



Safeguarding Zanzibar's Forest and Coastal Habitats for Multiple Benefits

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID

9400

Project Type

FSP

Type of Trust Fund

GET

Project Title

Safeguarding Zanzibar's Forest and Coastal Habitats for Multiple Benefits

Countries

Tanzania

Agency(ies)

UNDP

Other Executing Partner(s):

Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources (MANR) and First Vice President's Office (FVPO)

Executing Partner Type

Government

GEF Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Taxonomy

Focal Areas, Biodiversity, Biomes, Mangroves, Tropical Dry Forests, Protected Areas and Landscapes, Productive Landscapes, Terrestrial Protected Areas, Community Based Natural Resource Mngt, Mainstreaming, Forestry - Including HCVF and REDD+, Agriculture and agrobiodiversity, Species, Threatened Species, Land Degradation, Sustainable Land Management, Sustainable Livelihoods, Sustainable Forest, Community-Based Natural Resource Management, Sustainable Agriculture, Climate Change, Climate Change Mitigation, Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Use, Influencing models, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Transform policy and regulatory environments, Stakeholders, Type of Engagement, Participation, Local Communities, Indigenous Peoples, Civil Society, Community Based Organization, Communications, Education, Gender Equality, Gender results areas, Access and control over natural resources, Access to benefits and services, Gender Mainstreaming, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Beneficiaries, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Learning, Theory of change, Indicators to measure change, Adaptive management, Knowledge Generation, Capacity Development, Knowledge Exchange

Rio Markers**Climate Change Mitigation**

Climate Change Mitigation 1

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 1

Duration

72In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

492,259

A. Focal Area Strategy Framework and Program

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
BD-1_P1	Outcome 1.2: Improved management effectiveness of protected areas	GET	3,013,493	15,000,000
LD-2_P3	Outcome 2.2: Improved forest management and/or restoration	GET	887,242	4,500,000
CCM-2_P4	Outcome A. Accelerated adoption of innovative technologies and management practices for GHG emission reduction and carbon sequestration	GET	1,280,936	6,500,000
Total Project Cost(\$)			5,181,671	26,000,000

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

Safeguard key terrestrial and coastal forest ecosystems on Zanzibar to deliver multiple benefits to the people inhabiting the islands

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
1. Strengthening Zanzibar's policy and institutional framework for effective biodiversity conservation and natural resources management	Technical Assistance	1.1 Integrated policy and planning framework developed and implemented to promote effective biodiversity conservation and ecosystem management to support Zanzibar's national development	1.1.1 Review of national framework (including policies, regulations and institutions) for land and forest management and biodiversity conservation. 1.1.2 Development and implementation of a Zanzibar Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (ZABSAP), building on sectoral strategies and plans, including the long-term forestry plan, national spatial plan and climate change strategy, to promote effective terrestrial and coastal forest management and sustainable land use.	GET	461,728	2,000,000

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
2. Strengthened management of Zanzibar's network of protected areas (PAs) and areas under community forest management	Technical Assistance	2.1 Improved effectiveness of the network of PAs and areas under community forest management leads to the protection of vulnerable ecosystems, especially mangroves, native forests and other habitats of global significance	<p>2.1.1 Detailed surveys of key areas for biodiversity conservation including mangrove forests and high-conservation value forests undertaken to establish or update baselines, identify priority sites for PA management interventions and establish wildlife corridors.</p> <p>2.1.2 New PAs are established, and management plans are developed or updated for core PAs. Management plans include improved management and restoration of forest and wetland ecosystems, as well as zones between them ensuring connectivity and maintenance of conservation values.</p> <p>2.1.3. Capacity for community forest management is strengthened.</p> <p>2.1.4. Learning and exchange between communities engaged in CoFMAs facilitated.</p> <p>2.1.5. Systems and infrastructure in key PAs are upgraded to</p>	GET	2,949,953	7,500,000

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
2. Strengthened management of Zanzibar's network of protected areas (PAs) and areas under community forest management	Investment	2.2: Sustainable land management practices and community-centred initiatives are adopted to support: i) effective co-management of wildlife and their habitats; ii) rehabilitation and restoration of degraded landscapes; and iii) sustainable local income generation	2.2.1 Community-based natural resource management and land-use practices are supported in target sites (including CoFMAs) to increase or maintain natural forest and mangrove cover and sustain the flow of ecosystem services, while supporting livelihood diversification.	GET	1,381,870	12,500,000
3. Gender mainstreaming, knowledge management and learning	Technical Assistance	3.1. Knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation and gender mainstreaming supports adaptive management and stakeholder's engagement	<p>3.1.1. Knowledge management supports policy making and systematizes lessons learned.</p> <p>3.1.2. Gender mainstreaming strategy implemented to support project implementation.</p> <p>3.1.3. Monitoring and evaluation support adaptive and effective project management and active participation from stakeholders.</p>	GET	217,058	3,000,000

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
				Sub Total (\$)	5,010,609	25,000,000
Project Management Cost (PMC)						
				GET	171,062	1,000,000
				Sub Total(\$)	171,062	1,000,000
				Total Project Cost(\$)	5,181,671	26,000,000

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

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount(\$)
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	1,000,000
Government	Ministry of Finance and Planning of Zanzibar	In-kind	10,000,000
Government	Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources, Livestock and Fisheries of Zanzibar	In-kind	15,000,000
Total Co-Financing(\$)			26,000,000

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

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
UNDP	GET	Tanzania	Biodiversity		No	3,013,493	286,282
UNDP	GET	Tanzania	Climate Change		No	1,280,936	121,689
UNDP	GET	Tanzania	Land Degradation		No	887,242	84,288
Total Grant Resources(\$)						5,181,671	492,259

E. Non Grant Instrument

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

PPG Required

☐

106,000

10,070

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
UNDP	GET	Tanzania	Biodiversity		No	55,000	5,225
UNDP	GET	Tanzania	Climate Change		No	25,000	2,375
UNDP	GET	Tanzania	Land Degradation		No	26,000	2,470
Total Project Costs(\$)						106,000	10,070

Core Indicators

Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	19,430.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
Akula National Park Mtambwe North and South	125689 N.I.	Select		0.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Uzi and Vundwe islands	125689 N.I.	Select		0.00		<input type="checkbox"/>

Indicator 1.2 Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	19,430.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
Akula National Park Jambiani-Muyuni Forest Reserve	125689 N.I.	Select		4,212.00			41.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Jozani-Chwaka Bay National Park	125689 350036	Select		6,434.00			73.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Kiwengwa-Pongwe Forest Reserve	125689 31760	Select		3,040.00			56.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Malilini Forest Reserve	125689 N.I.	Select		406.00			47.00		<input type="checkbox"/>

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
Akula National Park Msitu Mkuu Forest Reserve	125689 31762	Select		180.00			47.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Ngezi-Vumawimbi Nature Reserve	125689 555556107	Select		2,900.00			56.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Ras Kiuyu Forest Reserve	125689 31764	Select		270.00			48.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Ufufuma – Pongwe Corridor Forest Reserve	125689 N.I.	Select		1,988.00			40.00		<input type="checkbox"/>

Indicator 3 Area of land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)

Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)

Ha (Achieved at MTR)

Ha (Achieved at TE)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural land restored			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
Indicator 3.2 Area of Forest and Forest Land restored			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and shrublands restored			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00			
Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (incl. estuaries, mangroves) restored			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00			
Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	24380.00	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)
Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes that meets national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (hectares)			
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)
24,380.00			

Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided

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

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

Title	Submitted
-------	-----------

Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (direct)	0	238000	0	0
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect)	0	685000	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 ₂ e (direct)		238000		
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect)		685000		
Anticipated start year of accounting		2020		
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 ₂ e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ 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 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female		8,100		
Male		9,900		
Total	0	18000	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

Total area of PAs included in the project: JCBNP (6,434 ha), JMFR (4,212 ha), KPFR (3,040 ha), MFR (406 ha), MMFR (180 ha), NVNR (2,900 ha), RKFR (270 ha), and UPCFR (1,988 ha). Include 21,730 ha of conservation areas under CoFMA management and 2,650 ha under sustainable agricultural practices: agroforestry (1,200 ha), conservation agriculture (1,200 ha) and woodlots (250 ha). Estimate obtained with Ex-ACT: reduced deforestation (189 ktCO₂e), reforestation (111 ktCO₂e), agroforestry (326 ktCO₂e) and conservation agriculture (59 ktCO₂e). Number of beneficiaries estimated on the basis of the number of members of communities engaged in CoFMAs that are expected to adopt sustainable land use practices and livelihoods (total 3,500). Households of members participating in the project are included as beneficiaries (on average 5.1 people per household). 3,500 participating members x 5.1 individuals per household result in approx. 18,000 beneficiaries.

PART II: Project JUSTIFICATION

1. Project Description

A. describe any changes in alignment with the project design with the original pif[1]¹

A.1. *Project Description*. Elaborate on: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed; 2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects, 3) the proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area[2]² strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project, 4) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing; 5) global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF); and 6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

1) Global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed

The threats, root causes and barriers identified in the PIF were further analysed and detailed upon stakeholder consultations. The role of threats to forest resources posed by fuelwood extraction was emphasized, and the activities connected to the supply of firewood and charcoal that lead to the degradation of forest and mangrove ecosystems were analysed in more detail (presented in section II of the project document).

2) Baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects

In addition to the baseline interventions that were identified in the PIF, on which the project design builds by integrating lessons learned and establishing linkages, activities will be framed by the newly established Zanzibar Agricultural Sector Development Program (ZASDP). The program will be implemented over a ten-year period (2019-2029) with the objective to transform the agriculture sector in Zanzibar in order to accelerate economic growth, reduce poverty, increase food security, increase private-sector involvement and investments, and contribute to the environmental sustainability of the sector. The tentative budget for ZASDP is USD 167.526 million and is composed of resources from the national budget and contributions from donors and development partners.

ZASDP will have four main results areas: (i) enhanced enabling environment for agricultural transformation, (ii) strengthened climate resilience and sustainable natural resources management, (iii) expanded rural infrastructure, and (iv) intensified and competitive value chains. The first results area will review and revise the governance of the agricultural sector to improve institutional coordination, strengthen agricultural organizations and cooperatives, facilitate access by agricultural producers to financing, and improve the overall business environment of the agricultural sector in Zanzibar. The second results area will mainstream concepts on sustainable natural resources management across the agricultural sector and institutions, improve access to sustainable agricultural technologies, strengthen the provision of agricultural extension services, and incorporate considerations on climate change adaptation into agriculture policies, plans and projects. The third results area will invest in transportation, irrigation and energy infrastructure, and improve facilities for the

commercialization of agricultural products (e.g. markets, cold storage, etc.). Lastly, the fourth results area will support agro-industrial initiatives and efforts to add value to agricultural commodities.

Since the development of the PIF, progress was made in to the local context the 2015 Zanzibar Declaration on the Illegal Trade of Timber and Forest Products to curb illegal trade of timber, and in enacting implementing regulation for CITES.[3]³ The Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar (RGZ) prepared an amendment to the Zanzibar Forest Act, including provisions that will give the legal mandate to enact the CITES regulation for Zanzibar. RGZ is also receiving support through TRAFFIC.

3) Proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area[4]⁴ strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project

· **Project Outcome 1.1.** was slightly rephrased from: “1.1 Development and implementation of an integrated policy and planning framework to promote effective biodiversity and ecosystem management that supports Zanzibar’s national development, with implementation capacity in place” to “Integrated policy and planning framework developed and implemented to promote effective biodiversity conservation and ecosystem management to support Zanzibar’s national development.” The intended outcome remains the same, but emphasis is put on the actual framework (instead of a process), with capacity development included implicitly.

· **Output 1.1.1.** “1.1.1 Review of national framework (including policies, regulations and institutions) for landscape planning and biodiversity management, and establishment of an inter-ministerial landscape management planning platform to strengthen national-local and cross-sectoral coordination and capacity” was rephrased as: “Review of national framework (including policies, regulations and institutions) for land and forest management and biodiversity conservation”. Instead, the re-establishment of a National Protected Areas Board under Output 2.1.6 will include activities to help strengthen the cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms that are required for enhanced protection of forests and biodiversity. This is relevant to the existing mandate of the Board, which includes responsibility for formulation and coordination of policies on PAs.

