination and cooperation in forest protection and conservation initiatives.

Relevant Stakeholders

Stakeholder	Role/Contribution
Regional Level	
Central American Integration System (SICA)	Highest-level institutional framework for political, social, and economic regional integration, as well as the coordination of regional environmental and agricultural policies, strategies, and cross-sectoral programs and initiatives.
National Level	
Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SERNA)	Honduran public body responsible for formulating, coordinating, and evaluating policies related to the protection and use of water resources, renewable energies, hydroelectric and geothermal energy generation and transmission, mining activity, and hydrocarbon exploration and exploitation. Additionally, it oversees the coordination and evaluation of policies concerning the environment, ecosystems, and the National System of Protected Areas of Honduras (SINAPH).
Institute of forest conservation (ICF)	The Institute of Forest Conservation, Protected Areas, and Wildlife is the state body responsible for administering policies, plans, programs, and projects related to forest resources. Its mandate is to ensure their rational and sustainable management at the public, private, and community levels.
Secretariat of Agriculture (SAG)	Among the main roles is to promote sustainable agricultural and livestock development in the region, coordinating with other

	governmental institutions and local and international organizations to implement comprehensive rural development projects that benefit the communities of the Moskitia.
Local Level	
Indigenous community territories (ICT)	The territorial councils serve as representatives of the communities within the Moskitia region and hold the highest authority in dealings with government bodies and international cooperation. Structured with a board of directors, the councils appoint a president, who assumes the highest position and is responsible for overseeing the council's management.
The Tawahka Indigenous Federation of Honduras (FITH)	Protecting and preserving Tawahka culture, traditions, and ancestral lands.
Federation of Pech Indigenous Tribes (FETRIPIH)	Fight for the protection of their forests against illegal occupation by settlers and to promote alternative livelihoods in a unique access and benefit sharing scheme
Unity of the indigenous and black peoples of the Honduran Moskitia (UPINMH)	It represents both indigenous peoples and Black communities, with a focus on economic development. The aim is to provide income and jobs for the people of the region through industries like cocoa production, artisanal fishing, and basic grains. Likewise, it advocates for the implementation of sustainable practices while creating economic opportunities.
MASTA	It is an indigenous federation representing the Miskitus of the Honduran Moskitia. It works to protect indigenous culture and territorial rights, strengthen local governance and natural resource management, and improve regional health and education systems. The Miskitus have 12 territories, each of which elects a territorial council.
Armed Forces (Green Battalion)	The specific mission is to protect forests from illegal logging, provide protection to rural populations, and combat drug trafficking.

Institutional Arrangement and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.

Please describe the Institutional Arrangements for the execution of this child project, including framework and mechanisms for coordination, governance, financial management and procurement. This should include consideration for linking with other relevant initiatives at country-level (if a country child project) or regional/global level (for coordination platform child project). If possible, please summarize the flow of funds (diagram), accountabilities for project management and financial reporting (organogram), including audit, and staffing plans. (max. 500 words, approximately 1 page)

Institutional Arrangement and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.

IUCN is the GEF implementing Agency (IA) and will be responsible for the overall quality assurance and oversight of the project while SERNA and WCS will act as Executing Agencies (EA) and will be responsible for managing and executing GEF's funds, under IUCN's supervision.

Governance and technical advice

A Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be established to provide strategic guidance for the project and as the highest level of the project governance. The PSC have the function to provide overall guidance and recommendations; ensure the project maintains its objectives and achieves expected outcomes; address project issues as raised by the Project Management Unit (PMU); review and validate the project annual workplan; monitor project risks and mitigation measures implemented and validates the annual project implementation report. The PSC will also be responsible for nominating a National Coordinator. The PSC will be chaired by the SERNA as a national focal point of the Honduras Child Project and as the Honduras representative at the Regional Program Level. SERNA will also act as the PSC Secretariat. The members of the PSC (SERNA, IUCN and Unity of Indigenous and Black Peoples of the Moskitia (UPINMH)) are expected to meet at least every 12 months. The Chair of the PSC will also be responsible to participate in the Program Steering Committee.


To improve the coordination and planning of activities, a technical committee composed of representatives of the executing agencies Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SERNA) and WCS; main project partners such as the Secretariat of Agriculture of Honduras (SAG), Institute of forest conservation (ICF), Indigenous federation representing the Miskitu people (MASTA), the Tawahka Indigenous Federation of Honduras (FITH), Federation of Pech Indigenous Tribes (FETRIPH), etc. The technical committee shall be consulted and shall provide technical advice when requested by the PSC.

Implementation

SERNA will act as the executing agency, will recruit a Project Management team with experience in managing international funds to establish the PMU. The PMU will be composed by a project coordinator, a financial and administration assistant, a monitoring and evaluation officer, a gender expert, a communication which will be recruited through a competitive process according to SERNA procurement and fiduciary guidance. The PMU will coordinate directly with SERNA and WCS for the project execution team and will be responsible for performing day-to-day implementation coordinating and supporting project implementation, supervising activities during the project lifecycle, and operating in close consultation and in coordinating with local governments and other relevant stakeholders.

For implementation, SERNA will cooperate closely with the ICF and provide funding for the implementation of activities within its mandate. Similarly, WCS will cooperate with MOPAWI in the implementation of specific activities with indigenous peoples.

The diagram below illustrates the project institutional arrangements:



Will the GEF Agency play an execution role on this child project?

If so, please describe that role here and the justification.

n/a

Also, please add a short explanation to describe cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects, including potential for co-location and/or sharing of expertise/staffing (max. 500 words, approximately 1 page)

Local indigenous governance institutions and NGOs are crucial partners, and coordination with relevant bodies is vital for the project's success. Effective engagement offers the project the chance to advocate for broader adoption of its approaches, increased uptake of its outputs, and enhanced sustainability beyond its duration. The project will proactively foster collaboration to enhance implementation synergies and further integrate forestry conservation.

