



## **Managing Together: Integrating Community-centered, Ecosystem-based Approaches into Forestry, Agriculture and Tourism Sectors**

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

#### **GEF ID**

9372

#### **Project Type**

FSP

#### **Type of Trust Fund**

GET

#### **Project Title**

Managing Together: Integrating Community-centered, Ecosystem-based Approaches into Forestry, Agriculture and Tourism Sectors

#### **Countries**

Sri Lanka

#### **Agency(ies)**

UNDP

#### **Other Executing Partner(s):**

Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment

**Executing Partner Type**

Government

**GEF Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Taxonomy**

Forest, Biodiversity, Focal Areas, Land Degradation, Climate Change, Gender results areas, Gender Equality, Deploy innovative financial instruments, Influencing models, Convene multi-stakeholder alliances, Demonstrate innovative approach, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Partnership, Type of Engagement, Stakeholders, Consultation, Information Dissemination, Participation, Behavior change, Communications, Awareness Raising, Public Campaigns, SMEs, Private Sector, Individuals/Entrepreneurs, Civil Society, Community Based Organization, Trade Unions and Workers Unions, Non-Governmental Organization, Local Communities, Gender Mainstreaming, Innovation, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Learning, Adaptive management, Indicators to measure change, Theory of change, Capacity Development, Forest and Landscape Restoration, Sustainable Land Management, Community-Based Natural Resource Management, Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands, Sustainable Livelihoods, Biomes, Wetlands, Tropical Dry Forests, Coral Reefs, Sea Grasses, Mangroves, Financial and Accounting, Payment for Ecosystem Services, Species, Threatened Species, Invasive Alien Species, Mainstreaming, Tourism, Fisheries, Agriculture and agrobiodiversity, Protected Areas and Landscapes, Productive Landscapes, Productive Seascapes, Community Based Natural Resource Mngt, Climate Change Mitigation, Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Use, Beneficiaries, Gender-sensitive indicators, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Women groups, Access and control over natural resources, Knowledge Generation and Exchange, Access to benefits and services, Participation and leadership

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

Climate Change Mitigation 1

**Climate Change Adaptation**

Climate Change Adaptation 1

**Duration**

42In Months

**Agency Fee(\$)**

317,937

**A. Focal Area Strategy Framework and Program**

<b>Objectives/Programs</b>	<b>Focal Area Outcomes</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>GEF Amount(\$)</b>	<b>Co-Fin Amount(\$)</b>
BD-4_P9	Outcome 1: Increased area of production landscapes and seascapes that integrate conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into management.	GET	1,515,418	7,935,000
LD-2_P3	Outcome 2.1: Support mechanisms for forest landscape management and restoration established Outcome 2.2: Improved forest management and/or restoration Outcome 2.3: Increased investments in SFM and restoration	GET	851,724	3,200,000
SFM-1	Outcome 1: Cross-sector policy and planning approaches at appropriate governance scales, avoid loss of high conservation value forests	GET	587,740	14,517,222
SFM-3	Outcome 5: Integrated landscape restoration plans to maintain forest ecosystem services are implemented at appropriate scales	GET	391,826	3,600,000
<b>Total Project Cost(\$)</b>			<b>3,346,708</b>	<b>29,252,222</b>

**B. Project description summary**

**Project Objective**

Strengthen protection of globally significant biodiversity through mainstreaming of conservation and sustainable practices into land use planning and sectoral decision making in forestry, agriculture and tourism sectors.

<b>Project Component</b>	<b>Financing Type</b>	<b>Expected Outcomes</b>	<b>Expected Outputs</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>GEF Project Financing(\$)</b>	<b>Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 1: Institutional capacity building, and enhanced cross-sectoral, trans-jurisdictional and donor agency coordination in planning, decision-making and action	Technical Assistance	<p><b>Outcome 1:</b> An enabling environment to mainstream integrated approaches into natural resource management in production sectors and landscapes.</p> <p><i>Key outcome indicators are:</i></p> <p>(i) <i>The number of sectoral and vocational training institutions that have adopted modules on mainstreaming of biodiversity into natural resource management, tourism and other economic development</i></p> <p>(ii) <i>Capacity of institutions as measured by the UNDP's Capacity Development Scorecard</i></p> <p>(iii) <i>Percentage of project recommendations for removal of perverse incentives and other changes in policy and institutional frameworks that have received support</i></p>	<p>Output 1.1: Draft ministerial directives and subsidiary agreements for special working arrangements between government agencies and administrations in the three Trial Landscapes. Ensures the background conditions necessary to achieve the Project Objective at the field level and subsequently to have the models established at the Trial Landscapes replicated elsewhere. Facilitation of administrative actions and mechanisms for cooperation across local government sectors and jurisdictions for the Project's landscape conservation design work, local land-use planning and livelihood-focused interventions.</p> <p>Output 1.2: Integrated Landscape Management and Mainstreaming Modules for institutions offering in-service and pre-service training of state employees. Training under the project will be done through existing institutions under a "training of trainers" and "establishing curriculum" approach. There will be a few cases in which an institutional setting for training will not be practical, and in such cases agricultural and fisheries extension officers will be trained to deliver the training again when necessary.</p>	GET	246,633	2,800,000

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 2: Design of landscape strategies for biodiversity conservation and sustainable livelihoods and upward integration into existing policy	Technical Assistance	<p><b>Outcome 2:</b> Natural resource management, tourism and land use are guided by a strategic design for biodiversity conservation and sustainable livelihoods across multiple jurisdictions in three Trial Landscapes in the Northern and North Central Provinces.</p> <p><u>Key outcome indicators are:</u></p> <p>(i) <i>Area of High Conservation Value Forest that has been secured for biodiversity conservation under the strategic designs</i></p> <p>(ii) <i>Annual percentage of Minor and Major Permit applications in which biodiversity impact criteria used in decisions by Coast Conservation Department in Trial Landscape 3</i></p> <p>(iii) <i>Mean score (+/- SD) on a standard environmental/biodiversity impact assessment score</i></p>	<p>Output 2.1: Public information and involvement programme designed and implemented across all Districts and Divisional Secretariats represented in the Trial Landscapes. Includes, among other things, excursions for members of the public to local protected areas, provision for a Mobile Education Unit that will travel around the three Trial Landscapes to develop a dialogue with people about biodiversity and ecosystem services and well-being, and the relationship between economic development and sustainability of livelihoods based on natural resources.</p> <p>The Project office will serve as a centre of excellence - a place where anyone who wants to know about biodiversity conservation and climate change, will be drawn to. Project will also work on capacity for public information and involvement, including resourcing.</p> <p>Output 2.2: Mechanisms for trans-jurisdictional and multi-sectoral consultations in the landscape conservation design process established and implemented. District and DSD Agriculture Sub-committees have been identified as appropriate starting points, and through them mechanisms will be agreed for cross-sectoral coordination within each hierarchical level, and trans-</p>	GET	850,000	9,480,000

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 3: Participatory land-use planning and livelihood-focused interventions to demonstrate socio-economic benefits of biodiversity conservation	Technical Assistance	<p><b>Outcome 3:</b> Biodiversity conservation priorities shape sustainable livelihoods in natural resource management and tourism in six Focal Village Clusters in three Trial Landscapes in the Northern and North Central Provinces.</p> <p><u>Key outcome indicators:</u></p> <p>(i) Area of land under improved management practices to benefit biodiversity</p> <p>(ii) Number of new instances each year of major coral damage along a 1km reef transect in Trial Landscape 3</p> <p>(iii) Percentage of interviewees disaggregated by gender in Focal Villages who say that livelihoods have been enhanced as a result of mainstreaming biodiversity into land-use plans</p> <p>(iv) Percentage of key</p>	<p>Output 3.1: Public information and involvement programme designed and implemented in the focal village clusters. This involves consulting community and government stakeholders for detailed local land-use planning. This Output will in some cases overlap in its activities with Output 2.1, but it has been separated out because the aim is to engage a smaller population, with the focus on the reasons for, and the importance of, village level planning. Will involve additional features such as school-based activities that aim to involve and inspire young people in conservation; and ecology and nature-watching clubs outside school that stimulate young people to take an interest in the natural world.</p> <p>Output 3.2: Participatory mechanisms to bring together community and government stakeholders in a landscape conservation design approach to local land use planning. Community-based Conservation Experts (CCEs) will be recruited in each of the three Focal Village Clusters to guide the planning process. A wide variety of community based organizations, including farmer, fisher and women's groups, and faith-based groups will be engaged.</p>	GET	1,300,000	15,267,514



Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
Component 4: Monitoring and evaluation, and dissemination of knowledge	Technical Assistance	<p><b>Outcome 4:</b> Monitoring and evaluation, and dissemination of project methods and results contributes to wider application of landscape approach to mainstreaming of biodiversity</p> <p><i>Key Outcome indicators:</i></p> <p>(i) Number of (a) villages and (b) DSDs in which independent monitoring of project impacts is taking place according to sound protocols</p> <p>(ii) Number of substantial knowledge products that reflect best practices and lessons learned including project results and sustainability strategy.</p>	<p>Output 4.1: Monitoring protocols and necessary institutional agreements to assess the impacts of the landscape conservation design and livelihood-focused interventions both during and after the end of the project. Records progress on, and impacts of, specific project interventions to assess effectiveness, and to monitor environmental and social risks. A Safeguards and Monitoring Officer is assigned to monitor risks identified in the SESP.</p> <p>Output 4.2: Periodic reviews and evaluations of monitoring data collected during the project will be reviewed at MTR and at the time of preparing the Terminal Report. Other indicators set up under Output 4.1 will be tracked more frequently.</p> <p>Output 4.3: Publications, films, exhibitions, databases that publicize the methods used and the results of the project interventions. Wide publicity for project methods and results among the public, government officials, and NGOs in Sri Lanka and overseas. Project website will be set up where project information and products will be made available. The guides to mainstreaming of biodiversity into natural resource management and tourism will be used at national level</p>	GET	790,708	1,204,708

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
				<b>Sub Total (\$)</b>	<b>3,187,341</b>	<b>28,752,222</b>
<b>Project Management Cost (PMC)</b>						
				GET	159,367	500,000
				<b>Sub Total(\$)</b>	<b>159,367</b>	<b>500,000</b>
				<b>Total Project Cost(\$)</b>	<b>3,346,708</b>	<b>29,252,222</b>

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

<b>Sources of Co-financing</b>	<b>Name of Co-financier</b>	<b>Type of Co-financing</b>	<b>Amount(\$)</b>
GEF Agency	UNDP	In-kind	250,000
Government	Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment	Grant	15,480,000
Donor Agency	GIZ	In-kind	6,700,000
Government	Tourism Development Authority	In-kind	4,722,222
Private Sector	Biodiversity Sri Lanka	In-kind	2,000,000
GEF Agency	IUCN	In-kind	100,000
<b>Total Co-Financing(\$)</b>			<b>29,252,222</b>

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

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Programming of Funds</b>	<b>NGI</b>	<b>Amount(\$)</b>	<b>Fee(\$)</b>
UNDP	GET	Sri Lanka	Biodiversity		No	1,515,418	143,965
UNDP	GET	Sri Lanka	Land Degradation		No	851,724	80,913
UNDP	GET	Sri Lanka	Multi Focal Area	SFM	No	979,566	93,059
<b>Total Grant Resources(\$)</b>						<b>3,346,708</b>	<b>317,937</b>

**E. Non Grant Instrument**

**NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement**

---

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

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

PPG Required

**PPG Amount (\$)**

100,000

**PPG Agency Fee (\$)**

9,500

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Programming of Funds</b>	<b>NGI</b>	<b>Amount(\$)</b>	<b>Fee(\$)</b>
UNDP	GET	Sri Lanka	Biodiversity		No	50,000	4,750
UNDP	GET	Sri Lanka	Land Degradation		No	25,000	2,375
UNDP	GET	Sri Lanka	Multi Focal Area	SFM	No	25,000	2,375
<b>Total Project Costs(\$)</b>						<b>100,000</b>	<b>9,500</b>

**Core Indicators****Indicator 3 Area of land restored**

<b>Ha (Expected at PIF)</b>	<b>Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>Ha (Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>Ha (Achieved at TE)</b>
0.00	21000.00	0.00	0.00

**Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural land restored**

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

**Indicator 3.2 Area of Forest and Forest Land restored**

<b>Ha (Expected at PIF)</b>	<b>Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>Ha (Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>Ha (Achieved at TE)</b>
	20,900.00		

**Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and shrublands restored**

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

**Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (incl. estuaries, mangroves) restored**

<b>Ha (Expected at PIF)</b>	<b>Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>Ha (Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>Ha (Achieved at TE)</b>
	100.00		

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

<b>Ha (Expected at PIF)</b>	<b>Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>Ha (Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>Ha (Achieved at TE)</b>
0.00	70549.00	0.00	0.00

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

<b>Ha (Expected at PIF)</b>	<b>Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)</b>	<b>Ha (Achieved at MTR)</b>	<b>Ha (Achieved at TE)</b>
	20,043.00		

**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)
----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

50,506.00

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

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

46,467.00

Indicator 5.1 Number of fisheries that meet national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations

Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
--------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------

Type/name of the third-party certification

Indicator 5.2 Number of Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs) with reduced pollutions and hypoxia

Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (achieved at MTR)	Number (achieved at TE)
--------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------

0	0	0	0
---	---	---	---



LME at PIF

LME at CEO Endorsement

LME at MTR

LME at TE

**Indicator 5.3 Amount of Marine Litter Avoided**

**Metric Tons (expected at PIF)**

**Metric Tons (expected at CEO Endorsement)**

**Metric Tons (Achieved at MTR)**

**Metric Tons (Achieved at TE)**

**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<sub>2</sub>e (direct)**

0

3556232

0

0

**Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (indirect)**

0

0

0

0

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

**Total Target Benefit**

**(At PIF)**

**(At CEO Endorsement)**

**(Achieved at MTR)**

**(Achieved at TE)**

**Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (direct)**

3556232

**Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (indirect)**

**Anticipated start year of accounting**

2019

**Duration of accounting**

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

**Total Target Benefit**

**(At PIF)**

**(At CEO Endorsement)**

**(Achieved at MTR)**

**(Achieved at TE)**

**Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (direct)**

**Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (indirect)**

**Anticipated start year of accounting**

**Duration of accounting**

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

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

<b>Target Energy Saved (MJ)</b>
---------------------------------

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)
<b>Female</b>		1,600		
<b>Male</b>		1,600		
<b>Total</b>	0	3200	0	0

## **PART II: Project JUSTIFICATION**

### **1. Project Description**

#### *A.1. Project Description.*

##### ***1) Global environmental problems, threats, root causes and barriers to be addressed.***

The environmental problems, the root causes and the three main barriers to be addressed are well described in the PIF (pp 5-10) and Section 2.3 of the Prodoc. The Project's Theory of Change (Prodoc Annex K) summarizes the problems and underlying causes or drivers in separate diagrams for each sector to be addressed by the Project.

In summary, the project is faced with the following drivers that advance or maintain biodiversity loss in the sectors of agriculture, fisheries, tourism and forest management.

- Overarching emphasis on economic development;
- High demand for natural resources;
- Unsustainable fishing and farming practices;
- Many people living from day to day without financial reserves;
- Government agencies acting independently of each other;
- Government subsidies that lead to excessive fertilizer use;
- Development projects acting in isolation;
- Insufficient levels of knowledge and skills related to mainstreaming of biodiversity into tourism and integrated natural resource management;
- Inadequate levels of law enforcement related to natural resource management;
- Complex local government arrangements, with some sectors devolved, some administered from Colombo; some officials elected locally, and others appointed centrally;
- Social tensions and feelings of instability related to resettlement, land tenure, and events during and following the war;
- High proportion of female headed households;
- Absentee entrepreneurs exploiting local people through loans and bad contractual arrangements; and
- Recent political instability linked to disputed powers of the executive presidency.