· **Output 1.1.3.** “Development of a new Zanzibar Strategy for Illegal Trade in Flora and Fauna (also harmonized with ZABISAP and the Tanzania national strategy to combat poaching and illegal wildlife trade), with coordinated implementation involving key institutions, such as PA authorities, judiciary, police, customs and immigration. Zanzibar’s signature of CITES is facilitated. Key institutions are supported to implement the Zanzibar Declaration on the Illegal Trade of Timber and Forest Products to curb illegal trade of timber of 2015” was removed given new baseline developments including support from TRAFFIC. Instead, issues relevant to addressing the illegal wildlife trade on Zanzibar will be explicitly addressed through ZABSAP (see Output 1.1.2) with linkages to ongoing GEF-funded projects under the umbrella of the Global Wildlife Program, including in Tanzania (GEF ID 9156 and 9071).

· **Output 2.1.1.** “Detailed BD surveys of protected areas [including 20,000 ha of mangroves, wildlife reserves and COFMAs] undertaken to establish project baselines, determine critical sites and potential for corridors (co-fin)” was rephrased as: “Detailed surveys of key areas for biodiversity conservation including mangrove forests and high-conservation value forests undertaken to establish or update baselines, identify priority sites for PA management interventions and establish wildlife corridors.”

· **Output 2.1.2.** “Based on earlier BD surveys (as supported by co-finance), PA management plans are developed or updated for core protected areas [Jozani, Kiwengwa, Ngezi, Ras Kiuyu, Masangini and Msitu Mkuu]. PA plans include improved management and restoration of forest and wetland ecosystems and zones between them ensuring connectivity and maintenance of conservation values.” Was rephrased as: “New PAs are established, and management plans are developed or updated for core PAs. Management plans include improved management and restoration of forest and wetland ecosystems, as well as zones between them ensuring connectivity and maintenance of conservation values.”

•A new output was added: **Output 2.1.3.** Capacity for community forest management is strengthened. This output aims to: i) Evaluate the status of implementation of 57 existing CoFMAs; ii) Review and approve CoFMA Guidelines. The guidelines will be reviewed following a participatory, gender-responsive process and taking into consideration the results from the first phase of the evaluation of existing CoFMAs. The revision of the CoFMA Guidelines will emphasize the role of CoFMAs on biodiversity conservation and climate change mitigation and will fully incorporate gender-responsive considerations; and iii) Provide targeted training and technical backstopping on issues related to land-use planning, natural resources management, biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and adaptation, gender mainstreaming, management and conflict resolution.

•A new component was added on gender mainstreaming, knowledge management and learning, including **Outcome 3.1.** Knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation and gender mainstreaming supports adaptive management and stakeholder's engagement, and three **Outputs: 3.1.1.** Knowledge management supports policy making and systematizes lessons learned; **3.1.2.** Gender mainstreaming strategy implemented to support project implementation; **3.1.3.** Monitoring and evaluation support adaptive and effective project management and active participation from stakeholders.

4) Incremental cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, GEF TF and co-financing

Initial co-financing identified during project identification stage included contributions from the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources, Livestock and Fisheries of Zanzibar (\$8,500,000), First Vice President's Office (\$7,500,000), Local Governments (\$5,000,000), The Hague Institute for Global Justice (\$500,000), and UNDP (\$1,000,000) to a total sum of \$23,000,000. Upon project development, it became clear that the project on Governance of Climate Change Adaptation in Small Island Developing States in Zanzibar that was

supported by the Hague Institute for Global Justice had ended in 2017, and as such was no longer relevant for co-financing. Co-financing from UNDP consists of a) Procurement of 2 Toyota Hard Top vehicles (US\$ 30,000 each) for support to Component 2 in the first year of project implementation; b) Parallel community-based activities in support of Component 2 - aimed at environmentally sustainable development in Zanzibar, at an estimated US\$ 664,116 over the project period of 6 years; c) Support to gender mainstreaming under Component 3 through additional targeted activities including further assessments and training, estimated at US\$ 50,000 in the first year of project implementation; d) Contributions to knowledge management and communication under Component 3, including consultants to support the production of photo-reportages, (photo)blogs, posters, and other communication outputs for targeted audiences, at an estimated US\$ 40,000 over the project period of 6 years; e) UNDP staff time investments for project quality assurance services not covered by the GEF Agency fee for project cycle management, including time invested on supporting Government partners with delivery, coordination, monitoring, outreach, and communication, estimated at US\$ 110,200; and f) DPC estimated at US\$ 75,684 over the duration of the project.

Co-financing estimates for MANRLF and MF&P are based on the proportion of interventions included within the ambitious Zanzibar Agricultural Sector Development Program (ZASDP) that is expected to directly or indirectly contribute to the achievement of the intended outcomes of the GEF-funded project, and which is costed for a total of US\$ 167,526 million over the 10-year period of 2019-2028. This includes a proportion of actions under i) Results Area 1 of the ZASDP that focuses on enhancement of the enabling environment through improved governance, sector coordination, and empowering cooperatives and stakeholder groups (total US\$ 27,019; estimated co-financing contribution to intended outcomes of GEF project US\$6,930); ii) Results Area 2 on strengthened resilience and sustainable natural resource management (total US\$ 32,647; co-financing US\$ 20,114); Results Area 3 on enhanced rural infrastructure (total US\$ 100,692; co-financing US\$ 33,564); and Results Area 4 on intensified and competitive value chains (total US\$ 7,168; co-financing US\$ 919). In addition, parallel co-financing estimates are based on a number of other relevant ongoing and planned projects under MANRLF and MF&P, including on women's economic empowerment through seaweed value chain development, mariculture, and climate resilience (up to a total of US\$86,717,011 of which an estimated US\$ 10,033,506 is considered relevant in contributing to the intended outcomes of the GEF-funded project). \$15,000,000 of the co-financing will be provided through MANRLF and \$10,000,000 through the Ministry of Finance and Planning of Zanzibar. In total, co-financing is estimated as \$26,000,000 (cofinancing ratio of 1:5).

5) Global environmental benefits

The PIF targeted a total of 78,632 ha under improved management of key biodiversity areas including expanded CoFMAs; 70,183 ha under improved sustainable land management; and 3,300,000 tCO₂e reduced over 20 years. Recalculations during project development rendered these numbers as improbable. Instead, the project will realistically target:

- Improved management of 19,430 ha of terrestrial landscapes in protected areas;
- Improved management of 21,730 ha of forests under CFM;
- Improved management of 2,650 ha of productive landscapes; and,
- Emissions reductions and enhancement of removals by 685,000 tCO₂e (over 20 years).

The targets set in the PIF assumed that all PAs and areas under CoFMA management in both Unguja and Pemba would benefit from the project. During project preparation, in consultation with stakeholders, it became evident that this was overly ambitious given the available resources. As a result, it was agreed that project resources would be focused on areas in Unguja that could re-establish connectivity between core PAs. In Pemba, the decision was to target the conservation of buffer areas surrounding the few remaining forests on the island. It is expected that the experience from the project, adequately documented, will allow for the replication of the sustainable land-use practices demonstrated by the project and will reach other areas in Zanzibar that were not prioritized for this project.

6) Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up

The project will contribute to improving the long-term environmental sustainability of natural ecosystems and productive lands in Zanzibar through the adoption of SFM, SLM and CSA practices. The monitoring and enforcement of agreements in CoFMAs related to conservation of forests and natural resources will be improved. Management of PAs will be improved by means of building capacities of staff, updating management plans and providing equipment that is required for the efficient management of these areas. Financial sustainability will be achieved by (i) review and improvement of the regulations and management of the Forestry Development Fund; (ii) improving the capacities of communities to raise and manage financial resources, including income from fees and fines; and, (iii) promoting the adoption of income generating agricultural and alternative livelihoods activities by members of communities engaged in CoFMAs. The landscape approach and community forest management (CFM) mechanisms to be supported by the project have both the objective of ensuring strong community engagement, hence contributing to social sustainability aspects. Activities to promote this participation, build the skills of communities and facilitate the exchange of experiences and lessons have been incorporated to ensure that the project responds to the needs and views of the ultimate beneficiaries. A stakeholder engagement plan has been prepared to plan and execute specific actions to promote the participation and involvement of communities in the project activities. Systematic capacity development of governmental organizations (in particular MANRLF and the departments of forestry (DFNR) and environment (DOE)), NGOs and CSOs (e.g. community conservation committees, Jumijaza, etc.) will strengthen the institutions responsible for natural resources management in Zanzibar and contribute to institutional sustainability. While most efforts by the project will be focused on existing organizations, new institutions to be supported by the project, like the NPAB, will address key gaps in the planning, management and decision-making process related to PAs and natural resources. The establishment of new institutions will be accompanied by the adoption of financial strategies and multi-annual budgets to ensure the sustainability of these institutions.

[1] For QA.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF, no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

[2] For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project’s consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which Aichi Target(s) the project will directly contribute to achieving..

[3] Also see CITES update on the legislative progress made by Parties since the 69th meeting of the Standing Committee (SC69, Geneva, November 2017)
<https://cites.org/sites/default/files/projects/NLP/E-SC70-25.pdf>

[4] For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project's consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which Aichi Target(s) the project will directly contribute to achieving.

A.2. Child Project?

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

N/A

A.3. Stakeholders

Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

Detailed stakeholder analysis took place during project preparation, and a Stakeholder Engagement Plan was prepared to guide the implementation process in ensuring that: i) all project partners and beneficiaries are adequately involved; ii) stakeholders are targeted through communication and outreach activities; and, iii) grievance redress mechanisms are available for all stakeholders in case of concerns related to human rights infringements, environmental or social impacts inadvertently directly or indirectly attributed to project implementation (see Annex H of the project document).

Through implementation of activities described under Component 3 and in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, the project will work with a range of partners and beneficiaries including government representatives, local communities, NGOs, and academic and research institutions, with the aim of strengthening joint abilities to protect key forests and mangrove areas, while generating local as well as global environmental benefits in terms of biodiversity, land degradation, SFM and climate change mitigation.

The main objective of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan is to ensure that the interests and priorities of the different stakeholder groups and sectors are taken into account during relevant phases of project development and implementation. Specific objectives of the plan include:

- Informing stakeholders to ensure a common understanding of project goals and approaches.
- Generating project buy-in and appropriation by targeted partners and beneficiaries.
- Identification of priority interventions and strategies to achieve the intended outcomes of the project.
- Identification of opportunities for synergies and partnerships, including co-financing and institutional cooperation.
- Validation of the intervention strategy and targets by its key stakeholders.
- Facilitation of participatory M&E mechanisms.
- Establishment of grievance mechanisms.

The Stakeholder Engagement Plan describes methods to target and engage stakeholders depending on the specific actor and stage of project implementation. In addition, the project will develop a communication strategy (see Output 3.1.1) that will take into consideration the stakeholder engagement plan and that will be adapted at different stages of the project also taking into account feedback from stakeholders, as well as the grievance mechanism. The contents and format of information disseminated will be specifically adapted to targeted audiences, their educational background, cultural contexts, and languages, in order to obtain the highest possible levels of understanding and buy-in.



Documents

Title	Submitted
Annex H Stakeholder Engagement Plan	

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; Yes

Executor or co-executor;

Other (Please explain) Yes

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): The project will work very closely with civil society in both implementation as well as through participatory monitoring and evaluation processes. Protected area management will take place through existing and new CoFMA (Community Forest Management Agreement) arrangements and community-based structures for CoFMA implementation.

A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis).

A gender analysis and a Gender Action Plan (GAP) were completed during project preparation. The project was classified as gender responsive (UNDP Gender Marker 2), and will address the different needs of men or women and equitable distribution of benefits, resources, status and rights. Output 3.1.2 on “Gender mainstreaming strategy implemented to support project implementation” was included to ensure that gender equality and women’s empowerment are adequately addressed throughout the project.

Both men and women in Zanzibar rely heavily on the use of natural resources, including forest, land, water and marine resources. While men traditionally take on key responsibilities as leaders and decision-makers in terms of natural resource management and governance, and women tend to be more engaged as users of natural resources for domestic purposes, these roles are rapidly changing. As women are becoming more emancipated and educated, they are increasingly directly or indirectly involved in the governance and management of natural resources, either as permanent employees in public service, private companies, and self-employed, or as in temporal/ seasonal employees (including as tour guides in PAs). Women in Unguja appear generally more emancipated than on Pemba, where traditional gender roles seem more deeply engrained in society.