Other key stakeholders include government institutions such as INA, SAG, UNACIFOR, and the municipal government. These institutions will operate within their mandates, ensuring the long-term effectiveness of project activities through their engagement at various levels. Additionally, the armed forces and judiciary will significantly contribute to the development and enforcement of relevant policies, particularly land reclamation protocols, during the project's implementation period.

For co-financing, the project will collaborate extensively with other Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) initiatives in Moskitia and relevant actors such as Forests of the World, World Wildlife Fund (WWF), and the Agency for the Development of the Moskitia (MOPAWI). Government institutions will also contribute to co-

financing through the budgets of INA, SAG, UNACIFOR, and the municipal government. Further details on co-financing are available in the relevant annex.

Where feasible, the project will establish cost-sharing agreements, such as for part-time staff roles, with various relevant projects within their portfolios.

Table On Core Indicators

Core Indicators

Indicate expected results in each relevant indicator using methodologies indicated in the GEF-8 Results Measurement Framework Guidelines. There is no need to complete this table for climate adaptation projects financed solely through LDCF and SCCF.

Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
1083281	1083281	0	0

Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0	0	0	0

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 1.2 Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
1083281	1083281	0	0

Name of the Protected Area	WDP A ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
			1,083,281.00						
RIo Platano	201	Habitat/Species Management Area		832,339.00			34.00		
Tawaka Asagni	41045	Habitat/Species Management Area		250,942.00			8.00		

Indicator 3 Area of land and ecosystems under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
500	2000	0	0

Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural lands under restoration

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
Rangeland and pasture	500.00	1,500.00		

Indicator 3.2 Area of forest and forest land under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	500.00		

Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and woodland under restoration

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0	0	0	0

Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Type/Name of Third Party Certification

Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value or other forest loss avoided

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
---------------------	----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

Indicator 4.5 Terrestrial OECMs supported

Name of the OECMs	WDPA-ID	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
		50,000.00			
Warunta	555582985		65,245.00		

Documents (Document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title

Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (direct)	1471338	7278151	0	0
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (indirect)	2207007	0	0	0

Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting				
Duration of accounting				

Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (direct)	1,471,338	7,278,151		
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (indirect)	2,207,007			
Anticipated start year of accounting	2024	2025		
Duration of accounting	20	20		

Indicator 6.3 Energy Saved (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Total Target Benefit	Energy (MJ) (At PIF)	Energy (MJ) (At CEO Endorsement)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at MTR)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at TE)
Target Energy Saved (MJ)				

Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Technology	Capacity (MW) (Expected at PIF)	Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at MTR)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at TE)
------------	------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female	14,000	18,100		
Male	26,000	28,000		
Total	40,000	46,100	0	0

Explain the methodological approach and underlying logic to justify target levels for Core and Sub-Indicators (max. 250 words, approximately 1/2 page)

- Indicator 1: Sum of the areas designated as protected areas within the project area for the Moskitia. The selection of PA targeted for improving management effectiveness was done with Government agencies and additional stakeholder when needed (i.e., subnational governments).
- Indicator 3: Sum of the areas identified as priority for forest landscape restoration, including mainly degraded forest land and to a lesser extent cropland/pasture. This was set in line with the national plan for ecosystem restoration, including both agricultural and forest restoration practices.
- Indicator 4: Sum of all areas proposed by the child national project for improved management, includes 4.5 Terrestrial OECMs supported in terms of finance access, political and regulatory framework (65,245 ha).
- Indicator 6: sum of:
 - o a) Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the sector of AFOLU (direct).

Calculations for this indicator were made using the EX-Ante Carbon-balance Tool (EX-ACT) version 9.4.1. The calculations assumed a moist tropical climate with high activity clay soils, with an implementation phase of 5 years and a capitalisation phase of 15 years for the project. Global warming potential was calculated using 100-year AR6 figures. Reduced emissions from avoided deforestation assumed a tropical moist deciduous forest type, changing to grassland, starting with 714,213 ha (Core Indicator 4) and reducing by 33% to 476,019 ha without the project and by 32% to 485,665 ha with the project (using areas and deforestation rates retrieved from baseline studies which can be found in tables in the "Calculations" tab of the EX-ACT spreadsheet), both without fire used.

Afforestation/reforestation efforts on 500 ha (Indicator 3.2) assumed land-use change from annual fallow to planted tropical rainforest, without fire used. Management for forest degradation assumed initial degradation of 25%, moving to 41% without the project (calculated using figures from baseline studies which can be found in the "Calculations" tab of the EX-ACT spreadsheet) and 40% with the project, with no fire in either scenario.

- Indicator 11:

46,100 people (28000 Men, 18100 Female)

The direct beneficiaries correspond to the entire population of the communities in the project intervention areas of La Moskitia, meaning those who will benefit directly from conservation activities, sustainable use or restoration of the areas, investments in restoration and sustainable land management, as well as those who will participate in capacity building at the local or national level. The direct beneficiaries were estimated based on the latest census data for communities within the boundaries of the project targeted protected areas and the OESM. Additional beneficiaries include those that will receive capacity building at a National and local level. There is no duplication between the two sets of beneficiaries.

