

Enhancing Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Land and Natural Resource Management

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10007

Countries

Sao Tome and Principe

Project Name

Enhancing Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Land and Natural Resource Management

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/27/2019

Review completed by PM

3/3/2020

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

- The project has evolved in comparison with the PIF at the light of the PPG: 1) 11,198 ha of coastal and marine areas will not be put under a marine protected area status (all the work on marine and coastal environment is cancelled) and 2) there is no more areas under SLM (17,767 ha). These changes are significant and could be considered as a major change, needing a circulation to GEF Council for four weeks.

- About the project title, please provide a revised letter of endorsement signed by the GEF OFP mentioning the new title.

February 25, 2020

Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

13Feb2020

Indeed, the project will now not work on marine biodiversity and not designate any marine protected areas, wherefore the GEB / core indicator target of 11,198 ha marine PA gazettment had to be removed. However, coastal biodiversity is still covered through the work on terrestrial PAs and land-use planning and related mainstreaming.

Regarding the SLM target area, the PIF had indeed indicated a target of 17,767 ha of “buffer zone around protected areas” to which SLM would be applied under LD; however, this was not entirely dropped as is implied in the comment – the 17,767 ha of SLM were replaced by 12,414 ha of “Area of landscapes under improved practices” (Core Indicator 4). This was explained in CEO ER and PRODOC in several places, most importantly in CEO ER §17: “...the 17,767 ha of “buffer zone around protected areas” to which SLM would be applied under LD, was replaced by a different and more realistic formula. Firstly, because the “buffer zone around protected areas” is poorly defined and demarcated and needs to be revisited; and secondly, because not all of the “buffer zone” could realistically be subjected to SLM given the [prevailing] land use. The new calculation now is more realistic and precise, by aiming to achieve improved practices and avoided loss in the 12,414 ha of HCV forest areas that are a better reference for the areas outside the PAs in which sustainable management or conservation regimes should be applied.”

A new Endorsement Letter was requested and received from the GEF OFP that was included in the revised PRODOC Annex 16.

2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

- In terms of language, please revise the notion of GEF implementing and executing agencies (para 286, 287):

- UNDP is the GEF Implementing Agency;
- The General Direction for the Environment (DGA) under the Ministry of Infrastructure, Public Works, Natural Resources and Environment is the main executing partner from the government, working with the Directorate of Forests and Biodiversity and The Secretariat for the Environment and Sustainable Development.
- Birdlife International will be the main technical executing partner.

We took note of the written request from the government to use UNDP as provider of some financing services. However, we would like some clarifications before taking a position on this request:

- Please provide the list of activities that will be executed by UNDP, with their respective budgets.
- For comparison, provide the budget amounts managed by Birdlife International and DGA.
- The use of GEF funds to purchase vehicles is strongly discouraged as such costs are normally expected to be borne by co-finance. Any request to use GEF funding to purchase project vehicles must be justified. The Secretariat assesses such requests and decides whether to approve them. Without more information, it is not possible to agree on the purchase of 3 Hilux, and a small 4x4 + maintenance. Cofinancing from the government and the GEF Agency (as announced at PIF level) would be welcome for these expenses.

February 25, 2020

- We take note and accept the role of UNDP providing project services at the request from the government (Project Document, annex 17a) and detailed in the letter of agreement (annex 17b).
- We also take note of the explanations provided to justify the purchase of two vehicles (one for each island), and found them acceptable. We accept, on an exception basis, this purchase, and at the condition that UNDP also buys one vehicle.

Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

13Feb2020



In UNDP terminology, the Ministry of Infrastructure, Public Works, Natural Resources and Environment / General Directorate for Environment is the national Implementing Partner. To reduce confusion, a parenthesis was added to CER §38 / PRODOC §287 “(per GEF terminology: *Executing Partner*)”, and CER §40 / PRODOC §289 was amended as follows “UNDP is *the GEF Implementing Agency and therefore* accountable...).