Approximately 98% of women in rural Zanzibar are engaged in agriculture (economically active), mostly in crop production, and livestock related activities including milking, marketing and processing. Women constitute 74% of the agro-enterprise labour force, including in agriculture, fisheries, seaweed farming (which is mostly done by women), as well as food preparation, fetching, harvesting, transportation and storage activities. Though women are the main producers, they have a minimal share of the benefits, limited access to production resources and less control over the proceeds of their labour. Ownership of land in Zanzibar remains heavily skewed towards men, although attitudes with respect to traditional tenure arrangements are rapidly changing.

Project activities are designed in a way that is gender responsive while facilitating equality and equity for both men and women to the extent possible given the constraints of structural barriers that are related to deep-rooted traditions and power structures. The project will aim at enabling transformational changes in women’s ability to engage in decision-making processes relevant to the governance and sustainable management of natural resources. While some of the root causes of the existing gender imbalances in

Zanzibar cannot be resolved given the focus, resources, and time that is available to this specific project, activities will ensure that both men and women will be empowered to increase their understanding and appreciation of the importance that both genders play in ensuring environmental sustainability.

The project will implement a dedicated GAP that includes activities to ensure mainstreaming of concerns related to gender equality and equity (Section 5 and Table 2 below). The aim of GAP is fourfold: (i) facilitate equality in accessing project benefits by both men and women; (ii) ensure that women are actively consulted and engaged in project design, decision-making, implementation and monitoring processes; and, (iii) collect gender disaggregated data/information to inform M&E and adaptive management responses. The plan will guide the Project Management Unit (PMU) as well as project partners on the involvement and integration of men and women, not only in the delivery of outputs, but also in the M&E of the process and the results obtained.

Throughout project implementation, the following actions will be undertaken to maximise gender mainstreaming opportunities:

- Empower women by targeting and involving them in planning processes, policy and legislation reviews, capacity enhancement and outreach activities.
- Invite gender-focused NGOs to participate in meetings, workshops and discussion groups.
- Actively involve gender-focused NGOs in activities aimed at enabling sustainable land management and alternative environmentally sustainable income generation.

In line with national policies as well as UNDP and GEF guidelines, the project will adopt the following principles in its day-to-day management:

- Demonstrate gender responsiveness in all interactions with project stakeholders.
- No use of language or behaviour denoting bias and disrespect for any individual based on gender.
- Avoid gender stereotyping in project documents, and communication outputs.
- Support zero tolerance for sexual harassment, gender-based violence and/or sexual exploitation and abuse of men, women, girls and boys that may occur in connection with any of its supported activities.

Please refer to Annex I of the project document for more details on the gender analysis and GAP.

Documents

Title	Submitted
Annex I Gender Action Plan	
Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?	
Yes	
If yes, please upload document or equivalent here	
If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:	

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

Improving women's participation and decision making Yes

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women Yes

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

Yes

A.5. Risks

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.

Risks identified in the PIF were updated during project preparation. As per standard UNDP requirements, the project will monitor risks continuously and report on their status on a quarterly basis (as recorded in the UNDP ATLAS risk log). Risks will be reported as critical when the expected impact and probability are high (i.e., when impact is rated as 5, and when impact is rated as 4 and probability is rated at 3 or higher).[1] Management responses to critical risks will be reported to the GEF in the annual PIR.

Risks are presented in section IV of the project document and in the table below.

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i>			QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?
<i>Risk Description</i>	<i>Impact and Probability (1-5)</i>	<i>Significance (Low, Moderate, High)</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in project design. If ESIA/SESA is required note that assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.</i>

<p>Principle 1: Human Rights - Risk 1 Possibility that the project may lead to adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups</p> <p>Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement - Risk 5.1 and 5.2. Probability that the project may involve permanent displacement and subsequent loss of assets.</p> <p>Standard 6. Indigenous Peoples - Risks 6.3., 6.5., 6.6. and 6.8 Possibility that project affects rights, lands and territories of indigenous peoples, involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by them</p>	<p>I = 5 P = 4</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>The project ultimately aims to improve enjoyment of human rights through improved PA management for the benefit of all, through the rendering of ecosystem services, and by strengthening environmentally sound livelihood alternatives.</p> <p>The project will contribute to capacitating civil servants responsible for monitoring and enforcement of measures to ensure adequate management of PAs (including through Community Forest Management CoFMA systems). People who are encroaching on PAs, poaching or otherwise illegally accessing natural resources could be apprehended and held accountable, which could result in limitation of access to natural resources (land</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the first 6 months of project implementation, an Environmental & Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) will be undertaken and an Environmental & Social Impact Management Plan (ESMP) prepared, to further refine risk identification and mitigation strategies, as well as to establish a system for monitoring these risks. Based on the findings, required management plans (e.g. Indigenous Peoples Plan, Resettlement/Livelihood Action Plan) will be developed and implemented as appropriate. The project will not initiate high risk activities until ESIA and ESMP have been finalised. The areas that were identified during project preparation for possible establishment of new CoFMa's and corridors are adjacent to forests that are already under community management and are situated largely in more sparsely populated parts of the islands. Site identification and boundary demarcation will be done in close consultations with local communities with the aim of securing their agreement through FPIC processes, participatory mapping, and validation. Applicable rights and claims to natural resources will be mapped and respected while working closely together with targeted communities and ethnic groups to protect biodiversity and strengthen livelihoods. The project will actively engage stakeholders at all levels through targeted communication and outreach efforts (also see Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Annex F) including with the aim to increase awareness about the boundaries of CofMas/Protected Areas, while simultaneously strengthening livelihoods and reducing the need to utilize resources from within PAs. Communities on Zanzibar have historically established traditional mechanisms using community dialogue supported by local leaders, which can potentially be used by the project as platforms to discuss and address grievances in case project activities are perceived to result in adverse impacts. The project Stakeholder Engagement Plan furthermore includes a Grievance Redress Mechanism that will immediately be activated in case any concerns are raised by partners or beneficiaries about human rights infringements, adverse socio-economic or environmental impacts directly or indirectly attributed to project implementation. All concerns will be assessed, documented, and followed up with appropriate responses in order to address the issue.
---	------------------------	--------------------	--	--

<p>Principle 1: Human Rights - Risk 6 & 7. Likelihood that duty bearers or rights-holders may not possess the capacity to meet their obligations or claim their rights.</p>	<p>I = 3 P = 2</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Stakeholder capacity is generally weak, both within Government and at the local community level.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The project will have a strong focus on enhancing capacity of relevant authorities and targeted communities to ensure that they have the required knowledge and skills to actively participate in project interventions, incorporate lessons learned, and uptake good practices. · The above-mentioned ESIA and plans will cover this risk too, as determined appropriate.
<p>Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability - Risk 1.2. & 1.6 Project activities are proposed within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas; and involves reforestation.</p>	<p>I = 1 P = 5</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>The project targets a network of PAs on Zanzibar, including critical coastal habitats and environmentally sensitive areas. The project is specifically designed to have a positive impact on biodiversity conservation and land management in critical habitats, through improved management of existing PAs and forests.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The project will work to strengthen institutional and community-based PA management capacities at all levels to ensure effective and efficient management of PAs and CoFMas– therefore its overall impact is expected to be positive.

<p>Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability - Risk</p> <p>1.5. Likelihood that inappropriate or inadequate efforts to rehabilitate and reforest the previously deforested areas (including through inadvertent introduction of invasive alien species) negatively affecting the ecological integrity of the area.</p>	<p>I = 3 P = 1</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>The project is designed to have a positive socio-economic and environmental impact by promoting sustainable land and forest management practices, including reforestation (of PA/CoFMa buffer zones and mangrove areas).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Care will be taken to use suitable species for reforestation activities and to avoid inadvertent negative ecological impacts. Only native species will be used, so the risk of introducing invasive species will be minimal. · Appropriate, sustainable land/forest management and biodiversity conservation approaches will be used.
--	------------------------	------------------------	---	--

<p>Standard 2: CCM & CCA - Risk 2.2. Probability that project outcomes are sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change.</p>	<p>I = 3 P = 4</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>The climate of Zanzibar is known to be changing, and the last decade has seen a significant increase in climate variability and extreme weather events. The majority of livelihoods of the targeted communities are dependent on climate-sensitive activities, including agriculture, fisheries and tourism. As an island, Zanzibar is also very likely to be affected by sea level rise and coastal erosion.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · By protecting coastal PAs and forests and strengthening livelihoods, the project will directly contribute to enhancing environmental and socio-economic resilience to the impacts of climate change. Linkages will be established with past, ongoing and future efforts to improve climate information and resilience.
---	------------------------	------------------------	--	--

<p>Standard 6. Indigenous Peoples - Risk 6.1. Presence of indigenous people in the project area (including project area of influence).</p>	<p>I = 2 P = 1</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>At present, the Zanzibar islands are inhabited by a diversity of ethnic groups including Waswahili/Shirazi (majority), Zanzibar Arabs, Hadimu, Tumbatu, Persians, Comorans, Somali, Indians a growing number of mainland Tanzanians and expats. Natural resource access rights/claims and land ownership patterns in Zanzibar underwent several historical shifts resulting from immigration as well as centralised government reforms. The Hadimu and Tumbatu are the initial inhabitants of Zanzibar, which were the dominant population until early 18th century. In the 10th century, settlers arrived from Persia, which were absorbed by the Hadimu and Tumbatu. In the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The presence of people with a diversity of ethnic backgrounds on Zanzibar is not necessarily perceived as a risk in itself, although there is a possibility that tensions/conflicts between people with different ethnicities / tribal affiliations are magnified in case of grievances. · Applicable rights and claims to natural resources will be respected while working closely together with targeted communities and ethnic groups to protect biodiversity and strengthen livelihoods. In addition, and as described above, grievance mechanisms will be put in place by the project.
---	------------------------	-------------------	--	---

Principle 2: Gender Equality & Women's Empowerment - Risk 2. Possibility that the Project potentially reproduces discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits?	I = 2 P = 1	Low	The project is designed to ensure gender issues are considered and taken into account during implementation.	· Project implementation will take into account the Gender Analysis and Action Plan (Annexed to the Project Document). The plan pays particular attention to existing discriminations against women (for instance, based on their level of education compared to men), and establish mechanisms (e.g. targeted training methods) to reduce the risk that these discriminations are inadvertently reproduced in project implementation.
QUESTION 4: What is the overall project risk categorization?				
Select one (see SESP for guidance)			Comments	
<i>Low Risk</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>		
<i>Moderate Risk</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>		
<i>High Risk</i>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?				
Check all that apply			Comments	
<i>Principle 1: Human Rights</i>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
<i>Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</i>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
1. <i>Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management</i>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Note that the project is designed to ensure that activities aimed at protecting biological diversity and promoting sustainable land management methods will benefit the livelihoods of participating communities.	
2. <i>Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</i>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
3. <i>Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>		
4. <i>Cultural Heritage</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>		
5. <i>Displacement and Resettlement</i>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

	6. <i>Indigenous Peoples</i>	X	While Zanzibar is inhabited by indigenous peoples as per UNDP definition, the presence of different ethnicities on the islands in itself is not considered a risk to the project, although there is a possibility that conflicts between people with different ethnicities / tribal affiliations are magnified in case of grievances (as also explained above).
	7. <i>Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

[1] UNDP 2016. Environmental and Social Screening Procedure

A.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.

The project will be implemented following UNDP's national implementation modality (NIM), according to the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between UNDP and the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania, and the Country Programme.

Implementing Partner: The lead implementing partner (IP) for this project is MANRLF, collaborating closely with the Second Vice-President's Office (SVPO), which will serve as the technical lead on climate change adaptation and mitigation. MANRLF will be responsible for the execution of activities under component one of the project. DFNR will be a Responsible Partner (RP) for the execution of components two and three. The IP is responsible and accountable for managing this project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of UNDP resources. The IP is responsible for: (i) approving and signing the multiyear workplan; (ii) approving and signing the combined delivery report at the end of the year; and, (iii) signing the financial report or the funding authorization and certificate of expenditures. The IP will appoint a Project Director (PD), who will serve as key contact at MANRLF and support the project management team. The PD may also serve as the IP's representative at the Project Board. The PD's role will not be financed by the project but will represent an in-kind contribution by the Government of Zanzibar.