Key Risks

	Rating	Explanation of risk and mitigation measures
CONTEXT		
Climate	Substantial	Climate change will strongly affect ecosystems in the Moskitia, which are vulnerable to changes in temperature and precipitation regimes. These changes can alter habitat suitability, disrupt ecological processes, and contribute to habitat loss and fragmentation. Consequently, this can result in shifts in species distributions, loss of biodiversity, and degradation of ecosystem services vital for human well-being. Mitigation Strategies: Ensure that program actions are aligned with both national and regional climate change strategies and action plans.
Environmental and Social	Substantial	The project area encompasses several social risks that may impede the meaningful participation and representation of local communities. These risks include socio-economic disparities, imbalances in land tenure, poverty, limited opportunities for young people, and the presence of illegal groups in the area. Mitigation Strategies: Implement a gender and stakeholders engagement action plans.
Political and Governance	Moderate	Lack of presence of governance agencies due to the difficulties in accessing the Moskitia, which can also result in limited access to public services and minimal political participation in decision-making processes. Mitigation strategies: Maintain fluid communication with pertinent authorities at the regional, national, subnational and local levels. When there are changes in the authorities, inform progress and provide information.
INNOVATION		
Institutional and Policy	Low	Communities' needs are left behind in political and institutional processes. Mitigation strategies: Maintain fluid communication with key

		stakeholders to promote policy coherence. Provide factual information to support informed analysis and decision-making.
Technological	Moderate	outdated technologies in sectors such as agriculture, transportation, and energy may impede efficiency, productivity, and sustainability, exacerbating vulnerabilities. Mitigation strategies: Elaborate comprehensive strategies that prioritize investment in capacity building, and technology transfer initiatives tailored to the region's unique socio-economic and environmental context.
Financial and Business Model	Moderate	Limited infrastructure and transportation networks in the region can restrict access to markets for local businesses as well High levels of poverty, unemployment, and social inequality in the region can affect consumer purchasing power, market demand, and the availability of financial resources for investment. Mitigation strategies: Collaboration between government agencies, private sector stakeholders, development organizations, that combines efforts to improve infrastructure, strengthen regulatory frameworks, promote entrepreneurship and innovation, enhance access to financial services.
EXECUTION		
Capacity	Moderate	The availability of skilled personnel, including project managers, technical experts, and community facilitators, may be limited in the Moskitia, which can hamper the implementation of initiatives requiring specialized knowledge and skills. Mitigation strategies: building institutional capacity fostering partnerships and collaboration, promoting community engagement and empowerment, and investing in human resource development and capacity-building initiatives.
Fiduciary	Moderate	Land tenure issues, and limited enforcement of laws and regulations can create uncertainty for businesses and investors, affecting long-term planning and investment decisions. Limited access to formal financial services, including banking and credit facilities, can constrain business growth and expansion opportunities in the Moskitia. Mitigation strategies: Collaboration between government agencies, private sector stakeholders, development organizations, that combines efforts to improve infrastructure, strengthen regulatory frameworks, promote entrepreneurship and innovation, enhance access to financial services.
Stakeholder	Moderate	Transformational change will require strong stakeholder engagement and participation throughout the program implementation. Mitigation strategies: Prepare sound stakeholder analyses and actions plans. Ensure communication and collaboration with key stakeholders during program implementation.
Other	Substantial	The presence of illegal groups in the Moskitia has created safety concerns in the local communities, which might lead them to withdraw from participating in the activities of this project. Mitigation Strategies:

		'Establish with local groups which are the safe areas and seek support from external agencies that can enhance the safety of the area.
Overall Risk Rating	Moderate	The overall risk rating of the project, synthesized from the thematic risk categories above is moderate.

C. ALIGNMENT WITH GEF-8 PROGRAMMING STRATEGIES AND COUNTRY/REGIONAL PRIORITIES

Explain how the proposed interventions are aligned with GEF- 8 programming strategies, including the specific integrated program priorities, and country and regional priorities, Describe how these country strategies and plans relate to the multilateral environmental agreements, such as through NDCs, NBSAPs, etc.

For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), please identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and explain how.

(max. 500 words, approximately 1 page)

The proposed project will contribute to the overall GEF-8 targets involved in the Mesoamerica program, aiming to improve conservation efforts in primary forests and increase awareness and information dissemination regarding the importance of Intact Forest Landscapes (IFLs). The interventions outlined in this project directly support these goals by focusing on conservation and safeguarding efforts in Honduras' Moskitia IFL. These efforts not only contribute to the preservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services but also align with Honduras' national priorities for environmental protection and sustainable development. Additionally, our project supports the objectives outlined in various multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) to which Honduras is a party, such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

The Program will coordinate actions with the following ongoing initiatives:

- The GEF Small Grant Program (SGP) implemented by UNDP in all Mesoamerica countries

Besides GEF initiatives, the project is also aligned with regional policies and instruments from the SICA, including:

- The Framework Regional Environmental Strategy (2021-2025): The project is in line with the 'Forests and Sustainable Landscapes' strategic line of the ERAM and contributes to the four expected results (4.1 to 4.4) that focus on landscape governance, increase forest restoration, increase the value of forests, and develop instruments, tools and mechanisms for sustainable forest use.
- Regional Strategy on Climate Change: The project is in line with the strategic objective 1.3 of reducing vulnerability of forest ecosystems and biodiversity through policies, incentives and scientific knowledge creation. Action 1.3.2 focus on the development of policies and economic incentives, this includes the

implementation of payment for ecosystem services, implement REDD processes, and to include a gender perspective.

- Regional agro-environmental and health strategy (2009-2024): The project will contribute to advance three action lines: (i) Action Line 2.5, action 2.5.2 to reduce emissions from deforestation, (ii) Action line 3.1, action 3.1.3 to improve the management of protected areas, and (iii) Action line 4.5 to incentive and strengthen conservation-linked businesses.
- Regional Strategic Program for the Management of Forest Ecosystems: The project will contribute to the four components of the PERFOR: (i) component 1 focused on strengthening governance, including land rights, engaging indigenous peoples and women, (ii) component 2 that includes potentiating community forestry, (iii) component 3 that includes developing new financial instruments including payment for forest ecosystem services, and (iv) component 4 that includes establishing intersectoral policies and plans and promoting forest restoration..
- Rural youth strategy of the SICA region (2022-2030): Project activities will support that this strategy is operationalized in the target intact forest landscapes.
- Regional Policy for Gender Equality and Equity of the PRIEG/SICA Central American Integration System (2014-2025): In line with this policy, the project will take affirmative actions to incentive that women participate in governance and decision-making processes and the development of forest-linked production initiatives.