##### ***2) Baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects.***

The baseline scenario is described in the PIF (p14) and remains valid as of the PPG phase. The Prodoc (Section 2.3, p.9) provides additional details. The overarching emphasis on pursuit of economic growth encourages government, residents and developers to make rapid capital out of natural resources and to promote consumptive and non-consumptive methods of exploitation that, although perhaps successful elsewhere, have not been adequately tested under local conditions. And people in many areas are so poor that they engage in destructive activities that have long term costs, simply to survive in the short term. This is leading to loss of biodiversity, and reduction in the productivity of the natural environment. Encroachment of state land for cultivation, infrastructure development, and sand mining reduces biodiversity and fragments habitats. Killing of wildlife (in retaliation for crop raiding

or livestock predation), and the overuse and misapplication of agrochemicals threaten biodiversity and ecological integrity[1]<sup>1</sup>. Permissive government policies regarding encroachments, overlapping and conflicting actions by different government agencies, political interference, and commercialization of rural economies[2]<sup>2</sup>, [3]<sup>3</sup> contribute to such environmental damage. Weak management and governance of fisheries is leading to the overexploitation of marine resources, including damaging levels of bycatch, and the degradation of coastal ecosystems. Environmental damage has resulted from over-visitation by tourists, particularly at coastal sites and in national parks[4]<sup>4</sup>. Government policy calls for a substantial increase in foreign tourist arrivals, an increase in per capita expenditure[5]<sup>5</sup>, [6]<sup>6</sup>.

Sri Lanka has designated 30% of its land as protected areas (the highest national coverage in Asia)[7]<sup>7</sup> [8]<sup>8</sup>, but protected areas, although vital, are insufficient, and habitat destruction and degradation are putting at risk the connectivity of suitable habitat - particularly important for megafauna such as elephants, bears and leopards.

The risks of global climate breakdown are well known by government and are the basis for a number of different projects and programmes, but there is room for improvement in the way that climate change considerations are taken into account in decisions on natural resource management and economic development.

The PIF envisaged mainstreaming within Environmentally Sensitive Areas, a category of protection being developed under the parallel GEF-UNDP-GOSL “*Enhancing Biodiversity Conservation and Sustenance of Ecosystem services in Environmentally Sensitive Areas*”, referred to here as the GEF5 ESA project (see PIF p20)[9]<sup>9</sup>, but the concept, the management regime and the mechanisms of protection in ESAs are still under discussion. The aim of the ESA project is to safeguard biodiversity in multiple land use areas through the operationalization of Environmentally Sensitive Area, as a new land use governance designation to mainstream biodiversity considerations into development in areas of high conservation significance. It was expected that the ESA would have been established in law and practice and that the (Managing Together) Project would demonstrate mainstreaming of biodiversity into natural resource management within newly designated ESAs. Progress on the GEF-5 ESA project has been slower than planned. The October 2018 Mid-term Review recommended further clarification among all stakeholders of the concept of the ESA. Under these circumstances the MT Project has selected an area of high conservation significance for demonstration of mainstreaming in the North Central and Northern Provinces[10]<sup>10</sup>. The two projects will collaborate closely, and once use of the ESA has been approved as government policy, the (MT) Project will include the ESA designation as one of the options for management in its landscape design approach to biodiversity conservation.

Mainstreaming biodiversity has been attracting increasing attention in government and donor-funded projects. The PIF (p20) mentions a few of these, and since the PIF was written a number of additional projects have been initiated, including the UNEP-GEF-GOSL “*Healthy Landscapes: Managing Agricultural Landscapes in Socio-ecologically Sensitive Areas to Promote Food Security, Well-being and Ecosystem Health*” project which operates in the selected (MT) Project landscape. Projects that advocate and practice mainstreaming are an important part of the baseline scenario but just as important for the MT Project (see Prodoc Section 4.2, pp. 32-36) are projects and programmes focused on development of single sectors, notably the ADB/Fisheries Department Northern Province Sustainable Fisheries Development Project, which could benefit from close synergy with the MT Project in improvements to their considerations of biodiversity. Table 2 in Section 4.2 of the Prodoc summarizes 16 baseline projects, one or two recently completed.

### ***3) Proposed alternative scenario, with brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project***

---

The context of the Project within the Biodiversity and Land Degradation Focal Area and Sustainable Forest Management Objectives and Programmes are as in the PIF and listed under Part IA above. The PIF (p21) summarizes the contributions the Project will make in some way towards the Aichi Targets 1,2,3 7, 10 and 11. The summary of the GEF Scenario in the PIF (p 20) remains valid and will be implemented in compliance with the general principles of project management and implementation developed during the project preparation phase (Prodoc Section 3.6, *pp.20-21*). A deliberate decision has been made to operate within existing policy and institutional frameworks and to be wary of guaranteeing results under Project outcomes that depend on institutional and individual decision making outside the Project. Detailed and long-term participatory planning with local communities and local governments will produce land-use plans and overarching landscape designs for conservation that the Project will not preempt by requiring specific results.

Although the baseline, the barriers, and the alternative GEF scenario presented in the PIF stand, the project preparation team have made some changes to the components and the expected outcomes of the Project. The GEF alternative scenario is basically that biodiversity will be considered routinely in government policy and decision making and that the results of this "mainstreaming" will be reflected in the nature of local livelihoods and in the level of threats to wild species and habitats.

Decisions were made during the Project Preparation Phase to make a few changes from the PIF

i) The ESA designation is not yet established in policy (see above under A1 (2)) so the Project focus has moved from the ESA (as in the PIF) to the wider landscape in areas that have ecological significance but have yet not been designated as ESAs. It is expected that under the guidance of the GEF-5 ESA project, the ESA designation will be established in law before the end of the MT Project and in that case the ESA designation will be available as an option in the Project's landscape designs.

(ii) The scope of the Project has been widened in that interventions in areas where fishing is a main livelihood are much more explicit than in the PIF.

(iii) The PIF had three components and the Prodoc has four. There has been some rearrangement of Outputs but all but one of the PIF Outputs has been subsumed under the new arrangements of Outcomes in the Prodoc. The changes involve Outcomes 2 and 3. The PIF dealt with natural resource management plans and interventions at the ESA and the community levels under Outcome 2, and dealt with tourism plans and interventions at the ESA and the community levels under Outcome 3. The Prodoc considers tourism and natural resource management together - at the landscape level (equivalent of ESA - see (i) above) in Outcome 2 and at the community level in Outcome 3. An additional Prodoc output (Output 4) covers monitoring and dissemination of knowledge. **Annex G** gives full details of the changes, comparing each PIF and Prodoc component, outcome and output.

#### ***4) Incremental/additional cost reasoning***

The Project will contribute to the conservation of global biodiversity both in the Project landscape and nationally. The PIF (p6) and the Prodoc (section 2.1, 2.2, *p. 8-9*) describe the global importance of the biodiversity of the overall Project landscape, the three Trial Landscapes and the whole country. The Project's Theory of Change (Prodoc **Annex K**) sets out the baseline and the baseline drivers and deals with each production sector and tourism separately. Without the Project there would be continuation of decline of biodiversity as shown in the PIF (pp7-10) and the Prodoc (section 2.3, *pp.9-10* and Annex K). Important conservation work is being done, particularly in protected areas, and funds are being made available to enhance this. Over exploitation of natural resources that threatens biodiversity and sustainability of ecosystems and is driven by an overriding emphasis on economic development on the one hand, and rural poverty on the other. Damaging practices in agriculture, fisheries and tourism are well publicized but they persist. Government expenditure on enforcement regimes outside protected areas is high, but results are poor. The Project will contribute incrementally in two major areas. First (Outcome 2, *p.25*) the Project will address the needs for coherent planning that bring together agencies to coordinate programmes of action that are at times conflicting, and will demonstrate the benefits in the overall landscape (this encompasses protected areas) of a spatial design approach to conservation planning taking into account the impacts of different land uses. Second (Outcome 3, *p.28*) planning and community empowerment under the Project at the village level will lead to livelihood-focused interventions that link that community level to the overall landscape. The Project has four years and will have expert staff based full time in the Project landscape throughout that time to facilitate joint planning and building of knowledge, understanding and trust. This is a clear increment over what government and NGOs are currently doing.

The Prodoc (Section IX, p.64) shows the agreed co-finance. GIZ will carry out community conservation planning near to the Wilpattu National Park (see Prodoc Annex IX). The Northern Province Sustainable Fisheries Project (see Prodoc section 4.2, pp.32-36) plans various livelihood-focused interventions and the MT Project will add incrementally to this through contribution of biodiversity expertise. The World Bank's ESCAMP (see Prodoc 4.2, p.32) is working on livelihood-focused interventions to alleviate problems caused by elephants and humans living in proximity to each other, and such interventions will be coordinated as co-finance with the Managing Together Project. The Project is in an excellent position to contribute biodiversity expertise to other projects and programmes including those involved in irrigation and dams within and near the Project landscape (Prodoc 4.2). Under Outcome 1 the Project will contribute its expertise to institutionalization of in-service and pre-service training in mainstreaming and landscape approach to conservation. Under Outcome 4 a major programme of dissemination of knowledge and lessons learned will draw attention to the benefits of a relatively simple change in approach to that way biodiversity is considered agriculture, fisheries, tourism and forestry. A key part of the Project's selected approach is to work within current policy, but as it becomes clear what changes in policy - and of course practice - would be useful, recommendations will be put forward and lobbied for at provincial and central government levels (under Outcome 1).

The estimates of baseline and incremental funding (including co-finance) from GEF and from other sources towards the two major global biodiversity results (represented by core indicators) that the Project will achieve are shown in the Table (**Annex H**).

### **5) Global Environmental Benefits**

In an area of high global biodiversity significance in northern Sri Lanka (see PIF p6 and Prodoc section 2.1, 3.3) the global environmental benefits of the Project as measured by the GEF Core Indicators can be summarized as:

- Ø Improved management of 70,549 ha of land, including forest and agricultural land in three demonstration areas (Trial Landscapes) in coordination with 42,182 ha of existing protected areas within those landscapes;
- Ø Improved management of 46,467 ha of marine habitats, including coastal mangroves and sea grass beds in one demonstration area (Trial Landscape/Seascape);
- Ø 17,781,160 t CO<sub>2</sub>e benefit by avoided deforestation & increased sequestration over 20 years
- Ø 3,200 people (approximately 50% of which are female) in receipt of targeted support and/or use resources that the Project maintains or enhances.

For further details see Prodoc Project Results Framework (Section VI) and Prodoc Annexes B, Q and W.

### **6) Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.**

#### Innovativeness

The main innovations in the selected Project approach (Prodoc 3.2, 4.1) involve in some cases taking a step backwards from practice in some recent projects, to a long and patient approach engaging with local governments and communities as deliberate choice, to utilizing the best science in analyzing landscape and community level options for biodiversity management, even if the solutions may be counter to widely held beliefs of what is good for biodiversity. For example, it may be better for biodiversity to engage in intensive agriculture in certain parts of a landscape if that can free up land for protection in another part: whereas some people believe that in an agricultural landscape low impact agriculture throughout brings the highest biodiversity benefits. Although the Project is not specifically focused on global climate change, it is essential that project implementation is flavoured with global climate change from start to finish in all activities and discussions whether in Colombo, a District centre or a Focal Village. When it comes to decisions on livestock herding for example, the discussions around planning this at the landscape scale under Outcome 2, and the village level under Outcome 3, will include considerations of the carbon costs of livestock herding and the costs and benefits of allocating land for livestock products or plant-based food and other products. Similarly every effort will be made to run the Mannar Project office and the village level premises in an environmentally friendly way as an example to all interlocutors and stakeholders.

The current planning approach (baseline scenario) is typically through single institutions with stakeholder input as part of the process, whereas the landscape conservation design approach to be implemented by the project involves multiple institutions and is stakeholder-driven. It is holistic and value-driven and guides collective decision-making and action across jurisdictions and sectors resulting in a "living" product determined by the stakeholders and updated from time to time via text, maps, data, strategic plans, decision support tools and cooperative agreements.

A major focus on coordinating donor investments in environmental and biodiversity conservation in the Project area will focus all efforts in the most efficient way, and will identify synergies, such that technical and organizational expertise and influence will be shared between projects and programmes taking advantage of the relative strengths of each project/programme.

#### *Landscape scale planning*

There is considerable experience in landscape scale community-centred approaches to natural resource management, but surprisingly few useful generalizations emerge. A lot depends on specific circumstances. One of the main lessons learned is that achieving lasting change in landscape management takes longer than the typical project duration of 3-5 years. Reid et al (2016)[11]<sup>11</sup> urged practitioners to monitor and document carefully inputs, short-term outcomes and long-term performance. Steps will be taken to ensure both continuity and monitoring after the project ends, and project staff, instead of merely visiting from time to time, will live and work full time in the Project landscapes throughout the whole duration of the Project. Policy changes also take a long time to achieve, longer than the normal duration of GEF projects, so the Project will deliberately not spend time on policy development early on. Lessons learned from earlier projects such as this one in Sri Lanka and elsewhere show that it is easy to get bogged down in technical papers and policy discussions "upstream" at the expense of making progress in understanding, capacity building, support and action in the field and at community and local government levels.

Conditions are favourable for implementing this Project (Prodoc section 2.3 and **Annex K**). There is wide realization among government officials that environmental degradation is accelerating; increasing concern among some sectors of the public about the state of environmental governance, including possible links to early deaths of rice farmers from chronic kidney disease of unknown etiology; a large number of keen green movements and organisations; demand for wildlife tourism that does not damage biodiversity or the ecology; Sri Lanka's status as part of a global biodiversity hotspot with high endemism; traditions of a sustainable waste-free rural lifestyle that still persists, especially in the North; a large number of rural development/ irrigation/ agriculture/conservation/fisheries projects and programmes with which synergies can be established; and enthusiastic responses both at central and local government levels to the briefings and consultations on the project to date. The northern region of Sri Lanka is a particularly good place to pilot "mainstreaming". Population densities are lower than in the south and because the area was a war zone for 26 years until 2009 there has been less economic development than in the south. Tourism is particularly under-developed in comparison to the south, where considerable environmental damage has been reported (see Prodoc 2.3), and it is an opportune time to get environmental and biodiversity concerns taken into account routinely in regulation and practice of the industry. On the other hand, the post-war situation brings its own complications to the establishment of effective joint community and government planning mechanisms. The overall ToC (Prodoc Annex K) summarizes some of these constraints, including disputes over land tenure as a result of people being resettled on land subsequently reclaimed by returning residents who had been displaced by the war. Loss of title deeds, and a high proportion of households headed by war widows who sometimes have difficulty in proving ownership of land, add to the complications. Rather than ignoring such constraints, the Project will take them into account, carrying out its participatory community-based planning assiduously through expert staff resident in the Project landscape.

#### *Reduced national level policy aims*

Some projects have ambitious policy aims that prove impossible to achieve within the project timeframe and beyond the control of an individual project. The selected approach departs from the model presented in the PIF in that it avoids trying to change much in the administrative systems and policy fields but rather works within or modify existing systems. This Project aims to concentrate efforts on producing results under the existing legislative and institutional environment, will make recommendations where appropriate for changes in the future, and will seek public and governmental feedback on those recommendations towards the end of the project. Biodiversity and environmental conservation committees and

---

institutions that are effectively project creations often tend not to survive much beyond the end of projects that created them, unless they are included formally in government structure with their own guaranteed funding for provision of resources including space, equipment, personnel, and travel and administrative costs. Even if new institutions may be preferable in theory, practical constraints favour modification of practices within existing processes, land designations and institutions as they have more chance of becoming permanent. The project aims to have the results at both Focal Village and Trial Landscape levels fed into revisions of the five year District Development Plans. In that way the results feed directly into the customary processes of government, rather than under a standalone strategy.

Current policies and laws do not constitute a barrier to mainstreaming of biodiversity into land-use planning and natural resource management in Sri Lanka. Indeed, a considerable amount of work has already been done in this field in agriculture, forestry, fisheries and tourism. The MT project will therefore focus first on demonstrating what can be done under current policies and laws to achieve the Project objective in selected areas and will then work upstream to incorporate recommendations for changes in policy and legislation arising from the project, including the possible application of the ESA management category to sites within the Project landscape, depending on the criteria agreed in due course for establishing sensitive areas under the ESA category of protection, or, potentially, ecological redlining[12]<sup>12</sup>. So Project targets for multisectoral achievements are limited to what is possible without structural changes in institutions and new policies. On the other hand, the Project will make clear recommendations for institutional and policy changes required in the future, and if possible will set these changes in motion through lobbying for them with government.