Project Board: The Project Board (PB) (also referred to as Project Steering Committee) is responsible for making by consensus, management decisions when guidance is required by the Project Manager (PM), including recommendations for UNDP/IP approval of project plans and revisions, and addressing any project level grievances. In order to ensure UNDP's ultimate accountability, Board decisions should be made in accordance with standards that shall ensure management for development results, best value money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition. In case a consensus cannot be reached within the Board, final decision shall rest with the UNDP Programme Manager. The Board will meet at least once annually, with additional meetings convened if deemed necessary. Specific responsibilities of the PB include: (i) provide overall guidance and direction to the project; (ii) address project issues as raised by the PM; (iii) provide guidance on new project risks, and agree on possible countermeasures and management actions to address

specific risks; (iv) agree on PM's tolerances as required; (v) review the project progress, and provide direction and recommendations to ensure that the agreed deliverables are produced satisfactorily according to plans; (vi) appraise the annual project implementation report, including the quality assessment rating report; make recommendations for the workplan; (vii) provide ad hoc direction and advice for exceptional situations when the PM's tolerances are exceeded; and, (viii) assess and decide to proceed on project changes through appropriate revisions. The composition of the PB must include the following roles:

Executive: The Lead IP represents ownership of the project and will Chair the PB. The Lead IP, MANRLF, is ultimately responsible for the project, supported by the **Beneficiary Representatives and Development Partner**. The Lead IP is represented at the PB by the Project Director. The Lead IP is represented at the PB by the PD. The IP's role is to ensure that the project is focused throughout its life cycle on achieving its objectives and delivering outputs that will contribute to higher level outcomes. The executive must ensure that the project gives value for money, ensuring cost-conscious approach to the project, balancing the demands of beneficiary and supplier. Specific responsibilities of the Executive, as part of the above responsibilities for the PB, include: (i) ensure that there is a coherent project organisation structure and logical set of plans; (ii) set tolerances in the annual work plan and other plans as required for the PM; (iii) monitor and control the progress of the project at a strategic level; (iv) ensure that risks are being tracked and mitigated as effectively as possible; (v) brief relevant stakeholders about project progress; and, (vi) organize and chair PB meetings.

Beneficiary Representatives: Individual or group of individuals representing the interests of those who will ultimately benefit from the project. The Senior Beneficiary's primary function within the Board is to ensure the realization of project results from the perspective of project beneficiaries. The Senior Beneficiary role is held by a representative of the government or civil society. The Senior Beneficiary will be selected from representatives from CoFMAs organizations at the project inception phase. The Senior Beneficiary is responsible for validating the needs and for monitoring that the solution will meet those needs within the constraints of the project. The Senior Beneficiary role monitors progress against targets and quality criteria. Specific responsibilities of the Senior Beneficiary, as part of the above responsibilities for the PB, are: (i) prioritize and contribute beneficiaries' opinions on PB decisions on whether to implement recommendations on proposed changes; (ii) specification of the Beneficiary's needs is accurate, complete and unambiguous; (iii) implementation of activities at all stages is monitored to ensure that they will meet the beneficiary's needs and are progressing towards that target; (iv) impact of potential changes is evaluated from the beneficiary point of view; and, (v) risks to the beneficiaries are frequently monitored.

Project Management Unit: A PMU, hosted by DFNR, will support the PM implementing the project. The PMU will be staffed by the PM, who will lead it, a part-time Technical Advisor, a Knowledge Management and M&E Expert, a Financial Accounting Expert and a Project Assistant. Activities on the ground, in particular activities to promote sustainable land-use practices by communities engaged in CoFMAs will be supported and overseen by local coordinators in Unguja (2) and Pemba (1). Both the Financial Accounting Expert and the Project Assistant are provided by the IP as part of its in-kind contribution to the project. Under the leadership of the PM, the PMU will plan and oversee the execution of the project activities and evaluate and report on their progress. The PMU will facilitate the coordination among teams, and the communication with the PB and stakeholders.

Project Manager: The PM has the authority to run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the PB within the constraints laid down by the Board. The PM is responsible for day-to-day management and decision-making for the project. The PM's prime responsibility is to ensure that the project produces the results specified in the project document, to the required standard of quality and within the specified constraints of time and cost, as well as to oversee safeguards monitoring and help ensure that grievances are adequately addressed. The PM will be appointed jointly by the lead IP and UNDP, who should be different from the Lead IP's representative in the Board.

The Lead IP appoints the PM, who should be different from the Lead IP's representative in the Board.

Technical Advisory Group: A Technical Advisory Group will provide technical and scientific guidance to the PMU and PB. Annual work plans for the Technical Advisory Group will be prepared by the PMU, in consultation with the Technical Advisory Group. Meetings of the Technical Advisory Groups will be convened by the PM every six months, at a minimum. The composition of the Technical Advisory Group includes a representative of the State of Zanzibar University, a representative from Kizimbani Agricultural Research Institute, a representative from the Institute of Marine Sciences and a representative from Jumijaza. Additional members of the Technical Advisory Group could be approved by the PM and experts may be invited to provide input to items under consideration by the group.

Project Assurance: UNDP provides a three-tier supervision, oversight and quality assurance role – funded by the GEF agency fee – involving UNDP staff in Country Offices and at regional and headquarters levels. Project Assurance must be totally independent of the Project Management function. The quality assurance role supports the PB and PMU by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions. This role ensures appropriate project management milestones are managed and completed. The PB cannot delegate any of its quality assurance responsibilities to the PM. This project oversight and quality assurance role is covered by the GEF Agency.

Coordination. The project integrates and will continue to build on lessons learned and successes from previous interventions relevant to natural resources management in Zanzibar through the establishment of partnerships. Project Document Section IV Results and Partnerships, Table 7 provides an overview of key partnerships for successful project implementation, including other ongoing GEF-funded projects (GEF ID 5034, 9132, 9400, 9524). The Project Manager will elaborate a collaboration plan with these and other relevant initiatives, which will be monitored and guided by the Project Board.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7. Benefits

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

The project will benefit local communities primarily by providing capacity enhancement through knowledge sharing and skill building as well as grants for the adoption of sustainable land-use practices and alternative livelihoods. Communities will receive training and technical assistance for undertaking initiatives involving, inter alia, conservation agriculture, forest farming, reforestation, water management, beekeeping, ecotourism and the production of improved cook stoves to improve their income in an environmentally sustainable way. Ultimately, local-scale socio-economic benefits are expected to result in enhanced protection of natural resources and biodiversity, and so contribute to the sustained provision of ecosystem services delivered by forests and mangrove forests. Activities under Component 3 on knowledge management and Output 2.1.4 on learning and exchange between CoFMAs will contribute to the identification, analysis and dissemination of successful land-use and conservation practices adopted at the local level to enable replication and upscaling at the national level.

The number of beneficiaries has been estimated on the basis of (1) number of producers expected to adopt sustainable land-use practices and livelihoods: 1,250 producers adopt agroforestry practices, 1,250 producers adopt conservation agriculture practices, 500 producers establish woodlots (total 3,000 producers); and (2) number of sustainable livelihoods initiatives adopted with support from the project: 40 initiatives on non-timber forest products (incl. beekeeping), each with 10 members (subtotal 400 entrepreneurs), 8 initiatives on improved cook stoves, each with 10 members (subtotal 80 entrepreneurs), 5 initiatives on ecotourism, each with 20 members (subtotal 100 entrepreneurs) (total 500 entrepreneurs). In total 3,500 member of communities engaged in CoFMAs in the project areas are expected to benefit directly from these activities. As project activities on sustainable land-use practices and livelihoods are expected to improve the income of participants, households (on average 5.1 individuals) of members of the communities taking part in these activities are also considered direct beneficiaries.

A.8. Knowledge Management

Elaborate on the Knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user- friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

Project Component 3 focuses specifically on gender mainstreaming, knowledge management and learning. Under this component, lessons learned and good practices relevant to natural resources management, biodiversity conservation and climate change mitigation will be identified, packaged and disseminated in appropriate formats to targeted audiences.

Strong focus will be placed on the development and implementation of a comprehensive communication strategy to ensure that lessons learned and good practices are systematically compiled and disseminated to enable adaptive management, replication and upscaling, including through policy recommendations. The contents and format of information disseminated will be specifically adapted to targeted audiences, their educational background, cultural contexts, and languages, in order to obtain the highest possible levels of understanding and buy-in, including through the following mechanisms:

- **Community skits and bulletin boards:** Kiswahilli-spoken skits, and notifications/posters on local bulletin boards/offices will be developed as a tool to help raise awareness of rural beneficiaries on relevant project subjects.
- **Brochures/flyers/newsletters:** Printed materials will be used for sharing project summaries and knowledge products with national stakeholders (Government staff, CoFMAs, communities around targeted forests).
- **Radio, TV, newspapers, press releases:** The media will be used to reach broader stakeholder groups in Zanzibar, mobilize support and raise awareness on project activities and relevant environmental topics.
- **Exhibitions:** Posters, photos, banners, and/or short (20 min) videos will be produced for display in national and international fora and fairs.
- **Policy briefs:** To inform decision makers on lessons learned and good practices resulting from project implementation and enable replication/upscaling, policy briefs will be developed for sharing with Government stakeholders.
- **Progress reports:** Reports produced as part of M&E processes (e.g. UNDP GEF PIR) will be shared with the PB, UNDP, donors, as well as other relevant stakeholders (as appropriate).

· **Online media:** The project will share with the general public progress updates and good practices through online media, including MANRLF’s website[1] and platforms such as UNDP EXPOSURE[2] and PANORAMA[3]. Posts may include stories, photos, photoblogs, short videos etc. To reach national and global audiences, the project could also consider establishing accounts on social media including Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube/Vimeo if sufficiently capacity is available (e.g. within the PMU, or through a dedicated communication expert at MANRLF) to manage these accounts appropriately.

In addition, the project will explore opportunities for learning and potential technology transfer from peer countries through South-South and Triangular Cooperation. To present opportunities for replication in other countries, the project will codify good practices and facilitate dissemination through global on-going South-South and global platforms, such as Africa Solutions Platform, the UN South-South Galaxy knowledge sharing platform and PANORAMA[4]. In addition, in order to bring the voice of Zanzibar to global and regional fora, the project will explore opportunities for meaningful participation in Match-Making events, as well as specific global events, where UNDP could support engagement through side events and other meetings in the global development discourse on biodiversity conservation and sustainable landscape management. The project will furthermore provide opportunities for regional cooperation with countries that are implementing initiatives on community forest and natural resources management through a landscape approach in geopolitical, social and environmental contexts relevant to the proposed project in Zanzibar. For example, Rwanda is investing in the restoration of forest landscapes strengthening CFM and supporting sustainable agricultural practices and alternative livelihoods (GEF ID 9385). The proposed project will contribute the knowledge and experience on these topics by documenting and disseminating lessons learned, best practices and successful technologies and business models. Component 3 will include activities to plan and maintain collaboration with relevant initiatives in Tanzania and other countries in East and South Africa.

[1] <http://www.kilimoznz.go.tz>

[2] <https://stories.undp.org>

[3] <https://www.iucn.org/theme/protected-areas/our-work/projects/panorama-solutions-healthy-planet>

[4] <https://panorama.solutions/en>

B. Description of the consistency of the project with:

B.1. Consistency with National Priorities

Describe the consistency of the project with nation strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.

Forestry and biodiversity conservation are rooted in Zanzibar’s environmental policies and social and economic development plans. CFM, agricultural development and a strong PAS system are three elements that are part of the strategies to meet the environmental and development goals of Zanzibar’s policies and plans.

The RGZ has adopted the third Zanzibar Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty of Zanzibar for 2016 – 2020 (MKUZA III). The objective of the strategy is to achieve “social and economic prosperity to reach middle-income status” by 2020. The strategy is organized around five key result areas: (i) sustainable and inclusive growth, (ii) human capital development, (iii) quality services, (iv) environmental sustainability and climate resilience, and (v) good governance. MKUZA III identifies the expansion of CFM as a key strategic action to achieve its objective on environmental sustainability. CFM is also promoted by Zanzibar’s Forest Policy (1999), as a mechanism for improving natural resources management and providing benefits to communities living close to forest reserves and conservation areas in Zanzibar. In Zanzibar, CFM is implemented by means of CoFMAs. The establishment and management of areas under CFM are regulated by the Forest Resources Management and Conservation Act No. 10 (1996). Under these regulations, communities, represented by Sheia Conervation Committees (SCCs), enter into agreements with DFNR to share responsibilities and obligations over the management of natural resources within their territories. Actions to achieve the government’s goals related to the expansion and strengthening of CoFMAs are described in Zanzibar’s National Forest Resources Management Plan (2015 – 2025). The plan has seven goals, the fourth of which is related to forests under community management. The goal aims at ensuring that at least 50% of community forests are sustainably managed. The strategy to achieve the goal includes (i) strengthening CoFMAs, (ii) promoting tree planting, (iii) reducing the demand for firewood, (iv) preventing and managing forest fires, and (v) promoting honey production. The (intended) nationally determined contribution ((i)NDC) by the URT lists actions to mitigate change in the forestry sector, including upscaling CFM and promoting reforestation and conservation initiatives. Similarly, Zanzibar’s Climate Change Strategy (2014 – 2030) also proposes the promotion of CoFMAs to achieve climate change mitigation objectives and aims at enhancing carbon sequestration in natural ecosystems.