At the national level, the project is aligned with several policies and instruments related to biodiversity, climate change and forestry. These include:

Alignment with national policies and instruments:

- Biodiversity strategies and action plans:
 - Honduras National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2018 - 2022.
- National climate change strategies:
 - Honduras National Climate Change Strategy.
- National forest policies and plans:
 - Honduras National Forest Policy and Protected Areas and Wildlife 2013-2022.

D. POLICY REQUIREMENTS

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment:

We confirm that gender dimensions relevant to the project have been addressed during Project Preparation as per GEF Policy and are clearly articulated in the child Project Description (Section B).

Yes

1) Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive-measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?

Yes

If the child project expects to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment, please indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;

Yes

Improving women's participation and decision-making; and/or

Yes

Generating socio-economic benefits or services for women.

Yes

2) Does the child project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

Yes

Stakeholder Engagement

We confirm that key stakeholders were consulted during Project Preparation as required per GEF policy, their relevant roles to project outcomes has been clearly articulated in the Child Project Description (Section B) and that a Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been developed before CEO endorsement.

Yes

Select what role civil society will play in the Project:

Consulted only; Yes

Member of Advisory Body; Contractor;

Co-financier; Yes

Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body ; No

Executor or co-executor;

Other (Please explain)

Private Sector

Will there be private sector engagement in the Child project?

Yes

And if so, has its role been described and justified in section B "Child project description"?

Yes

Environmental and Social Safeguards

We confirm that we have provided information regarding Environmental and Social risks associated with the proposed child project or program, including risk screenings/ assessments and, if applicable, management plans or other measures to address identified risks and impacts (this information should be presented in Annex E).

Yes

Please provide overall Project/Program Risk Classification

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
	Medium/Moderate		

E. OTHER REQUIREMENTS

Knowledge management

We confirm that an approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been clearly described during Project Preparation in the Project Description and that these activities have been budgeted and an anticipated timeline for delivery of relevant outputs has been provided. This includes budget for linking with and participation in knowledge exchange activities organized through the coordination platform.

Socio-economic Benefits

We confirm that the child project design has considered socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and these have been clearly described in the Project Description and will be monitored and reported on during project implementation (at MTR and TER).

Through project implementation, the socio-economic benefits that will be generated for the population involved include, firstly, the protection and conservation of primary forests. This recognizes the work of indigenous communities in protecting and conserving these forests, as well as addressing the problems related to the lack of presence of authorities and political actors in the area, which over the years has led to an increase in illegal activities and settlements. Moreover, it aims to integrate the conservation of primary forests at the economic, social, and institutional levels, as well as into municipal land-use planning guidelines and ICTs “life plans.”

Beyond this, the project seeks to generate and adopt new and better sustainable practices, whether applied to territorial planning or value chains, which prioritize the inclusion of women and rural youth. This involves capacity-building initiatives in developing deforestation-free value chains and workshops on forest management and indigenous rights, ensuring that these groups become participatory actors in decision-

making. This guarantees their active participation, the generation of employment, and technical training. The activities involved in this project focus on improving the livelihoods of local communities, with an emphasis on sustainable forest management and gender inclusion.

ANNEX A: FINANCING TABLES

GEF Financing Table

Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Grant / Non-Grant	GEF Project Grant(\$)	Agency Fee(\$)	Total GEF Financing (\$)
IUCN	GET	Honduras	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation: IPs	Grant	1,759,863.00	158,387.00	1,918,250.00
IUCN	GET	Honduras	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation: IPs	Grant	175,986.00	15,839.00	191,825.00
IUCN	GET	Honduras	Biodiversity	BD IP Matching Incentives	Grant	586,621.00	52,795.00	639,416.00
IUCN	GET	Honduras	Climate Change	CC IP Matching Incentives	Grant	58,662.00	5,279.00	63,941.00
IUCN	GET	Honduras	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation: IPs	Grant	703,945.00	63,355.00	767,300.00
IUCN	GET	Honduras	Land Degradation	LD IP Matching Incentives	Grant	234,648.00	21,118.00	255,766.00
Total GEF Resources (\$)						3,519,725.00	316,773.00	3,836,498.00

Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

Was a Project Preparation Grant requested? true

PPG Amount (\$) 150000

PPG Agency Fee (\$) 13500

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	PPG(\$)	Agency Fee(\$)	Total PPG Funding(\$)
------------	------------	---------------------------------	------------	-------------------------	---------	-------------------	--------------------------

IUCN	GET	Honduras	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation: IPs	75,000.00	6,750.00	81,750.00
IUCN	GET	Honduras	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation: IPs	7,500.00	675.00	8,175.00
IUCN	GET	Honduras	Biodiversity	BD IP Matching Incentives	25,000.00	2,250.00	27,250.00
IUCN	GET	Honduras	Climate Change	CC IP Matching Incentives	2,500.00	225.00	2,725.00
IUCN	GET	Honduras	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation: IPs	30,000.00	2,700.00	32,700.00
IUCN	GET	Honduras	Land Degradation	LD IP Matching Incentives	10,000.00	900.00	10,900.00
Total PPG Amount (\$)					150,000.00	13,500.00	163,500.00

Please provide Justification

Sources of Funds for Country Star Allocation

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Sources of Funds	Total(\$)
IUCN	GET	Honduras	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	2,000,000.00
IUCN	GET	Honduras	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation	200,000.00
IUCN	GET	Honduras	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	800,000.00
Total GEF Resources					3,000,000.00

Focal Area Elements

Programming Directions	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Co-financing(\$)
CFB MesoAmerica IP	GET	3,519,725.00	22963181.87
Total Project Cost		3,519,725.00	22,963,181.87

Confirmed Co-financing for the project, by name and type

Please include evidence for each co-financing source for this project in the tab of the portal

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Recipient Government	Country Secretariat of Natural Resources and Environment	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	15000000
Recipient Government	Country National Conservation Forest Institute	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	6000000
Civil Society Organization	MOPAWI	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	600000
GEF Agency	IUCN	Grant	Investment mobilized	1363181.87
Total Co-financing				22,963,181.87

Please describe the investment mobilized portion of the co-financing

IUCN project in the area will ensure synergies and specific strategies between two projects in the field in all the project components and in strengthening capacities for the effective management of protected and conservation areas and development of more sustainable economic alternatives that favour the connectivity and restoration of priority landscapes..

