

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

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9372

Countries

Sri Lanka

Project Name

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

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

5/28/2019

Review completed by PM

11/4/2019

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Project Design and Financing

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

06/17/2019 UA:

Yes. Minor changes in the design have been explained and justified.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

06/17/2019 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

06/17/2019 UA:

Yes.

However, in the portal Table D, the third line has to indicate "multi-focal area" and "SFM" as a source (same as in the PPG request table F).

08/08/2019 UA:

Addressed.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

06/17/2019 UA:

Yes. The proponent makes reference to the project document. However, please include a brief summary in the portal template together with the reference for further details. This applies to all three sections A3, A4, and A5.

08/08/2019 UA:

Addressed.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

Thank you for the comments. Brief summary of Section A3, A4 and A5 are included as follows:

A.3: Please provide the stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent

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.

A.4: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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.

A.5: Risks – Elaborate on indicated risks including climate change, potential social and environmental risks..

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

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

06/17/2019 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

11/14/2019 UA: Discrepancy found: IUCN co-financing commitment letter refers to "in kind" while table C entry has selected "grant" from the drop-down menu. Please check and correct.

01/13/2020 UA: Has been corrected.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Response, 14 Nov. 2019:

Thank you for the comment. This is corrected in the CEO ER

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

06/17/2019 UA:

Yes. Core indicator table has been completed.

Cleared

11/14/2019 UA: Missing data: "Improved management of 46,467 ha of marine habitats", which is mentioned in the PIF text and uploaded versions is not listed under Core Indicator 5.

01/13/2020 UA: Has been corrected.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Response, 14 Nov 2019:

There is a slight mistake in the figure. This has now been correctly reflected in the CEO ER.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement n/a

Response to Secretariat comments

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

06/17/2019 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

06/17/2019 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

11/19/2019 UA: Ineligible expenses in M&E budget, please remove:

- NIM audit (as per guidelines, audit costs are paid out of PMC);
- Stakeholder engagement and gender plan (have been finalized at CEO endorsement stage);
- GEF tracking tool update (not applicable anymore, reporting is now done through core indicators).

01/13/2020 UA: Has been removed as per response by agency. However, please clarify why the NIM audit costs are still listed in the budgeted M&E plan?

02/05/2020 UA:

Has been removed.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Response, 11 Nov 2019:

1. NIM audit (as per guidelines, audit costs are paid out of PMC)

This is well noted and adjusted accordingly.

2. Stakeholder engagement and gender plan (have been finalized at CEO endorsement stage)

While stakeholder engagement and gender plans are finalized at CEO endorsement stage, the project team would need to monitor the implementation of the action plans to ensure that the project interventions are well consulted with the stakeholders and are gender responsive.

The budget for engagement and gender plan has been removed from the M & E.

3. GEF tracking tool update (not applicable anymore, reporting is now done through core indicators).

Thanks for pointing this out. It has been corrected to reflect update of core indicators by the PM.

UNDP Response, 21 January 2020

NIM audit cost has been removed from the budgeted M&E plan (CEO ER, p. 23; UNDP prodoc, p.59)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

06/17/2019 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Responses

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

GEFSEC

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

06/17/2019 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

06/17/2019 UA:

Yes.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

none received

11/14/2019 UA:

CORRECTION:

Germany's comments have not been responded to. Please see comments uploaded in the portal and provide a response.

01/13/2020 UA: Responses to Council comments, as usual, need to be inserted into Annex B of the CEO endorsement request template in the portal.

02/05/2020 UA:

Germany's comments have been responded to.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Response, 14 Nov 2019:

(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.

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 sustainably be integrated into forestry, agriculture and tourism sector decision making processes- this has been well articulated within the four outcomes of the project where:

1) Outcome 1 – focuses on ensuring the background conditions necessary to achieve the Project Objective at the field level and subsequently to have the models established at the Project sites (Trial Landscapes) replicated elsewhere; this will be followed training of government officials in all relevant sectors at central and local levels so that staff are available both to deliver the project effectively and to roll out Project models regionally and nationally; initiate and maintain coordination among the large number of other projects and programmes that overlap with it geographically and/or thematically in order to build on progress made already and to take up the obvious opportunities for synergies.

2) Outcome 2 – will identify actual requirements and priorities for biodiversity conservation in each Trial Landscape. For this to be successful, the project will have to collaborate across multiple jurisdictions including DSDs, Districts, GNDs and Provincial authorities; a well-informed and supportive public; an inclusive and integrated planning process where conservation agencies and production-oriented agencies design together with communities; and one that provides for additional data collection where required, possibly through carrying capacity assessments and strategic environmental assessments; and an action programme to implement the approved strategy. The strategic designs will feed into work under other development projects, programmes, and public and private sector enterprises in the Trial Landscapes.

3) Outcome 3 - focuses on village level land-use planning using the landscape approach to mainstream biodiversity into local livelihoods, including possibly setting aside land for conservation, and linking social and financial benefits to conservation benefits.

4) Outcome 4 – focuses on monitoring of project results, paying attention to social, economic, environmental and biodiversity impacts, followed by scaling up and dissemination of results and lessons learned.

Please refer to Section IV “Project’s results and partnerships” of UNDP ProDoc (pp. 22-32)

(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.