Under UNDP rules, there can only be one such Implementing Partner. The role of the Directorate of Forests and Biodiversity and Regional Secretariat for Environment and Sustainable Development, as well as that of BirdLife International was explained in CER § 44-45 / PRODOC §293-294. To reduce confusion, a parenthesis was added to CER §44 / PRODOC §293 “(per GEF terminology: *Technical Executing Partner*)”.

Regarding the list of activities executed and budgets managed by UNDP, BirdLife and DGA.

The USD 4,262,559 of GEF resources are made available for: IP DGA \$2,942,384 (69%), RP BLI \$1,277,100 (30%) and UNDP \$43,075 (1% DPC for national implementation support: transaction costs of procurement, etc., see in PRODOC Annex 17b). None of the **activities** will be executed by UNDP, except the implementation support under the \$43,075/1% DPC (details in the UNDP Support Services Letter of Agreement in PRODOC Annex 17b).

As per the risks identified in the third-party HACT Assessment, no cash can be transferred to the IP – wherefore the items procured by the IP will be paid by UNDP under the Direct Payment cash transfer modality.

Regarding the cost of vehicles for the project / implementing partner:

UNDP consulted Government on this matter, and the following is a consolidated response and reaction:

i. As was explained in the original PRODOC and CEO ER, especially in the CEO ER table under §13, the Government is not in the position to provide any cash/grant financing; the Government also does not have excess vehicles that could be made available from other sources.

ii. São Tomé and Príncipe is a SIDS with extremely low GDP and a persistent economic deceleration, especially in the last years since external financial fluxes have considerably diminished. Traditionally, the USD 150-160 million public budget depended to more than 95% on foreign support.

iii. While it would be appropriate and desirable that the country contributed to this and similar development projects by co-financing the vehicles necessary to project activities, the reality is that all or most vehicles in the public administration, including of high-ranking officials, come from bilateral and multilateral donors.

iv. In November 2019, the government announced that the 2020 public budget will amount to USD 159 million, with recurrent operational expenditures to be covered from internal revenue for the first time in history, thanks to the introduction of VAT as of January 2020 – while investment expenditures (such as vehicle purchases) will continue to be covered from foreign aid.

v. This project includes significant field work, with different project and national government teams requiring vehicles extensively during implementation (field work on PA management and surveillance, law enforcement, reforestation, work with communities and charcoal-makers, etc.). In addition, the project is active on both the islands of the country, each requiring their separate transport means.

vi. As for vehicle maintenance, the same principle associated to the lack of resources applies. In the recent past (2017-2019), UNDP transferred to government institutions full responsibility for vehicles purchased under projects, with the purpose of creating a gradual scheme for the coverage of expenses related to car maintenance and insurance. Evidence suggests that vehicles life is notably shortened by this procedure, since government will not make resources available in a timely manner for insurance and maintenance.

UNDP and the Government therefore in this resubmission propose the following: GEF resources will be used to purchase two of the four originally requested vehicles, and UNDP will provide new co-financing (USD 20,000) to finance a third.

The Total Budget and Work Plan with the Summary of Funds and Budget Notes in PRODOC Section VIII, like other sections and tables in the PRODOC (§301, Table 13) and CEO ER (Tables A-B-C, Table under §9, Tables under §13) related to budget and co-financing were updated/amended to reflect the above changes as well as some minor corrections after errors were detected during the review. The UNDP co-financing letter was added to PRODOC Annex 18.

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Cofinancing letters are provided.

We take note of the significant decrease in cofinancing from \$11,757,908 to \$6,204,000 due to the evolution of the project and the change in partnerships (cofinancing from the Ministry of Agriculture and IFAD was representing \$5 million).

- We regret that UNDP does not cofinance anymore (\$241,500 in grants). We would like UNDP to reconsider this point. It is not a good practice to promise funds at PIF level and not confirm them at CEO endorsement.