ANNEX B: ENDORSEMENT

GEF Agency(ies) Certification

GEF Agency Coordinator	Date	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email
GEF Agency Coordinator	6/4/2024	SungAh Lee		sungah.lee@iucn.org
Project Coordinator	6/4/2024	Nadia Mujica	50660221799	nadia.mujica@iucn.org

Record of Endorsement of GEF Operational Focal Point (s) on Behalf of the Government(s):

Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this template.

Name of GEF OFP	Position	Ministry	Date (MM/DD/YYYY)
Malcolm Stuffkens	Depuy Minister of Natural Resources	Secretariat of National Resources and Environment	4/23/2023

ANNEX C: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Please indicate the page number in the Project Document where the project results and M&E frameworks can be found. Please also paste below the Project Results Framework from the Agency document. For the Integrated Programs' global/regional coordination child project, please include the program-wide results framework, inclusive of results specific to the coordination child project. For any country child project, please ensure that relevant program level indicators are included.

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Mid-term target	Final target	Source of verification	Assumptions / Risks
Component 1 - Enabling conditions for the protection and conservation of primary forests						
Outcome 1.1: Strengthened local, national, and regional governance mechanisms in support of primary forests conservation.	Indicator 1: Number of strengthened local, national, and regional governance structures.	0	1	2	Annual, Mid-term and Terminal evaluation reports. Minutes of the meetings from the Technical Committee on Forests	<u>Assumptions:</u> Target include 1 national guide for strengthening justice sector capacity and 1 national roadmap for decentralisation of forestry powers to local governments <u>Risk:</u> National Ministries will not approve the proposals during the time of project implementation.
	Indicator 2: Number of local and national instruments that use nature positive criteria for their design and implementation	0	1	3	Annual, Mid-term and Terminal evaluation reports. SE-CCAD reports and minutes of meetings. SE-CAC reports and minutes of meetings. Approval from Council of Ministers.	<u>Assumption:</u> Target include 1 report on transboundary analysis, 1 document constituting the Rural Youth Network and 1 Capacity Building Plan. <u>Risk:</u> the instruments will not be approved by the Council of Ministers during the time of project implementation.
Outputs to achieve outcome 1.1	<p>Output 1.1.1: Awareness-raising and advocacy plan on primary forest protection and conservation targeted at policymakers, sectoral entities, and private sector</p> <p>Output 1.1.2: Strengthening local governance structures to improve the effectiveness of the protection and conservation of the primary forests of the Honduran Moskitia, through zoning and norm building processes in at least 2 of the territorial councils.</p> <p>Output 1.1.3: Strengthened agreements for cross-border protected areas collaboration.</p>					
Outcome 1.2: Key national and regional policy and regulatory instruments prioritize primary forest conservation.	Indicator 3: Number of updated policies and regulations that support primary forest protection and conservation	0	2	4	Annual, Mid-term and Terminal evaluation reports. Approval from environmental government agencies.	<u>Assumption:</u> Political determination and dedication from both national and municipal governments are crucial. Effective collaboration and cooperation among governmental agencies and local governance organizations are essential. Flexibility and adaptability in policy instruments are necessary to address and prioritize urgent environmental challenges.

<p>Outputs to achieve Outcome 2.1</p>	<p>Output 2.1.1: Strengthening protected area management instruments and tools.</p> <p>Output 2.1.2: Assessment of the risk of collapse of the of lowland rainforest in Honduras</p> <p>Output 2.1.3: Information about the contribution of protected areas and indigenous peoples to conserve primary forests of the Honduran Moskitia and advance the global biodiversity framework to support fact-based decision making.</p>					
<p>Outcome 2.2: Increased area of OECMs that protect primary forests integrity and expand functional connectivity.</p>	<p>Indicator 6: Area (ha) of newly established OECMs that protect primary forests integrity and expand functional connectivity.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>65,245</p>	<p>Annual, Mid-term and Final evaluation reports. Verification of the areas (ha) established as OECMs</p>	<p><u>Assumption:</u> There is suitable land available for designation as OECMs, including areas with primary forests, and that this land is not already allocated for conflicting land uses. The stakeholders involve will collaborate and cooperate in the establishment of OECMs.</p> <p><u>Risk:</u> Local conflicts over land tenure or resources management that causes the delay on the implementation of OECMs</p>
<p>Outputs to achieve Outcome 2.2</p>	<p>Output 2.2.1: National frameworks or protocols for the application of OECM.</p> <p>Output 2.2.2: Establishment of an OECM zone to support the conservation of primary forests of the Honduran Moskitia.</p>					
<p>Outcome 2.3: Ongoing restoration of 65,000 ha to increase primary forest connectivity.</p>	<p>Indicator 8: Area of land restored (=GEF CI-3) (ha)</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>150</p>	<p>500</p>	<p>Annual, Mid-term and Final evaluation reports.</p>	<p><u>Assumption:</u> The project will support restoration from local communities, including agroforestry, sustainable timber, community nurseries, and gardens, under local community management with active participation of women and youth. Restoring degraded landscapes and enhance ecosystem connectivity while promoting gender and youth inclusion</p> <p><u>Risk:</u> Technical challenges such as limited availability of suitable planting materials, lack of expertise in restoration techniques, and adverse environmental conditions may impede the success of restoration projects.</p>
<p>Outputs to achieve Outcome 2.3</p>	<p>Output 2.3.1: Updated assessment of the restoration area in agreement with the ICTs and in the framework of the process of remediation and reclamation of areas.</p> <p>Output 2.3.2: Key priority areas for the restoration of indigenous territorial areas.</p>					
<p>Component 3: Innovative finance and investment</p>						