Other models were considered, such as declaring the Trial Landscapes as Special Management Areas. These are available at present under the Coastal Conservation Department, so the category would have to be extended to terrestrial and inland areas. However, reviews of the performance of SMAs, particularly after donor projects featuring them have ended, are not promising. The ambition, in the SMA concept, to bring about a sharing of authority and control in coastal management has not quite worked out in practice, partly as a result of problems with representativeness[13]<sup>13</sup>, [14]<sup>14</sup>. However, the main reason for selecting the Trial Landscape approach, with no special management area designation, is that mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation into governance in through an integrated landscape approach is something that should become routine in all places, whether with globally significant biodiversity or local biodiversity only. So finding a mechanism to establish this over the landscape will have much wider significance than developing yet another model for a restricted area. By practicing the landscape approach to planning and then feeding the recommendations into the standard Land Use Plans and Five Year District Development Plans the project has a much higher probability of making long lasting impacts.

#### *Comprehensive consideration of the drivers of environmental damage*

The project's Theory of Change (ToC) identified damage to species and habitats from agriculture and fisheries as threats to biodiversity, the underlying causes being that large numbers of people are seeking incomes and subsistence from unsustainable practices. Contributing factors lie in post-war community tensions, some related to land tenure disputes, and gender pay differentials and social status. The project will address incomes and subsistence requirements through livelihood analysis as part of its community-centred approach. However, true to the principles of landscape conservation design it is a mistake to specify precisely what will be recommended in terms of livelihoods in the sectors addressed by the project. So rather than specify actions and outputs in agriculture, fisheries, tourism, and forestry and wildlife, the Prodoc presents options for these, for discussion with communities and government agencies during the project itself. Full funding of these plans and strategies will not be possible under the project, but substantial funds will be applied for implementation and the project will engage with local government, the private sector, and other government and donor funded projects and programmes to leverage additional costs of implementation.

#### *Patient engagement through resident experts in participatory planning*

---



The Project will establish a landscape and seascape approach to natural resource management that yields a robust, complex, interconnected network of protected, conserved, productive, unproductive, and developed lands that facilitates sustainable livelihoods and decreases damaging livelihood practices. Landscape conservation planning and implementation has been done in the past mainly top-down and less frequently bottom-up, but preferable and increasingly common systems of governance for landscapes are hybrids of community-centred, cross-sectoral and multi-level government. Landscape planning is not a fixed process, but rather an outlook to achieve holistic consideration of social, economic and ecological complexity, subject to unexpected feedback, and impacts, often delayed[15]<sup>15</sup>. Of the ten key characteristics of the landscape approach proposed by Sayer et al. (2013)[16]<sup>16</sup> the following are the most pertinent in this project: continuous learning and adaptive management; focusing first on easy-to-reach intermediate targets; working at multiple scales (community-based and up to local government levels and higher); equitable engagement of stakeholders; transparency in process and rights and responsibilities of participants; strengthening capacity of stakeholders; and participatory monitoring.

At the village level the project will follow participatory methods such as described by Bello et al (2016)[17]<sup>17</sup> talking with local people patiently, first asking them how they themselves want to plan their land use, and then including biodiversity conservation objectives as relationships are formed and the project is able to explain the benefits. The project will reach common understanding with local communities and local government through a slow but steady process of dialogue and discussion. Patient listening to the concerns and interests of people in local communities and local government will lead on to establishing genuine dialogue. Once common ground has been established the next step will be to ensure that the objective and scope of the project are fully understood and accepted, and that false expectations of project results are not built up. Project staff at the beginning, and throughout, will concentrate on listening and learning, accepting differences and building mutual trust, dialogue to challenge own and others' assumptions and build common ground and shared assumptions, and advocacy for, and discussion of, project objectives and outcomes, and desires, aspirations and needs of local people and government.

The MT Project aims to reduce encroachment on forest land through mechanisms that can lead to income from either certified brands of agricultural crops or NTFPs or from sustainable tourism enterprises that make use of land set aside for biodiversity. Community involvement has the potential to slow, stop or reverse the decline of biodiversity but only under the right conditions. Security of land tenure (or use or management rights) is an important requirement for successful biodiversity conservation by communities, and this requires attention from the project even though lack of clarity in this respect represents a widespread and intractable barrier. Schemes are liable to founder in the absence of confidence that the resources will remain with the community in the long term. Co-management may work well under certain circumstances. These include a smallish, well defined community, an interested and highly motivated set of government officials, official enabling policy, and a basic robust law enforcement regime to back up community agreements more generally adhered to as a result of peer pressure. Outsiders have to be considered too in formulating conservation solutions. The project will avoid telling the local people what it would like them to do, or organizing them into cooperatives, but will work towards sustainable solutions through learning, dialogue and patient discussions in and out of formal meetings.

Experience with integrated conservation and development projects has shown that the best results have been under arrangements that mix government and community involvement. The project will employ specific mechanisms for public and local government consultation and collaboration tailor-made for each of the six Focal Villages or Village Clusters. Formal workshops will play a role, but the emphasis will be more on short, regular and sustained interactions with stakeholders at GND, DSD, and District levels for the duration of the project. The Project will engage staff who will be permanently based in the Trial Landscapes to interact with local communities and government and to facilitate collaboration with the private sector, particularly in the field of tourism. The project will be working mainly in a decentralized (whether formal or by default) policy and legislative environment in and around the three Trial Landscapes. Prodoc **Annex V** illustrates the complex nature of Sri Lankan local government with some officials elected locally and others with staff answering to central government.

---

Many powers, such as setting and ensuring compliance with national environmental laws, priorities and standards, and approving large infrastructure and development projects lie with central government and have not been devolved. Tourism is one sector that has not been devolved. The Project's approach is to involve central government institutions throughout: in seeking feedback on project reports, in capacity building in different sectors, in drawing up recommendations for possible policy changes in the future (see below), and in developing synergies with governmental and private sector development projects and programmes in the project landscape. Reid et al (2016)[18]<sup>18</sup> urged practitioners of the landscape approach to monitor and document carefully inputs, short-term outcomes and long term performance. Monitoring the results after the project ends is particularly important to guide landscape planning initiatives worldwide: many have been implemented but data on long term impacts are sparse. It should be possible to achieve the objective of *strengthening* protection of biodiversity within the 48 months allowed, but it is necessary to follow up after that to measure actual impacts on biodiversity.

#### *Role of livelihood-focused interventions under the Project*

The project aims to reduce the prevalence of activities deemed to be environmentally damaging through livelihood-focused interventions that establish a clear link to biodiversity conservation. The project will avoid using the term "alternative livelihoods" because of three flawed assumptions[19]<sup>19</sup> that underlie most alternative livelihood projects that seek to substitute damaging livelihood practices with alternatives that provide at least equivalent benefits. The first flawed assumption is that providing alternatives will reduce people's needs or desires to exploit natural resources. This rarely holds, as the alternatives become supplementary sources of income and that income may even subsidize the original damaging practices through allowing purchase of more efficient equipment for example. The second is that communities are homogeneous: they are frequently not, and especially so in the Trial Landscapes, so it is important to generate benefits for the "right" people - those who, collectively, are most heavily exploiting the target resource. The third assumption is that targeting interventions at some individuals will scale up to population-level reductions in impacts on natural resources. Change at one level does not automatically translate into change at higher levels. What can be done under livelihood interventions is to build good community relations and develop strategic and innovative approaches to payments for ecosystem services, and distribution of benefits from those like tour companies, and fishermen, who are profiting from a public good. In an analysis of 34 livelihoods-focused conservation projects, empowerment, security and social network development were more significant short-term outcomes than income generation[20]<sup>20</sup>. The project will provide or facilitate technical support and partial funding for livelihood-focused interventions, and in principle will require contributions in cash and/or in kind from local communities and/or local governments. In tourism development in particular, private sector engagement has already begun, and the project will ensure that such engagement is fair and equitable to local communities.

#### *Rigorous environmental assessments for project interventions*

During both planning and implementation potential and actual environmental, social and biodiversity impacts, both positive and negative, will be assessed. It is extremely difficult to predict impacts, especially indirect ones, as they arise from complex interactions and require understanding and analysis of human behaviour, administrations, politics, economics, biology and environmental science. The project's approach will be to require such assessments for actions undertaken in the name of conservation, just as much as those undertaken for economic development. Raising income levels *per se* will not necessarily lead to an overall reduction in activities that damage biodiversity. Certain people may change their behaviour, but project interventions must look at all ramifications of proposed schemes. So for all interventions there will be assessment of likely impacts not just on target species (harvested species for example) but also on associated species and on ecosystem services. Impacts can be direct or indirect through changes in the socio-economic conditions of "target beneficiaries"

#### Sustainability and potential for scaling-up

A summary of the mechanisms under all Outcomes to report Project results and methods widely, to make recommendations for changes in policy and practice (see immediately above) and to inspire others through example and demonstration to adopt Project approaches, is given in the Prodoc (section 4.7, pp.43-44)

---

The changes achieved under the project in mainstreaming and the landscape approach to biodiversity conservation in the Trial Landscapes, if effective and well-publicized, will lead to wider adoption of similar practices throughout the project landscape. In due course, as the benefits become clear, it is expected that the landscape approach will be replicated elsewhere, supported, where necessary, by the development of new policy and administrative arrangements (see above and Prodoc 4.7). The intention is that demonstrations of modifications to livelihoods, for example through establishment of tourism ventures reliant on intact wild biodiversity, will provide stimulus for dissemination and replication. However, this will require collaboration on a large scale between agencies and between and within communities. Examples of schemes that have been successful in this area, such as the one that benefits local villagers in areas adjoining the Chitwan National Park in Nepal<sup>[21]</sup><sup>21</sup>.

General principles of Project management and implementation (Prodoc section 3.6, *pp.20-21*) illustrate how the project is aiming for innovativeness and sustainability, including through scaling up. Adaptive management will react quickly to opportunities, difficulties and emerging threats during the course of the project. holistic landscape. Other features include:

- Decentralized and holistic planning and management at the community and local government level without getting bogged down in policy development,
- The support of local people gained through permanent Project presence in the Trial Landscapes Addressing social issues as far as feasible through, for example, representations to relevant government agencies,
- A focus on tangible results that can be demonstrated during the project and employed to encourage replication and policy change subsequently,
- Attention to representativeness in community engagement and identification of people genuinely interested in undertaking new enterprises that provide not only incomes and resources, but long-term ecological sustainability,
- Engagement with rural development projects that do not focus specifically on biodiversity but that would increase sustainability of outcomes from biodiversity conservation inputs provided by this Project.

The Project scope is narrow enough to achieve results during the project period, and wide enough to have continued impact after the end of the project. The Prodoc is not over-prescriptive, thus allowing for adaptive management and maintaining flexibility in activities. Although the planning procedures are laid down, care has been taken to allow flexibility in the activities to come out of the planning: to do otherwise would have been to discount the importance of the consultations and planning. However, options for activities in line with the project objectives and thought to be promising ways of linking biodiversity conservation with livelihoods, are presented in the ProDoc (**Annex Z**).

The Project will develop modules for pre-service and in-service vocational training as this can be done within existing frameworks. Training under the project will whenever possible and appropriate be done through an institution under a "training of trainers" and indeed "establishing curriculum" approach, so that the training will be available after the project has been completed. There will be some cases in which an institutional setting for training will not be practical, and in such cases agricultural and fisheries extension officers will be trained to deliver the training again when necessary. The proposed CADEC training centre to be set up under the Northern Province Sustainable Fisheries Project (Prodoc 4.2, *p.32*) will be supported by the MT project in course development and delivery, and modules will be designed for existing vocational pre-service and in-service training institutions to familiarize students with the concept and practice of mainstreaming biodiversity and ecosystem services.

Training will be focused strictly on requirements, with a training needs analysis done early on for the planning phase and for more specialist training a second TNA will be completed after the landscape plans have been completed. Training within institutions will focus on topics that have immediate relevance to the trainees' work. Selection of trainees is important too: one cannot teach anyone to become a trainer: aptitude and interest are essential requisites.

Changes to the national educational curriculum in schools will neither be achievable nor attempted under this project, although recommendations will be made in this regard. Project activities in local schools, meanwhile, will provide immediate benefits and support for the livelihood-focused interventions in the Trial Landscapes and Focal Villages, as well as lessons for eventual wider application.

The project aims to show how a landscape approach to natural resource management can be applied for the long-term benefit of people in such a way that publicity becomes to an extent self-generated by participants and the media. Politicians and government officers, in particular central government officials, and donor agency senior management staff are busy people, so in selection of interventions the project will consider, among other factors, ease of access for demonstrating progress (or otherwise) to visiting officials.

---

[1] <https://medium.com/@VIIPhoto/in-the-hot-zone-chronic-kidney-disease-in-sri-lanka-bb9c21ea6847>

[2] [http://redd.lk/web/images/contents/document\\_centre/Final\\_DD\\_Summary\\_Completed.pdf](http://redd.lk/web/images/contents/document_centre/Final_DD_Summary_Completed.pdf)

[3] <https://www.cbd.int/doc/world/lk/lk-nbsap-v2-en.pdf>

[4] <http://repository.kln.ac.lk/bitstream/handle/123456789/13623/SV.139-152.pdf?sequence=1>

[5] <https://www.slideshare.net/BTOEducational/sri-lanka-tourism-strategic-plan-and-action-2017-2020>

<https://2017.globaleco.com.au/perch/resources/Gallery/rashmini-mather.pdf>

<http://www.sltda.lk/sites/default/files/tourism-strategic-plan-2017-to-2020.pdf>

[6] <https://oxfordbusinessgroup.com/overview/rising-star-government-setting-out-its-plans-sector>

[7] far exceeding Aichi Target 11 for terrestrial protected areas, although it has few marine protected areas

[8] <https://www.bipindicators.net/indicators/coverage-of-protected-areas-terrestrial-and-marine>

[9] <https://www.thegef.org/project/enhancing-biodiversity-conservation-and-sustenance-ecosystem-services-environmentally>

[10] Parts of Anuradhapura District (North Central Province), Mannar District (Northern Province) and a very small part of Vavuniya District (Northern Province)

[11] 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

[12] <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/8c7d/6fcf3e222dd672d2b5e72135dd348acf886d.pdf>

[13] <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:169239/FULLTEXT01.pdf>

[14] [http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/coastal\\_20zone\\_20management\\_20in\\_20sri\\_20lanka.pdf](http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/coastal_20zone_20management_20in_20sri_20lanka.pdf)

[15] Campellone, R.M. et al. (2018) The iCASS Platform: Nine principles for landscape conservation design *Landscape and Urban Planning* 176 (2018) 64–74

[16] [www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1210595110](http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1210595110)

[17] Bello, F., et al. (2016). "Community participation framework for

protected area-based tourism planning". *Tourism Planning & Development* Vol. 13 , Iss. 4, 2016.

[18] 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

[19] <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26310510>

[20] <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/oryx/article/disentangling-the-links-between-conservation-and-poverty-reduction-in-practice/D60B5A9E113B551E1E45433E1B57E72D>

[21] [https://www.academia.edu/6952610/LOCAL\\_PERCEPTION\\_TOWARDS\\_VILLAGE\\_TOURISM\\_A\\_Case\\_Study\\_of\\_Sauraha\\_Village\\_in\\_Chitwan](https://www.academia.edu/6952610/LOCAL_PERCEPTION_TOWARDS_VILLAGE_TOURISM_A_Case_Study_of_Sauraha_Village_in_Chitwan)

#### **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.**

. See Prodoc Section 4.4 (*pp.41-42*)

Wide range of consultations with stakeholders have been conducted during the PPG stage. During the PPG stage, the stakeholder analysis was updated and elaborated following consultations at the project trial landscapes, and with the national and local governments addressing both institutional stakeholders in the context of their statutory involvement in the project, and more broadly for non-governmental stakeholders including communities. Field level stakeholder consultations were conducted to obtain the perspective of the different stakeholders.