The promotion of a productive and sustainable agricultural sector is a main objective under the key result area on sustainable and inclusive growth of MKUZA III. The Agricultural Sector Policy of Zanzibar (2003) links agricultural development to poverty reduction and to the sustainable management of natural resources, including addressing threats posed by unsustainable fuelwood collection and the extraction of forests products (incl. timber). The policy identifies several barriers to the sustainable development of the agricultural sector, including limited of access to knowledge, technologies, infrastructure (e.g. irrigation), agricultural inputs and agricultural extension services. Zanzibar’s Climate Change Strategy highlights the challenges presented by the unsustainable use of natural resources and the low productivity of the agricultural sector. The strategy discusses climate mitigation options linked to CSA -including agroforestry-, and the large-scale adoption of improved cook stoves.

The strategy on growth and poverty reduction defines the protection of marine and terrestrial ecosystems as one of the major objectives under the key result area on environmental sustainability and climate resilience. The strategy sets targets for the fraction of marine and terrestrial areas to be put under protection (from 16% in 2015, to 20% in 2020) and on the area to be reforested/afforested (3,200 ha by 2020). The strategy also proposes the establishment of a National Protected Areas Board. Zanzibar’s Environmental Policy (2013) defines strategies for the establishment and management of PAs in the marine and terrestrial environment and echoes the call in MKUZA III for the establishment of a National Protected Areas Board. Zanzibar’s Environmental Management Act (2015) provides faculties to the Minister responsible for terrestrial and marine natural resources, in consultation with the Minister responsible for environmental management, to designate new PAs and to enact regulations for the management of these areas.

Tanzania’s NBSAP for 2015-2020 has a goal to improve the integrity of country’s ecosystems, contributing to the wellbeing and socio-economic development of the country. The NBSAP sets national targets in line with the Aichi targets under CBD. While the NBSAP is focused mainly on Tanzania’s mainland, the project will contribute to several of the targets defined therein, including target 5 on reducing the rate of degradation and fragmentation of ecosystems and the loss of habitats; Aichi Target 7 on agriculture and biodiversity policies, laws and strategies to promote sustainable management of forests, agricultural and aquaculture ecosystems; target 11 on increasing the area under marine PAs and managing effectively both terrestrial and marine PAs; Target 14 on restoring and safeguarding ecosystems that provide essential services, taking into account the needs of women and local and vulnerable communities; and, Target 15 on enhancing ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks through conservation and restoration, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation, and combating

C. Describe The Budgeted M & E Plan:

As outlined in the Project Results Framework, progress towards delivering outputs and activities towards achieving the intended outcomes will be monitored annually and evaluated regularly. The project M&E plan will also facilitate adaptive management and learning; and ensure that knowledge is shared and widely disseminated to support the scaling up and replication of project results. These activities will be supported by project Component 3.

Project-level monitoring and evaluation will be undertaken in compliance with UNDP requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP and UNDP Evaluation Policy. The UNDP Country Office will work with the relevant project stakeholders to ensure UNDP M&E requirements are met in a timely fashion and to high quality standards. Additional mandatory GEF-specific M&E requirements (as outlined below) will be undertaken in accordance with the GEF M&E policy and other relevant GEF policies.[1]

In addition to these mandatory UNDP and GEF M&E requirements, other M&E activities deemed necessary to support project-level adaptive management will be agreed during the Project Inception Workshop and will be detailed in the Inception Report. This will include the exact role of project target groups and other stakeholders in project M&E activities including the GEF Operational Focal Point and national/regional institutes assigned to undertake project monitoring. The GEF Operational Focal Point will strive to ensure consistency in the approach taken to the GEF-specific M&E requirements (notably the GEF Tracking Tools) across all GEF-financed projects in the country. This could be achieved for example by using one national institute to complete the GEF Tracking Tools for all GEF-financed projects in the country, including projects supported by other GEF Agencies.[2]

M&E Oversight and monitoring responsibilities

Project Manager: The project will employ a PM who will be responsible for day-to-day project management and regular monitoring of project results and risks, including social and environmental risks. The PM will ensure that all project staff members maintain a high level of transparency, responsibility and accountability in M&E and reporting of project results. The PM will inform the Project Board, the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor of any delays or difficulties as they arise during implementation so that appropriate support and corrective measures can be adopted.

The PM will develop annual work plans based on the multi-year work plan included in Annex A of UNDP project document, including annual output targets to support the efficient implementation of the project. The PM will ensure that the standard UNDP and GEF M&E requirements are fulfilled to the highest quality. This includes, but is not limited to, ensuring the results framework indicators are monitored annually in time for evidence-based reporting in the GEF Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), and that the monitoring of risks and the various plans/strategies developed to support project implementation (e.g. GAP, stakeholder engagement plan, etc.) occur on a regular basis.

Project Board: The PB will take corrective action as needed to ensure the project achieves the desired results. The Project Board will hold project reviews to assess the performance of the project and appraise the annual work plan for the following year. In the project's final year, the PB will hold an end-of-project review to capture lessons learned and discuss opportunities for scaling up and to highlight project results and lessons learned with relevant audiences. This final review meeting will also discuss the findings outlined in the project terminal evaluation report and the management response.

Project Implementing Partner: The IP is responsible for providing all required information and data necessary for timely, comprehensive and evidence-based project reporting, including results and financial data, as necessary. The IP will strive to ensure project-level M&E is undertaken by national institutes and is aligned with national systems so that the data used and generated by the project supports national systems.

UNDP Country Office: The UNDP Country Office will support the PM as needed, including through annual supervision missions. The annual supervision missions will take place according to the schedule outlined in the annual work plan. Supervision mission reports will be circulated to the project team and Project Board within one month of the mission. The UNDP Country Office will initiate and organize key GEF M&E activities including the annual GEF PIR, the independent mid-term review and the independent terminal evaluation. The UNDP Country Office will also ensure that the standard UNDP and GEF M&E requirements are fulfilled to the highest quality.

The UNDP Country Office is responsible for complying with all UNDP project-level M&E requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP. This includes ensuring the UNDP Quality Assurance Assessment during implementation is undertaken annually; that annual targets at the output level are developed, monitored and reported using UNDP corporate systems; the regular updating of the ATLAS risk log; and, the updating of the UNDP gender marker on an annual basis based on gender mainstreaming progress reported in the GEF PIR and the UNDP Results Oriented Annual Report (ROAR). Any quality concerns flagged during these M&E activities (e.g. annual GEF PIR quality assessment ratings) must be addressed by the UNDP Country Office and the Project Manager.

The UNDP Country Office will retain all M&E records for this project for up to seven years after project financial closure to support ex-post evaluations undertaken by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (UNDP IEO) and/or the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (GEF IEO).

UNDP-GEF Unit: The UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor and the UNDP-GEF Directorate will provide additional M&E and implementation quality assurance and troubleshooting support as needed.

Audit: The project will be audited as per UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies on NIM implemented projects.[3]

Additional GEF monitoring and reporting requirements

Inception workshop and report: A project inception workshop will be held within two months after the project document has been signed by all relevant parties to, amongst others:

- a) Re-orient project stakeholders to the project strategy and discuss any changes in the overall context that influence project strategy and implementation;
- b) Discuss the roles and responsibilities of the project team, including reporting and communication lines and conflict resolution mechanisms;
- c) Review the results framework and finalize the indicators, means of verification and monitoring plan;
- d) Discuss reporting, monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities and finalize the M&E budget; identify national/regional institutes to be involved in project-level M&E; discuss the role of the GEF Operational Focal Point in M&E;
- e) Update and review responsibilities for monitoring the various project plans and strategies, including the risk log; Social and Environmental Procedure (SESP), Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP), and other safeguard requirements; project grievance mechanisms; the gender strategy; the knowledge management strategy, and other relevant strategies;
- f) Review financial reporting procedures and mandatory requirements, and agree on the arrangements for the annual audit; and,
- g) Plan and schedule Project Board meetings and finalize the first year annual work plan.

The PM will prepare the inception report no later than one month after the inception workshop. The inception report will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and will be approved by the Project Board.

GEF PIR: The Project Manager, the UNDP Country Office, and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor will provide objective input to the annual GEF PIR covering the reporting period July (previous year) to June (current year) for each year of project implementation. The Project Coordinator will ensure that the indicators included in the project results framework are monitored annually in advance of the PIR submission deadline so that progress can be reported in the PIR. Any environmental and social risks and related management plans will be monitored regularly, and progress will be reported in the PIR.

The PIR submitted to the GEF will be shared with the PB. The UNDP Country Office will coordinate the input of the GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders to the PIR as appropriate. The quality rating of the previous year's PIR will be used to inform the preparation of the subsequent PIR.

Lessons learned and knowledge generation: Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention area through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to the project. The project will identify, analyze and share lessons learned that might be beneficial to the design and implementation of similar projects and disseminate these lessons widely. There will be continuous information exchange between this project and other projects of similar focus in the same country, region and globally.

GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools: The GEF Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) will be used to track improvements to the management of PAs include in the project. UNDP's capacity development scorecard will be used to monitor and evaluate changes to the capacities of key institutions participating in the project.

The baseline/CEO Endorsement GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools (submitted as Annex D to the project document) will be updated by the Project Manager/Team (not the evaluation consultants hired to undertake the mid-term review or the terminal evaluation) and shared with the mid-term review (MTR) consultants and terminal evaluation (TE) consultants before the required review/evaluation missions take place. The updated GEF Tracking Tools will be submitted to the GEF along with the completed MTR report and TE report.

Independent MTR: An independent MTR process will begin after the second PIR has been submitted to the GEF, and the MTR report will be submitted to the GEF in the same year as the third PIR. The MTR findings and responses outlined in the management response will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's duration. The terms of reference, the review process and the MTR report will follow the standard templates and guidance prepared by the UNDP IEO for GEF-financed projects available on the UNDP Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). As noted in this guidance, the evaluation will be 'independent, impartial and rigorous'. The consultants that will be hired to undertake the assignment will be independent from organizations that were involved in designing, executing or advising on the project to be evaluated. The GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders will be involved and consulted during the MTR process. Additional quality assurance support is available from the UNDP-GEF Directorate. The final MTR report will be available in English, cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and approved by the Project Board.

Independent TE: An independent TE will take place upon completion of all major project outputs and activities. The TE process will begin three months before operational closure of the project allowing the evaluation mission to proceed while the project team is still in place, yet ensuring the project is close enough to completion for the evaluation team to reach conclusions on key aspects such as project sustainability. The Project Manager will remain on contract until the TE report and management response have been finalized. The terms of reference, the evaluation process and the final TE report will follow the standard templates and guidance prepared by the UNDP IEO for GEF-financed projects available on the UNDP ERC. As noted in this guidance, the evaluation will be 'independent, impartial and rigorous'. The consultants that will be hired to undertake the assignment will be independent from organizations that were involved in designing, executing or advising on the project to be evaluated. The GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders will be

involved and consulted during the TE process. Additional quality assurance support is available from the UNDP-GEF Directorate. The final TE report will be available in English, cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and approved by the Project Board. The TE report will be publicly available on the UNDP ERC.

The UNDP Country Office will include the planned project TE in the UNDP Country Office evaluation plan, and will upload the final TE report in English and the corresponding management response to the UNDP ERC. Once uploaded to the UNDP ERC, the UNDP IEO will undertake a quality assessment, validate the findings and ratings in the TE report, and rate the quality of the TE report. The UNDP IEO assessment report will be sent to the GEF IEO along with the project TE report.

Final report: The project's terminal PIR along with the TE report and corresponding management response will serve as the final project report package. The final project report package shall be discussed with the PB during an end-of-project review meeting to discuss lesson learned and opportunities for scaling up.