- We take note that the letter from Valudo mentions \$300,000 in cash and in-kind cofinancing. Please, explain on which criteria you split the resources between in cash and in-kind cofinancing... Written evidence from the partner would be welcome.

February 25, 2020

We appreciate the cofinancing from UNDP, as well as the revised letter from Valudo.

Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

13Feb2020

As outlined above, the UNDP has now committed USD 20,000. As explained in CEO ER table under §13, the UNDP Country Office in STP is not in the position to assign more resources anymore, and this co-finance is made available specifically for the purchase of critical transport means.

Regarding the USD 300,000 of co-financing from VALUDO: the company was now contacted and in response provided the calculation/details in the following table (translated from French), indicating USD 225,000 of cash and 75,000 of in-kind co-financing. All relevant budget tables were amended accordingly in the PRODOC (page 2, Table 13) and CEO ER (Table C, Table under §13). The email exchange is provided equally beneath the table.

	Category	Annual amount USD	Duration (years)	Total USD
Primary material	cash	18,000	5	90,000
Transport cost (maintenance, insurance and fuel)	cash	12,000	5	60,000
Production cost (generator, machine maintenance, labour)	cash	15,000	5	75,000
Distribution cost	in kind	3,000	5	15,000
Rent, insurance and security	in kind	12,000	5	60,000
Total				300,000

From: Guillaume Taufflieb <g.taufflieb@valudo.st>
Sent: 27 January 2020 13:44
To: Yves de Soye <yves.desoye@undp.org>
Subject: Re: Valudo Cofinance Explanation

Bonjour Yves,

Merci de trouver ci-joint un tableau avec les explications chiffrées du co-financement et répartition in-kind/ cash.

A ton écoute s'il y a des modifications à apporter.

Bien à toi,

Guillaume Taufflieb

Gérant | Valúdo, LDA

site: www.valudo.st

email: g.taufflieb@valudo.st

address: Largo de Bom Despacho - 725 São Tomé
São Tomé e Príncipe

Le 22 janv. 2020 à 19:23, Yves de Soye <yves.desoye@undp.org> a écrit :

Bonjour Guillaume (et JB si tu pouvais nous aider) :

Mes meilleurs vœux pour cette nouvelle année à toi et Valudo !

Nous avons reçu des commentaires du GEF sur le paquet envoyé le 26 décembre [...] y compris celui-ci :

- We take note that the letter from Valudo mentions \$300,000 in cash and in-kind cofinancing. Please, explain on which criteria you split the resources between in cash and in-kind cofinancing... Written evidence from the partner would be welcome.

Est-ce que tu pourrais / Valudo pourrait me faire un petit mail/courrier avec un calcul pour répondre à cela ? Je me rappelle d'un calcul que vous aviez fait ensemble / nous avons fait pour le cofinancement de Valudo, mais je ne trouve plus parmi les 1300 mails sur le projet entre novembre et décembre...

J'avais de mon côté divisé de manière aléatoire en deux les 300 000 USD => 150 000 cash + 150 000 in kind. A noter que j'appellerais CASH tout ce que vous dépenseriez EXTRA une fois que la chaîne de valeur charbon coco démarre - opérateurs du four, transports ; pendant que les actifs existant (camions, terrain, etc.) seraient du IN KIND

Tu peux changer les chiffres/ %, pas de soucis.

Merci de me dire !

Bât, Yves

Yves de Soye
Regional Technical Advisor, Ecosystems & Biodiversity
Bureau for Policy and Programme Support
UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub
E: yves.desoye@undp.org.
Skype: yvesdesoye.undp
www.undp.org

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Core indicators are provided; with significant changes (no more MPA for 11,198 ha and no more 17,767 ha under SLM)

Please confirm that the 6207 ha under 4.1 (management for biodiversity) and 4.4 (HCVF) are distinct, there is no double counting, and the sum is well 12,414 ha.

