



## **Resilient and sustainable livelihoods for rural Yemen**

### **Part I: Project Information**

**GEF ID**

10562

**Project Type**

FSP

**Type of Trust Fund**

MTF

**CBIT/NGI**

**CBIT No**

**NGI No**

**Project Title**

Resilient and sustainable livelihoods for rural Yemen

**Countries**

Yemen

**Agency(ies)**

FAO

**Other Executing Partner(s)**

Environmental Protection Agency -Ministry of Environment and Water

**Executing Partner Type**

Government

**GEF Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Sector**

AFOLU

**Taxonomy**

Focal Areas, Land Degradation, Sustainable Land Management, Income Generating Activities, Sustainable Agriculture, Integrated and Cross-sectoral approach, Community-Based Natural Resource Management, Sustainable Livelihoods, Land Degradation Neutrality, Land Cover and Land cover change, Climate Change, Climate Change Adaptation, Least Developed Countries, Livelihoods, Mainstreaming adaptation, Climate resilience, Ecosystem-based Adaptation, Biodiversity, Mainstreaming, Fisheries, Agriculture and agrobiodiversity, Forestry - Including HCVF and REDD+, Influencing models, Transform policy and regulatory environments, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Stakeholders, Private Sector, Individuals/Entrepreneurs, SMEs, Financial intermediaries and market facilitators, Communications, Behavior change, Beneficiaries, Civil Society, Community Based Organization, Non-Governmental Organization, Type of Engagement, Consultation, Participation, Local Communities, Gender Equality, Gender results areas, Knowledge Generation and Exchange, Participation and leadership, Access to benefits and services, Awareness Raising, Capacity Development, Access and control over natural resources, Gender Mainstreaming, Gender-sensitive indicators, Women groups, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Knowledge Exchange, Peer-to-Peer, Field Visit, Twinning, Knowledge Generation, Master Classes, Training, Workshop, Seminar, Professional Development

**Rio Markers****Climate Change Mitigation**

No Contribution 0

**Climate Change Adaptation**

Principal Objective 2

**Biodiversity****Land Degradation****Submission Date**

3/23/2020

**Expected Implementation Start**

10/1/2022

**Expected Completion Date**

9/30/2029

**Duration**

84In Months

**Agency Fee(\$)**

1,445,202.00

**A. FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS**

<b>Objectives/Programs</b>	<b>Focal Area Outcomes</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>GEF Amount(\$)</b>	<b>Co-Fin Amount(\$)</b>
CCA-1	CCA-1	LDCF	5,006,056.00	32,500,000.00
CCA-2	CCA-2	LDCF	4,000,000.00	26,000,000.00
BD-1-1	Mainstreaming	GET	5,079,416.00	32,000,000.00
LD-1-1	SLM	GET	1,100,000.00	8,000,000.00
LD-2-5	LDN	GET	872,326.00	5,718,400.00
<b>Total Project Cost(\$)</b>			<b>16,057,798.00</b>	<b>104,218,400.00</b>

0

## B. Project description summary

### Project Objective

Support the development of sustainable and resilient livelihoods for rural Yemenis by mainstreaming climate change adaptation, biodiversity conservation, and SLM across productive agriculture, livestock and fisheries sectors

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
1. Spatial planning describes and prioritizes conservation and sustainable production practices to increase climate change resilience across terrestrial and marine areas	Investment	Outcome 1. Spatial and land use planning ensures terrestrial and marine resource use is appropriately situated to maximize production while promoting biodiversity conservation, SLM, and climate change adaptation.	1.1 Government and private enterprise capacity built to enable creation and administration of spatial planning  1.2 Government and private enterprises adopt, implement, and monitor legally binding spatial plans	GET	1,015,780.00	13,000,000.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
1. Spatial planning describes and prioritizes conservation and sustainable production practices to increase climate change resilience across terrestrial and marine areas	Investment	Outcome 1. Spatial and land use planning ensures terrestrial and marine resource use is appropriately situated to maximize production while promoting biodiversity conservation, SLM, and climate change adaptation.	1.1 Government and private enterprise capacity built to enable creation and administration of spatial planning  1.2 Government and private enterprises adopt, implement, and monitor legally binding spatial plans	LDC F	1,293,333.00	24,846,000.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
2. Agriculture, livestock, and fisheries practices stimulated to improve livelihoods and mainstream conservation to increase climate change resilience	Investment	Outcome 2: Private enterprises adopt innovative agriculture, fisheries, and livestock production practices that improve livelihoods while delivering biodiversity, SLM, and climate adaptation benefits	2.1 Extension training program assists agriculture, livestock and fisheries enterprises to mainstream conservation within productive practices  2.2 Market innovations generate economic incentives for improved agriculture, livestock and fisheries production	GET	4,888,385.00	25,718,400.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
2. Agriculture, livestock, and fisheries practices stimulated to improve livelihoods and mainstream conservation to increase climate change resilience	Investment	Outcome 2: Private enterprises adopt innovative agriculture, fisheries, and livestock production practices that improve livelihoods while delivering biodiversity, SLM, and climate adaptation benefits	2.1 Extension training program assists agriculture, livestock and fisheries enterprises to mainstream conservation within productive practices  2.2 Market innovations generate economic incentives for improved agriculture, livestock and fisheries production	LDC F	5,348,729.00	26,251,600.00

<b>Project Component</b>	<b>Financing Type</b>	<b>Expected Outcomes</b>	<b>Expected Outputs</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>GEF Project Financing(\$)</b>	<b>Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)</b>
3: Policy and regulatory frameworks guarantee enduring results by integrating lessons learned	Technical Assistance	Outcome 3: Policies and knowledge management reflect project results, including incentivizing production practices that improve livelihoods and benefit biodiversity conservation, SLM, and climate change adaptation	3.1 Targeted capacity building generates policy and regulatory improvements  3.2 Effective monitoring and evaluation implemented with project lessons captured, disseminated and upscaled	GET	811,780.00	4,500,000.00
3: Policy and regulatory frameworks guarantee enduring results by integrating lessons learned	Technical Assistance	Outcome 3: Policies and knowledge management reflect project results, including incentivizing production practices that improve livelihoods and benefit biodiversity conservation, SLM, and climate change adaptation	3.1 Targeted capacity building generates policy and regulatory improvements  3.2 Effective monitoring and evaluation implemented with project lessons captured, disseminated and upscaled	LDC F	1,935,134.00	4,902,400.00



Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
				<b>Sub Total (\$)</b>	<b>15,293,141.00</b>	<b>99,218,400.00</b>
<b>Project Management Cost (PMC)</b>						
	GET		335,797.00		2,500,000.00	
	LDCF		428,860.00		2,500,000.00	
	<b>Sub Total(\$)</b>		<b>764,657.00</b>		<b>5,000,000.00</b>	
	<b>Total Project Cost(\$)</b>		<b>16,057,798.00</b>		<b>104,218,400.00</b>	
<b>Please provide justification</b>						

**C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type**

<b>Sources of Co-financing</b>	<b>Name of Co-financier</b>	<b>Type of Co-financing</b>	<b>Investment Mobilized</b>	<b>Amount(\$)</b>
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment and Water - EPA	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	369,600.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	268,800.00
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	Investment mobilized	103,580,000.00
<b>Total Co-Financing(\$)</b>				<b>104,218,400.00</b>

**Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified**

New and additional investments from project partners executed in the same geography and during the same period of time, have been mapped and relevant projects and programs capitalized and recognized as mobilized investment. These include: ? Consolidating the Decentralized Integrated Water Resource Management System in Sana'a Basin, Yemen (Sana'a Basin Project Phase II) ? GCP /YEM/048/NET ? Strengthening of the National Designated Authority in Yemen and Enabling Strategic Frameworks for Engagement with the Green Climate Fund - GCP/YEM/048/GCR ? FAO Resilience Programme in the Irrigation and Agricultural Sector -GCP/YEM/046/GER ? Yemen Food Security Response and Resilience - GCP/YEM/103/WBK and GCP/YEM/104/WBK ? Sustainable Watershed Management through Reinforced Governance, Resilience and Regenerative Agriculture - Concept Note # 717462 ? Supporting Resilient Livelihoods and Food Security in Yemen Joint Programme (ERRY III) - UNJP/YEM/049/EC All these programmes and projects are executed by FAO and details are found in the project justification section of the CEO Endorsement Request.