<p>Outputs to achieve Outcome 3.1:</p>	<p>Project Specific Indicator 1: Number of payments for ecosystem services mechanisms developed.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Annual, Mid-term and Final evaluation reports. Mechanism documentation</p>	<p><u>Assumption:</u> Landowners and stakeholders will voluntarily participate in these PES schemes, generating enough demand among potential buyers, such as governmental agencies, individuals, or corporations. <u>Risk:</u> Some landowners can free-ride by actually not delivering the PES. Likewise, the demand for ecosystem services may fluctuate due to economic, political, or environmental factors, leading to uncertainty in PES markets.</p>
<p>Outputs to achieve Outcome 3.1</p>	<p>Output 3.1.1: Analysis of funding gaps and barriers to investment in primary forest landscapes and forest-linked livelihoods in RPBR, TABR and Warunta. Output 3.1.2: Innovative financing instruments and tools to increase investments in primary forest protection, protected areas, OECMs, and forest linked livelihoods- in RPBR, TABR and Warunta.</p>					
<p>Outcome 3.2: Increase in the number of forest-friendly initiatives</p>	<p>Indicator 9: Number of new women or youth led businesses supported</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>Annual, Mid-term and Final evaluation reports. Number of women and young businesses establishes.</p>	<p><u>Assumption:</u> Participation in workshops, training sessions, and educational programs will enable women and young people to support their businesses and adopt forest-friendly practices. <u>Risk:</u> Communities might don't find the same revenue from forest-friendly initiatives making them return to deforestation economic activities.</p>
	<p>Indicator 10: Number of business plans developed to implement forest-friendly goods and services</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>40</p>	<p>Annual, Mid-term and Final evaluation reports. Business plans finalised.</p>	<p><u>Assumption:</u> Strengthen of mechanisms that can finance forest-friendly initiatives such as the BANHPROVI products and services and the SAG grants. <u>Risk:</u> Communities might don't find the same revenue from forest-friendly initiatives making them return to deforestation economic activities.</p>
<p>Outputs to achieve Outcome 3.2</p>	<p>Output 3.2.1: Innovative mechanisms to incentivize forest-friendly endeavors. Output 3.2.2: Innovative business models to develop forest-friendly goods and services. Output 3.2.3: Project preparation mechanism to allow access to private and development financing.</p>					

Component 4 - Coordinated and improved learning and regional collaboration

Outcome 4.1: Improved national and regional coordination for the protection and conservation of the primary forests	Indicator 11: Number of south-south / lessons exchange events with other initiatives of the GEF Amazon, Congo, and Critical Forest Biomes Integrated Program.	0	1 exchange visit	2 exchange visits	Annual, Mid-term and Terminal evaluation reports. Reports from exchange visits. List of participants of events held during exchange visits.	<u>Assumption:</u> The regional coordination project will coordinate visits to foster knowledge exchange with other forest programs in the Amazon, Congo, Indo-Malaysia, West Africa and Guinea. <u>Risk:</u> Coordination with other GEF Integrated Program is weak and hinders the organization of exchange visits.
	Indicator 12: Number of private sectors, indigenous peoples' organizations, and civil society organizations representatives participating in the national and regional coordination platforms.	0	0	10	Annual, Mid-term and Terminal evaluation reports. Minutes of the meetings from the Technical Committee on Forests SICA Council of Ministries approval of the proposals	<u>Assumption:</u> The regional project will support SE-CCAD in the elaboration of a protocol to regulate and formalise the participation of the private sector, civil society, indigenous peoples, and forest communities in the Technical Committee on Forests. One organization of each group will participate in the Technical Committee on Forests. <u>Risk:</u> The Council of Environmental Ministers will not approve the protocol for inclusion of the new actors within the project implementation timeframe. New actors' representatives will not be interested/will not have financial resources or technical capacity to participate at the regional level decision making process.
Outputs to achieve Outcome 4.1	Output 4.1.1: Regional long-term communication plan to mobilize support for the conservation of primary forests of the Honduran Moskitia. and critical forest biomes.					
Outcome 4.2: Lessons on primary forest protection and conservation models are	Indicator 13: Level of capacities, technical cooperation and technology transfer on CFB within and between participating countries (measured by tailor- made KAP	0	20% of KAP responders will increase their scores by 10%.	50% of KAP responders will increase their scores by 10%.	Annual, Mid-term and Terminal evaluation reports.(10% increased of the KAP)	<u>Assumption:</u> Capacity building activities, technical cooperation initiatives, and technology transfer efforts are relevant and responsive to the needs and priorities of