The Learning and Communication Officer (LCO), based in Mannar, will be responsible for maintaining a Stakeholder Coordination Framework (SHF) that summarizes interests, communications and engagements, and ongoing collaboration with details of mutual feedback and leveraged actions. Based on this a more detailed Stakeholder Engagement Plan will be prepared, engaging relevant stakeholders identified under Annex F. The LCO will plan in detail how stakeholders will be informed, consulted, included in participatory planning for biodiversity (and gender) mainstreaming, involved in the screening of potential Project interventions and given specific responsibilities (including contracts) as part of the overall Project team. The LCO will also be responsible for soliciting and dealing with complaints and grievances against the Project from stakeholders with specific concerns.

The project will reach common understanding with local communities and local government through a slow but steady process of dialogue and discussion. Patient listening to the concerns and interests of people in local communities and local government will lead on to establishing genuine dialogue on the Project's aims and expected results, and the desires, aspirations and needs of local people and government. Once common ground has been established the next step will be to ensure that the Objective and scope of the project are fully understood and accepted, and that false expectations of project results are not built up.

Please refer to stakeholder engagement plan (sub-section 4.4 of UNDP ProDoc, *p.42*) and Annex F, which lists the main organizational stakeholders, their normal roles and responsibilities and their relationship and/or participation with the MT Project.

## Documents

Title

Submitted

**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; Yes**

**Member of Advisory Body; Contractor; Yes**

**Co-financier; Yes**

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

**Executor or co-executor; Yes**

**Other (Please explain)**

#### 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).**

See Gender Action Plan in second part of Prodoc Annex G, and also Gender Stakeholder Engagement Plan in Prodoc Annex F)

Data from the rapid gender assessment in the Trial Landscapes 1, 2 and 3 in consultation with women and men in a selected few villages and a few service and resource agencies indicated the following:

- Some of the major challenges that confront women in the Trial landscapes is the access to and control over resources, poor access to decision making and the culturally defined reproductive roles that curtail their choices to make decisions.
- In the two selected provinces, whether in fishing or farming, even though women play a major role in livelihood, it goes unrecognized. In particular, men hold privileged positions where they engage in activities that is tied to payments by the department of irrigation such as cleaning, repair of canals and desilting small tanks.
- Men hold legitimacy over all services of livelihood organisation such obtaining seeds, fertilizer and other benefits from Agrarian Services or benefits from Fisheries Societies due to being men. The patriarchal norms therefore disadvantage women socially, economically and politically.
- The ownership to land is thus the legitimacy for access to livelihood related loans, seeds, fertilizer, subsidies on nets, boats etc. Resulting from this legitimacy, majority of women lose their right to access livelihood to related services and resources.
- The membership in the fisher and farmer livelihood societies are skewed with a domination of men. However, women's membership is highly noticeable in associations and societies that are voluntary in nature such as the Rural Women's Societies, parental groups in schools etc. providing voluntary services. This observation directly associates to the views of gendered division labour framework where men are in control of paid work and women in voluntary work.
- Violence against women is a general malaise in the Project areas and child pregnancies, and employment of children (for example in sand-mining) are common. Access to vocational training and technology is biased towards men, thus exacerbating a situation in which women play subordinate roles and are not equitably represented in jobs and local decision making. Women have a great deal of local knowledge that can be utilized towards conservation.

The Project will follow an affirmative action path because a passive approach of an equitable approach to participation based on qualifications for example, is unlikely to unlock the potential of women participants to break through traditional barriers and become involved in decision making and livelihood modifications. This can result in lasting change in their roles together with real conservation benefits.

Specific attention will be focused on ensuring the active participation of women, particularly in the livelihood-focused interventions. During project implementation, capacity building and training will ensure that women as well as men are actively engaged in all aspects of the Project, and that there is a bias towards women in participation - potentially in local tourism businesses for example.

Please refer to **Annex G** (of UNDP ProDoc) for Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan, and Annex F2 for the Stakeholder Engagement Plan with respect to Gender.

## Documents

Title

Submitted

**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.**

Please see Prodoc Section 4.3, Table 3 (project Risk Log, *pp.36-39*) and Annex E (SESP).

12 risks (one of them High Risk, 9 Medium Risk and two Low Risk) associated with the Project is given in **Table 3** together with mitigation measures (UNDP prodoc, *p. 36*). Seven Environmental and Social Risks were identified through the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP). The overall SESP risk categorization for the project is High'. Notably, Principle 1 on human rights and standard 5 on displacement and resettlement, have been triggered with a high risk because one of the project sites fall within the proposed elephant corridors, and people may be asked or forced to relocate from forest areas designated as Elephant Corridors as part of overall conservation management.



An ESIA will be performed if resettlement of people is proposed in the Trial Landscapes whether or not the MT Project is involved in actual funding, because the MT Project will by default be associated with such an action as the landscape designs will identify the forest/wildlife corridors. The mitigation measures as detailed (in Table 3 and Annex H), all possible alternative solutions will be explored as part of the Landscape Strategies for Trial Landscapes 2 and 3 under the MT Project, before resettlement is recommended under the Project's landscape planning activities.

Further assessment of (Risk 11 - involuntary resettlement of people from proposed elephant corridors and other forest areas) will be undertaken during project implementation. Project activities contributing to these risks will not commence until the assessments have been completed and any required risk management plans have been approved and are under implementation. Assessment and management planning will involve public consultation and public disclosure.

Other environmental and social risks (Risks 6,8,9 of table 3) arise because many livelihood interventions, however well planned, end up with unintended and damaging consequences, both ecological and social. Risk 7 concerns poor implementation of reforestation which often fails as a result of poor execution and contingency planning. Mitigation of these four risks will be by way of thorough planning, and patient and unhurried consultations and engagement with communities and local government carried out by project staff based full time in the Project Landscapes.

The Project will set up and manage a grievance redress mechanism (GRM) that would address project affected persons' (PAP) grievances, complaints, and suggestions.

For detail explanation of the risks, please refer to (*sub-section 4.3 of UNDP prodoc, pp.36-42*), Annex H – UNDP Risk Log, and Annex E\_Social and Environmental Screening Procedure and Action Plan.

#### **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.**

Details on project implementation arrangement including governance structure, organogram, roles and responsibilities of different entities is described under Section VIII "Governance and Management Arrangements" (p. 61) of UNDP Project Document.

The **Implementing Partner** for this project is the Ministry of Mahaweli Development and the Environment (MoMDE). The Implementing Partner 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.

IUCN Sri Lanka has been identified as the **Responsible Party** to provide project implementation support through a field-based Project Management Unit (PMU). The IP will identify other responsible parties to decentralize implementation of project activities to the stakeholders at the regional and local levels to take ownership of project activities and build their capacity. Some of these agencies include: North Central and Northern Provincial Councils to deliver government agriculture, fisheries and tourism related mainstreaming activities, and Biodiversity Sri Lanka as a private sector platform for mainstreaming and policy advocacy.

The **Project Board** (also called Project Steering Committee) will comprise of Project Executive, Beneficiary Representatives and Development Partners. PB is responsible for taking corrective action as needed to ensure the project achieves the desired results. In order to ensure UNDP's ultimate accountability, Project 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. PB will be chaired by the Secretary, MoMDE; Additional Secretary, Environment Projects and Education and Training, MoMDE will represent the interests of the GEF Focal Point, National Planning Department and the External Resources Department will also be represented. The wider membership of the Project Board including Beneficiary Representative and Development Partner will be settled before project inception.

**Project Director (PD)** is the designated representative of MoMDE. He/she will head the PMU and will be accountable to MoMDE for the use of project resources and to deliver on outcomes. The PD will manage the implementation of all project activities and will work closely with all partner institutions to link the project with complementary national programs and initiatives. The PD is accountable to the PB for the quality, timeliness, and effectiveness of the project intervention implementation, as well as for the use of resources. The PD will be technically supported by contracted national and international consultants and service providers. As this Project will be field-based, the Project Director will liaise with the District Secretaries and Provincial Chief Secretaries to ensure effective field level implementation and transfer of funds to national and sub-national government entities.

**Project Management Unit (PMU)** will be based in or near the District Secretariat, Mannar, within easy reach of the Project's three Trial Landscapes. Close collaboration with the DS on a day to day basis will enhance the Project's impacts through on-the-job learning. The PMU will manage project contracts and finances and will provide day to day logistic and technical support for implementation of project activities. The PMU will consist of a Project Director, Project Manager, Finance and Procurement Officer, Senior Technical Adviser, Learning and Communications Officer, three Community Conservation Experts and a Project Assistant.

The Implementing Partner will appoint the **Project Manager (PM)**. S/he will be responsible to run the Project for day-to-day management and decision making, on behalf of the Project Board within the constraints laid down by the Board. The Project Manager's primary 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. He or she will report to and support the Project Director (PD), who holds overall responsibility for Project results. The Project Manager will inform the Project Board and the Project Assurance roles of any delays or difficulties as they arise during implementation so that appropriate support and corrective measures can be adopted.

**Project Assurance** - UNDP provides supervision, oversight and quality assurance role involving UNDP staff in Country Offices and at regional and headquarters levels. Project Assurance is totally independent of the Project Management function. The quality assurance role supports the Project Board and Project Management Unit by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions. This role ensures appropriate project management milestones are managed and completed. The Project Board cannot delegate any of its quality assurance responsibilities to the Project Manager. This project oversight and quality assurance role is covered by the GEF Agency.

**Coordination with other projects** - the urgent need for biodiversity to be mainstreamed into economic development, and into natural resource management in north-western Sri Lanka in particular, has been widely recognized, and is reflected in a significant number of projects and programmes. The proposed project will explore opportunities for synergies through careful coordination and pooling of specialist expertise leading to the optimal application of funds and other inputs towards achievement of planned results across all participating projects and programmes. Agreements have been reached with many of the projects and programmes with regard to common coordination mechanisms and outreach

programmes. The Project will benefit from the partnerships and institutional and coordination mechanisms already established by other projects at national and field-level while maintaining its own emphasis on mainstreaming biodiversity into routine decision making and action by government and communities on natural resource management. The partners fall into six main categories according to thematic field. The Project will coordinate closely with projects that overlap geographically with similar activities in order to maximize potential impact, sustainability and learning. Cooperation arrangements in sustainable tourism and land-use planning have been agreed with the World Bank ESCAMP project and the GIZ Wilpattu National Park and its Influence Zone Project, which will bring in considerable investment, to enable more effective delivery of donor funding in the same and neighboring landscapes, and to build national capacities and systems for conservation-friendly, culturally sensitive tourism that provides direct benefits to local communities and avoids the damaging environmental and social impacts of tourism seen in many other parts of Sri Lanka. The Project will build strong partnerships with public and private institutions for financing biodiversity conservation building on the analysis and initial pilots of the BIOFIN (Biodiversity Finance Initiative) project (E1 below). BIOFIN provides the potential for Project partnerships with state banks (green financing), tourism establishments (sustainable product and services certification) and for establishing new financing streams through public-private partnerships for bioprospecting, payments for ecosystem services, and offsets. Collaboration with projects in agriculture, irrigation, fisheries and tourism will comprise sharing of expertise. *(Please refer to table 2 of UNDP ProDoc, pp.33-35)*

**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 objective of the Project is to change the way that biodiversity is considered in routine decision making and action in natural resource management and tourism. It is well known now, that economic activity ultimately depends on biodiversity and natural ecological processes and the long term socio-economic benefits are therefore contingent on not harming the environment. The Project, although not primarily set up to provide socio-economic benefits, will demonstrate that mainstreaming and a community-centred ecosystem based approach (PIF title) can provide such benefits and indeed are vital in the long term to avoid break-up of ecosystems and societies. In the short term livelihood-focused interventions under the Project will provide opportunities for learning and incentives to reduce damaging practices. It would be a mistake to raise expectations of financial benefits. Although it is expected that local residents in Project focal villages will gain monetarily from livelihood modifications and from payments for ecosystem services instigated under the Project, many such benefits may not be realized until after the Project has terminated. However, it is expected that in terms on non-monetary benefits there will be greater progress in areas such as community involvement and feeling of empowerment, particularly in traditionally marginalized sections of society. In the long term there will of course be socioeconomic benefits nationally if the principles of mainstreaming are replicated and established as accepted policy and practice.

#### **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.**

See Prodoc Sections 4.1 (under Outcome 4) and 4.7 (*pp.43-44*) with regard to plans to disseminate experience of the project - methods, obstacles, progress, results and outlook - through a wide range of approaches including print, online, radio and TV, talks and meetings, a mobile educational unit (minibus or 4WD), visits to project sites by public and government, visits arranged to protected areas under the Project. With regard to learning from other projects and, most important, contributing knowledge and expertise to other projects, see Prodoc Sections 4.1 (under Outcome 1) and 4.2. The project will seek synergies with other projects, large and small, in order to expand opportunities for mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation and sustainable practices into sectoral decision making and action. The US\$201 million Northern Provinces Sustainable Fisheries Project (NPSFP) (Prodoc 4.2) is particularly important here. The MT project will contribute landscape/seascape planning expertise and ecological knowledge for the much larger alternative livelihoods, construction, hatchery and training components of the NPSFP. The project will work closely at the operational level with individual projects active in the same geographical areas or seeking similar or relevant objectives and outcomes in different areas. The Wilpattu National Park and Influence Zone project management, and NPSFP management will meet monthly with MT project management, either jointly or separately to coordinate activities and exchange information and ideas, and inter-project meetings will be arranged with additional projects, programmes and private sector enterprises as required for smooth operation and maximum learning and synergy. This collaboration will be regardless of whether the projects or programmes are specifically targeted on biodiversity. The project will strive to engage with all poverty alleviation and rural development projects and programmes, both government and donor funded, operating in the project landscape (and indeed with the parent agencies themselves at national level in Colombo). Many such projects and programmes work on what they call "alternative livelihoods", and additional sources of income for local people: the MT project aims to influence the types of business activities that are promoted and to work together with those projects to ensure that they at least do no harm to biodiversity and that they preferably contribute to biodiversity conservation.

In addition to more formulaic meetings to report progress, the MT project will convene meetings focused on specific themes that bring together not only department heads but also all relevant projects and programmes in order to increase communication and the effectiveness of each individual project and programme. These meetings will build on the inter-project collaboration at the operational level, and generate feedback and ideas from a wider range of projects and programmes.

The project also aims to contribute to biodiversity conservation through engaging with donors that support poverty alleviation and rural development projects and programmes. There is great potential for improvements in mainstreaming of biodiversity over whole donor agency programmes, as opposed to working locally at the individual project or programme level.

The MT project takes the approach of seeking collaboration with national and international partners in order to benefit both from local knowledge and steady input of international best practice experience. Universities, research institutions, conservation organizations, both national and international, will be approached for their inputs. The private sector too, will be invited to collaborate, for example on setting up community-based tourism ventures, and establishing better practices in existing hotels, guesthouses and tour activities that have impacts on wild species and habitats.

## **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.**

The PIF (Section 6, p20) summarizes this adequately. The Sri Lanka National Biodiversity Strategy Action Plan was approved in 2016 and covers the important areas of biodiversity conservation, including the cross-sectoral requirements for action. The project will provide guidance in the field of mainstreaming for local implementation of the NBSAP and will contribute to provincial NBSAP implementation plans as they are prepared.