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

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Programming of Funds</b>	<b>Amount(\$)</b>	<b>Fee(\$)</b>	<b>Total(\$)</b>
FAO	LD CF	Yemen	Climate Change	NA	9,006,056	810,545	9,816,601.00
FAO	GET	Yemen	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	5,079,416	457,147	5,536,563.00
FAO	GET	Yemen	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	1,972,326	177,510	2,149,836.00
<b>Total Grant Resources(\$)</b>					<b>16,057,798.00</b>	<b>1,445,202.00</b>	<b>17,503,000.00</b>

**E. Non Grant Instrument**

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

---

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

**F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)**

PPG Required **true**

**PPG Amount (\$)**

300,000

**PPG Agency Fee (\$)**

27,000

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Programming of Funds</b>	<b>Amount(\$)</b>	<b>Fee(\$)</b>	<b>Total(\$)</b>
FAO	LDC F	Yemen	Climate Change	NA	168,256	15,143	<b>183,399.00</b>
FAO	GET	Yemen	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	94,896	8,541	<b>103,437.00</b>
FAO	GET	Yemen	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	36,848	3,316	<b>40,164.00</b>
<b>Total Project Costs(\$)</b>					<b>300,000.00</b>	<b>27,000.00</b>	<b>327,000.00</b>

## Core Indicators

**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)
118000.00	115000.00	0.00	0.00

**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)
45,000.00	45,000.00		

**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)
70,000.00	70,000.00		

**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)
Select	3,000.00	3,000.00		

**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)

**Documents (Please upload document(s) that justifies the HCVF)**

Title

Submitted

**Indicator 5 Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity (excluding protected areas)**

<b>Ha (Expected at PIF)</b>	<b>Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>Ha (Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>Ha (Achieved at TE)</b>
100,000.00	100,000.00		

**Indicator 5.1 Fisheries under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations**

<b>Number (Expected at PIF)</b>	<b>Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>Number (Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>Number (Achieved at TE)</b>

Type/name of the third-party certification

**Indicator 5.2 Large Marine Ecosystems with reduced pollution and hypoxia**

<b>Number (Expected at PIF)</b>	<b>Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>Number (achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>Number (achieved at TE)</b>
0	0	0	0

<b>LME at PIF</b>	<b>LME at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>LME at MTR</b>	<b>LME at TE</b>

**Indicator 5.3 Amount of Marine Litter Avoided**

<b>Metric Tons (expected at PIF)</b>	<b>Metric Tons (expected at CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>Metric Tons (Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>Metric Tons (Achieved at TE)</b>

**Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated**

<b>Total Target Benefit</b>	<b>(At PIF)</b>	<b>(At CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>(Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>(Achieved at TE)</b>

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (direct)	0	5953387	0	0
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (indirect)	0	12269046	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 CO <sub>2</sub> e (direct)		5,953,387		
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (indirect)		12,269,046		
Anticipated start year of accounting		2023		
Duration of accounting		20		

**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 CO <sub>2</sub> e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting				
Duration of accounting				

**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 8 Globally over-exploited fisheries moved to more sustainable levels

Metric Tons (Expected at PIF)	Metric Tons (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Metric Tons (Achieved at MTR)	Metric Tons (Achieved at TE)
	2,500.00		

#### Fishery Details

Annual national catch exceeds 250,000 tons. However, project target estimates are a conservative portion of the catch documented for the project areas Socotra and Al-Maharah. Socotra: Annual fisheries: 3,600 metric tons (estimate). Al-Maharah: Annual fisheries: 86,161 metric tons (estimate, even though Hawf numbers are much lower, though not available). There are nearly 730 species of fish, including 600 commercial species. There are more than 300 species of crab, lobster, and shrimp. Target species include shallow demersal and reef fishes, rock lobster, sea cucumber inshore. The high value families targeted include: Groupers, trevallies or jacks, snappers, sweetlips and emperors. Increasingly, deep demersal species and large pelagic fishes such as kingfish, tuna, and billfish. The fishery actively targets a variety of sharks including silvertip, spot-tail, hammerhead, blacktip reef, and tiger.

#### 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	60,000	60,000		
Male	60,000	60,000		
Total	120000	120000	0	0

Provide additional explanation on targets, other methodologies used, and other focal area specifics (i.e., Aichi targets in BD) including justification where core indicator targets are not provided

## Meta Information - LDCF

---

LDCF true

SCCF-B (Window B) on technology transfer false

SCCF-A (Window-A) on climate Change adaptation false

---

Is this project LDCF SCCF challenge program?  
false

---

This Project involves at least one small island developing State(SIDS). false

---

This Project involves at least one fragile and conflict affected state. true

---

This Project will provide direct adaptation benefits to the private sector. true

---

This Project is explicitly related to the formulation and/or implementation of national adaptation plans (NAPs). false

---

This Project has an urban focus. false

---

This Project covers the following sector(s)[the total should be 100%]:\*

Agriculture	<b>50.00%</b>
Natural resources management	<b>25.00%</b>
Climate information Services	<b>0.00%</b>
Costal zone management	<b>25.00%</b>
Water resources Management	<b>0.00%</b>
Disaster risk Management	<b>0.00%</b>
Other infrastructure	<b>0.00%</b>
Health	<b>0.00%</b>
Other (Please specify:)	<b>0.00%</b>
Total	<b>100%</b>

---

This Project targets the following Climate change Exacerbated/introduced challenges:\*

Sea level rise true

Change in mean temperature true

Increased Climatic Variability true

Natural hazards true

Land degradation true  
Costal and/or Coral reef degradation true  
GroundWater quality/quantity true

---

To calculate the core indicators, please refer to [Results Guidance](#)

## Core Indicators - LDCF

<b>CORE INDICATOR 1</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>% for Women</b>
Total number of direct beneficiaries	330,000	165,000	165,000	50.00%
<b>CORE INDICATOR 2</b>				
Area of land managed for climate resilience (ha)	100,000.0	0		
<b>CORE INDICATOR 3</b>				
Total no. of policies/plans that will mainstream climate resilience	3			
<b>CORE INDICATOR 4</b>				
Total number of people trained	30,360	15,180	15,180	50.00%

## OUTPUT 1.1.1

# Physical and natural assets made more resilient to climate variability and change

---

		Male	Female
Total number of direct beneficiaries from more resilient physical assets	<b>105,000</b>	<b>52,500</b>	<b>52,500</b>
Ha of agriculture land	Ha of urban landscape	Ha of rural landscape	No. of residential houses
<b>100,000.00</b>			<b>0</b>
No. of public buildings	No. of irrigation or water structures	No. of fishery or aquaculture ponds	No. of ports or landing sites
<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>
Km of road	Km of riverban	Km of coast	Km of storm water drainage
		<b>300.00</b>	
Other	Other(unit)	Comments	
<b>0</b>			

## OUTPUT 1.1.2

# Livelihoods and sources of income of vulnerable populations diversified and strengthened

---

		Male	Female
Total number of direct beneficiaries with diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income	<b>105,000</b>	<b>52,500</b>	<b>52,500</b>
<b>Livelihoods and sources of incomes strengthened / introduced</b>			
Agriculture	Agro-Processing	Pastoralism/diary	Enhanced access to markets
<b>true</b>	<b>true</b>	<b>true</b>	<b>false</b>
Fisheries /aquaculture	Tourism /ecotourism	Cottage industry	Reduced supply chain
<b>true</b>	<b>false</b>	<b>false</b>	<b>false</b>
Beekeeping	Enhanced opportunity to employment	Other	Comments
<b>false</b>	<b>true</b>	<b>false</b>	

## OUTPUT 1.1.3

### New/improved climate information systems deployed to reduce

# vulnerability to climatic hazards/variability

---

		Male	Female
Total number of direct beneficiaries from the new/improved climatic information systems	<b>105,000</b>	<b>52,500</b>	<b>52,500</b>
<b>Climate hazards addressed</b>			
Flood	Storm	Heatwave	Drought
<b>false</b>	<b>true</b>	<b>true</b>	<b>true</b>
Other	Comments		
<b>false</b>			
<b>Climate information system developed/strengthened</b>			
Downscaled Climate model	Weather/Hydromet station	Early warning system	Other
<b>true</b>	<b>false</b>	<b>true</b>	<b>false</b>
Comments			
<b>Climate related information collected</b>			