February 25, 2020

Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

13Feb2020

As explained above, and in more detail in CEO ER and PRODOC in several places (most importantly in CEO ER §17), the changes to the core indicator targets are not as drastic:

While it is correct that the core indicator target of 11,198 ha marine PA gazettelement was entirely removed, the 17,767 ha of “buffer zone around protected areas” to which SLM would be applied under LD was not entirely dropped but replaced by 12,414 ha of “Area of landscapes under improved practices” (Core Indicator 4).: *“...the 17,767 ha of “buffer zone around protected areas” to which SLM would be applied under LD, was replaced by a different and more realistic formula. Firstly, because the “buffer zone around protected areas” is poorly defined and demarcated and needs to be revisited; and secondly, because not all of the “buffer zone” could realistically be subjected to SLM given the [prevailing] land use. The new calculation now is more realistic and precise, by aiming to achieve improved practices and avoided loss in the 12,414 ha of HCV forest areas that are a better reference for the areas outside the PAs in which sustainable management or conservation regimes should be applied.”*

Regarding the 12,414 ha of HCV, it is confirmed that the two 6,207 ha under Core Indicator 4.1 and distinct from those under 4.4 and there is no double counting. The footnotes d) and e) under the Core Indicator tables in PRODOC Annex 6 provided the following explanations (which were also uploaded to the GEF portal in the December 2019 submission):

(d): Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity: estimated to 50% of 10,913 ha of HCV in São Tomé (the half not under avoided loss below) + 50% of the HCV areas to be identified on Príncipe (1,500 ha estimated before studies, so 50%=750 ha; the half not under avoided loss below).

(e): Avoid loss of HCV Forests: estimated to 50% of 10,913 ha of HCV in São Tomé (the half not under better management above) + 50% of the HCV areas to be identified on Príncipe (1,500 ha estimated before studies, so 50%=750 ha; the half not under better management above; the objective is not to avoid wholesale conversion but to avoid HCV trigger status loss from forest degradation by unsustainable selective logging and natural resource exploitation.

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement NA

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Yes, we especially appreciate the partnership with BirdLife International, also executing agency under the UE-ECOFAC 6 programme.

Response to Secretariat comments

9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Not fully.

UNDP responded to the questions asked before the Council (France, USA).

However, we received complementary comments from Germany and the USA after the Council (<http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/work-program-documents/Compilation%20of%20Council%20Comments%20-%20June%202018%20Work%20Program.pdf>). Please include these comments and your responses in the Annex B of the request for CEO endorsement.

February 25, 2020

Addressed. However, the connection with the US Administration in STP and Libreville needs to be confirmed at the inception workshop and included in the first PIR.

Response to Secretariat comments

13Feb2020

Responses to these additional comments were added to Annex B in the CEO ER; amendments were made in PRODOC and CEO ER accordingly as indicated in these responses.

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement NA

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Not yet. Please address the comments above.

February 25, 2020

The project is recommended for CEO endorsement. The PPG results led to a project amendment without change in GEF financing - the project will not deliver 11,980 ha of marine protected areas. We reviewed the project and found the amendment acceptable. However, following the procedures for major amendments, we also recommend a circulation to the Council for four weeks for comments and approval.

Portal issue: Please, correct the Executing Partner Type:

CEO Endorsement (CEO) entry – Full Sized Project – GEF - 6

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID
10007

Type of Trust Fund
GET

Countries
Sao Tome and Principe

Other Executing Partner(s):
Ministry of Infrastructure, Public Works, Natural Resources and Environment / General Directorate for Environment

GEF Focal Area
Multi Focal Area

Project Type
FSP

Project Title
Enhancing Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Land and Natural Resource Management

Agency(ies)
UNDP

Executing Partner Type
GEF Agency

Taxonomy
Focal Areas, Influencing models, Stakeholders, Gender

March 3, 2020

Addressed. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

April 6, 2020

Please, address the two following items:

1- Audit should be removed from the M&E budget:

Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) and management response	UNDP Evaluation Specialists and independent evaluation consultants.	42,000	30 November 2025
Audit	Appointed auditors for project audits	4,000/yr * 6 yrs = 24,000	Annually or other frequency as per UNDP Audit policies.
TOTAL indicative COST		USD 133,000	Noting this does not entirely reflect the M&E costs in the TBWP which are higher but cannot be easily transposed to this table

2- About the vehicles, we have had exchanges by email to clarify the situation. It is important to summarize the whole situation and have a common understanding. Please confirm and/or complete the following items:

- a. We already agreed that the GEF project will budget two new vehicles for the Administration (\$35,000). UNDP will buy a vehicle with core resources accounted in cofinancing. Birdlife provides two more vehicles (one for ST, the other for Principe) with cofinancing from EU/COMIFAC6. A third car is also financed by cofinancing for a NGO on the field – OIKOS- who is part of the consortium to execute the EU/COMIFAC project.
- b. Two second-hand vehicles (\$30,000x2) are budgeted in the project for BirdLife International and the additional GEF activities. These two vehicles will complete the Birdlife International 's fleet covered by EU/COMIFAC (two vehicles).
- c. About the motorcycles: 13 motorcycles are budgeted to the GEF project (13 x \$4,000 = \$52,000), in view to implement the protection and development strategy of the Biosphere Reserve. These two-wheel vehicles are essential for mobility where the roads are very bad or do simply not exist. In complement EU/COMIFAC pays for six additional motorcycles for surveillance and ecotourism activities (4 in Sao Tome and 2 in Principe).
- d. On top of these, there are vehicle maintenance, fuel, and insurance costs associated with them. The total reaches \$450,000, nearly 11% of the GEF financing.

Row Labels	Sum of Total
Fuel	182,000
Insurance	43,000
Maintenance	43,000
Purchase	182,000
Grand Total	450,000

- e. All the vehicles bought by BirdLife International will be transferred to the Administration when the projects will close (EU/COMIFAC and GEF).

Once you will have responded to these two pending items, we will recommend the project for CEO endorsement.

April 13, 2020

The two points are addressed.

We discussed with GEF management and agreed with the purchase of the requested two-wheel and four-wheel vehicles - these vehicles are needed for the project strategy, and several other vehicles are covered by cofinancing. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

Response to Secretariat comments

13Feb2020

Responses to the comments are fully provided in the sections above.

In addition, a minor oversight was detected in the maps of target sites (PRODOC Figs 14 & 15, CEO ER Annex E), these were updated.

03March2020

The Executing Partner Type is corrected

09 April 2020

1. Audit Costs were removed from the M&E table in PRODOC Section V Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan, and the cost total for that table was accordingly reduced from USD 133,000 to USD 109,000.

2. In response to the query on transport means, the above statements are confirmed in the following slightly amended form:

a new. "The GEF project will budget two new vehicles for the Administration (\$35,000 x 2). UNDP will buy a vehicle with core resources accounted in cofinancing. Birdlife provides two more vehicles (one for ST, the other for Principe, used in the respective Natural Parks) with cofinancing from EU/ECOFAC6. A third car is also provided from EU/ECOFAC6 cofinancing to the NGO OIKOS, for community development work in ST, as part of the consortium executing the EU/ECOFAC6 project."

b new. Two second-hand vehicles (\$30,000 x 2) are budgeted in the project for BirdLife International and the additional GEF activities. These two vehicles will complement Birdlife International's fleet covered by EU/ECOFAC6 (two vehicles).

c new. About the motorcycles: 13 motorcycles are budgeted to the GEF project (13 x \$4,000 = \$52,000: 10 for the government of which 7 for ST, and 3 for Principe; and 3 for BirdLife, 2 for ST and 1 for Principe), to implement the protection and development strategy of the Natural Parks and operationalise environmental law enforcement. These two-wheel vehicles are essential for mobility where the roads are very bad or do simply not exist. In complement EU/ECOFAC6 pays for six additional motorcycles for surveillance and ecotourism activities (4 in ST and 2 in Principe).