**C. Describe The Budgeted M & E Plan:**

**C. Describe the budgeted m & e plan:**

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget[1] (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
<b>Inception Workshop</b>	UNDP Country Office	3,300	500	Within two months of project document signature
<b>Inception Report</b>	Project Manager	-	None	Within two weeks of inception workshop
<b>Standard UNDP monitoring and reporting requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP</b>	UNDP Country Office	-	None	Quarterly, annually
<b>Risk management</b>	Project Manager	-	None	Quarterly, annually
	Country Office			
<b>Monitoring of indicators in project results framework</b>	Project Manager	13,500		Annually before PIR
<b>Baseline establishment for the PRF</b>	Project Manager CO	8,000	2,500	Before project inception/Y1
<b>GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)</b>	Project Manager and UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF team	None	None	Annually
<b>Lessons learned and knowledge generation</b>	Project Manager	34,000	4,000	Annually
<b>Monitoring of environmental and</b>	Project Manager	12,500	None	On-going

<b>social risks, and corresponding management plans as relevant</b>	UNDP Country Office			
<b>Stakeholder Engagement Plan</b>	Project Manager	None	None	Completed at the CEO endorsement stage
	UNDP Country Office			
<b>Gender Action Plan</b>	Project Manager	10,000	2500	On-going
	UNDP Country Office			
	UNDP GEF team			
<b>Addressing environmental and social grievances</b>	Project Manager	20,000	20,000	On-going
	UNDP Country Office			
<b>Project Board meetings</b>	Project Board	1,500	500	At minimum annually
	UNDP Country Office			
	Project Manager			
<b>Supervision missions</b>	UNDP Country Office	None[2]	add	Annually
<b>Oversight missions</b>	UNDP-GEF team	None	add	Troubleshooting as needed
<b>GEF Secretariat learning missions/site visits</b>	UNDP Country Office and Project Manager and UNDP-GEF team	-	None	To be determined.
<b>Mid-term GEF core indicator to be updated by</b>	Project Manager		none	Before mid-term review mission takes place.
<b>Independent Mid-term Review (MTR) and management response</b>	UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team	20,000	none	Between 2nd and 3rd PIR.
<b>Terminal GEF core indicator to be updated</b>	Project Manager	none	none	Before terminal evaluation mission takes place
<b>Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) included in UNDP evaluation plan, and management response</b>	UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team	35,000	none	At least three months before operational closure
<b>TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time, and UNDP staff and travel expenses</b>		<b>157,800</b>	<b>31,000</b>	

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

[2] 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**

<b>GEF Agency Coordinator</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Project Contact Person</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Email</b>
Pradeep Kurukulasuriya, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator	5/28/2019	Tashi Dorji, UNDP Regional Technical Specialist		tashi.dorji@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).**

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK**

<p>This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Goal 12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns</li> <li>- Goal 14: Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development.</li> <li>- Goal 15: Sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, halt and reverse land degradation, halt biodiversity loss</li> </ul>					
<p>This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Driver 4: Enhancing Resilience to Climate Change and Disasters and Strengthening Environmental Management: <i>By 2022, people in Sri Lanka, in particular the vulnerable and marginalized are benefiting from increasingly sustainable management of natural resources, better environmental governance and blue/green development</i></li> </ul>					
<p>This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Signature solution 4: <i>Promote nature-based solutions for a sustainable planet.</i></li> <li>- Output 1.4.1: Solutions scaled up for sustainable management of natural resources, including sustainable commodities and green and inclusive value chains.</li> </ul>					
	<b>Objective and Outcome Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Mid-term Target</b>	<b>End of Project Target</b>	<b>Data Collection Methods and Risks/Assumptions</b>
<p><b>Project Objective:</b></p> <p>To strengthen protection of globally significant biodiversity through mainstreaming of conservation and sustainable practices into land use planning and sectoral</p>	<p><b>Indicator 1 (Ref. GEF Core Indicators 4 &amp; 5):</b> Area of land and marine habitat administered under a landscape conservation design that mainstreams biodiversity conservation into natural resource management (hectares)</p>	<p>Land 0</p> <p>Sea 0</p>	<p>Land 80,000</p> <p>(TL1 44,000 + TL2 27,000 + TL3 9,000)</p> <p>Marine (TL3) 20,000</p>	<p>Land 155,000 ha</p> <p>(TL1 87,000 + TL2 53,000 + TL3 15,000 )</p> <p>Marine (TL3) 55,000</p>	<p>DSD and District Coordinating Committee Meeting Minutes</p> <p>Draft and Final Strategic Design</p> <p>Risks: Political will, both at national and sub-national levels is insufficient to drive the landscape approach for</p> <p>Assumptions: Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment builds the necessary support for the project time of project inception.</p>
	<p><b>Indicator 2 (Ref: GEF</b></p>	<p>Male 0</p>	<p>Male 500</p>	<p>Male</p>	<p>Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) and including interviews and direct observations</p>

decision making in forestry, agriculture and tourism sectors	<b>Core Indicator 11):</b> The number of people, disaggregated by gender, that have benefitted either monetarily or non-monetarily, or both, from project-induced changes in livelihoods.	Female 0	Female 500	1,600 Female 1,600	Risks: Difficulties in establishing clear criteria for who is a beneficiary prove too great  Assumptions: PRA carried out throughout the project by project staff resident in the Trial Landscapes
	<b>Indicator 3 (Ref: GEF Core indicator 3):</b> Area of tropical dry forest and mangrove in the three Trial Landscapes restored and rehabilitated under a landscape conservation design (hectares)	0 ha	6,000 Tropical Dry Forest: TL1 2,500 TL2 3,000 TL 3 500 Mangrove TL3 20	21,000 Tropical Dry Forest: TL1 8,950 TL2 8.950 TL 3 3,000 Mangrove TL3 100	Surveys and project reports  Risks: Political will, both at national and sub-national levels is insufficient to drive the landscape approach for  Assumptions: Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment builds the necessary support for the project
<b>Outcome 1</b> <b>An enabling environment to mainstream integrated approaches into natural resource</b>	Output 1.1: Draft ministerial directives and subsidiary agreements for special working arrangements between government agencies and administrations in the three Trial Landscapes Output 1.2: Integrated Landscape Management and Mainstreaming Modules for institutions offering in-service and pre-service training of state employees Output 1.3: Coordination established with relevant development projects, programmes, and public and private sector initiatives operating in the same geographical area Output 1.4: Recommendations and proposals for changes in policy, institutions or practice that will be required for replication of the landscape conservation design approach to mainstream				
	<b>Indicator 4:</b> Number of	0	4	9	Copies of the curricula of the training institutions

<b>management in production sectors and landscapes</b>	sectoral and vocational training institutions that have adopted modules on mainstreaming of biodiversity into natural resource management, tourism and other economic development				Risks: Institutional constraints in administration leads to slow uptake of the modules even though there is cle Assumptions: Institutions collaborate with the project
	<b>Indicator 5:</b> Capacity of institutions as measured by the UNDP's Capacity Development Scorecard	District 18/45 Division 14/45	District 22/45 Divisional 17/45	District 30/45 Divisional 30/45	Communication with the relevant institutions and application of the Scorecard modified to deal with the aspe Risks: Some of the aspects of the Scorecard not attributable to the project (could modify the Scorecard at Inc Assumptions: Institutions collaborate with project
<b>Outcome 2: Natural resource management, tourism and land use are guided by a strategic design for biodiversity conservation</b>	Output 2.1: Public information and involvement programme designed and implemented across all Districts and Divisional Secretariats represented in the Trial Landscapes				
	Output 2.2: Mechanisms for trans-jurisdictional and multi-sectoral consultations in the landscape conservation design established and implemented				
Output 2.3: Strategic conservation designs for each Trial Landscape for incorporation into government decision making and local development plans					
Output 2.4: Guidelines for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into natural resource management, tourism and land use planning.					
Output 2.5: Technical and material support for immediate actions required under the agreed strategic designs					
<b>Indicator 6 (Ref. GEF)</b>	0	0	18,824	Decisions verified at Provincial Government level	

<b>and sustainable livelihoods across multiple jurisdictions in three Trial Landscapes in the Northern and North Central Provinces.</b>	<b>Core Indicator 4.1):</b> Area of High Conservation Value Forest that is under improved management to benefit biodiversity under landscape conservation designs in the three Trial Landscapes (hectares)  <i>(equivalent to GEF Core Indicator 4.1 but excluding the 1,219 ha of Forest Plantation)</i>				Risks: Decisions may not be carried through in practice, but this indicator focuses on securing protection of s  Assumptions: Provincial government supports the decisions made during the landscape conservation design
	<b>Indicator 7:</b> Annual percentage of Minor and Major Permit applications in which biodiversity impact criteria used in decisions by Coast Conservation Department in Trial Landscape 3	[To be determined for the preceding twelve months before Inception]	Increase on baseline to be determined by Inception (depending on baseline value)	Increase on baseline to be determined by Inception (depending on baseline value)	Examination of applications and judgements/ responses. See: <a href="http://www.coastal.gov.lk/downloads/pdf/PermitApplications.pdf">http://www.coastal.gov.lk/downloads/pdf/PermitApplications.pdf</a> <a href="http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/proceedings_of_the_workshop_on_ecological_considerations_in_coastal_areas.pdf">http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/proceedings_of_the_workshop_on_ecological_considerations_in_coastal_areas.pdf</a>  Risks: Ambiguity in the documentation  Assumptions: Access to all required documentation
	<b>Indicator 8:</b> Mean score (+/- SD) on a standard environmental/biodiversity impact assessment score card modified for the project, of tourism operations (a) marine-based (b) land-based in the three Trial Landscapes	To be established by Inception	To be established by Inception	To be established by Inception	Scorecard completed by independent consultant  Risks: Unexpected difficulties on the application of the scorecard  Assumptions: (i) Good cooperation from local communities in answering questions and providing information (ii) Adequate time assigned for verification
	<b>Indicator 9:</b> Estimate of	889,058	889,058	889,058	Recalculation with updated information according to the approach in Annex B

	<p>the annual amount of carbon (tCO<sub>2</sub>eq) sequestered/ emissions avoided over the twenty years following the project's inception taking into account progress on the development, adoption, and implementation of the strategic designs at the heart of the project.</p>				<p>Risks: Inherent uncertainties about future events</p> <p>Assumptions:</p> <p>Targets based on the assumption that the strategic design is adopted (Baseline and Mid-term estimates) and f</p> <p>Good cooperation with communities and local government, and thorough marine and terrestrial surveys and</p>
<p><b>Outcome 3</b> <b>Biodiversity conservation priorities shape sustainable livelihoods in natural resource management and tourism in six Focal Village Clusters in three Trial Landscapes in the Northern and North Central Provinces.</b></p>	<p>Output 3.1: Public information and involvement programme designed and implemented in the focal village clusters Output 3.2: Participatory mechanisms to bring together community and government stakeholders in a landscape conservation design approach to local land use planning Output 3.3: Biophysical and socio-economic information required for analysis and reference before and during community-centred land-use planning. Output 3.4: Six village cluster land-use plans that provide opportunities for novel or modified livelihoods linked with biodiversity conservation Output 3.5: Livelihood interventions to enhance tourism and natural resource management under the land-use plans developed and implemented</p>	<p><i>Indicator 10 (Ref. Core indicator 4.3):</i> Area of land in production systems under sustainable land management compatible with biodiversity conservation (hectares)</p>	<p>Likely to be zero - to be measured by inception</p>	<p>15,000</p> <p>50,406</p>	<p>The area of land reaching threshold selected on scorecard . See Annex Z and Bucket et al. 2006 (<a href="https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237228931_UNDERSTANDING_ECOAGRICULTURE_A_FRA">https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237228931_UNDERSTANDING_ECOAGRICULTURE_A_FRA</a>)</p> <p>Risks: Unexpected difficulties on the application of the scorecard</p> <p>Assumptions: (i) Good cooperation from local communities in answering questions and providing information (ii) Adequate time assigned for verification</p> <p>Standard fixed transect survey</p> <p>Risks: The standard fixed transect is left untouched simply to achieve a good score on the indicator</p> <p>Assumptions: The assessment will be done by an independent diving team without broadcasting the links to</p>
	<p><i>Indicator 11:</i> Number of new instances each year of major coral damage along a 1km reef transect in Trial Landscape 3</p>	<p>Measured after one year against baseline condition measured by inception</p>	<p>Decrease on baseline by 10%</p>	<p>Decrease on baseline by 30%</p>	

	<b>Indicator 12:</b> Percentage of interviewees disaggregated by gender in Focal Villages who say that livelihoods have been enhanced as a result of mainstreaming biodiversity into land-use plans	0 (men) 0 (women)	20% (men) 20% (women)	50% (men) 50% (women)	Interviews with sound sampling protocols Risks: Sampling problems make comparisons invalid Assumptions: Well-designed polling. Honest answers from interviewees
	<b>Indicator 13:</b> Percentage of key government and community organizations that publicly endorse and commit to each of the six village-cluster land-use plans	Plan 1: 0 Plan 2: 0 Plan 3: 0 Plan 4: 0 Plan 5: 0 Plan 6: 0	Plan 1: 30 Plan 2: 30 Plan 3: 30 Plan 4: 30 Plan 5: 30 Plan 6: 30	Plan 1: 60 Plan 2: 60 Plan 3: 60 Plan 4: 60 Plan 5: 60 Plan 6: 60	Minutes of meetings, publications and official documents issued Risks: Sampling problems invalidate the results Assumptions: (i) Expertly designed protocols (ii) Good collaboration from respondents for interviews and ho
	<b>Indicator 14:</b> Policy, community readiness for sustainable tourism in the Focal Village Clusters measured by Scorecard in Annex Y	To be determined at Inception - score out of total 205	Increase of 15% on baseline score out of 205	Increase of 35% on baseline score out of 205	Scorecard completed by independent consultant Risks: Unexpected difficulties in the application of the scorecard Assumptions: (i) Good cooperation from interlocutors in answering questions and providing information. (ii) Adequate time assigned for verification
<b>Outcome 4</b>	Output 4.1: Monitoring protocols and necessary institutional agreements to assess the impacts of the landscape conservation design and livelihood-focused interventions both during a Output 4.2: Periodic reviews and evaluations of monitoring data collected during the project Output 4.3: Publications, films, exhibitions, databases that publicize the methods used and the results of the project interventions Output 4.4: Organized visits by the public and by national and regional government officials to project sites to demonstrate and explain project activities and achievements Output 4.5: Talks and presentations by project staff in Colombo and in District and Provincial centres to explain project methods and results				
<b>Monitoring and evaluation, and dissemination of knowledge</b>	<b>Indicator 15:</b> Number of	(a) 0	To be	To be	Interviews and demonstrations from those doing monitoring

<b>of project methods and results contributes to wider application of landscape approach to mainstreaming of biodiversity</b>	(a) villages and (b) DSDs in which independent monitoring of project impacts is taking place according to sound protocols	(b) 0	determined by Inception based on numbers of villages in Focal Village Clusters	determined by Inception, based on numbers of villages in Focal Village Clusters	Risks: Wide range of protocols with wide range of credibility  Assumptions: Sufficient time allowed
	<i>Indicator 16:</i> Number of substantial knowledge products that reflect best practices and lessons learned including project results and sustainability strategy.	0	22	42	Measures of website traffic, search results on project name, social media reach and engagement. Lists of grey and published literature  Risks: Ambiguous internet metrics  Assumptions: Use of state of the art measures

**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).**

PIMS: 5804 GEF SEC ID: 9372 Project Title: Managing Together: Integrating Community-centered, Ecosystem-based Approaches into Forestry, Agriculture and Tourism Sectors  Date of original STAP Comments: November 20, 2017			Relevant Section of Project Document & GEF CEO ER
<b>STAP Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Responses at PPG Stage</b>	
<b>Specific comments</b>			

<p>1. This is an ambitious project with 19 Outcomes. While this might be possible given the level of co-financing, the PPG stage should focus on key priorities and what can be delivered reliably. In other words, STAP requests that the project focus on doing a sound job, and does not reduce its potential impact by overstretching.</p>	<p>We take note of STAP’s concern not to reduce the potential impact of the project by overstretching.</p> <p>During the PPG stage, UNDP together with IUCN will ensure that key stakeholders are consulted (which shall include – Ministries, NGO partners, private sectors, local governments and communities in the target sites). The proposed project outcomes and outputs will be discussed during the stakeholder consultation and validation workshops.</p>	<p>There are 4 Outcomes and 19 Outputs in the Project Document, but, in response to STAP Comment 1 they are much more closely focused on achievable results in carefully defined geographical areas than was the PIF.</p>	<p>CEO ER Annex G Prodoc Section 3.2 Selected Approach</p>
<p>2. The emphasis on tourism is welcome, both in terms of sustainable practices and the financing of biodiversity. In this respect STAP:</p> <p>a) calls attention to various economic tools for evaluating the total economic value and employment multipliers of tourism (Lynne Koontz, Catherine Cullinane Thomas et al. 2017, Thiago Souza, Alex Chidakel et al. 2017 (final draft)).</p> <p>b) Recommends that the Project considers developing something like a regional Tourism Operator Association, and work with and empower them to implement many of the good ideas in the project.</p>	<p>Suggestions are well noted and will be further discussed with the implementing partner and stakeholders during the PPG stage. The recommendations will be elaborated in the project and CEO ER documents.</p>	<p>(a) Consultations during the PPG highlighted fundamental problems with the many of the current models on tourism practiced in Sri Lanka, and drew attention to the need to work closely with local residents at the same time as clearly defining overarching biodiversity conservation design at the landscape scale. The Project will take a comprehensive landscape design approach that will employ the range of tools suggested, in the context of local societies, and cost-benefit analyses (non-financial as well as financial) of tourism and other livelihoods.</p> <p>b) The Project will work with Biodiversity Sri Lanka under the landscape design approach to biodiversity conservation to develop tourism plans at various scales and to assist in mainstreaming biodiversity into the regulation of tourism at the landscape and focal village cluster scales.</p>	



3. To strengthen communities' abilities to adapt to change and uncertainty resulting from social, economic, and political transformations at the sub-national and national level, STAP encourages the project proponents to apply resilience thinking. Engaging stakeholders and establishing project governance arrangements, essential components in resilience thinking, will be critical to delivering the outcomes and meeting the project objective.