Temperature	Rainfall	Crop pest or disease	Human disease vectors
<b>true</b>	<b>true</b>	<b>true</b>	<b>false</b>

Other	Comments
<b>false</b>	

**Mode of climate information dissemination**

Mobile phone apps	Community radio	Extension services	Televisions
<b>true</b>	<b>true</b>	<b>true</b>	<b>false</b>

Leaflets	Other	Comments
<b>false</b>	<b>false</b>	

## **OUTPUT 1.1.4**

# **Vulnerable natural ecosystems strengthened in response to climate change impacts**

---

### Types of natural ecosystem

Desert	Coastal	Mountainous	Grassland
<b>true</b>	<b>true</b>	<b>true</b>	<b>true</b>
Forest	Inland water	Other	Comments
<b>true</b>	<b>false</b>	<b>false</b>	

## **OUTPUT 1.2.1**

# **Incubators and accelerators introduced**

---

Total no. of entrepreneurs supported	0	Male <b>7,500</b>	Female <b>7,500</b>
No. of incubators and accelerators supported	0	Comments	
No. of adaptation technologies supported	0	Comments	

## OUTPUT 1.2.2

### Financial instruments or models to enhance climate resilient developed

---

#### Financial instruments or models

PPP models <b>false</b>	Cooperatives <b>true</b>	Microfinance <b>true</b>	Risk insurance <b>false</b>
Equity <b>false</b>	Loan <b>false</b>	Other <b>false</b>	Comments

## OUTPUT 2.1.1



## Cross-sectoral policies and plans incorporate adaptation considerations

---

Will mainstream climate resilience	Of which no. of regional policies/plans	Of which no. of national policies/plan		
<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>		
<b>Sectors</b>				
Agriculture <b>true</b>	Fishery <b>true</b>	Industry <b>false</b>	Urban <b>false</b>	
Rural <b>true</b>	Health <b>false</b>	Water <b>true</b>	Other <b>false</b>	

Comments

### OUTPUT 2.1.2

## Cross sectoral institutional partnerships established or expanded

---

No. of institutional partnerships established or strengthened	<b>0</b>
---------------------------------------------------------------	----------

Comments

### **OUTPUT 2.1.3**

## **Systems and frameworks established for continuous monitoring, reporting and review of adaptation**

---

No. of systems and frameworks      **3**

Comments

### **OUTPUT 2.1.4**

## **Systems and frameworks established for continuous monitoring, reporting and review of adaptation**

---

No. of systems and frameworks      **3**

Comments

### **OUTPUT 2.2.1**

## **No. of institutions with increased ability to access and/or manage climate finance**

---

No. of institution(s)    **2**

Comments

### **OUTPUT 2.2.2**

**Institutional coordination mechanism created or strengthened to access and/or manage climate finance**

---

No. of mechanism(s)    **0**

Comments

### **OUTPUT 2.2.3**

**Global/regional/national initiatives demonstrated and tested early concepts with high adaptation potential**

---

No. of initiatives or technologies 0

Comments

## **OUTPUT 2.2.4**

### **Public investment mobilized**

---

Amount of investment (US\$) 0

Comments

## **OUTPUT 2.2.5**

### **Private investment mobilized**

---

Amount of investment (US\$) 0

Comments

## OUTPUT 2.3.1

# No. of people trained regarding climate change impacts and appropriate adaptation responses

---

Total no. of people trained	<b>30,360</b>	Male <b>15,180</b>	Female <b>15,180</b>
Of which total no. of people at line ministries	<b>60</b>	Male <b>30</b>	Female <b>30</b>
Of which total no. of community/association	<b>15,000</b>	Male <b>7,500</b>	Female <b>7,500</b>
Of which total no. of extension service officers	<b>100</b>	Male <b>50</b>	Female <b>50</b>
Of which total no. of hydromet and disaster risk management agency staff	<b>0</b>	Male <b>0</b>	Female <b>0</b>
Of which total no. of small private business owners	<b>15,000</b>	Male <b>7,500</b>	Female <b>7,500</b>
		Male	Female

Of which total no. school children, university students or teachers **200** **100** **100**

Other

Comments

## **OUTPUT 2.3.2**

### **No. of people made aware of climate change impacts and appropriate adaptation responses**

---

		Male	Female
No. of people with raised awareness	<b>105,000</b>	<b>52,500</b>	<b>52,500</b>

Please describe how their awareness was raised

## **OUTPUT 3.1.1**

### **National climate policies and plans enabled including NAP processes by stronger climate information decision-support services**

---

No. of national climate  
policies and plans

Comments

## **OUTPUT 3.1.2**

### **Systems and frameworks established for continuous monitoring, reporting and review of adaptation**

---

No. of systems and  
frameworks

Comments

## **OUTPUT 3.1.3**

### **Vulnerability assessments conducted**

---

No. of assessments  
conducted

Comments

### **OUTPUT 3.2.1**

**No. of institutions with increased ability to access and/or manage climate finance**

---

No. of institution(s)

Comments

### **OUTPUT 3.2.2**

**Institutional coordination mechanism(s) created or strengthened to access and/or manage climate finance**

---

No. of mechanism(s)

Comments

### **OUTPUT 3.2.3**



# Global/regional/national initiative(s) demonstrated and tested early concepts with high adaptation potential

---

No. of initiative(s) or  
technology(ies)

Comments

## OUTPUT 3.3.1

### No. of people trained regarding climate change impacts and appropriate adaptation responses

---

Total no. of people trained	<b>0</b>	Male	Female
		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Of which total no. of people at line ministries	<b>0</b>	Male	Female

Of which total no. of community/association	0	Male	Female
Of which total no. of extension service officers	0	Male	Female
Of which total no. of hydromet and disaster risk management agency staff	0	Male	Female
Of which total no. of small private business owners	0	Male	Female
Of which total no. school children, university students or teachers	0	Male	Female
Other	Comments		

## OUTPUT 3.3.2

### No. of people made aware of climate change impacts and appropriate adaptation responses

---

No. of people with raised awareness	0	Male	Female
-------------------------------------	---	------	--------

Please describe how their awareness was raised

## **Part II. Project Justification**

### **1a. Project Description**

### **1b. Project Map and Coordinates**

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

### **1c. Child Project?**

**If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.**

## **2. Stakeholders**

**Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase:**

**Civil Society Organizations**

**Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities**

**Private Sector Entities**

**If none of the above, please explain why:**

**Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.**

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement

**Select what role civil society will play in the project:**

**Consulted only;**

**Member of Advisory Body; Contractor;**

**Co-financier;**

**Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body;**

**Executor or co-executor;**

**Other (Please explain)**

### **3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Provide the gender analysis or equivalent socio-economic assesment.**

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

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

**Improving women's participation and decision making**

**Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women**

**Does the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?**

### **4. Private sector engagement**

**Elaborate on the private sector's engagement in the project, if any.**

### **5. Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):**

### **6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination**

**Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.**

### **7. Consistency with National Priorities**

**Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assesments under relevant conventions from below:**

**NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.**

**8. Knowledge Management**

**Elaborate the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, including a budget, key deliverables and a timeline, and explain how it will contribute to the project's overall impact.**

**9. Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Describe the budgeted M and E plan**

**10. Benefits**

**Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels, as appropriate. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCE/SCCF)?**

**11. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks**

Provide information on the identified environmental and social risks and potential impacts associated with the project/program based on your organization's ESS systems and procedures

**Overall Project/Program Risk Classification \***

<b>PIF</b>	<b>CEO Endorsement/Approva l</b>	<b>MTR</b>	<b>TE</b>
<b>Medium/Moderate</b>			

**Measures to address identified risks and impacts**

Elaborate on the types and risk classifications/ratings of any identified environmental and social risks and impacts (considering the GEF ESS Minimum Standards) and any measures undertaken as well as planned management measures to address these risks during implementation.