The budget for M&E activities is as follows:

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to project budget[4] (USD)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
Inception workshop	UNDP CO	6,000	None	Within 2 months of ProDoc signature
Inception report	Project Manager	None	None	Within two weeks of inception workshop
Standard UNDP monitoring and reporting requirements as outlined in POPP	UNDP CO	None	None	Quarterly, annually
Risk management	Project Manager UNDP CO	None	None	Quarterly, annually
Review of indicators in project results framework	Project Manager	10,000	None	Annually
GEF PIR	Project Manager UNDP CO UNDP-GEF team	None	None	Annually
Spot checks as part of assurance activities in the context of HACT	UNDP CO	6,000	None	Annually or as required.
Lessons learned and knowledge management as outlined in output 3.1.	Project Manager	30,000	None	Annually
Monitoring of environmental and social risks, and corresponding management plans as relevant	Project Manager UNDP CO	2,000	None	On-going
Addressing environmental and social grievances	Project Manager UNDP CO	2,000	None	On-going

Project Board meetings	Project Board, UNDP CO Project Manager	8,000 (1,333.33/year)	None	At minimum annually (8 meetings)
Stakeholder consultation meetings	Project Manager	10,000	None	At minimum annually (budget for ten meetings)
Supervision missions	UNDP CO	None ^[5]	None	Annually
Oversight missions	UNDP-GEF team	None	None	Troubleshooting as needed
GEF Secretariat learning missions/site visits	Project Manager UNDP CO UNDP-GEF team	None	None	To be determined
Updating of mid-term Tracking Tool data	Project Manager	None	None	Before mid-term review mission takes place
Independent MTR and management response	Project team UNDP CO UNDP-GEF team	30,000	None	Between 2nd and 3rd PIR
Updating of final Tracking Tool data	Project Manager	None	None	Before TE mission
Independent TE included in UNDP evaluation plan, and management response	Project team UNDP CO UNDP-GEF team	40,000	None	At least 3 months before operational closure
TOTAL indicative cost Excluding project team staff time, and UNDP staff and travel expenses		USD 144,000	None	

[1] See https://www.thegef.org/gef/policies_guidelines

[2] See https://www.thegef.org/gef/gef_agencies

[3] See guidance here: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/frm/pages/financial-management-and-execution-modalities.aspx>

[4] Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff time and travel expenses.

[5] The costs of UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF Unit's participation and time are charged to the GEF Agency Fee.

PART III: Certification by GEF partner agency(ies)

A. GEF Agency(ies) certification

GEF Agency Coordinator	Date	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator	5/29/2019	Saskia Marijnissen, Regional Technical Advisor RBA		saskia.marijnissen@undp.org

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).

This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goals: *Goal 1. End poverty in all its forms everywhere; Goal 13. Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts; and, Goal 15. Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss*

This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document:

Outcome 1. The economy is increasingly transformed for greater pro-poor inclusiveness, competitiveness and increased opportunities for decent and productive employment.
Country programme document for the United Republic of Tanzania (2016 – 2021)

This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan:

1.4.1 Solutions scaled up for sustainable management of natural resources, including sustainable commodities and green and inclusive value chains

	Objective and Outcome Indicators (no more than a total of 15 -16 indicators)	Baseline	Mid-term Target	End of Project Target	Data Collection Methods and Risks/Assumptions
Project Objective: Safeguard key terrestrial and coastal forest ecosystems on Zanzibar through a landscape approach, and so deliver multiple benefits to the people inhabiting the islands	IRRF indicator 1 Output indicator 1.4.1. Natural resources that are managed under a sustainable use, conservation, access and benefit-sharing regime: (b) Area of existing	0 ha <u>METT scores</u> JCBNP: 73 JMFR: 41 KPFR: 56 MFR: 47	0 ha <u>METT scores</u> JCBNP: 88 JMFR: 74 KPFR: 78 MFR: 72	19,430 ha <u>METT scores</u> JCBNP: 95 JMFR: 93 KPFR: 84 MFR: 83	Data collection: -Information will be collected through the use of the METT scorecard to assess protected area management effectiveness.

	<p>protected area under improved management (ha)</p> <p>An area will be considered under improved management when and if the METT score reaches the end-of-project target for the corresponding PA. The following areas apply:</p> <p>JCBNP: 6,434 ha JMFR: 4,212 ha KPFR: 3,040 ha MFR: 406 ha MMFR: 180 ha NVNR: 2,900 ha RKFR: 270 ha UPCFR: 1,988 ha</p>	<p>MMFR: 47 NVNR: 56 RKFR: 48 UPFR: 40</p>	<p>MMFR: 74 NVNR: 78 RKFR: 75 UPFR: 50</p>	<p>MMFR: 83 NVNR: 84 RKFR: 84 UPFR: 67</p>	<p>Risks: Changes in government priorities may affect efforts to improve PA management.</p> <p>Assumptions: Local community members who have encroached some of the PAs are voluntarily willing to relinquish those areas to allow the improvement of the networks of PAs</p>
	<p>IRRF indicator 2 Output indicator 1.4.1. Natural resources that are managed under a sustainable use, conservation, access and benefit-sharing regime: (d) Area under sustainable forest management (ha)</p> <p>- A forested area will be</p>	<p>0 ha</p>	<p>7,000 ha</p>	<p>21,730 ha</p>	<p>Data collection: Official gazette (for approved CoFMAs) Reports by the Forestry Development Fund on approved grants from land-use practices in areas under CFM Field visits Reports by DFNR staff Project reports</p>

	considered under SFM when and if: (i) the corresponding community adopts/reaffirms commitments to conserve that area under a CoFMA that has been approved by the Minister of Agriculture, and (ii) measures to implement the commitment under the approved CoFMA have been verified on site by DFNR staff. The baseline value for the indicator is zero, since commitments on SFM by communities engaged in CoFMAs are currently not verified and enforced by DFNR.				Risks: Benefits accrued from the activities promoted by the project are low compared to what communities were benefiting. This will lower the willingness of the communities to participate in the conservation of the resources in the area. Assumptions: Local communities are willing to participate in the project activities.
	Mandatory indicator 3 # direct project beneficiaries In the context of this indicator, direct beneficiaries are defined as members of households that have received support from the project for the adoption of sustainable land-use practices or alternative livelihoods.	0	6,000 (45% men, 55% women)	18,000 (45% men, 55% women)	Data collection: Interviews, household surveys, group discussion meetings and field observations. Risks: Priorities of government and communities might shift if development benefits take long to be realized Unequal right to benefits from sustainable use of natural resources to men and women may result into low participation by affected groups Assumptions: Local communities are willing to participate in project activities.

	Indicator 4 GHG emissions reductions and removals from the reduction in deforestation, reforestation and increase in carbon stocks in agricultural lands under agroforestry systems and annual agriculture under CSA practices (tCO ₂ e)	0	46,400 tCO ₂ e	685,000 tCO ₂ e Reduced deforestation: 189 ktCO ₂ e (280 ha) Reforestation: 111 ktCO ₂ e (250 ha) Agroforestry: 326 ktCO ₂ e (1,200 ha) CSA: 59 ktCO ₂ e (1,200 ha)	Data collection: Field visits Reports by the Forestry Development Fund on approved grants from land-use practices in areas under CFM Estimates made with Ex-Ante Carbon Balance Tool (Ex-ACT) over a lifetime of 20 years (three years for mid-term target). Risks: Extreme weather events, shifts in planting seasons, fires and plagues may affect the schedule for the adoption of land-use activities and actions to reduce deforestation Assumptions: Local communities are willing to participate in the project activities.
Component/Outcome 1 Integrated policy and planning framework to promote effective biodiversity and ecosystem management that supports Zanzibar's national development, developed and implemented	Indicator 5 Zanzibar Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (ZABSAP) and implementation plan are adopted and under implementation	ZABSAP and implementation plan do not exist	ZABSAP and implementation plan are adopted	ZABSAP and implementation plan are being implemented	Data collection: Published ZABSAP and action plan Project reports Risks: Political priorities and the allocation of responsibilities among ministries may change. Assumptions: Willingness and active participation of stakeholders in the review process
	Indicator 6 Number of institutions that reach the target on capacity improvement,	N.A. - - -	9 (of 12) institutions meet the mid-term target -	12 (of 12) institutions meet the end of project target -	Data collection: Data will be collected through the use of UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard

	as measured by UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard	<u>Capacity development scorecards</u> DNFR: 35 DoA: 34 DoE: 23 District Councils Central: 30 Chake Chake: 23 Micheweni: 15 Mkoani: 19 North A: 23 North B: 21 South: 16 Wete: 18 Jumijaza: 14	<u>Capacity development scorecards</u> DNFR: 40 DoA: 40 DoE: 40 District Councils Central: 31 Chake Chake: 34 Micheweni: 31 Mkoani: 34 North A: 30 North B: 27 South: 30 Wete: 31 Jumijaza: 30	<u>Capacity development scorecards</u> DNFR: 45 DoA: 45 DoE: 45 District Councils Central: 43 Chake Chake: 45 Micheweni: 45 Mkoani: 45 North A: 43 North B: 44 South: 44 Wete: 41 Jumijaza: 45	Risks: High personnel turnover Assumptions: Managers authorize participation of staff in trainings
Component/ Outcome 2.1 Effectiveness of the network of Pas and COFMAs is improved and leads to the protection of vulnerable ecosystems, especially mangroves, native forests and other habitats of global significance	Indicator 7 Management plans are prepared/updated and implemented for the following protected areas: (1) JCBNP, (2) KPFR, (3) JMFR, (4) NVNR, (5) MFR, (6) MMFR, (7) RKFR and (8) UPCFR	Management plans for six protected areas are outdated: JCBNP, KPFR, NVNR, MFR, MMFR, and RKFR. Two protected areas have no management plan: JMFR and UPCFR	No change	8 plans are prepared/updated and are being implemented	Data collection: Published management plans
	Indicator 8 CoFMA guidelines are revised to include provisions	CoFMA guidelines require revision to improve enforcement	CoFMA guidelines are revised and adopted	Revised CoFMA guidelines are being implemented	Risks: Delays in upstream activities (ZABSAP, biodiversity surveys) Assumptions: Government financial resources are adequate to implement management plans
					Data collection: Published CoFMA guidelines Project reports

	on biodiversity conservation and climate change mitigation, and to improve the monitoring and enforcement of agreement. Approved guidelines are adopted and implemented	provision and incorporate consideration on biodiversity conservation and climate change			Risks: None Assumptions: Willingness and active participation of stakeholders in the review process
	Indicator 9 Extension of the areas included in the project that are covered by forests (ha)	Area to be determined during project inception	Area to be determined during project inception	Area to be determined during project inception	Data collection: Remote sensing Site visits
					Risks: Conflicts over land use Disagreement of conservation and land use objectives Assumptions: Open, transparent and active participation by communities Communities agree on the value and benefits from conservation
	Indicator 10 Extension of the areas included in the project that are covered by mangroves (ha)	Area to be determined during project inception	Area to be determined during project inception	Area to be determined during project inception	Data collection: Remote sensing Site visits
					Risks: Conflicts over land use Disagreement of conservation and land use objectives Assumptions: Open, transparent and active participation by communities Communities agree on the value and benefits from conservation

	Indicator 11 Change in status of the red colobus monkey (<i>Piliocolobus kirkii</i>) Change in status of the Aders' duiker (<i>Cephalophus adersi</i>)	Population of red colobus monkey: 5,862 individuals Population of Aders' duiker: To be assessed by DFNR and WCS	Population increases Population increases	Population increases Population increases	Risks: Conflicts over land use Disagreement of conservation and land use objectives Assumptions: Open, transparent and active participation by communities Communities agree on the value and benefits from conservation
					Risks: External factors (natural disasters, disease) may affect populations Assumptions: Technical capacities to monitor biodiversity are developed
Component/ Outcome 2.2 Adoption of land management practices and community-centred initiatives that support: (i) effective co-management of wildlife and their habitats; (ii) restoration and rehabilitation of degraded forest landscapes; and (iii) sustainable local income generation.	Indicator 12 New areas under sustainable production systems, including agroforestry, CSA and reforestation, in areas of participating CoFMAs (ha)	0 ha	900 ha	2,650 ha New areas under agroforestry: 1,200 ha CSA on annual crops: 1,200 ha Woodlots: 250 ha	Data collection: Field visits Reports by the Forestry Development Fund on grants allocation Project reports Risks: Benefits accrued from the activities promoted by the project are low compared to what communities were benefiting. This will lower the willingness of the communities to participate in the conservation of the resources in the area. Assumptions: Local communities are willing to participate in the project activities.