d new. On top of these, there are vehicle maintenance, fuel, and insurance costs associated with them. The total reaches \$447,400, 10% of the GEF project grant:

FUEL	MAINT	INSURANCE	VEHICLES	MOTOS	TOTALS	
179,400	43,000	43,000	130,000	52,000	447,400	TOTAL

e new. All the vehicles bought by BirdLife International will eventually be transferred to the Administration; the GEF financed vehicles upon closure of the GEF project; and the EU/ECOFAC6-financed vehicles upon closure of the EU/ECOFAC6 project or of a possible new project phase funded by the EU.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations

Context

Geographically, the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome y Principe (STP) consists of two volcanic islands situated in the Gulf of Guinea, off the western equatorial coast of Central-West Africa, with a population of #200,000 (10,000 in Principe). STP has never been with the continent, separated by ocean depths exceeding 3,000m. STP is classified amongst the countries with the highest levels of endemic species in the world, mainly birds, amphibians, plants, bats, reptiles, butterflies and molluscs distributed in different terrestrial and marine ecosystems and habitats. STP in its entirety is identified as a Key Biodiversity Area (KBA), and a global priority for conservation. The Obô Natural Park in São Tomé and Obô Natural Park in Príncipe cover one-third of the islands. The entire island of Principe, its islets, and the surrounding marine areas were classified as a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve since 2012 (more than 71,000 ha).

STP is both a SIDS and LDC, with about half of the population below the poverty line. The main economic sectors of STP are 73% from services (14% from tourism), 15% from industry, and 12% from agriculture. The main export crops are cocoa (est. 95% of agricultural exports), coffee, copra, and palm kernels. The terrestrial and coastal and marine landscapes of São Tomé and Príncipe are subject to numerous threats including land conversion for large-scale agriculture and agriculture developments, and the over-exploitation of forest resources from largely illegal timber logging and charcoal processing.

The GEF project will provide an additional investment to the European Union funded Forests Ecosystems in Central Africa Programme (ECOFAC), implemented by BirdLife International.

Project

The project aims to “Safeguard globally significant terrestrial biodiversity and ecosystems services by strengthening national capacities and frameworks for biodiversity and natural resource management, integrated land use planning and environmental law enforcement as well as enhancing protected area management and the sustainability of charcoal production”. The project is designed through four components: 1) Enhancing systems and enforcement for biodiversity conservation and integrated landscape and natural resource management; 2) Management, monitoring and financing of PAs and adjacent key biodiversity and forest areas; 3) Reducing forest degradation and ecosystem loss from unsustainable charcoal-making; and 4) M&E, Knowledge Management and Gender.

Global Environment Benefits

The project will contribute to improve the management of 32,454 ha of protected areas and 12,414 ha of landscapes. The project targets 2,000 beneficiaries (half women).

Alignment with GEF6 Strategies

The project aligned with BD1.1 (PA), BD4.9 (human-biodiversity interface), LD2.3 (forests), and LD3.4 (landscape approach).

Country Priorities

The project is aligned with national strategies, as the NBSAP II (2015-2020), the Strategy on Desertification and Land Degradation (2005), as well as the Second National Poverty Reduction Strategy.

Sustainability, Innovation & Scaling up

Sustainability is an issue in STP, in a country where 95% of the national budget is dependent from ODA. However, there is a stakeholder engagement strategy for sustainability in view of reinforcing capacities of institutions, CSO, and partners. The project design is innovative, including innovations in business models with PPP between the government and the private sector (Valudo, coconut based products), innovations in policies and institutions, also in view of sustainability with sustainable financing mechanisms (PPP, conservation trust fund). The project’s experience will create opportunities for scaling-up.