Risk identified	Risk Classification	Mitigation Action (s)	Indicator / Mean(s) of Verification	Progress on mitigation action
-----------------	---------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------

<p>ESS #2 SAFEGUARD 2 BIODIVERSITY, ECOSYSTEMS AND NATURAL HABITATS</p>	<p>Moderate (reclassified from High, based on discussion with FAO ESM Unit)</p>	<p>One of the project's core objectives is biodiversity conservation, hence it will directly address the current state of overexploitation of resources in protected areas, which are being overused for livestock production and fisheries. Spatial planning activities will strengthen the implementation of conservation values by: promoting the regulation of uses in protected areas; identifying and conserving migratory corridors and buffer areas to increase climate change resilience; rehabilitate degraded areas (mangrove); restore marine and terrestrial environments in protected areas and buffer zones.</p>	<p>Total area under improved management expanded.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Risk identified: 2.1 - Would this project be implemented within a legally designated protected area or its buffer zone?</p>	<p>The project will also equip and capacitate the competent institutes (in particular EPA and MFW) to better manage and monitor the protected areas, terrestrial and marine biodiversity and enforce relevant regulations.</p>	<p>The project will also equip and capacitate the competent institutes (in particular EPA and MFW) to better manage and monitor the protected areas, terrestrial and marine biodiversity and enforce relevant regulations.</p>		
		<p>Without such planning, protected areas will be threatened by encroachment by production practices incompatible with biodiversity conservation objectives. The expected results are:</p>		
		<p>Protection of 390,000 hectares of terrestrial and 1,781,861 hectares of marine area for a total of 2,171,861 hectares all within protected areas or buffer zones, currently utilized for livestock and fisheries. This would include improved conservation of 67,000 hectares of sublittoral biotopes, 18,000 hectares of reef and unknown areas of mangroves and seagrass habitat; restoration of 5,000 acres of agricultural and grazing lands; and, regeneration of coastal mangroves covering at least 1,000 hectares.</p>		

**Supporting Documents**

Upload available ESS supporting documents.

Title	Module	Submitted
ESS certificate	CEO Endorsement ESS	



**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).**

Result Chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-Term Milestone	Targets	Means of Verification
Project Objective: Support the development of sustainable and resilient livelihoods for rural Yemenis by mainstreaming climate change adaptation, biodiversity conservation, and SLM across productive agriculture, livestock and fisheries sectors.	Hectares of productive land under sustainable and resilient management benefiting biodiversity with LDN targets established, monitored, and on-track to achievement.	0 ha	50,000 ha	118,000 ha	Project evaluations and reports  Project emplaced monitoring and assessment tools
	Hectares of productive marine area under improved management to benefit biodiversity conservation.	0 ha	50,000 ha	100,000 ha	National strategies and reports  Local Government reports, including financial
	Number of rural producers demonstrating SLM and climate change adaptive practices and reporting stable productivity and food security.	agriculture 0 female 0 male livestock 0 female 0 male fisheries 0 female 0 male	agriculture 20,000 female 20,000 male livestock 3,000 female 2,000 male fisheries 500 female 2,000 male	agriculture 20,000 female 20,000 male livestock 3,000 female 2,000 male fisheries 500 female 2,000 male	agriculture 51,000 female 51,000 male livestock 8,000 female 4,000 male fisheries 1,000 female 5,000 male

<p>Percentage of target landscape farms reporting a CAET-score (characterization of agro-ecological transition) of 50 or above, representing an incipient agro-ecological transition in the target landscapes</p>	<p>6% only of 394 surveyed HH have CAET score of 50 and above</p>	<p>12% of surveyed HHs have CAET score of 50 and above</p>	<p>18% of surveyed HHs have CAET score of 50 and above</p>	<p>reports</p> <p>TAPE assessment (household surveys)</p> <p><b>EXACT</b></p>
<p>Increased empowerment, agency and inclusion of women in the agricultural sectors, using an abbreviated version of the Women's Empowerment In Agricultural Sector Index (A-WEAI)</p>	<p>A-WEAI is 51% in the targeted areas (a score below 60% is considered unsustainable)</p>	<p>A-WEAI is 55%</p>	<p>A-WEAI is above 60%, which is considered acceptable</p>	<p>B-INTACT assessment</p>
<p><b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated (metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e)</b></p>	<p><b>0</b></p>	<p><b>TBD</b></p>	<p><b>5,953,387</b></p>	
<p>Globally over-exploited marine fisheries moved to more sustainable levels (metric tons).</p>	<p>Socotra: 0 mt</p> <p>Hawf: 0 mt</p>	<p>Socotra: 1,000 mt</p> <p>Hawf: 500 mt</p>	<p>Socotra: 1,500 mt</p> <p>Hawf: 1,000 mt</p>	

<p>Outcome 1:</p> <p>Spatial and land use planning ensures terrestrial and marine resource use is appropriately situated to maximize production while promoting biodiversity conservation, SLM, and climate change adaptation.</p>	<p>Hectares of productive land and sea managed according to binding spatial plans that describe biodiversity conservation, SLM, and climate change adaptation objectives, best practices, and targets.</p>	<p>0 ha agricultural</p>	<p>12,500 ha agricultural</p>	<p>40,000 ha agricultural</p>	<p>Project evaluations and reports</p>
	<p>Improved soil health using the SOCLA methodology in targeted landscapes</p>	<p>Soil Health average score of 3,3 (considered acceptable)</p>	<p>Improving Soil Health average score</p>	<p>Soil Health average score of 3,5 and above (considered desirable)</p>	<p>Local Government reports, including financial</p>
		<p>0 ha grazing</p>	<p>35,000 ha grazing</p>	<p>75,000 ha grazing</p>	<p>Project emplaced monitoring and assessment tools</p>
		<p>0 ha marine</p>	<p>50,000 ha marine</p>	<p>100,000 ha marine</p>	<p>National strategies and reports</p>
		<p>0 ha of High Conservation Value Forest.</p>	<p>1,500 ha High Conservation Value Forest.</p>	<p>3,000 ha of High Conservation Value Forest.</p>	

	Hectares covered by spatial plans monitored annually and reporting progressive achievement of biodiversity conservation, SLM, and climate change adaptation targets.	0 ha agricultural  0 ha grazing  0 ha marine  0 ha of High Conservation Value Forest	12,500 ha agricultural  35,000 ha grazing  50,000 ha marine habitat  1,500 ha High Conservation Value Forest	40,000 ha agricultural  75,000 ha grazing  100,000 ha marine  3,000 ha of High Conservation Value Forest	Spatial planning and monitoring results  Remote sensing analysis  Fisheries, livestock, and agriculture monitoring reports  TAPE assessment  B-INTACT assessment
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Output 1.1 Government and private enterprise associations establish and operationalize assessment and monitoring program

Output 1.2 Government and private enterprise associations adopt, implement, and monitor legally binding spatial plans

Result Chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Milestones	Targets	Means of Verification
Outcome 2:  Private enterprises adopt innovative agriculture, fisheries, and livestock production practices that improve livelihoods	Number of livestock sustainably managed with annual monitoring reporting progressive achievement of BD conservation, SLM and CC adaptation targets.	Socotra:  0 livestock  Hawf:  0 livestock	Socotra:  50,00 livestock  Hawf:  3,000 livestock	Socotra:  200,000 livestock  Hawf:  10,000 livestock	Project evaluations and reports  Project emplaced monitoring and assessment tools

while delivering biodiversity, SLM, and climate change adaptation benefits	Hectares of khat replaced by diversified agriculture with annual monitoring reporting progressive achievement of BD conservation, SLM and CC adaptation targets.	Utoma: 0 hectares	Utoma: 1,500 ha	Utoma: 15,000 ha	National strategies and reports  Local Government reports, including financial
	Number of fishing vessels agreeing to voluntary guidelines/code of conduct and regular monitoring reporting progressive achievement of BD conservation and CC adaptation targets.	Socotra: 0 vessels  Hawf: 0 vessels	Socotra: 600 vessels  Hawf: 100 vessels	Socotra: 1,400 vessels  Hawf: 225 vessels	Spatial planning and monitoring results  Remote sensing analysis  Fisheries, livestock, and agriculture

	agriculture 0 female 0 male	agriculture 20,000 female 20,000 male	agriculture 51,000 female 51,000 male	monitoring reports  TAPE assessment
Number of target women and youth reporting improved livelihoods	livestock 0 female 0 male	livestock 3,000 female 2,000 male	livestock 8,000 female 4,000 male	B-INTACT assessment
	fisheries 0 female 0 male	fisheries 500 female 2,000 male	fisheries 1,000 female 5,000 male	
Percentage of women reporting improved food security and nutrition level based upon Minimum Dietary Diversity for Women (MDD-W score)	Average MDD-W score of 4,2 in project landscapes (below 5 is considered unsustainable)	Average MDD-W score is 5	Average MDD-W score between 5 and 7 in project landscapes (this is considered acceptable)	
Number of women participating each year in FFS and APFS training programs and reporting increased climate change adaptation capacity	Socotra: 0 women  Hawf: 0 women  Utoma: 0 women	Socotra: 2,000 women  Hawf: 2,000  Utoma: 10,000 women	Socotra: 4,000 women  Hawf: 2,000  Utoma: 15,000 women	