	Indicator 13 Initiatives on sustainable livelihoods by targeted communities in participating CoFMAs (e.g. beekeeping, ICS, ecotourism, etc.) contribute to increasing household income.	To be defined after target households are identified	To be defined after target households are identified	To be defined after target households are identified	Data collection: Field visits Project reports Reports by the Forestry Development Fund on grants allocation.
Component/ Outcome 3 Knowledge Management and M&E	Indicator 14 Number of best practices on sustainable land-use demonstrated, documented and upscaled for replication	0	3 best practices demonstrated and documented	5 best practices demonstrated, documented and with plans for replication	Risks: Priorities of governments and local communities might shift if development benefits take long to be realized Assumptions: Local communities are willing to participate.
					Data collection: Published case studies and policy briefs Project reports
	Indicator 15 Fraction of the number of grants under output 2.2.1. awarded to women or to initiatives led by women	0%	30%	50%	Risks: Delay in upstream activities may not give adequate time to analyze and document successful experiences Assumptions: None
					Data collection: Project reports Risks: None Assumptions: None

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).

COMMENTS ON PIF RECEIVED FROM STAP

Comment	Response
<p>1. STAP encourages UNDP to develop further activities on climate change mitigation (e.g. climate smart agriculture), and land management to support the expected project results and targets (page 5). It also encourages stronger links, or integrated planning, between activities on biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management, and climate change mitigation, and clearer definitions of the global environmental benefits for the latter two activities.</p>	<p>Under output 2.2.1., agricultural extension services and grants will be made available to participating communities for the adoption of climate-smart agriculture practices and for the establishment of woodlots to supply firewood to households and/or for the production of charcoal. Also under output 2.2.1., grants and technical assistance will be made available to small producers of improved cook stoves to improve business practices and the quality of their products. The enforcement of charcoal regulations, including the issuance of permits, will be improved through output 2.1.3. on strengthening capacities on community forest management, and through output 2.1.5. improvements to the management of protected areas.</p> <p>Activities on climate change mitigation will contribute to enhancing the removal of carbon dioxide in agricultural lands under climate-smart agriculture practices (in particular under agroforestry practices) and to reducing greenhouse gas emissions from agricultural and forested lands by reducing deforestation and the unsustainable extraction of biomass for charcoal production and/or household use.</p>
<p>2. The project proponents should consider how to strengthen the evidence base of applying landscape approaches for achieving synergies between agricultural production, forest management and biodiversity conservation. The following two papers may be useful to consider when designing the project: 1) Sunderland, T., et al. (2017). "A methodological approach for assessing cross-site landscape change: Understanding socio-ecological system". Forest Policy and Economics 84 (2017) 83–91; and 2) Reed, J. et al. (2016). "Integrated landscape approaches to managing social and environmental issues in the tropics: learning from the past to guide the future their progress is measured and to support indicators, so they capture measurements". Global Change Biology (2016) 22, 2540–2554, doi: 10.1111/gcb.13284</p>	<p>The project strategy focuses on integrating community forest management to the management of protected areas in Zanzibar, as research and stakeholder consultations indicated this would be the most viable approach to achieving impacts in terms of biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management in the specific local context. While the scope of the project is such that it will not be able to implement a full landscape approach in all its dimensions, principles of the landscape approach were incorporated into specific aspects of the project design (i.e. stakeholders engagement, monitoring and evaluation, etc.).</p>

<p>3. STAP agrees that an approach should be used to address the multiple environmental degradation drivers affecting the project site. The PIF recommends a landscape approach. STAP encourages, however, that the project proponents consider a source-to-sea approach, which will assist in meeting the project's objective on safeguarding Zanzibar's terrestrial and coastal forest habitats for multiple benefits. A source-to-sea framework facilitates integrated planning across sectors (e.g. biodiversity, land management, climate change mitigation), and institutions. The framework also encourages governance, which is an important element for the project's sustainability. The project proponents may want to consider the source-to-sea conceptual framework proposed on page 15 in STAP's report "A Conceptual Framework For Governing and Managing Key Flows in a Source-to-Sea Continuum": http://www.stapgef.org/conceptual-frameworkgoverning-and-managing-key-flows-source-sea-continuum.</p> <p>STAP also recommends drawing from the following paper in the project design; this provides an environmental and socio-economic assessment of Zanzibar's needs for integrated coastal management. It also provides recommendations on how to improve Zanzibar's management of natural resources based on Zanzibar's forest management plan, Zanzibar's forest policy, and other initiatives that aim to improve Zanzibar's land and coastal management: Khamis, A., et al. (2017). "Geographical characterization of the Zanzibar coastal zone and its management perspectives". Ocean & Coastal Management 149 (2017) 116-134</p>	<p>As indicated in the response to Comment 2 above, the integration of community forest management and protected areas management was considered to be the most viable approach given the specific Zanzibar context.</p> <p>Implementing a full source-to-sea approach in order to address both terrestrial as well as marine environmental threats in a comprehensive and all-encompassing manner would go beyond the scope of the PIF and would result in substantial dilution of project funds to the point where it will be unlikely to achieve meaningful impact. While there is overlap in threats to terrestrial and marine systems, the pressures that are affecting coastal ecosystems are a combination of uncontrolled tourism, overfishing and destructive fishing practices, harvesting of mangroves, pollution, increases in sea temperatures and sea levels as well as outbreaks of invasive species (e.g. Staehr et al. 2018. Managing human pressures to restore ecosystem health of Zanzibar coastal waters, J Aquac Mar Biol. 7:59-70) Addressing these combined in a meaningful way would require substantially more resources than are available for this project.</p> <p>However, the project does incorporate key components of the integrated source-to-sea approach, including principles related to the facilitation of integrated planning across sectors (including biodiversity, land management, climate change mitigation), and institutions. The project also takes into account concerns expressed in Khamis (2017) related to the need for improved integrated planning and community engagement.</p>
<p>4. STAP recommends explaining how the intervention will achieve "Support to transformational shifts towards a low emission". The PIF provides an estimate for carbon benefits, but it does not appear to include an activity that addresses climate change mitigation (e.g. climate smart agriculture, sustainable production of bioenergy). It was not possible therefore to determine the scientific and technical soundness of this corporate level result (page 5). During the project design, it would be valuable to establish links, and tradeoffs, between sustainable bioenergy production, forest management, and biodiversity conservation.</p>	<p>As described in the response to comment one, the project now includes activities to promote the adoption of climate-smart agriculture practices (incl. agroforestry), the establishment of woodlots to supply fuelwood, and the production of improved cook stoves by participating communities.</p> <p>The project's climate change mitigation benefits have been estimated using the Ex-Ante Carbon balance Tool (Ex-ACT).</p>

<p>5. The stakeholder table in the PIF presents an unduly top-down perception of the project, where governmental agencies and NGOs are detailed, but local groups such as different land user groups are apparently dismissed in one or two lines. STAP urges the project proponents to undertake a full stakeholder analysis in the PPG phase. The stakeholder analysis suggested by STAP should drill deeper into the communities and groups, including the role of men and women, actually involved in resource exploitation and who will necessarily be part of the integrated management of Zanzibar's resources. A useful starting point is the World Bank guidance on its anti-corruption pages - http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/PoliticalEconomy/stakeholderanalysis.htm . There are also a number of purpose-built tools to conduct stakeholder analysis – see for example, on the europa.eu website a Stakeholder Analysis Tool that has an ‘actor assessment matrix’ that includes the interests, resources, and power-base of all stakeholders. A social science input here would be very relevant.</p>	<p>The project recognises the importance of a less-top down driven approach and improved opportunity for communities and local groups to be actively engaged in design and implementation. The stakeholder analysis presented in the PIF was deepened during the PPG phase, including preparation of a Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Gender Action Plan (Annex H and I) following standard approaches.</p>
<p>6. STAP recommends that the project propose a framework on the use and management of bioenergy that is supported by stakeholders. The purpose will be to implement a regulatory framework for sustainable charcoal production that decreases threats to forest resources, and biodiversity. The framework should be informed by an assessment of charcoal production, including consumption data, if available, technologies used, and a life cycle assessment of charcoal production. This paper, although based on Brazil's experience with charcoal production, may provide insights: Miranda Santos, S., et al. (2017). "Life Cycle Analysis of Charcoal Production in Masonry Kilns with and without Carbonization Process Generated Gas Combustion". Sustainability 2017, 9, 1558; doi:10.3390/su9091558 A paper on charcoal production in Tanzania may complement the information and data on charcoal production: Felix, M. et al (2017). "Future prospect and sustainability of wood fuel resources in Tanzania". RenewableandSustainableEnergyReviews51(2015)856–862</p>	<p>As described in the response to Comment 1, the project includes activities to promote the establishment of woodlots to supply fuelwood, and the production of improved cook stoves by participating communities. Activities to improve the enforcement of charcoal regulations will be implemented under outputs 2.1.3. and 2.1.5.</p>
<p>7. In addition to a robust monitoring and assessment system, STAP recommends strengthening the knowledge management and learning element of the project by adding a fourth component. The project should consider how it will advance learning of COFMAs' impacts on biodiversity conservation, and sustainable land management. COFMAs have an established baseline as a participatory planning process, and can benefit from the project's insights. The project proponents also should design the project in a manner that establishes adaptive learning as part of the monitoring and assessment system, and which facilitates responses to the learning in a structured manner. UNDP can refer to the GEF's website on knowledge management and learning, or STAP's RAPTA guidelines to help guide the development of structured knowledge management and learning: http://www.thegef.org/topics/knowledge-learning; http://www.thegef.org/publications/designing-projects-rapidly-changing-work</p>	<p>A component on knowledge management and gender mainstreaming has been added to the project design. Outputs and activities on knowledge management and learning have been defined under that component. Additionally, activities on knowledge management and learning specifically for members of participating CoFMAs have been defined under output 2.1.4. on “learning and exchange between CoFMAs”.</p>

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

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: US\$ 106,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount US\$</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formulation of UNDP-GEF <u>ProDoc</u> • Inception Workshop • Preparatory Technical Studies & reviews • Validation Workshop and Report 	106,000	57,598	48,402
Total	106,000	57,598	48,402

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

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: US\$ 106,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount US\$</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formulation of UNDP-GEF <u>ProDoc</u> • Inception Workshop • Preparatory Technical Studies & reviews • Validation Workshop and Report 	106,000	57,598	48,402
Total	106,000	57,598	48,402

N/A

ANNEX E: GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to compute those indicator values as required in Part I, Table G to the extent applicable to your proposed project. Progress in programming against these targets for the program will be aggregated and reported at any time during the replenishment period. There is no need to complete this table for climate adaptation projects financed solely through LDCF and SCCF.

Core Indicator 1	Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use					(Hectares)	
			Hectares				
			Expected			Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
			116,849.40	19,430 (plus two newly created PAs)			
Indicator 1.1	Terrestrial protected areas newly created						
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares				
			Expected			Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
Uzi and Vundwe islands	N.I.	Not reported	0	N.I.			
Mtambwe North and South	N.I.	Not reported	0	N.I.			
		Sum	0	N.I.			
Indicator 1.2	Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness						
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares	METT Score			
				Baseline		Achieved	
					Endorsement	MTR	TE
Jozani-Chwaka Bay National Park	350036	Not reported	6,434		73		
Jambiani-Muyuni Forest Reserve	N.I.	Not reported	4,212		41		
Kiwengwa-Pongwe Forest Reserve	31760	Not reported	3,040		56		

Malilini Forest Reserve	N.I.	Not reported	406		47		
Msitu Mkuu Forest Reserve	31762	Not reported	180		47		
Ngezi-Vumawimbi Nature Reserve	555556107	Not reported	2,900		56		
Ras Kiuyu Forest Reserve	31764	Not reported	270		48		
Ufufuma – Pongwe Corridor Forest Reserve	N.I.	Not reported	1,988		40		
		Sum	19,430				
Core Indicator 2	Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use					(Hectares)	
			Hectares				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
			0	0			
Indicator 2.1	Marine protected areas newly created						
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares				
			Expected		Achieved		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
			0	0			
		Sum	0	0			
Indicator 2.2	Marine protected areas under improved management effectiveness						
Name of Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN category	Hectares	METT Score			
				Baseline		Achieved	
				PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
				0	0		
		Sum	0				
Core Indicator 3	Area of land restored					(Hectares)	
			Hectares				
			Expected		Achieved		

			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			0			
Indicator 3.1	Area of degraded agricultural land restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			0			
Indicator 3.2	Area of forest and forest land restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			0			
Indicator 3.3	Area of natural grass and shrublands restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			0			
Indicator 3.4	Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			0	0		
Core Indicator 4	Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)					(Hectares)
			Hectares			
			Expected		Expected	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			70,183	24,380		
Indicator 4.1	Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			0	0		
Indicator 4.2	Area of landscapes that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations					

Third party certification(s):			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			0	0		
Indicator 4.3	Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			70,183	24,380		
Indicator 4.4	Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided					
Include documentation that justifies HCVF			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			0	0		
Core Indicator 5	Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity					(Hectares)
Indicator 5.1	Number of fisheries that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations					
Third party certification(s):			Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			0	0		
Indicator 5.2	Number of large marine ecosystems (LMEs) with reduced pollution and hypoxial					
			Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			0	0		
Indicator 5.3	Amount of Marine Litter Avoided					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			0	0		
Core Indicator 6	Greenhouse gas emission mitigated					(Metric tons of CO ₂ e)
			Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (6.1+6.2)			

			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			Expected CO2e (direct)	N.I.	238,000	
			Expected CO2e (indirect)	3,300,000	685,000	
Indicator 6.1	Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector					
			Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			Expected CO2e (direct)	N.I.	238,000	
			Expected CO2e (indirect)	3,300,000	685,000	
			Anticipated start year of accounting	N.I.	2020	
			Duration of accounting	20 years	20 years	
Indicator 6.2	Emissions avoided Outside AFOLU					
			Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			Expected CO2e (direct)	0	0	
			Expected CO2e (indirect)	0	0	
			Anticipated start year of accounting	N.A.	N.A.	
			Duration of accounting	N.A.	N.A.	
Indicator 6.3	Energy saved					
			MJ			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			N.A.	N.A.		
Indicator 6.4	Increase in installed renewable energy capacity per technology					
			Capacity (MW)			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			N.A.	N.A.		
Core Indicator 7	Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management					(Number)
Indicator 7.1	Level of Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Program (TDA/SAP) formulation and implementation					
			Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			N.A.	N.A.		