As recommended, the project design will apply resilience thinking to adapt to change and uncertainty from social, environmental, political transformations at the national and provincial levels. The project developers, UNDP and IUCN will refer to STAP's RAPTA guidelines, and other available tools while conducting resilience thinking exercise with the stakeholders during the PPG stage.

The Project's selected approach emphasizes engagement with local government and local communities in slow and steady participatory processes that lead to the conservation design at the landscape level, and land-use plans at the village cluster level and this focus on extended contacts and exchanges of knowledge and experience will facilitate resilience thinking while taking into account potential for ambiguity, difficulties in measurement, and the possibility that over emphasis on maintaining resilience in harvests or tourism income can mask impacts on biodiversity.

The RAPTA guidelines with their emphasis on resilience as a neutral concept, have helped in selection of PRF indicators, and will be applied during the Project's engagements with communities and local governments. The Prodoc emphasizes the importance of limiting exploitation to sustainable levels and reduction of side-effects that might feedback to biodiversity through delayed socio-economic effects. The Risk Matrix identifies such risks and reflects the importance of setting the levels of natural resources at levels sufficiently low to cope with bad years, because overexploitation reduces, and can destroy, the ability of ecosystems to be restored.

**To address during the project design**


<p>4. STAP recommends detailing the landscape management approach "Ecologically Sensitive Areas" (ESA). It also would be valuable to describe how the project intends to apply lessons learned from the approach, and advance ESA's learning as a biodiversity planning framework. If publications (published, or unpublished) on ESA are available, STAP suggests referencing them to support the framework's evidence base as a landscape planning tool in areas experiencing landscape change.</p>	<p>Well noted. Some lessons generated from the ongoing ESA project in Sri Lanka (PIMS 5165) which began implementation in the beginning of 2016 will be referred at the design stage.</p>	<p>The Ecologically Sensitive Areas project is referenced throughout the Managing Together Project Document. The selected approach is indeed a landscape management approach and it will not be known until the landscape conservation designs and land-use plans have been developed through extended participatory processes involving the public and local government.</p>	
<p>5. The project proponents are encouraged to consider indicators that reflect managing biodiversity conservation, agriculture production and forest management at the landscape level. Doing so, will assist in monitoring and assessment of a landscape approach – including how progress was measured and data gathered to support landscape-level outcomes. 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. 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>Fully concur with STAP's suggestions to include indicators reflecting managing biodiversity conservation, agriculture production and forest management at the landscape level.</p>	<p>This is a key part of the selected approach of the Managing Together Project and the two papers suggested are referenced more than once in the Prodoc.</p>	

<p>6. STAP suggests developing a plan (or framework) that engages the proposed multiple stakeholders. Engaging stakeholders (identifying which stakeholders need to be engaged, and when to engage them) will assist in designing and implementing effectively the components. Doing so will embed stakeholders' values, needs, knowledge, and decision-making into the interventions, which is critical to the success of the project. STAP would like to see the stakeholder plan, or framework, described in the project document.</p>	<p>Fully concur. UNDP will ensure to consult with all relevant stakeholders during the PPG stage, and reflect the stakeholder consultation process including the stakeholder engagement plan in the pro doc.</p>	<p>Many projects and programmes address natural resource management and biodiversity conservation in the selected landscape, so a specific output (Output 1.3) has been included in the Project design, to establish and maintain good cooperation and synergies to make use of the distinctive strengths of each partner. A dedicated Learning and Communications Office (LCO) take charge of the stakeholder engagement plan. Two dedicated outputs (Outputs 2.1 and 3.1) will address information and stakeholder involvement at landscape and focal village cluster levels respectively as integral parts of the landscape conservation design and land use planning processes.</p>	
<p>7. Engagement of stakeholders also is important for analyzing the synergies and trade-offs between the multiple benefits – such as strengthening biodiversity conservation and establishing local development (e.g. establishing eco-tourism) opportunities. The project should detail how communities will be engaged in the tourism plans (component 3) for the three ecologically sensitive areas. Based on stakeholder's socioeconomic characteristics, the project should also detail what is required for effective community participation in developing tourism plans. The following paper may be useful to the project proponents when considering measures for engaging stakeholders: Bello, F., et al. (2016). "Community participation framework for protected area-based tourism planning". <i>Tourism Planning &amp; Development</i> Vol. 13 , Iss. 4, 2016.</p>	<p>The project will undertake community consultation as well as socio-economic assessment of the communities in the target sites. Accordingly, the project will develop interventions that would effectively engage community in developing tourism plans.</p>	<p>Three Community Conservation Experts (CCE) will be engaged to live and work full time in the Focal Village Clusters in order to establish the rapport and trust required to mobilize communities, individuals and local government representatives to reduce, and eventually eliminate, damaging practices in fisheries, agriculture, forestry and tourism. The slow and steady, patient engagement model detailed in the Prodoc builds on the paper suggested, which is referenced more than once in the documents.</p>	

<p>8. In addition, the project proponents should apply resilience thinking. Global change impacts dynamics at the local level - socially, economically, and ecologically. The dynamics and change affecting social ecological systems have important links to tourism. STAP's application of the Resilience, Adaptation, Pathways and Assessment (RAPTA) Framework can assist the project proponents frame how global change is affecting the targeted social-ecological systems, and how the systems can respond and adapt favorably to uncertainties and change. STAP suggests two sources on resilience thinking: 1) RAPTA guidelines: <a href="http://www.stagef.org/rapta-guidelines">http://www.stagef.org/rapta-guidelines</a> 2) Cheer, J., et al. (Eds) (2018). "Tourism, Resilience, and Sustainability". New York, New York. Routledge.</p>	<p>As discussed above, resilience thinking will be a key element of the project design.</p>	<p>See above, against Comment 3</p>	
<p>9. STAP suggests describing how the project intends to implement adaptive management during the project planning. This is important as the project makes assumptions about the outcomes, which will need verification and actions that require adjustments (e.g. eco-tourism will support biodiversity conservation and wildlife management).</p>	<p>Adaptive management will be an integral part of UNDP's project design process as well as during the project implementation. This will be explicitly elaborated in the pro doc and the CEO ER documents.</p>	<p>The PPG team has taken very seriously the advantages of adaptive management, and the drawbacks of having an overly prescriptive Project Document. The Managing Together Project will engage with government and communities to develop actions and recommendations under landscape conservation designs and village cluster land-use plans that are, of necessity, not pre-determined, thus adding an imperative in the Project Design to allow for open ended decisions and agreements. A robust staffing arrangement will allow the Project to guide decision making through expert knowledge, rigorous analysis of potential social and environmental impacts of Project interventions and the capacity of potential local partners.</p>	

**Responses to comments from Council at work program inclusion**

Comment's date: November 2017

<b><i>Council Comments</i></b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Response at CEO ER submission</b>	<b>Relevant Section of Project Document &amp; GEF CEO ER</b>
--------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------------	--

Germany's comments:

1) Against the background of identified shortcomings in inter-agency communication and given the large number of stakeholders to be involved the full proposal should clearly identify a suitable steering structure and a strategy to ensure that ecosystem services can sustainably be integrated into forestry, agriculture and tourism sector decision making processes.

2) GIZ on behalf of the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) is currently implementing the project "Supporting Wilpattu National Park and Influence Zone Management in Sri Lanka" together with the Department of Wildlife Conservation. Germany recommends to seek an exchange on its approach and the lessons learnt with the project.

Comments will be addressed during the project development.

1) The project recognises the large number of stakeholders that will be involved in this project. The main group of stakeholders are: a) national level government b) training organizations c) local government d) private sector and trade organizations e) civil society organizations. For this, the project has build in a position of Learning and Communication Officer (LCO) who will be responsible for maintaining a Stakeholder Coordination Framework (SHF) that summarizes interests, communications and engagements, and ongoing collaboration with details of mutual feedback and leveraged actions. The LCO will plan in detail how stakeholders will be informed, consulted, included in participatory planning for biodiversity (and gender) mainstreaming, involved in the screening of potential Project interventions and given specific responsibilities (including contracts) as part of the overall Project team.

In terms of a suitable steering structure – The project's Implementing Partner (IP) – Ministry of Mahaweli Development and the Environment (MoMDE) will play a key role in connecting with the beneficiary representatives and the development partners. The Implementing Partner is responsible and accountable for managing the project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of resources. The Project Director will be appointed by the IP and will head the Project Management Unit and will be accountable to MoMDE for the use of project resources and to deliver on outcomes. The PD will manage the implementation of all project activities and will work closely with all partner institutions to link the project with complementary national programs and initiatives. **Project Management Unit (PMU)** will be based in or near the District Secretariat, Mannar, within easy reach of the Project's three Trial Landscapes. Close collaboration with the DS on a day to day basis will enhance the Project's impacts through on-the-job learning. IUCN Sri Lanka as the **Responsible Party** will provide project implementation support through a field-based Project Management Unit (PMU). The project management structure would enable project to connect stakeholders at all levels from central, provincial, district to community levels.

*please refer to project organization structure, page 62 of UNDP ProDoc.*

As for the project strategy to ensure ecosystem services can

Relevant Comment from GEF Secretariat Response Matrix on PIF

[25 March 2016]

<i>Review Criteria</i>		<b>Document Reference</b>	<b>Responses at CEO ER submission</b>
<b>GEF Secretariat's Comments</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Changes to PIF</b>	
<b>Recommendations</b>			

6. *Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?*

Gender consideration is very general and not specific to the country/thematic topic. Please review and provide tangible information. Please clarify involvement of indigenous peoples in the project.

We agree and thank the reviewer for this comment. In this section, a full gender analysis will be conducted during PPG and gender responsive project framework will be developed by CEO endorsement has been added. However, a more detailed and context specific description of gender has been added to Section 03

The targeted region also has a few isolated Veddah communities who are Sri Lanka's only indigenous people. These communities been practicing sustainable harvesting methods of forest products such as bees honey, medicinal plants and seed varieties for many centuries. Their traditional knowledge of wildlife, forest products and sustainable practices can support the project related community activities and also provide these isolated communities support through responsible tourism initiatives. A relevant indigenous peoples plan will be developed by CEO endorsement.

This has been added to the gender considerations under section 3.

Sri Lanka had a human civilization for at least 25-30,000 years. Around 600 B.C. some north Indian settlers came and established a regime. Most indigenous groups were united with this regime and majority of Sinhala people are descendants of them. Real indigenous communities (Veddah community) were pushed towards the central part of the country where there were no proper settlements till 13<sup>th</sup> Century A.D. Simple reason behind this push was 'new' settlers wanted more land for agriculture, homes etc. our trial landscapes are in the heart of the kingdom (capital was Anuradhapura and Mannar was the main western sea port belonged to the kingdom and Malwathu Oya is the lifeline for that Kingdom. All the key settlements except the settlements in down south of the country were built around the Malwathu Oya till 9-10 Century A.D.). As such, there are no Veddha community in our trial landscape.

Under the UNREDD programme, and the formulation of the National REDD+ Strategy, UNDP worked closely with Indigenous community. There are basically seven clans living under the leadership of a Veddah Chieftain. Closest clan to the trail landscape is living around 50-60 km away from Anuradhapura district. So the project will not affect the Veddah (real indigenous community of the country) community.

Some studies found that few communities living in Anuradhapura district are calling themselves indigenous communities but they don't call themselves Veddhas. Origin of this claim is due to shift of civilization Sri Lanka experienced since 13<sup>th</sup> Century A.D. initially due to invaders from South Asian countries but afterwards from Western Europe. Some people who lived in Anuradhapura continued to live there away from the rule of any government. This happened till 19<sup>th</sup> Century. They are not officially recognized as indigenous community and the REDD programme also didn't consider them as



**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: <b>100,000</b>			
<i><b>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</b></i>	<i><b>GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</b></i>		
	<i><b>Budgeted Amount</b></i>	<i><b>Amount spent to date</b></i>	<i><b>Amount Committed</b></i>
Component A: Preparatory Technical Studies & Reviews	50,000	41,542	8,458
Component B: Formulation of the UNDP-GEF Project Document, CEO Endorsement Request, and Mandatory and Project Specific Annexes	25,000	20,771	4,229
Component C: Validation Workshop and Report	25,000	20,771	4,229
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>100,000</u></b>	<b><u>83,084</u></b>	<b><u>16,916</u></b>

**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)**

**ANNEX G: changes to the original project concept and rationale**

The Table below summarizes changes made to the Outcomes and Outputs of the original PIF and the rationale for doing so. M These are discussed below:

<b>Managing together: Integrating community-centered, ecosystem-based approaches into forestry, agriculture and tourism sectors</b>		<b>Notes</b>
PIF Objective	Strengthen protection of globally significant biodiversity through mainstreaming of conservation and sustainable practices into land use planning and sectoral decision making in forestry, agriculture and tourism sectors	No change to the Objective
Prodoc Objective	Strengthen protection of globally significant biodiversity through mainstreaming of conservation and sustainable practices into land use planning and sectoral decision making in forestry, agriculture and tourism sectors  <i>Indicated by (i) Area of land and marine habitat administered under a clearly stated landscape approach to mainstreaming biodiversity conservation (ii) The number of people, disaggregated by gender, that have benefitted either monetarily or non-monetarily, or both, from project-induced changes in livelihoods.</i>	Same as PIF  (i) Equivalent to PIF Outcome 1 indicator (ii) Refinement of indicators for PIF Outcomes 2c and 3b. The Prodoc indicator here includes non-monetary benefits in view of increasing evidence that these are extremely important for sustainable solutions
PIF Component	Component 1. Creation of an enabling environment to mainstream integrated approaches to NRM in production sectors and landscapes	This is reflected in Prodoc Outcome 1. Prodoc Component 1 gives more detail
Prodoc Component	Component 1. Institutional capacity building, and enhanced cross-sectoral, trans-jurisdictional and donor agency co-ordination in planning, decision-making and action	Equivalent to PIF Component 1 but gives more detail. NRM not mentioned specifically because understood from the Project title and objective