Output 2.1 Pro-conservation and resilient fisheries management models established at Socotra and Al-Maharah

Output 2.2 Pro-conservation and resilient agriculture models established at central highlands target areas

Output 2.3 Pro-conservation and resilient livestock management models established at Socotra and Al-Maharah

<p>Outcome 3:</p> <p>Policies, financing, and knowledge management reflect project results, including incentivizing production practices that improve livelihoods and benefit biodiversity conservation, SLM, and CCA</p>	<p>Members of producer associations with by-laws that stipulate BD conservation, SLM, and CC adaptation principles and objectives.</p>	<p>agriculture</p> <p>0 female</p> <p>0 male</p> <p>livestock</p> <p>0 female</p> <p>0 male</p> <p>fisheries</p> <p>0 female</p> <p>0 male</p>	<p>agriculture</p> <p>20,000 female</p> <p>20,000 male</p> <p>livestock</p> <p>3,000 female</p> <p>2,000 male</p> <p>fisheries</p> <p>500 female</p> <p>2,000 male</p>	<p>agriculture</p> <p>51,000 female</p> <p>51,000 male</p> <p>livestock</p> <p>8,000 female</p> <p>4,000 male</p> <p>fisheries</p> <p>1,000 female</p> <p>5,000 male</p>	<p>Project evaluations and reports</p> <p>Project emplaced monitoring and assessment tools</p> <p>National strategies and reports</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>Socotra: 0 EPA 0 Fisheries 0 Ag/Livestock</p> <p>Utoma: 0 EPA 0 Ag/Livestock</p> <p>Hawf: 0 EPA 0 Fisheries 0 Ag/Livestock</p>	<p>Socotra: 1 EPA 1 Fisheries 1 Ag/Livestock</p> <p>Utoma: 1 EPA 1 Ag/Livestock</p> <p>Hawf: 1 EPA 1 Fisheries 1 Ag/Livestock</p>	<p>Socotra: 1 EPA 1 Fisheries 1 Ag/Livestock</p> <p>Utoma: 1 EPA 1 Ag/Livestock</p> <p>Hawf: 1 EPA 1 Fisheries 1 Ag/Livestock</p>	<p>Local Government reports, including financial</p> <p>Spatial planning and monitoring results</p> <p>Remote sensing analysis</p> <p>Fisheries, livestock, and agriculture monitoring reports</p> <p>TAPE assessment</p> <p>B-INTACT assessment</p>
<p>Number of government agencies adopting and enforcing spatial plans that mainstream BD conservation, SLM, and climate change adaptation principles and objectives.</p>	<p>0 users annually</p>	<p>20,000 users annually</p>	<p>100,000 users annually</p> <p>* disaggregating male ? female users not possible</p>	



Number of government resource management agencies reporting capacity and budget increases adequate to continue and advance project emplaced programming as detailed in the project handover strategy.	Socotra:	Socotra:	Socotra:
	0 EPA	0 EPA	1 EPA
	0 Fisheries	0 Fisheries	1 Fisheries
	0 Ag/Livestock	0 Ag/Livestock	1 Ag/Livestock
	Utoma:	Utoma:	Utoma:
	0 EPA	0 EPA	1 EPA
	0 Ag/Livestock	0 Ag/Livestock	1 Ag/Livestock
	Hawf:	Hawf:	Hawf:
	0 EPA	0 EPA	1 EPA
	0 Fisheries	0 Fisheries	1 Fisheries
	0 Ag/Livestock	0 Ag/Livestock	1 Ag/Livestock

Output 3.1 Targeted capacity building generates policy, regulatory, and sustainable financing to support SLM, BD Conservation, and Resilient Livelihoods

Output 3.2 Effective monitoring and evaluation implemented with project lessons captured, disseminated, adopted and upscaled

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).**

**GEF COUNCIL REVIEW**

Norway/Denmark Comments
-------------------------

General comments:	
This project seems to be addressing very relevant issues related to biodiversity and sustainable land management in Yemen. On an overall level, this is a well-planned project.	Noted.
The theory of change is however not clear and could benefit from a more thorough description of the linkage between the planned activities and the expected results.	Comments regarding TOC and causal reasoning noted and addressed in the project design.
The food security component is not sufficiently clear. It seems that food security is a secondary concern, and that the food security related outputs are in fact just an additional benefit of switching to a more environmentally friendly crop and production system (khat vs coffee). Given the complexity of the situation, it would make sense to apply a sustainable food systems approach, but this is not mentioned in the proposal. However, it is positive that spatial planning is planned to be cross-sectoral.	Noted. Regarding the food production system observation, coffee is generally promoted as part of an integrated and diversified production system. This is contrary to khat which is often mono-cropped and highly reliant upon adverse inputs (e.g., pesticides, chemical fertilizers, etc.). Working with farmers to assist them to move towards a more diversified farm system is considered a valuable approach to realize SLM, BD, climate resiliency, and food security benefits.
The description of the transition from khat production to coffee production, intercropped with other crops, is a bit limited. It is also not clear how this will lead to improved food security. It is mentioned that 40% of all Yemeni children suffer from malnutrition, but it is not explained how the activities will actually lead to improved nutrition. Increased food production does not automatically lead to improved nutrition.	This is well noted and more fully analyzed and detailed in the project document.
The CCA-potential of the project is not sufficiently explained. Investments aimed at increasing biodiversity and ensuring sustainable land management can also have adaptation benefits. Ecosystem-based adaptation should be considered.	The project fully embraces the concept of ecosystem-based adaptation approaches. This includes regenerative agricultural systems.

<p>The project sustainability lacks a description of how the activities in the Water User Associations will be sustained.</p>	<p>FAO's work with WUAs has proven to be well-sustained. The major challenge is assisting producers to reduce risks associated with 'bridging' between unsustainable and sustainable production modalities. Several well-established WUAs now function independently. Indeed, many of these WUAs have their own internal micro-credit programs for participants.</p>
<p>Detailed comments:</p>	
<p>It is mentioned that climate information will be tailored to stakeholders needs. How will the climate information be obtained? Is there a well-functioning NMHS in Yemen? How will users be included in the climate information production? How to ensure co-production?</p>	<p>During the PPG, climate information was attained through a combination of national and international sources. Yemen does not have a well-functioning NMHS. However, there are several climate change experts in Yemen. This includes staff within the EPA.</p>
<p>Using Water User Associations as entry points seems promising. Adding additional resources and possibilities to these groups will probably require strict control measures. Which measures will be taken to ensure transparency and avoid corruption in the WUAs and fisher associations?</p>	<p>FAO has developed a set of by-laws with each WUA based upon a comprehensive template and safeguards. These by-laws provide for a high level of transparency and accountability. These by-laws require that a board be established that is responsible for oversight. Board membership includes a gender membership requirement as detailed in the project document.</p>
<p>How realistic is the ambition of 50% of the beneficiaries of the project being female? How will female participation in the WUAs be ensured? Even though 30% of the board members must be female, this does not guarantee for female participation in the association.</p>	<p>In the realm of both agriculture and livestock, the majority of stakeholders will likely be women. In both of these areas, women have an outsized role. Indeed, on Socotra, traditionally women are responsible for 90% of livestock management efforts. Fisheries, however, is very much a male dominated sector. In addition, the project has a very strong element of gender and women empowerment woven throughout the design. 50% is aspirational but realistic given these factors.</p>
<p>The project does not seem to focus on women's IGAs ? could this be included?</p>	<p>Women rely upon agriculture and livestock for income generation. These activities are key to the project.</p>
<p>How will vulnerable groups be included in the project?</p>	<p>All targeted groups are vulnerable.</p>