available worldwide	survey among stakeholders).					<p>stakeholders involved in CFBs.</p> <p><u>Risk:</u> Weak coordination mechanisms and communication channels among participating countries and stakeholders may hinder effective cooperation, knowledge exchange, and technology transfer on CFBs</p>
	Indicator 14: Number of lessons learned documents.	0	5	10	Mid-term and Terminal reports.	<p><u>Assumption:</u> Systematically organizing the lessons learned, creating valuable resources for knowledge sharing and dissemination, and facilitating the exchange of experiences and lessons learned with national and local stakeholders.</p> <p><u>Risk:</u> Incomplete or inaccurate information, leading to misunderstandings, misinterpretations, or ineffective application of lessons learned in future activities.</p>
	Indicator 15: Number of local and national lessons sharing events.	0	4 workshops	6 Workshops	<p>Annual, Mid-term and Terminal evaluation reports.</p> <p>Workshop reports</p> <p>List of participants and reports from workshops.</p>	<p><u>Assumption:</u> Key stakeholders will be participating in the annual workshops to ensure knowledge sharing.</p> <p><u>Risk:</u> Key stakeholders may not fully engage or actively participate in the annual workshops, potentially due to conflicting priorities, lack of interest, or perceived relevance of the workshops to their work or objectives.</p>
<p>Outputs to achieve Outcome 4.2</p>	<p>Output 4.2.1: Knowledge platform on critical forest biomes</p> <p>Output 4.2.2: Lessons, forest management and governance models, and integration of IPLCs, women and rural youth into decision-making processes documented and disseminated</p> <p>Output 4.2.3: South-South cooperation/knowledge exchange with other critical forest biomes.</p> <p>Output 4.2.4: Annual regional knowledge sharing workshops.</p> <p>Output 4.2.5: Harmonized annual program planning, reporting, monitoring and evaluation.</p>					

ANNEX D: STATUS OF UTILIZATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG)

Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
Consultancies (CEO endorsement, coordination, ecosystem risk of collapse, project annexes)	111,235.82	105,636.00	5,599.82
Field Visit- Indigenous preliminary consultation (MOPAWI)	8,264.18	8,264.18	0.00
Admin/financial support	7,500.00	4,231.00	3,269.00
Travel	15,000.00	12,685.00	2,315.00
Workshops	8,000.00	3,745.82	4,254.18
Total	150,000.00	134,562.00	15,438.00

ANNEX E: PROJECT MAP AND COORDINATES


Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place


Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	GeoName ID
Warunta Moskitia	15.326719	-84.238231	

Location Description:

Activity Description:

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where project interventions are taking place as appropriate.





ANNEX F: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS DOCUMENTS INCLUDING RATING

Attach agency safeguard datasheet/assessment report(s), including ratings of risk types and overall project/program risk classification as well as any management plans or measures to address identified risks and impacts (as applicable).

Title

5. Honduras- Gender Action Plan
4. Honduras - Grievance mechanism
3. Honduras Indigenous people plan
2. Honduras SEP
1. ESM Checklist Honduras

ANNEX G: BUDGET TABLE

Please upload the budget table here.

Appendix A: Indicative Project Budget Template

Expenditure Category		Component (USDeq.)											Total (US Deq.)	Responsible Entity (Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency [1])		
		Component 1			Component 2			Component 3		Component 4		Sub-Total			M & E	P M C
		Outcome 1.1	Outcome 1.2	Outcome 1.3	Outcome 2.1	Outcome 2.2	Outcome 2.3	Outcome 3.1	Outcome 3.2	Outcome 4.1	Outcome 4.2					
Consultants	1.2.2 National data collection on Information to support fact-based decision making on forest conservation interventions.		35 000									35 000			35 000	WCS
Consultants	1.1.3 Diagnostic report on the potential of cross-border collaboration and management with Nicaragua.	15 000										15 000			15 000	WCS
Consultants	1.2.1 Municipal land-use planning policy guides with respect of the indigenous peoples rights on collective and titled lands		20 000									20 000			20 000	WCS
Consultants	1.2.1 Revision of territorial "life plans" to integrate the protection and conservation or primary forest		20 000									20 000			20 000	WCS
Consultants	1.3.2 Develop affirmative action protocols for including women and			7 000								7 000			7 000	WCS

	rural youth within program implementation plans															
Consultants	2.2.2 Identification and characterization of OMEC Guarunta in the Moskitia					40 000						40 000			40 000	WCS
Consultants	2.2.1 Foster the capacity of actors and the effective management for the delimited OECM.					45 000						45 000			45 000	WCS
Consultants	1.1.2 Native technical personnel to ensure institutional presence during the project	55 000										55 000			55 000	WCS
Consultants	2.2.2 Zoning and survey of the OECM area.					25 000						25 000			25 000	WCS
Consultants	2.2.2 Conservation Plan for OMEC					40 000						40 000			40 000	WCS
Consultants	2.2.2 Gender responsive strategy and Management Plan for the OMEC					40 000						40 000			40 000	WCS
Consultants	3.1.1 Development of gender responsive capacity building material on climate and forest conservation financing						20 000					20 000			20 000	WCS
Consultants	3.1.2 Development of a pilot mechanism for payment for ecosystem services (carbon credits)							50 000				50 000			50 000	WCS
Consultants	3.2.1 Development of forest friendly financing mechanism for BANHPROVI products and services and the SAG grants focusing on								50 000			50 000			50 000	WCS

	women in Moskitia														
Consultants	2.3.2 Technical consultancy for sustainable agricultural production on restored areas t					40 000						40 000		40 000	WCS
Consultants	1.3.2 Consultancy for FPIC implementation			80 000								80 000		80 000	WCS
Consultants	2.2.1 Policy framework for the OECMs in Honduras					60 000						60 000		60 000	WCS
Consultants	2.3.2 Nursery personnel					32 000						32 000		32 000	SERN A
Consultants	3.2.2 TA (extentionist) for the establishment and development of deforestation free and women empowering value chains								37 500			37 500		37 500	WCS
Consultants	3.2.2 TA (agricultural finance) for the establishment and development of deforestation free and women empowering value chains								37 500			37 500		37 500	WCS
Consultants	3.2.3 TA for the development of documentation								37 500			37 500		37 500	WCS
Consultants	3.2.3 Feasibility screening of projects								37 500			37 500		37 500	WCS
Contractual Services – Company	1.1.1 Gender responsive advocacy plan incorporating IPLC consideration	20 000										20 000		20 000	WCS
Consultants	2.1.2 National assessment of the risk of collapse and extension of critical Mesoamerican Forest biomes.					83 200						83 200		83 200	WCS