Indicator 7.2	Level of Regional Legal Agreements and Regional Management Institutions to support its implementation					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			N.A.	N.A.		
Indicator 7.3	Level of National/Local reforms and active participation of Inter-Ministerial Committees					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			N.A.	N.A.		
Indicator 7.4	Level of engagement in IWLEARN through participation and delivery of key products					
		Shared water ecosystem	Rating (scale 1-4)			
			Rating		Rating	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			N.A.	N.A.		
Core Indicator 8	Globally over-exploited fisheries Moved to more sustainable levels					(Metric Tons)
Fishery Details			Metric Tons			
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			N.A.	N.A.		
Core Indicator 9	Reduction, disposal/destruction, phase out, elimination and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste					(Metric Tons)
			Metric Tons (9.1+9.2+9.3)			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	PIF stage	MTR	TE
			N.A.	N.A.		
Indicator 9.1	Solid and liquid Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) removed or disposed (POPs type)					
POPs type			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			N.A.	N.A.		
Indicator 9.2	Quantity of mercury reduced					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			N.A.	N.A.		

Indicator 9.3	Hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFC) Reduced/Phased out					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			N.A.	N.A.		
Indicator 9.4	Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste					
			Number of Countries			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			N.A.	N.A.		
Indicator 9.5	Number of low-chemical/non-chemical systems implemented particularly in food production, manufacturing and cities					
		Technology	Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			N.A.	N.A.		
Indicator 9.6	Quantity of POPs/Mercury containing materials and products directly avoided					
			Metric Tons			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	PIF stage	Endorsement
			N.A.	N.A.		
Core Indicator 10	Reduction, avoidance of emissions of POPs to air from point and non-point sources					(grams of toxic equivalent gTEQ)
Indicator 10.1	Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control emissions of POPs to air					
			Number of Countries			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			N.A.	N.A.		
Indicator 10.2	Number of emission control technologies/practices implemented					
			Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			N.A.	N.A.		
Core Indicator 11	Number direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment					(Number)

			Number			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Female	<i>N.I.</i>	<i>8,100</i>		
		Male	<i>N.I.</i>	<i>9,900</i>		
		<i>Total</i>	<i>N.I.</i>	<i>18,000</i>		

NB: Climate change mitigation benefits have been estimated using the Ex-Ante Carbon Balance Tool (Ex-ACT), which is available as a separate annex to this CEO ER.

ANNEX: Project Taxonomy Worksheet

Use this Worksheet to list down the taxonomic information required under Part1 by ticking the most relevant keywords/topics//themes that best describes the project

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Influencing models			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transform policy and regulatory environments		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Convene multi-stakeholder alliances		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrate innovative approaches		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Deploy innovative financial instruments		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indigenous Peoples		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Capital providers	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Financial intermediaries and market facilitators	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Large corporations	
		<input type="checkbox"/> SMEs	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Individuals/Entrepreneurs	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Grant Pilot	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Project Reflow	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Beneficiaries		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Communities		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Civil Society		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Based Organization	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Governmental Organization	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Academia	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Trade Unions and Workers Unions	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Type of Engagement		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Information Dissemination	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Partnership	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Consultation	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Participation	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communications		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Awareness Raising	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Education	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Public Campaigns	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Behavior Change	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity, Knowledge			

and Research			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Enabling Activities		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity Development		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge Generation and Exchange		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Targeted Research		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Learning		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Theory of Change	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adaptive Management	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Indicators to Measure Change	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Innovation		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge and Learning		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge Management	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Innovation	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity Development	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Learning	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder Engagement Plan		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender Equality			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender Mainstreaming		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Beneficiaries	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Women groups	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sex-disaggregated indicators	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Gender-sensitive indicators	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender results areas		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Access and control over natural resources	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Participation and leadership	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Access to benefits and services	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Capacity development	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Awareness raising	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Knowledge generation	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focal Areas/Theme			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated Programs		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Commodity Supply Chains ("Good Growth Partnership")	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Commodities Production
			<input type="checkbox"/> Deforestation-free Sourcing
			<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Screening Tools
			<input type="checkbox"/> High Conservation Value Forests
			<input type="checkbox"/> High Carbon Stocks Forests
			<input type="checkbox"/> Soybean Supply Chain
			<input type="checkbox"/> Oil Palm Supply Chain
			<input type="checkbox"/> Beef Supply Chain
			<input type="checkbox"/> Smallholder Farmers
			<input type="checkbox"/> Adaptive Management
		<input type="checkbox"/> Food Security in Sub-Saharan Africa	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Resilience (climate and shocks)
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Production Systems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Agroecosystems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Land and Soil Health
			<input type="checkbox"/> Diversified Farming
			<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated Land and Water Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Smallholder Farming
			<input type="checkbox"/> Small and Medium Enterprises
			<input type="checkbox"/> Crop Genetic Diversity
			<input type="checkbox"/> Food Value Chains

		<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Commodity Production
		<input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive Land Use Planning
		<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated Landscapes
		<input type="checkbox"/> Food Value Chains
		<input type="checkbox"/> Deforestation-free Sourcing
		<input type="checkbox"/> Smallholder Farmers
	<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Cities	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated urban planning
		<input type="checkbox"/> Urban sustainability framework
		<input type="checkbox"/> Transport and Mobility
		<input type="checkbox"/> Buildings
		<input type="checkbox"/> Municipal waste management
		<input type="checkbox"/> Green space
		<input type="checkbox"/> Urban Biodiversity
		<input type="checkbox"/> Urban Food Systems
		<input type="checkbox"/> Energy efficiency
		<input type="checkbox"/> Municipal Financing
		<input type="checkbox"/> Global Platform for Sustainable Cities
		<input type="checkbox"/> Urban Resilience
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biodiversity	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protected Areas and Landscapes	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Protected Areas
		<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal and Marine Protected Areas
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Productive Landscapes
		<input type="checkbox"/> Productive Seascapes
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Based Natural Resource Management
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mainstreaming	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Extractive Industries (oil, gas, mining)
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forestry (Including HCVF and REDD+)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Tourism
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & agrobiodiversity
		<input type="checkbox"/> Fisheries
		<input type="checkbox"/> Infrastructure
		<input type="checkbox"/> Certification (National Standards)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Certification (International Standards)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Species	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Illegal Wildlife Trade
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Threatened Species
		<input type="checkbox"/> Wildlife for Sustainable Development
		<input type="checkbox"/> Crop Wild Relatives
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plant Genetic Resources
		<input type="checkbox"/> Animal Genetic Resources
		<input type="checkbox"/> Livestock Wild Relatives
		<input type="checkbox"/> Invasive Alien Species (IAS)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biomes	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mangroves
		<input type="checkbox"/> Coral Reefs
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sea Grasses
		<input type="checkbox"/> Wetlands
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rivers
		<input type="checkbox"/> Lakes
		<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical Rain Forests
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tropical Dry Forests
		<input type="checkbox"/> Temperate Forests
		<input type="checkbox"/> Grasslands
		<input type="checkbox"/> Paramo
		<input type="checkbox"/> Desert

			<input type="checkbox"/> Access to Genetic Resources Benefit Sharing
	<input type="checkbox"/> Forests		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Forest and Landscape Restoration	
			<input type="checkbox"/> REDD/REDD+
		<input type="checkbox"/> Forest	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Amazon <input type="checkbox"/> Congo <input type="checkbox"/> Drylands
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Degradation		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Land Management	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands
			<input type="checkbox"/> Ecosystem Approach
			<input type="checkbox"/> Integrated and Cross-sectoral approach
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community-Based NRM
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Livelihoods
			<input type="checkbox"/> Income Generating Activities
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Agriculture
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Pasture Management
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Forest/Woodland Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Improved Soil and Water Management Techniques
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Fire Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Drought Mitigation/Early Warning
		<input type="checkbox"/> Land Degradation Neutrality	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Land Productivity
			<input type="checkbox"/> Land Cover and Land cover change
			<input type="checkbox"/> Carbon stocks above or below ground
		<input type="checkbox"/> Food Security	
	<input type="checkbox"/> International Waters		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Ship	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Freshwater	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Aquifer
			<input type="checkbox"/> River Basin
			<input type="checkbox"/> Lake Basin
		<input type="checkbox"/> Learning	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Fisheries	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Persistent toxic substances	
		<input type="checkbox"/> SIDS : Small Island Dev States	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Targeted Research	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Pollution	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Persistent toxic substances
			<input type="checkbox"/> Plastics
			<input type="checkbox"/> Nutrient pollution from all sectors except wastewater
			<input type="checkbox"/> Nutrient pollution from Wastewater
		<input type="checkbox"/> Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Plan preparation	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Strategic Action Plan Implementation	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Large Marine Ecosystems	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Aquaculture	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Marine Protected Area	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Biomes	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Mangrove

		<input type="checkbox"/> Coal Fired Industrial Boilers	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Ferrous Metals Production	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Ozone	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Persistent Organic Pollutants	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Unintentional POPs	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sound Management of chemicals and Waste	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Waste Management	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Hazardous Waste Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Waste
			<input type="checkbox"/> e-Waste
		<input type="checkbox"/> Emissions	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Disposal	
		<input type="checkbox"/> New Persistent Organic Pollutants	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Polychlorinated Biphenyls	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plastics	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Eco-Efficiency	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Pesticides	
		<input type="checkbox"/> DDT - Vector Management	
		<input type="checkbox"/> DDT - Other	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Emissions	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Open Burning	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Best Available Technology / Best Environmental Practices	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Green Chemistry	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Change		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Adaptation	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Finance
			<input type="checkbox"/> Least Developed Countries
			<input type="checkbox"/> Small Island Developing States
			<input type="checkbox"/> Disaster Risk Management
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sea-level rise
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Resilience
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate information
			<input type="checkbox"/> Ecosystem-based Adaptation
			<input type="checkbox"/> Adaptation Tech Transfer
			<input type="checkbox"/> National Adaptation Programme of Action
			<input type="checkbox"/> National Adaptation Plan
			<input type="checkbox"/> Mainstreaming Adaptation
			<input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector
			<input type="checkbox"/> Innovation
			<input type="checkbox"/> Complementarity
			<input type="checkbox"/> Community-based Adaptation
			<input type="checkbox"/> Livelihoods
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Mitigation	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture, Forestry, and other Land Use
			<input type="checkbox"/> Energy Efficiency
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Urban Systems and Transport
			<input type="checkbox"/> Technology Transfer
			<input type="checkbox"/> Renewable Energy
			<input type="checkbox"/> Financing
			<input type="checkbox"/> Enabling Activities
		<input type="checkbox"/> Technology Transfer	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Poznan Strategic Programme on Technology Transfer
			<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Technology Centre & Network



Submitted to GEF Secretariat Review

[Go To Home](#)