<p>Drought resistant, early-maturing and improved seed varieties to ensure good productivity will be promoted. How is the existing seed security in the area? Has a seed systems analysis verified that there is a need for bringing in new seeds? Will the seed supply be sustainable?</p>	<p>FAO has experience with these issues throughout Yemen. The project's work with agriculturalists will involve analysis to assist producers to identify best seed varieties based upon various agricultural aspects (e.g., rainfall, irrigation, soil, elevation, etc.). Generally, the approach includes supporting farmers to improve seed storage for planting seasons.</p>
<p>The issue of water efficiency for agricultural production is not sufficiently addressed. Stone bunds are mentioned, but other water harvesting and irrigation techniques could also be relevant.</p>	<p>Water harvesting is applied in the area. The project will work with agriculturalists to help identify and apply water use improvements. However, as explained in the project document, the amount of water required to consume khat is far greater than amounts required for diversified farms that integrate coffee as a primary cash crop.</p>
<p>How will the project balance the promotion of cash crops with subsistence crops?</p>	<p>As noted in the project document, coffee is generally produced as a cash crop along with symbiotic production of a variety of subsistence crops. One challenge has been that producers are not able to realize the full cash potential of coffee and, as a result, have relied upon mono-cropping of khat. As noted, once producers shift to khat production it is challenging to revert to a diversified farm. The project will assist producers to both realize the cash potential of coffee as part of a diversified farm economy.</p>
<p>Agroforestry is mentioned, but not described. While agroforestry can be seen as a good way of enhancing smallholder's food supply, income and health, the adoption and scaling up of these systems among food insecure communities can be difficult. The proposal does not provide a description of how agroforestry will be introduced in the communities.</p>	<p>As noted in the project document, coffee is often grown along with tree species. Often, these trees are globally significant. In other cases, coffee is may be grown with domestic trees such as almonds.</p>
<p>In terms of risks, the long civil war in Yemen should be better taken into consideration and its impacts mitigated.</p>	<p>This is well noted and expanded upon within the completed project document.</p>
<p>Germany Comments:</p>	

<p>Germany approves the following PIFs in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:</p> <p>Suggestions for improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Provide a more precise description of the fragile and dynamic situation in the country as basis for a risk assessment regarding political fragmentation and the role and status of Government in Yemen within the proposal.</p>	<p>This is well noted and expanded upon within the completed project document.</p>
<p>Further explain how local ownership will be ensured, taking into account the de facto Huthi ?government? in the northern governorates as well as recently elected local councils in Socotra and Al Mahra as part of a Do No Harm approach in a highly conflictive context.</p>	<p>FAO has offices in both the north and south of the country. During the PPG, dialog and communication was extensive with government representatives in both the north and the south. Critically, district officials in both Hawf and Socotra were fully engaged during the design process. In many instances, these officials and government agencies provided very useful baseline information and data as well as design inputs.</p>
<p>Consider coordination with ongoing thematically relevant GIZ projects: Strengthening Resilience and Local Participation (transitional aid); Institutional Development of the Water Sector III ?IDWS? - Addressing Basic Needs. Note that the mentioned GIZ projects Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity (approach taken up by FAO) and Food and Nutrition Security, Enhanced Resilience have expired or are about to expire but can provide relevant lessons learnt</p>	<p>This is well noted. FAO-Yemen has worked with each of these projects and lessons learned are integrated.</p>

<p><b>USA Comments:</b></p>	
<p>Ensure that any repercussions from the project do not result in a reduction of food output.</p>	<p>Thank you for the suggestion. Please, do note that FAO places special attention to food security and nutrition, particularly in a context like the Yemeni context. A number of outputs and outcomes focus on sustainable food and agriculture, and key indicators of success cover food security and healthy diets aspects.</p>

<p>Communicate project objectives with farmers and fisherfolk to help explain why spatial planning and fishing restrictions to sustain fish populations are in their best interest.</p>	<p>The stakeholder engagement plan secured relevant and in-depth dialogue and exchange with producers, including farmers, pastoralists and fishermen. A great number of producers were exchanged within the context of the TAPE assessments, including participatory context analyses, household surveys, and participatory validation workshops of assessment results. During these exchanges, many thematic areas were touched upon, covering the 10 elements of agroecology.</p>
<p>Understand the complexities in building a reliable partnership with the ROYG at this stage. Consider that simple approaches, such as prohibition or severe taxation of khat production, may be possible but understand that it may be difficult to prevent rent-seeking.</p> <p>Recognize the limitations that the ROYG has to institute beneficial reforms due to the current instability. There is little capacity to develop or enforce spatial planning models. It could easily serve as a mechanism for government rent-seeking.</p>	<p>During the PPG phase, experts were engaged to map out the complexities of the transformational approach that is proposed for the Northern landscapes. Project interventions therefore build on change processes already initiated, leverage the behavioral change already noted, build upon niche but successful initiatives converting khat into coffee. The understanding of the complexities has helped the PPG team identify relevant partners (carefully considering power dynamics), project sites, and project activities.</p>
<p>Include YESS/ERLP in project coordination, keep them up to date with intended activities and progress.</p>	<p>Thank you for the suggestion. These partners had indeed not been identified in a first stakeholder mapping exercise but will now be fully engaged in future project activities and progress.</p>

## STAP REVIEW

<p>STAP Overall Assessment and Rating</p>	<p>Minor issues to be considered during project design:</p> <p>STAP welcomes this project in Yemen that aims to bolster community resource management processes and their governance context despite a situation of on-going conflict and uncertain governance, noting the realistic timeframes proposed.</p> <p>The basic logic outlined herein is plausible. However, to ensure successful outcomes, STAP strongly urges that attention is given to a more formal theory of change as a matter of urgency in the next design phase, probably separately for the major regions, recognizing that a key issue is to be able to justify that the intervention components (with other activities going on) are both necessary but also sufficient to achieve the outcomes. We note below a number of areas where this is not clear so far, even though there is a great deal of implicit logic hidden in this proposal. In particular some issues around behavior and power dynamics are poorly addressed.</p> <p>A strong ToC would also provide the basis for identifying assumptions that need monitoring through the project, to help guide adaptive implementation.</p> <p>Design should also address any risk of maladaptation and leakage that would reduce the durability of the benefits achieved. The LDN checklist is useful in this regard, but could be reflected in the project design more explicitly.</p> <p>Below, STAP specifies its guidance.</p>	<p>Comments regarding TOC and causal reasoning as well as maladaptation and leakage were noted and addressed in the project design.</p>
-------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Part I: Project Information  B. Indicative Project Description Summary	Response	Response at Time of CEO Request Submission
Project Objective	Yes: this emphasizes mainstreaming, which suggests the importance of addressing scaling.	Noted
Project components	Broadly; as noted below, however, whilst these are probably necessary, it is not clear as stated that these are sufficient to achieve the objectives.	Noted
Outcomes	Yes, potentially.	Noted
Outputs	As above, probably necessary but not clearly sufficient: in particular, the top down aspects are over-emphasised over some key bottom up issues, see below.	Comment much appreciated and addressed during the PPG. The project clarified that work will work at the field level with government and private stakeholders. This includes an emphasis upon users groups (livestock, agriculture, fisheries) and community-based associations.
Part II: Project justification		



<p>1. Project description. Briefly describe:</p> <p>1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)</p>	<p>The problem statement is well-defined and includes linkages between socio-economic and environmental drivers of degradation the project seeks to address.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>Changing threats are mostly discussed in terms of hazards, mentioning exposure and vulnerability (or adaptive capacity) as relatively static issues; it would be useful for consider possible change in these too ? clearly conflict may drive increased vulnerabilities and reduced adaptive capacity at least (as acknowledged on p.73). e.g. the analysis of khat farming is strong, and is changing vulnerabilities - what are possible trends in this?</p>	<p>During the PPG a climate risk assessment was carried out in addition to more in-depth analysis of the overall context for project implementation. These factors are more fully considered and integrated within the project design.</p>
	<p>The barriers are well-described. While the PIF describes the state of environmental policy and planning in Yemen clearly, it does so at a generic level (with the exception of the Socotra Conservation Zoning Plan). It would be useful for the barriers section to reference more specific policies and processes to illustrate the character of the broad challenges being described. In addition, barrier 1 notes that existing promulgated plans have not been operationalised as the ?capacity of government has been outpaced by ...development?. At some point later in the proposal it would be good to return to argue why the interventions proposed will actually reverse this rather than just slightly reduce the gap, else benefits are unlikely to be durable.</p>	<p>Comment appreciated. The project design fully considered these inputs and provides greater detail with regards to operationalization and reversal, including directly addressing identified drivers.</p>
	<p>Does not apply</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects</p>	<p>The baseline is clear with regard to governmental structure, policy framework, civil society, private enterprise, and international investments. It also explains the underpinning tools to be scaled, in the form of CBOs like the WUAs. However, there is no environmental baseline data in the baseline scenario, and therefore no way of tracking the current state of the environment. Further, there is no socioeconomic data in the baseline that allows for the measurement of the sustainability and resilience of rural Yemeni livelihoods. STAP suggests that the baseline scenario include such data to allow for the measurement of project impact on its stated goals.</p>	<p>The project document contains substantially more information with regards to both environmental and socio-economic data. The design also identifies and recognizes gaps and sets in place tools to address these gaps.</p>
	<p>The baseline provides a feasible basis for quantifying change in governmental structure, policy framework, civil society, and private enterprise. It does not provide a basis for quantifying the benefits to livelihoods or the environment. STAP suggests that such data is critical to an effective baseline, and should be added.</p>	<p>As above. This is now much more fully reflected in the project document.</p>
	<p>It is not, as it does not provide a means of measuring progress toward the stated project goals. See above.</p>	<p>Noted above.</p>