PIF Outcomes	<p>Outcome 1. Legal and institutional commitments made to utilize integrated approaches to NRM and strengthened institutional, policy, regulatory and technical capacity for sustainable ecosystem management and biodiversity conservation in place especially for forestry, agriculture and tourism sectors.</p> <p><i>Indicated by: (i) area of landscapes identified and sustainably managed including at least 214,213 ha high conservation value areas; (ii) increase in UNDP capacity development scorecard (iii) Increased financing for ecologically sensitive areas including protected areas (PA) and forest buffer zones indicated by the Financial Sustainability Scorecard.</i></p>	<p>In interests of brevity PIF Outcome 1 has been summarized and language simplified in the Prodoc Outcome 1 but substance is equivalent</p> <p>(i) This is included under Prodoc Objective indicator although areas have been adjusted to fit the situation in the selected Project landscape (ii) No change to Prodoc Outcome 1 Indicator (iii) Decision made not to restrict Project to ESAs (here ecologically sensitive areas - but otherwise known as environmentally sensitive areas) because concept/designation yet accepted policy. Financial Sustainability Scorecard not used because the Project focuses on conservation action in production sectors so any gains not attributable to the Project.</p>
Prodoc Outcome	<p>Outcome 1. An enabling environment to mainstream integrated approaches into natural resource management in production sectors and landscapes</p> <p><i>Indicated by (i) The number of sectoral and vocational training institutions that have adopted modules on mainstreaming of biodiversity into natural resource management, tourism and other economic development, (ii) Score on UNDP's GEF Capacity Development Scorecard</i></p>	<p>Almost same as PIF Component 1. See above under PIF Outcome 1</p> <p>(i) Captures the impact of the Project on these institutions - whether or not they build on the Project interventions and technical support (ii) Same as PIF Outcome 1 indicator</p>
<b>PIF Outputs</b>	<b>Prodoc Outputs</b>	<b>Notes</b>
1.1 Improved and localized set of global biodiversity assessment and planning tools	Output 1.1 Draft ministerial directives and subsidiary agreements for special working arrangements between government agencies and administrations in the three Trial Landscapes	<p>PIF Output subsumed in Prodoc Outputs 2.2, 3.2, 3.3 with policy feedback to central government under Output 1.4.</p> <p>Prodoc Output is a necessary precondition to facilitate the demonstrations of landscape conservation design and village level land-use planning approaches to be piloted by the Project under existing policy and regulations, so the authorizations required are actually merely orders to local government to collaborate with the Project</p>

<p>1.2 Targeted Scenario Analysis (TSA) to support incorporation of biodiversity and sustainable natural resource management into forestry, agriculture and tourism sector plans and strategies</p>	<p>Output 1.2. Integrated Landscape Management and Mainstreaming Modules for institutions offering in-service and pre-service training of state employees</p>	<p>PIF Output: Will use TSA under landscape design and focal village planning as part of mechanisms to be developed under Outputs 2.2 and 3.2</p> <p>Prodoc Output: First activity under this Output will be training and capacity needs analyses to identify the gaps (see Prodoc 4.1)</p>
<p>1.3 Regulations on sustainable management of land, ecosystems and water resources, that safeguards critical ecosystem services at watershed and landscape level to support adoption of biodiversity safeguards in ESAs</p>	<p>Output 1.3. Coordination with the wide range of relevant development projects, programmes, and public and private sector initiatives operating in the same geographical area</p>	<p>PIF Output: Overlap with GEF5 ESA Project, and, for clear division of labour, that project will take main responsibility, with technical support through Prodoc Output 1.3 here</p> <p>Prodoc Output - Decision made to emphasize this aspect of the Project because there are so many projects with which synergies will be extremely important for achievement of Project Objective. Also, one of the recommendations in the Mid-term Review of the GEF5 ESA Project is to increase coordination between the several projects that overlap with that project in location and theme. (See Prodoc 4.2)</p>
<p>1.4 Develop guidelines and SOPs for forestry and agriculture sectors to address threats to biodiversity including; (i) sustainable and ecological agricultural and forestry practices (ii) integrating biodiversity in to land use planning and agriculture/irrigation development plans (iii) recommendations on ecological, low-chemical input agriculture; (iv) revision of provincial land use plans, forest conservation strategies, and agriculture and (v) improved community-based forest livelihood models for upscaling</p>	<p>Output 1.4. Recommendations and proposals for changes in policy, institutions or practice that will be required for replication of the landscape conservation design approach to mainstreaming to the whole Project landscape and nationally.</p>	<p>PIF Output: Here the guidelines are part of the enabling activities under Outcome 1. For the Project a decision was made to do these guidelines as part of demonstration of landscape design/mainstreaming under Output 2.4 in the Trial Landscapes, drawing attention to them, and facilitating their adoption more widely through feedback to national level under Prodoc Output 1.4 here</p>

<p>1.5 Policy, institutional and operational strengthening for biodiversity friendly tourism development in ESAs including (i) a national-level policy committee to improve land use policy and planning coherence between tourism planning and biodiversity priorities in ESAs (ii) biodiversity informed strategic environmental assessments in at least 3 ESAs to inform tourism plans (with co-finance); (iii) operator certification system based on a set of standards, guidelines geared towards protecting biodiversity (v) regulatory and institutional arrangements for biodiversity offsetting mechanism; (iv) a system of operationalizing tourism concessions including development of a prototype concession agreement; (v) biodiversity monitoring mechanism to assess impact on critical ecosystems (vi) incentives and disincentives (tax deductions, promotions through national/provincial campaigns) to encourage adoption of voluntary certification systems for nature based tourism.</p>	<p>-----</p>	<p>As above, and see below under 1.7. Policy feedback to the national level will take place under Prodoc Output 1.4 during project implementation and after progress has been made and lessons learned during demonstrations under Outcomes 2 and 3. A deliberate decision has been made to avoid getting involved in policy committees at national level early in the project, because lessons learned from other projects indicate against this. Policy along these lines exists to a certain extent already and the Project will shed light on problems in implementation and gaps in existing policy. Under the project preparation phase consultancy reports on tourism policy and decision making tools supply the background for policy gap analysis based on the results of demonstrations under the Project. As above, and for reasons explained in CEO ER (Section A1(2)) the PIF emphasis on operation within ESAs has been shifted to a focus on landscapes, keeping the ESA available as a land designation option once it is available.</p>
<p>1.6 Training programmes developed and institutionalized for all relevant staff of government agencies (Departments of Forestry, Wildlife, Coast Conservation, Irrigation, Agriculture, Tourism Development Authority, Chambers of Commerce, Mahaweli Authority) and private sector, community based tourism enterprises on integrated nature based approaches to improve ESA management also taking the climate challenges into account.</p>	<p>-----</p>	<p>PIF Outcome 1.6 is equivalent to Prodoc Outcome 1.2, but the training under the Project will include, but not be limited to, mainstreaming of biodiversity within ESAs. This will have wider application than what is proposed in the PIF</p>

<p>1.7 Develop decision making tools on supporting ecotourism including; (i) an inventory and data-base of existing and potential ecotourism products and services; (ii) an assessment of lesser known and visited wildlife destinations to diffuse pressure on over-visited and over-promoted sites; (iii) assessment of innovative PA and biodiversity financing options learning from global best practices and, (iv) evaluation of environmental, social and economic benefits of current ecotourism practices to enable market and service transformation.</p>		<p>See above under 1.5</p>
<p><b>PIF Component</b></p>	<p>Component 2. Integrated approach to NRM incorporated in the management of ESAs in northern region</p>	<p>Equivalent to Prodoc Component 2. Once ESAs are established the designation will become one of the options under the landscape designs.</p>
<p><b>Prodoc Component</b></p>	<p>Component 2. Design of landscape strategies for biodiversity conservation and sustainable livelihoods and upward integration into existing policy</p>	<p>Equivalent to PIF Component 2 but goes beyond ESAs</p>

## PIF Outcomes

Outcome 2a. Restoration of critical ecosystem services from ESAs including carbon storage and sequestration and provision of habitats for biodiversity and of food and water to local communities

*Indicated by: (i) 214,213 ha of catchment forests and wildlife corridors with elevated protection status; (ii) afforestation / reforestation of at least 1,000 ha sequestering 193,549 tCO<sub>2</sub>-eq/10 y (iii) total exclusion from development of remaining mangroves and sea grass beds in the northern province; (iv) increased or stable population of threatened species such as Marsheer, Orange Sloth bear (sic) etc.*

Outcome 2b. At least 30,000 ha of new High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF) declared leading to a total 214,213 ha of HCVFs/High Carbon stock forests secured and protected *avoiding emissions from deforestation of 1,447,953.00 tC/10 yr. period*  
Outcome 2c Conservation-SLM-SFM compatible economic activities adopted by local communities covering 20,000 ha resulting in; i) *sustained flow of ecosystem services such as water security, health ii) 2,876,566 tC/10 yr. period iii) increase in the income level of the target communities (women and men).*

PIF Outcome 2a subsumed under Prodoc Outcome 2 into landscape conservation design approach that includes consideration of BD and ES in three Trial Landscapes, so the wider landscape replaces ESA as the planning unit and when the ESA designation is available it will be one of the options under the design.

(i)(ii) These indicators have changed following final selection of the Project landscapes, and a decision not to preempt the landscape design process. The aim is to improve management over defined areas (see Prodoc Annexes B, W) and in many cases this will be through elevated protection status, but this has to be determined through genuine participatory planning with local government and communities. (iii) Beyond the scope of the Project to be able to guarantee this for the whole of the Northern Province, but targets have been set for the Trial Landscapes and mechanisms for dissemination and replication have been set out. (iv) Population sizes of these species are not suitable as indicators of project impact over a four year period.

PIF Outcome 2b also subsumed, like PIF Outcome 2a, under Prodoc Outcome 2 (see immediately above) and it is intended that forests will be confirmed as protected, especially in proposed Elephant Corridors in TL1 and TL2 (See Prodoc Annexes B, W)

PIF Outcome 2c has been moved to Prodoc Outcome 3 as a deliberate change in structure because during project preparation a decision was made to have the landscape design as Prodoc Outcome 2 and the community level livelihood-focused interventions as Outcome 3, with interactions between the two. The PIF separates tourism, including community-based ecotourism interventions as a separate outcome (PIF Outcome 3), The Prodoc puts tourism, SLM and SFM compatible livelihood-focused interventions, in keeping with its holistic approach to planning and implementation.

(i) (ii) These figures have changed - see Prodoc Annexes B, W

(iii) Prodoc does not use income levels as a numerical indicator because it does not represent an accurate measure of progress towards the outcome. The Prodoc includes consideration of non-monetary benefits

<p><b>Prodoc Outcome</b></p>	<p>Outcome 2: Natural resource management, tourism and land use are guided by a strategic design for biodiversity conservation and sustainable livelihoods across multiple jurisdictions in three Trial Landscapes in the Northern and North Central Provinces</p> <p>Indicated by: (i) Area of High Conservation Value Forest that has been secured , (ii) Annual percentage of Minor and Major Permit applications in which biodiversity impact criteria used in decisions by Coast Conservation Department in Trial Landscape 3, (iii) Mean score (+/- SD) on a standard environmental/biodiversity impact assessment score card modified for the project, of tourism operations (a) marine-based (b) land-based in the three Trial Landscapes, (iv) Estimated amount of carbon (tCO<sub>2</sub>eq) forecast to be sequestered per year over the six years following the project if the strategic designs are followed - including through protection of forest, sea grass beds, mangroves; replanting and regeneration of mangroves and forests; and various impacts of sustainable agriculture and tourism.</p>		<p>See immediately above: change in design to ensure cross-sectoral approach to mainstreaming so Prodoc Outcomes 2 and 3 address landscape (2) and community level (3) strategies for all sectors, as opposed to the PIF Outcomes 2 and 3 which address agriculture and forestry at both landscape (or ESA) and community level (2) and then tourism at landscape (or ESA) and community level (3) separately.</p> <p>Note that the Prodoc includes explicit consideration of seascapes. The PIF mentions impacts in the marine environment (e.g. PIF Outcome 2a Indicator, PIF Output 3.2 and the SAM [see PIF Output 2.3] approach to coastal zone management) but the main emphasis in the PIF is on the terrestrial. A deliberate decision was made during Project preparation to include consideration of the coastal and marine environment, in order to have a "ridge to reef" approach and to address the serious threats to marine biodiversity in the area.</p> <p>(i) It was decided to set indicators at levels achievable by and attributable to the Project that do not depend on separate legislation. Here "secured" is preferred to PIF language such as "declared".</p>
	<p><b>PIF Outputs</b></p>	<p><b>Prodoc Outputs</b></p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p>
	<p>2.1 Land use plans for ESAs and surroundings developed and improved taking into account resettlements, irrigation, agriculture practices and other development related pressures, and implemented to address conservation needs of key threatened species and land-use conflicts in target provinces<sup>[1]</sup>.</p>	<p>Output 2.1. Public information and involvement programme designed and implemented across all Districts and Divisional Secretariats represented in the Trial Landscapes</p>	<p>PIF Output, with scope of ESAs and surroundings, is equivalent to Prodoc Output 2.3 with scope of Trial Landscapes. As noted above, this is necessitated by the fact that the ESA is still not established as an official land designation, although progress is being made towards that under the GEF5 ESA project.</p> <p>Prodoc Output is an important and essential addition</p>



	<p>2.2 ESA management plans implemented to improve the effective use of existing corridors and establish new wildlife corridors and manage mining of construction material in sensitive habitats. These corridors are supplemented with restoration (enrichment planting) of at least 20,000 ha of degraded forests that improves habitat connectivity and increase carbon sequestration.</p>	<p>Output 2.2 Mechanisms for trans-jurisdictional and multi-sectoral consultations in the landscape conservation design process</p>	<p>PIF Output is equivalent, once adjustment made from ESAs to Trial Landscapes, to implementation under Prodoc Output 2.5</p> <p>Will build on existing proposals for Elephant Corridors (see Prodoc 4.1 and 4.2 and Annexes Q, T, W).</p> <p>Landscape strategies will combine priorities in agriculture, forestry, biodiversity conservation and tourism.</p> <p>Prodoc Output: An important - and essential - addition that stresses the innovative and long term commitment to finding a way to do genuine landscape approach to conservation design</p>
	<p>2.3 Special Area Management (SAM) plans developed and implemented for coastal ESAs leading to value added tourism and agriculture.</p>	<p>Output 2.3 Strategic conservation designs for each Trial Landscape for incorporation into government decision making and local development plans</p>	<p>PIF Output involves declaration of Special Area Management zones in addition to ESAs. During Project preparation decision was made not to specify declaration of SAMs as a requirement for coastal zone interventions, but to retain the SAM designation as an option under the landscape planning process (along with the ESA designation when finalized). The long term benefits of previous SAM interventions by projects are unconvincing (see Prodoc 3.2) and (b) the benefits of mainstreaming within the wider landscape to be demonstrated by the Project (without the need to declare a SAM) are potentially more likely to be replicated elsewhere. PIF Output includes both development and implementation of SAM plans: the Prodoc Output covers development only, with implementation falling under Prodoc Output 2.5. Prodoc Output includes the equivalent of the PIF Output, with SAM plans for coastal ESAs replaced by landscape conservation designs in the coastal Trial Landscape 3, and also includes strategic designs for the terrestrial Trial Landscapes 1 and 2.</p>

	<p>2.4 Community-based forestry and natural resources management models to improve land productivity developed and implemented to reverse land degradation, and associated loss of biodiversity /habitats in identified Ecologically Sensitive Areas (ESA) (<i>sic</i>) and help address climate associated risks such as salt water intrusion, droughts etc.</p>	<p>Output 2.4 Guidelines for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into natural resource management, tourism and land use planning</p>	<p>PIF Output is covered now under Prodoc Outcome 3 (the community-based planning level - Prodoc Outputs 3.4, 3.5) - see notes above against PIF Outcome 2. These community based models in NRM will be planned and implemented alongside models in tourism after extended community-based planning in Focal Village Clusters identified (these are already shortlisted) as areas of ecological significance, but they will not be considered for designation as ESAs until criteria have been established under the GEF5 ESA project.</p> <p>When considering best agricultural practices, options for intensifying agriculture in some areas thus freeing up land elsewhere for conservation will be considered alongside alternative proposals to establish organic agriculture or equivalent in wider areas (Land sparing vs Land sharing - see Prodoc Section 4.1 under Output 2.4)</p>
	<p>2.5 Ecosystem based community level integrated natural resources management plans for ESAs developed and implemented (interventions will include sustainable land and forest management, value added wood/non-wood forest products with robust sustainable harvesting regimes and marketing) to complement and supplement agriculture and tourism based potential incomes in order to promote payments for ecosystem services and sustained benefit sharing among communities</p>	<p>Output 2.5 Technical and material support for immediate actions required under the agreed strategic designs</p>	<p>PIF Output overlaps with PIF Output 2.4. Under the Project, participatory planning will address all these potential activities but will not preempt the final plans, so as to maintain open and genuine involvement in planning. See Prodoc Outputs 3.4 (planning) and 3.5 (implementation) at Focal Village Cluster level.</p> <p>Prodoc Output supports <i>implementation</i> of selected parts of the landscape designs developed under Output 3.4. (see indicative activities in Prodoc Annex Z). Training, including the potential for study tours are possible activities under this Output.</p>