Equipment	2.1.1 Basic equipment for Resource Guard personnel					22 500							22 500			22 500	SERN A
Equipment	2.1.1 Biodiversity management equipment					22 500							22 500			22 500	SERN A
Equipment	2.2.2 Partial physical delimitation of and signs for OEMC												50 000			50 000	WCS
Equipment	2.3.2 Seed collection equipment and seeds for restoration												20 000			20 000	SERN A
Equipment	2.3.2 Equipement for restoration												25 000			25 000	SERN A
Consultants	Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) / Project Director	25 000	25 000	25 000	25 000	25 000	25 000	25 000	25 000	25 000	25 000	25 000	25 000			250 000	SERN A
Consultants	KMAL and M&E Expert (Comp 4)	5 000	5 000	5 000	5 000	5 000	5 000	5 000	5 000	5 000	5 000	5 000	5 000			50 000	WCS
Consultants	KMAL and M&E Expert (Comp 4)	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000			100 000	SERN A
Consultants	Gender, Indigenous Peoples and Social Inclusion Specialist (Comp 1)	7 500	15 000	15 000	15 000	15 000	15 000	15 000	15 000	15 000	15 000	15 000	14 250			142 500	WCS
Consultants	Communication expert (Comp 4)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25 000	25 000	50 000			50 000	WCS
Consultants	Field Technical Coordinator		7 000	3 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000				60 000		78 000	138 000	WCS
Salary and benefits / Staff costs	Financial and Administrative Assistant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				-		75 000	75 000	WCS
Consultants	Technical and Administrative Support	6 000	6 000	6 000	6 000	6 000	6 000	6 000	6 000	6 000	6 000	6 000	60 000			60 000	SERN A
Consultants	Restoration and innovative financial mechanisms for conservation expert (Comp 2 & 3)						18 750	18 750	18 750	18 750						75 000	WCS
Trainings, Workshops,	1.1.1 National advocacy events	40 000														40 000	WCS

Meetings															
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	1.1.2 Support territorial and national dialogues	50 000										50 000		50 000	WCS
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	1.1.3 Implementation of cross-border collaboration and management activities	25 000										25 000		25 000	WCS
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	1.2.1 Workshops for the development of ITC gender responsive "life plans"		30 000									30 000		30 000	WCS
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	1.3.1 National AFOLU roundtable to integrate Moskitia-level consideration for coordination and financing.			40 000								40 000		40 000	SERNA
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	2.1.1 Workshops for the development of land reclamation protocols with the inclusion of women leaders				50 000							50 000		50 000	WCS
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	2.1.1 Specialised training for new Guards based on the gender responsive manual				40 000							40 000		40 000	WCS
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	2.2.2 Workshops for the Identification and characterisation of OMEC Guarunta in the Moskitia					60 000						60 000		60 000	WCS
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	2.3.2 Exchange of experiences						30 000					30 000		30 000	WCS
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	3.1.1 Capacity building of local governance on gender responsive climate in environmental							30 000				30 000		30 000	WCS

	and climate finance																		
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	3.2.1 Capacity building for indigenous peoples in the legal framework linked to the forest carbon law.								30 000					30 000				30 000	WCS
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	3.2.1 Workshops to define a negotiation protocol for indigenous peoples on issues related to carbon credits.								30 000					30 000				30 000	WCS
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	3.2.1 Workshops for training and awareness raising about the regulation of carbon credits aimed at the indigenous peoples of the Muskitia.								25 000					25 000				25 000	WCS
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	3.2.2 Workshops for the establishment and development of deforestation free and women empowering value chains								20 000					20 000				20 000	WCS
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	4.1.1 Dissemination workshops (including facilitating women participation)								40 000					40 000				40 000	WCS
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	M&E Inception Workshop													-	7 578			7 578	SERN A
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	4.2.2 National knowledge sharing workshops (including facilitating women participation)								50 000					50 000				50 000	WCS

Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	1.3.2 Workshops to support the FPIC implementation taking into consideration gender needs for participation													20 000				20 000	20 000	WCS
Travel	1.1.1 Travel to Regional gender responsive advocacy events	20 000																20 000	20 000	WCS
Travel	1.1.2 Travel for territorial and national dialogues	20 000																20 000	20 000	WCS
Travel	3.2.4 Participation to High-impact and promotional events																	30 000	30 000	WCS
Travel	4.2.3 Participation to South-South cooperation/knowledge exchange with other critical forest biomes.																	27 000	27 000	WCS
Travel	4.2.4 Participation in Annual regional knowledge exchange workshops.																	24 000	24 000	SERNA
Travel	1.1.3 Travel for cross-border collaboration and management activities	30 000																30 000	30 000	WCS
Travel	1.3.2 Travel to support FPIC implementation (including facilitating women participation)																	20 000	20 000	WCS
Works	2.1.1 Partial support to basic infrastructure																	20 000	20 000	SERNA
Works	2.3.2 Nursery for the production of forest seedlings																	20 000	20 000	SERNA
Works	2.3.2 Restoration of degraded areas prioritising opportunities that strengthen gender inclusion																	80 000	80 000	SERNA

Other	Offices rents, utilities, licences	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	10 000	100 000	SERN A
Grand Total		349 947	183 000	241 000	484 200	499 750	436 750	224 750	434 750	226 000	162 000	3 24 2 14 7	11 0 57 8	16 7 00 0	3 519 725	
		22%			40%			19%		11%						

[1] In exceptional cases where GEF Agency receives funds for execution, Terms of Reference for specific activities are reviewed by GEF Secretariat

Please explain any aspects of the budget as needed here

ANNEX I: 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.