<p>3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project</p>	<p>There is no explicitly stated theory of change, but one can infer that the project assumes that the land degradation, biodiversity, and climate change adaptation challenges that negatively impact both the global environment and Yemeni well-being is a product of open access resource management and limited capacity at levels from the producers of agricultural goods and livestock to the national government. By improving the capacity for spatial planning within resource management, increasing access to tools and knowledge for the identification and uptake of sustainable practices at the producer level, and building an enabling environment (including policy frameworks) to support informed decision-making and provide incentives for the uptake of improved practices, this project will address the root cause of this linked environmental/human well-being challenge.</p> <p>STAP urges the proponents to develop a proper ToC in the next stage (STAP's ToC Primer may be of help here) - probably for both the agriculture and fisheries aspects though there will be some common elements. Furthermore, the project is mostly based on scaling out and up the CBO success stories, spreading them more widely and ensuring that the regulatory environment supports them. Developing a ToC that focuses on this scaling (and associated barriers) would help to ensure the interventions are both necessary and sufficient (see below).</p> <p>The proposal contains many references which suggest most of these issues have in fact been considered, but in the absence of a formally outlined ToC (i) it is hard to be sure they are recognised and given appropriate priority, (ii) they may in fact be missed in the final design, and (iii) explicit attention to monitoring related assumptions as part of adaptive project implementation is missing.</p> <p>STAP's theory of change primer can be accessed at: <a href="https://stapgef.org/theory-change-primer">https://stapgef.org/theory-change-primer</a></p>	<p>Significant project design effort was focused upon improving and clarifying the project's causal reasoning.</p> <p>The project document now contains an extensive theory of change detailing the challenges, barriers, baseline, proposed project response, and intended results.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>A spatial planning exercise will prioritize conservation and sustainable production practices across project areas. Resource user groups will be organized to develop binding spatial planning to guide sustainable production with conservation benefits. Agriculture, livestock, and fisheries producers will be provided with the training, capacity building and tangible incentives needed to access and adopt improved production practices.</p> <p>The project will monitor impacts to inform decision-making, and improve policy and regulatory frameworks to allow these lessons to be taken up to support enduring results.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>The mechanisms for change are limited to the described project activities. This suggests that the project assumes that farmers, livestock producers, and fishermen and women will willingly participate in the planning exercises and take up the interventions identified through those exercises. This could be a problematic assumption. Most existing behavior comes with its own incentives. STAP suggests the project clearly articulate these existing incentives, and how participation in this planning process and uptake of identified interventions will overcome these incentives and produce changed behaviors and conservation outcomes. For example, the PIF discusses a shift from coffee to khat production that appears to be problematic environmentally and, from a livelihoods perspective, weakens the negotiating position of the producers. However, the PIF also notes that this switch occurred because farmers perceived greater cash returns from khat. The project would be well-served by an effort to articulate in a ToC the assumptions about the intervention that would overcome this incentive, such as engaging with the coffee value chain (which is mentioned as a stakeholder and on p.61 &amp; p.85 but not given prominence in the ToC logic).</p> <p>While the PIF uses language like 'the project will work with stakeholders to generate planning guidelines covering issues of responsible parties, administration, process and stakeholder engagement strategies' at various points, this assumption and incentive identification should be an explicit part of participant engagement. Similarly, there are evident possible power dynamics associated with commercial fishers around Socotra; the proposal indicates the intent to support better policing capacity but does not address how to ensure these powerful players are not motivated to overrule this given the context of disrupted governance.</p>	<p>This input much appreciated. The need to incentivize engagement and behavioral change is well noted. Current issues and pathways to facilitate change are now more fully analyzed and explained within the project document.</p>

	<p>Under the risks section, the PIF discusses the potential for natural resource constraints, including climate change, drought, and food insecurity, to impact the project. The PIF says that the project</p> <p>agriculture, fisheries, and livestock production it capture baseline numbers of individuals already participating in these practices to allow for the capture of data about change over time, and therefore the size of the adaptation benefit. In general, STAP suggests that indicators have baseline measurements against which target numbers can be compared, and achieved numbers can be measured.</p>	<p>More detailed baseline numbers are included within the project document.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>Nearly all activities in this project are aimed at improving the resilience of people and places to climate change impacts ? whether through on-the-ground activities or through changes in institutions that might facilitate effective planning of such activities.</p> <p>However, the risk of maladaptation is not addressed explicitly; for example, though coffee uses less water than khat, will even this use be incompatible with climate change or rising population pressures on demand and land use? in the latter case should coffee actually be promoted as a stepping stone to a more diversified economy, etc? Similar issues arise in fisheries.</p>	<p>The concept of maladaptation was considered during project design.</p> <p>For instance, in the case of coffee, khat is generally a mono-crop that has replaced diversified production modalities. Coffee is traditionally shade grown, organic, and is grown as part of a diversified farmstead. Some adaptation may have to occur for coffee producers due to climate change. For instead, over the next 50+ years, coffee plantations may need to slowly shift up in elevation. In areas, the coffee band may shift from 1,200 ? 1,500m to 1,250 ? 1,550. This shift is marginal, would like impact only growers and lower elevations, and could be accommodated.</p>
<p>7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up</p>	<p>The project is innovative in its reach across three distinct ecosystems/livelihoods zones in Yemen. The general approach of the project, framed so that it can be tailored to these different places, will facilitate learning about the efficacy of specific activities and their outcomes in different places, while allowing for data collection and advice to be aggregated to influence national policy discussions.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	Yes, the project is aimed at working across scales and influencing national policy structures, specifically to scale the community level of organization. The theory of change should recognise and address barriers to scaling more explicitly than at present	Noted.
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------

Most of the work proposed in the PIF is incremental adaptation, although if scaled well the establishment of an effective CBO layer of organization could be transformative for Yemen.

Durability of the outcomes is crucial; acknowledging the conflict context, explicitly addressing the durability of government regulatory intervention needs continued attention. Further guidance from STAP on enduring outcomes is available at: <https://www.stapgef.org/achieving-enduring-outcomes-gef-investment>

In addition, it would be easy to predict 'leakage' of benefits from improved land and fisheries management, with pressures being transferred from the project target areas to others. In the case of land degradation, there is a good framework for avoiding this, in Yemen's commitment to LDN - the issue of leakage is specifically mentioned in the checklist on p.60, which is good, though the assertion that 'community based approaches [will ensure there re no tradeoffs of leakage?': is naive as stated - the leakage will occur to other areas that where the community activity is working. This requires addressing at a higher level of governance such as Yemen's national commitment to LDN.

The ToC should address how this can be reinforced (e.g. at the least, all successes under this project should be formally listed as part of the nation's LDN commitment, thus at least making any leakage visible).

Durability continued to be a focus throughout project design.

Leakage was also considered. The project will focus upon three distinct areas.

In the Highlands, the likelihood of leakage is limited. Lowering khat production and shifting to a diversified farmstead with coffee - rather than khat - as a key cash crop will not likely increase khat production in other areas.

For fisheries, the fleets from Hawf and Socotra will not likely move to further to search out harvest. This is not plausible given vessel size. As noted, nearly all vessels are small and medium sized craft.