	2.6 New HCVF and HCSF areas of 30,000 ha identified bringing total of HCVFs under protection to 214,213 ha, and pilot scale plans designed for conservation and management implemented through Government, Non-Government and community based partnerships for conservation/protection and management of ecosystems	See notes against PIF Outcome 2b above. This is an expected Output but details of areas and designations achieved (under Prodoc Output 2.5) will be available only after the landscape conservation designs have been completed and approved by local government under Prodoc Output 2.3.
<b>PIF Component</b>	Component 3. Implementation of integrated approach to NRM including sustainable and biodiversity friendly tourism in the northern region	Here is the main change from PIF to Prodoc (already explained partially against PIF Outcome 2c above). In summary, local level tourism interventions under the PIF were separated from NRM under a stand-alone Component/Outcome, whereas under the Prodoc local level tourism interventions are dealt with alongside NRM interventions in a single Outcome. The division under the PIF is NRM (PIF Outcome 2) vs Tourism (PIF Outcome 3), whereas the division under the Prodoc is wider Landscape-level (Prodoc Outcome 2) vs Community-level (Prodoc Outcome 3). This change encourages cross-sectoral coordination at both local government and community levels
<b>Prodoc Component</b>	Component 3. Participatory land-use planning and livelihood-focused interventions to demonstrate socio-economic benefits of biodiversity conservation	Prodoc Component includes but is not limited to tourism. See immediately above

<p><b>PIF Outcomes</b></p>	<p>Outcome 3a. Biodiversity friendly tourism practices and infrastructure in place including:  <i>(i) at least 30 eco-tour operators, eco-lodges and environmental camp sites in the targeted area adopt the biodiversity friendly and/or low carbon standards; (ii) at least 30% of hotels in the ecologically sensitive areas meet biodiversity-friendly certification requirements and adopted by the government.</i></p> <p>Outcome 3b Increased contribution of nature based tourism to wildlife conservation and local livelihoods of both women and men, <i>indicated by the increase of 20%-30% in income levels for target communities and reduced pressure on surrounding forests and wildlife.</i></p> <p>Outcome 3c Reduced incidence of human-wildlife conflict, especially elephant deaths, in project target ESAs</p>	<p>Outcome 3a reflected under Prodoc Output 3.5 (see Prodoc 4.1 and Annex Z)  (i) Decision made during project preparation that this is overambitious and that five is more feasible (Prodoc Annex N)  (ii) Equivalent to Prodoc Indicator (iii) under Prodoc Outcome 2 above</p> <p>Outcome 3b Actual benefits depend on conditions and reactions - the intention (see against Prodoc Objective Indicator (ii)) is to assess non-monetary as well as monetary benefits</p> <p>Outcome 3c Doubtful whether this can be measured adequately to be attributable to Project impacts over four years.  Notes on ESAs already made above - e.g. against PIF Outcome 1 and CEO ER (Section A1(2))</p>	
<p>Prodoc Outcome</p>	<p>Outcome 3: Biodiversity conservation priorities shape sustainable livelihoods in natural resource management and tourism in six Focal Village Clusters in three Trial Landscapes in the Northern and North Central Provinces</p> <p><i>Indicated by (i) Area of land under improved management practices to benefit biodiversity (ii) Number of new instances each year of major coral damage along a 1km reef transect in Trial Landscape 3 , (iii) Weight of litter collected per quarter during standard volunteer clean-ups along the coastline in Focal Village Clusters of Trial Landscape 3</i></p>	<p>Addresses all kinds of livelihoods, including but not limited to livelihoods in tourism</p> <p>Chosen for attributability Project interventions</p>	
	<p><b>PIF Outputs</b></p>	<p><b>Prodoc Outputs</b></p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p>
	<p>3.1 Sustainable and participatory nature-based tourism plans for three ecologically sensitive areas in the target provinces developed and implemented with private sector tour operators, including the application of biodiversity friendly tourism standards and guidelines developed in 1.5</p>	<p>Output 3.1. Public information and involvement programme designed and implemented in the focal village clusters</p>	<p>PIF Output subsumed under Prodoc Outputs 2.3 and 2.5 - see Prodoc Annex N</p> <p>Prodoc Output - an important and essential addition</p>

	<p>3.2 Training programmes on SOPs and guidelines for biodiversity friendly tourism practices rolled out for tourism service providers and regulators (such as hospitality industry and local authorities and sectors that underpin tourism assets such as forestry, coastal management and wildlife conservation); as well as TOTs for wildlife and nature interpreters.</p>	<p>Output 3.2. Participatory mechanisms to bring together community and government stakeholders in a landscape conservation design approach to local land use planning (ToC:M6)</p>	<p>PIF Output - to be included, along with training for other types of interventions, under Prodoc Output 3.5. Study tours also potential activities here.</p> <p>Prodoc Output - an important and essential addition</p>
	<p>3.3 Public-private and community partnerships and tourism concessions in wildlife areas/ESAs implemented to develop tailored, low-impact tourism infrastructure and products to market critical ecosystems, habitats and species in a responsible and sustainable manner taking into account the carrying capacities and sensitivities.</p>	<p>Output 3.3. Collection of biophysical and socio-economic information required for analysis and reference before and during community-centred land-use planning</p>	<p>PIF Output. Very important, and now subsumed within Prodoc Outputs 2.5 and 3.5, with details of indicative activities under Prodoc Annex Z. The final activities will be decided upon only after the TL designs and FVC plans have been completed - they have to be the result of planning, and not to preempt planning.</p> <p>Prodoc Output - an important and essential addition</p>
	<p>3.4 Community capacity building programmes for eco-tourism designed and implemented targeting youth and women in forest-peripheral villages (such as home-stays, business services, nature interpreters, community guides, community ranger system and other conservation jobs) and entrepreneurship training (book-keeping, safety, language skills, etc.).</p>	<p>Output 3.4. Six village cluster land-use plans that provide opportunities for novel or modified livelihoods linked with biodiversity conservation</p>	<p>PIF Output covers potential livelihood-focused interventions in tourism that are now expected to be developed under Prodoc Outputs 3.4 (designs) and 3.5 (implementation)</p> <p>Prodoc Output -a key Output that covers development of all the tourism related plans under PIF Outputs 3.4, 3.6 in addition to other livelihood-focused interventions in agriculture, forestry and fisheries.</p>

	3.5 Site specific effective financing systems for protected areas and ESAs based on national biodiversity financing policies (developed in 1.5) building on gate fees, operator taxes, concession fees and biodiversity offset schemes and re-investing these in maintaining and conserving critical habitats and eco-systems.	Output 3.5. Technical and material support for livelihood changes under the land-use plans in the fields of tourism and natural resource management	PIF Output 3.5 is subsumed into Prodoc Output 3.5 but these kinds of financing mechanisms will need policy clearance at central level, so results cannot be guaranteed within the Project period.  Support under Project Output 3.5 will include technical support on financial mechanisms and results will be taken to the central government policy formulation level under Project Output 4.1.
	3.6 Private sector, communities, government conservation agencies and relevant local authorities in the project areas develop and implement strategies for conservation and management of Asian Elephant partially or fully supported by sustainable eco-tourism targeting wildlife corridors and buffer-zones to manage human-elephant conflict in target region.	-----	This is the one and only PIF output that does not fit under the selected approach to mainstreaming of biodiversity into NRM and tourism.  Financial mechanisms will be a key part of landscape designs (Prodoc Output 2.3) but the emphasis will be on PES and other schemes to return funds, from biodiversity-based tourism for example, to local communities as incentivization to refrain from damaging activities. The Project will work closely with other ADB and World Bank/ Government of Sri Lanka and programmes aimed at addressing the difficulties faced by elephants and people living in close proximity - difficulties exacerbated by agriculture practiced near forest patches, which is attractive habitat for wild species.  Managing human-elephant conflict, will naturally be considered as part of the landscape designs (Prodoc Output 2.3) but is not within the scope of the Project to implement.
<b>PIF Component</b>	-----		----- No PIF Component 4
<b>Prodoc Component</b>	Monitoring and evaluation, and dissemination of knowledge		Monitoring and dissemination of results, effectiveness, impacts within the Project period, and long term impacts beyond the Project period,
<b>PIF Outcomes</b>	-----		No PIF Outcome 4
<b>Prodoc Outcome</b>	Outcome 4 Monitoring and evaluation, and dissemination of project methods and results contributes to wider application of landscape approach to mainstreaming of biodiversity		See above under Prodoc Component

	PIF Outputs	Prodoc Outputs	Notes
	NA - No fourth component	Output 4.1 Monitoring protocols and necessary institutional agreements to assess the impacts of the landscape conservation design and livelihood-focused interventions both during and after the end of the project	Vital component of the Project
		Output 4.2 Periodic reviews and evaluations of monitoring data collected during the project	
		Output 4.3 Publications, films, exhibitions, databases that publicize the methods used and the results of the project interventions	
		Output 4.4 Organized visits by the public and by national and regional government officials to project sites to demonstrate and explain project activities and achievements	
		Output 4.5 Talks and presentations by project staff in Colombo and in District and Provincial centres to explain project methods and results	

[1]The project will target the north central and northern provinces, commonly referred to as the northern region in the project identification form

#### 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.

See [Prodoc Annexes B2, B3, Q and W](#) for further details

Core Indicator 3	Area of land restored				<i>(Hectares)</i>	
		Hectares (3.1+3.2+3.3+3.4)				
		Expected		Achieved		
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
		20,000	21,000			
Indicator 3.1	Area of degraded agricultural land restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 3.2	Area of forest and forest land restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Area restored and rehabilitated	20,000	20,900		
Indicator 3.3	Area of natural grass and shrublands restored					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 3.4	Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) restored					
			Hectares			





			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Mangroves restored	<i>no exact data</i>	100		
<b>Core Indicator 4</b>	<b>Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)</b>					<b>(Hectares)</b>
		Hectares (4.1+4.2+4.3+4.4)				
		Expected		Expected		
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
			<i>no corresponding data</i>	70,549		
<b>Indicator 4.1</b>	<b>Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity</b>					
			Hectares			
			Expected		Achieved	
			PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
	1	First proposed Elephant Corridor in TL1	<i>no corresponding data</i>	6,442		
	2	Second proposed Elephant Corridor in TL1	<i>no corresponding data</i>	1,874		
	3	Areas expected to match ESA criteria in TL1	<i>no corresponding data</i>	2,000		
	4	Forest plantations in TL1	<i>no corresponding data</i>	1,219		
	5	Proposed Elephant Corridor in TL2	<i>no corresponding data</i>	5,508		
	6	Areas expected to match ESA criteria in TL2	<i>no corresponding data</i>	2,000		
	7	Areas expected to match ESA criteria in TL3	<i>no corresponding data</i>	1,000		
<b>TOTAL</b>			<i>no corresponding data</i>	20,043		



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
Indicator 4.3		Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems			
		Hectares			
		Expected		Achieved	
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
		Sustainable Forest Management, GAP (good agricultural practices) and nature-friendly tourism, in TL1	32,876		
		Sustainable Forest Management, GAP (good agricultural practices) and nature-friendly tourism, in TL2	12,910		
		Sustainable Forest Management, GAP (good agricultural practices) and nature-friendly tourism, in TL3	4,720		
<b>TOTAL</b>			20,000	50,506	
Indicator 4.4		Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided			
		Hectares			
		Expected		Achieved	
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE



<b>Core Indicator 5</b>	<b>Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity</b>				<i>(Hectares)</i>
	Proposed Dugong & Seagrass Conservation Area 1 (27,662 ha)				46,467
	Proposed Dugong & Seagrass Conservation Area 2 (18,805 ha)				
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	
Indicator 5.2	Number of large marine ecosystems (LMEs) with reduced pollution and hypoxia				
	Number				
	Expected		Achieved		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
<b>Core Indicator 6</b>	<b>Greenhouse gas emission mitigated</b>				<i>(Tons)</i>
	Tons (6.1+6.2)				
	Entered		Entered		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	
	Expected CO2e (direct) – 4 years	1,807,227	3,556,232		
	Lifetime direct post-project emissions mitigated – 16 years	7,228,908	14,224,928		
	Expected CO2e (indirect)				
	Anticipated Year	2017	2019	2021	2023
Indicator 6.1	Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector				
	Tons				
	Entered		Entered		
	PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE	



	Lifetime direct post-project emissions mitigated – 16 years	7,228,908	14,224,928		
	Expected CO2e (indirect)				
	Anticipated Year	2017	2019	2021	2023
Indicator 6.2	Emissions avoided				
		Hectares			
		Expected		Achieved	
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
	Expected CO2e (direct)				
	Expected CO2e (indirect)				
	Anticipated Year				
Indicator 6.3	Energy saved				
		MJ			
		Expected		Achieved	
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
Indicator 6.4	Increase in installed renewable energy capacity per technology				
		Capacity (MW)			
	Technology	Expected		Achieved	
		PIF stage	Endorsement	MTR	TE
	(select)				
	(select)				
Core Indicator 11	Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment				(Number)
				Number Achieved	
		Endorsement		MTR	TE
	Male	1,600	Female		
	Female	1,600	Male		
	Total	3,200	Total		



**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

## Annex F: GEF Project Taxonomy Worksheet

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Influencing models	<input type="checkbox"/> Transform policy and regulatory environments		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Convene multi-stakeholder alliances		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Demonstrate innovative approaches		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deploy innovative financial instruments		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders	<input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous Peoples		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private Sector		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Capital providers	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Financial intermediaries and market facilitators	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Large corporations	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SMEs	
		<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Governmental Organization	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academia	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Trade Unions and Workers Unions	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Type of Engagement		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Dissemination	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partnership	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consultation	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Participation	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communications		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Awareness Raising	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Education	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Campaigns	
		<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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"/> Beneficiaries	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Women groups	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sex-disaggregated indicators	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender-sensitive indicators	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gender results areas		
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Access and control over natural resources	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Participation and leadership	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Access to benefits and services	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capacity development	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Awareness raising	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge generation	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focal Areas/Theme			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Integrated Programs		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Commodity Supply Chains (11 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"/> Gender Dimensions
			<input type="checkbox"/> Multi-stakeholder Platforms
		<input type="checkbox"/> Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Food Systems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Restoration
			<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 type="checkbox"/> Terrestrial Protected Areas
			<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal and Marine Protected Areas
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Productive Landscapes
			<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Forestry (Including HCVF and REDD+)
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tourism
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & agrobiodiversity
			<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Invasive Alien Species (IAS)
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biomes	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mangroves
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coral Reefs
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sea Grasses
			<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial and Accounting	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Payment for Ecosystem Services
			<input type="checkbox"/> Natural Capital Assessment and Accounting
			<input type="checkbox"/> Conservation Trust Funds
			<input type="checkbox"/> Conservation Finance
		<input type="checkbox"/> Supplementary Protocol to the CBD	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Biosafety
			<input type="checkbox"/> Access to Genetic Resources Benefit Sharing
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forests			
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forest and Landscape Restoration	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Forest	<input type="checkbox"/> REDD/REDD+
			<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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Income Generating Activities
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Agriculture
			<input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Pasture Management
			<input 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"/> Coral Reefs
			<input type="checkbox"/> Seagrasses
			<input type="checkbox"/> Polar Ecosystems
			<input type="checkbox"/> Constructed Wetlands
	<input type="checkbox"/> Chemicals and Waste		
		<input type="checkbox"/> Mercury	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Artisanal and Scale Gold Mining	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Coal Fired Power Plants	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Coal Fired Industrial Boilers	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cement	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Ferrous Metals Production	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Ozone	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Persistent Organic Pollutants	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants	
		<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"/> 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 <del>Programme</del> 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 <del>Programme</del> on Technology Transfer
		<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Technology Centre & Network (CTCN)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Endogenous technology
		<input type="checkbox"/> Technology Needs Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> Adaptation Tech Transfer
	<input type="checkbox"/> United Nations Framework on Climate Change	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Nationally Determined Contribution
		<input type="checkbox"/> Paris Agreement
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Finance (Rio Markers)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Development Goals
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Mitigation 1
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Mitigation 2
		<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Adaptation 1
		<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change Adaptation 2



Submitted to GEF Secretariat Review

[Go To Home](#)