For livestock, the project is taking a comprehensive approach working across the landscapes. This includes all of Hawf - which is currently subjected to grazing pressure from outside of



<p>1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide</p> <p>geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.</p>	<p>There is a reasonably clear map and georeferenced coordinates for the proposed activity areas.</p>	<p>Noted. Maps were improved.</p>
<p>2. Stakeholders.</p> <p>Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities.</p> <p>If none of the above, please explain why.</p> <p>In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.</p>	<p>The PIF identifies a wide range of relevant institutional stakeholders, from government offices to multilateral organizations to farmers, fishers, and herders (private producers). This list appears to cover the complexity of the problem.</p> <p>However, STAP suggests this should be continually reviewed with regard to the barriers to scaling, particularly those that arise due to erratic governance and power dynamics among actors who may see themselves as losers from an effective community layer of resources management (e.g. khat value chain, commercial fishing interests, as well as those that are important to some implicit assumptions noted above (e.g. the coffee value chain actors).</p>	<p>This is very well noted. The dynamics at each location are complicated. There are layers of community, religion, culture, and governance that are unique to each location.</p>

	<p>Governmental stakeholders appear to have a central role in the implementation of interventions and the mainstreaming of lessons learned. Civil society organizations are largely envisioned as contributing to conservation planning and stakeholder awareness. The role of private producers appears to be heavily confined to receiving the interventions, with less attention given to the ways in which they might participate in or guide project design and implementation to ensure effective, impactful interventions. STAP suggests that the role of private producers be expanded in the spatial planning, intervention selection, and intervention implementation activities of the project such that they have a clear voice in the design of the project, as this is likely to result in more locally-appropriate activities and more impactful project outcomes.</p>	<p>The role of private enterprise is more explicit in the project design. Indeed, the project focuses upon and builds upon livestock, fisheries, and agricultural associations. These CSOs that represent private sector producers and resource users are fully integrated and engaged. This includes being central to the design and implementation of community-based by-laws to improve resource use, access, and accountability.</p>
<p>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.</p>	<p>While the PIF is not specific about the challenges that women face in Yemen, STAP welcomes the fact that the project clearly acknowledges that Yemeni women have substantially lower opportunities to engage meaningfully in economic, social and political sectors. Further, STAP appreciates that the project will acknowledge gender differences, it will assess and comprehensively understand them, and it will then design and implement activities that promote women's empowerment and gender equality. STAP also appreciates that the PIF goes beyond gender to consider ways to address the impacts of climate change on women and other particularly vulnerable groups.</p>	<p>Noted. The project design strives to meaningfully address gender issues and challenges.</p>

<p>5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design</p>	<p>The identified risks are valid and comprehensive. STAP particularly appreciates the attention the PIF pays to conflict, and the GEF IEO guidance on the evaluation of GEF engagement in fragile and conflict-affected situations. STAP is pleased to see the project consider its adaptation and conservation efforts as opportunities to enhance cooperation.</p> <p>The project has undertaken a climate risk screen, and considered the results in its design. STAP suggests that the project team consider developing more than one future scenario for climate change, and weigh how different scenarios might impact the project's outcomes over this time period, looking for actions that are robust to the uncertainty about the future. Such scenarios could also address any uncertainty in changes in population, market demand, and conflict.</p> <p>The project is aimed at addressing the sensitivity of various livelihoods activities and resource management practices to climate change through resilience-building efforts. Further, it seeks to build the technical and institutional capacity necessary to address climate risk and render its resilience work durable.</p>	<p>Noted and reflected in the project design.</p>
<p>6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed an</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<p>8. Knowledge management. Outline the 'Knowledge Management Approach' for the project, and how it will contribute to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.</p>	<p>The overall approach is to embed specific knowledge management activities in project components, which makes sense given the disparate character of the project sites and the potential for one or more of the sites to be disrupted by conflict or other stressors.</p> <p>Component-specific knowledge is expected to facilitate learning and improvement at the project component level, while producing opportunities for synthetic learning that will allow for the up-scaling of lessons learned and best practices.</p> <p>As noted previously, what is missing is an explicit plan to monitor some simple indicators relevant to critical assumptions, that might help adapt project implementation. STAP recommends this issue be considered during the next stage of design.</p> <p>STAP also notes that some of the indicators listed in section 1 (e.g. 'number of enterprises adopting productive practices' p.7 or 'number of enterprises incentivised' p.9) are useful immediate indicators but do not measure outcomes: for this, whether income variability has reduced, or more food is available or whether enterprises are actually doing anything as a result of the incentives, would also be useful.</p>	<p>Noted. These recommendations and similar are now reflected in the results framework:</p> <p>Income variability has reduced,</p> <p>More food is available; or,</p> <p>Whether enterprises are actually doing anything as a result of the incentives.</p>
	<p>The project will work with national and regional technical and education institutions, work through South-South cooperation channels to disseminate experiences and lessons regionally and internationally, and will work with the FAO to disseminate knowledge products regionally and internationally.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

**ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG).**  
**(Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:**

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: <b>131,744</b>			
GCP /YEM/045/GFF			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
(5011) Salaries Professional			
(5013) Consultants	90,500	25,126	65,374
(5014) Contracts	15,000	25,674	
(5021) Travel	26,244		15,570
(5023) Training			
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>131,744</u></b>	<b>50,800</b>	<b>80,944</b>

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: <b>168,256</b>			
GCP /YEM/043/LDF			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>LDCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
(5011) Salaries Professional	5,000		5,000
(5013) Consultants	107,600	34,604	72,996
(5014) Contracts	10,500	25,675	
(5021) Travel	25,156		9,981
(5023) Training	20,000		20,000
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>168,256</u></b>	<b><u>60,279</u></b>	<b>107,977</b>

#### **ANNEX D: Project Map(s) and Coordinates**

**Please attach the geographical location of the project area, if possible.**



Proposed Project Site	Coordinates
Socotra Archipelago	N 12° 27' 48.31" E 53° 49' 53.00"
Hawf, Al-Maharah Governate	N 17° 11' 01.48" E 54° 05' 32.97"
Sarawat Mountains	N 14° 37' 19.21" E 44° 21' 28.61"

**ANNEX E: Project Budget Table**

**Please attach a project budget table.**

---

	ProDoc			GEF	LDCF
Outcome 1	\$2,309,114			1,015,780	1,293,333
Outcome 2	\$10,237,114			4,888,384	5,348,729
Outcome 3	\$2,255,114			736,780	1,518,333
M&E 3%	\$491,800	3.06%		75,000	416,800
<b>subtotal</b>	<b>\$15,293,141</b>		15,293,141	<b>6,715,945</b>	<b>8,577,196</b>
PMC 5%	\$764,657	5.00%	764,657	<b>335,797</b>	<b>428,860</b>
<b>TOTAL GEF</b>	<b>\$16,057,798</b>		<b>16,057,798</b>	<b>7,051,742</b>	<b>9,006,056</b>

**ANNEX F: (For NGI only) Termsheet**

Instructions. Please submit an finalized termsheet in this section. The NGI Program Call for Proposals provided a template in Annex A of the Call for Proposals that can be used by the Agency. Agencies can use their own termsheets but must add sections on Currency Risk, Co-financing Ratio and Financial Additionality as defined in the template provided in Annex A of the Call for proposals. Termsheets submitted at CEO endorsement stage should include final terms and conditions of the financing.

NA

**ANNEX G: (For NGI only) Reflows**

Instructions. Please submit a reflows table as provided in Annex B of the NGI Program Call for Proposals and the Trustee excel sheet for reflows (as provided by the Secretariat or the Trustee) in the Document Section of the CEO endorsement. The Agencies is required to quantify any expected financial return/gains/interests earned on non-grant instruments that will be transferred to the GEF Trust Fund as noted in the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy. Partner Agencies will be required to comply with the reflows procedures established in their respective Financial Procedures Agreement with the GEF Trustee. Agencies are welcomed to provide assumptions that explain expected financial reflow schedules.

NA

**ANNEX H: (For NGI only) Agency Capacity to generate reflows**

Instructions. The GEF Agency submitting the CEO endorsement request is required to respond to any questions raised as part of the PIF review process that required clarifications on the Agency Capacity to manage reflows. This Annex seeks to demonstrate Agencies? capacity and eligibility to administer NGI resources as established in the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy, GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01, June 9, 2017 (Annex 5).

NA