One of the key outputs of this project (Output 1.3) is establishing and enhancing coordination with relevant development projects, programmes, and public and private sector initiatives operating in the same geographical area. 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 neighbouring 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.

Please refer to Table 2 on Partnerships (pp. 33-36) and Annex F of UNDP ProDoc

UNDP Response, 21 January 2020:

Response to council comment has been included in Annex B of the CEO endorsement request document.

(please refer to the table: responses to comments from council at WP inclusion (pp.38-40)).

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement none received

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

06/17/2019 UA:

No. Please address comments above.

Please also check:

- IUCN as a executing partner is listed in the same line as the government agency, which can cause misunderstandings
- The Standard letter of agreement between UNDP and the government executing partner is not signed. Please provide a signed version.

08/09/2019 UA:

No. The following issues are outstanding:

- The Project Objective in Table B is referring to Cambodia. Please check the entire Table B on whether this is an isolated typo or if also other components in Table B are mixed up or uploaded erroneously.
- If IUCN Sri Lanka is a partner working under the Executing Agency, it does not need be listed as Executing agency in the portal, part I.

09/07/2019 UA:

The signed letter of agreement between UNDP and the executing agency is not in line with GEF policy. As per GEF guidelines, the procedure on exceptions for a GEF Implementing Agency providing execution functions must be initiated "... as per the request of the beneficiary country/countries ..." Consequently, the request should come from the Country, not from the Agency. Further, the letter does not include a justification that explains why for the GEF Implementing Agency needs to perform such execution functions.

Please remove all reference to executing functions of UNDP from the CEO endorsement request and project document.

11/14/2019 UA: Outstanding issues to be addressed in addition to comments made above:

1) **On coordination arrangements:** In section 6. Institutional Arrangements and Coordination there is no information – instead, it is referred o pages 57-63 of the ProDoc. Please summarize in a comprehensive manner the institutional arrangements and coordination in this section, otherwise a reader that cannot access the ProDoc will have no information on this topic.

The following paragraphs in the ProDoc still contain references to UNDP providing execution support: paragraphs 152, 159, 166. The standard letter of agreement between UNDP as the implementing agency and the government executing partner has not been considered an adequate justification for the provision of execution support. All references to UNDP providing such support need therefore be removed from the documentation.

2) Project staff costs must be paid from the Project Management Cost (PMC) and not from project's components (see budget notes 4 and 22) Further, the following budget notes indicates that staff costs have been charged to the project's component: Note 27 says that "Additional consultants required to facilitate the project management related services and to absorb any incremental costs in the above consultancies (USD 4,367)" – the explanation for budgeting \$4,367 for unforeseen costs is not acceptable).

01/13/2020 UA: No. Please note clarification question on M&E budget and on Council comments response. Please re-submit addressing these issues.

Implementation/execution arrangement clarification request has been addressed.

02/05/2020 UA:

All comments made above have been addressed.

Program manager recommends the project for CEO endorsement.

Response to Secretariat comments
UNDP Response, 30 October 2019

Cost related to project support services (DPC) has been removed from the prodoc (*para 175, and TBWP - budget note 25, p.71*)

IUCN as a executing partner is listed in the same line as the government agency, which can cause misunderstandings

The executing partner for this project is the Ministry of Mahaweli Development and the Environment (MMDoE), and 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 financial resources.

The IUCN Sri Lanka is a Responsible Party to provide project implementation support to deliver technical outputs and project activities. Project implementation support will be carried out under the overall supervision of a Project Director (PD) appointed by the Executive (MMDoE). Thus, they, accountable for implementing and reporting on project activities as per approved work plans and budgets.

Please refer to Section VIII – Governance and management arrangements of UNDP prodoc (*pp.61-65*)

The Standard letter of agreement between UNDP and the government executing partner is not signed. Please provide a signed version.

The LoA has been signed by the government.

UNDP, 13 August 2019

Project Objective has been corrected.

We will ask the Help Desk to remove IUCN as executive agency in the portal, since UNDP does not have access to this field.

UNDP Response, 14 Nov 2019:

1) On coordination arrangements: In section 6. Institutional Arrangements and Coordination there is no information – instead, it is referred to pages 57-63 of the ProDoc. Please summarize in a comprehensive manner the institutional arrangements and coordination in this section, otherwise a reader that cannot access the ProDoc will have no information on this topic

The following paragraphs in the ProDoc still contain references to UNDP providing execution support: paragraphs 152, 159, 166. The standard letter of agreement between UNDP as the implementing agency and the government executing partner has not been considered an adequate justification for the provision of execution support. All references to UNDP providing such support need therefore be removed from the documentation.

Thank you for the comments to elaborate on the institutional arrangements and coordination. This has now been summarized and included in the CEO ER document (*please see pp.20-21*)

Reference to UNDP's execution service has been revised to focus on assurance role (*please see the changes in para 155, 156, 162, 166, 168 & 169 of UNDP ProDoc, pp. 62-66*).

2) Project staff costs must be paid from the Project Management Cost (PMC) and not from project's components (see budget notes 4 and 22) Further, the following budget notes indicates that staff costs have been charged to the project's component: Note 27 says that "Additional consultants required to facilitate the project management related services and to absorb any incremental costs in the above consultancies (USD 4,367)" – the explanation for budgeting \$4,367 for unforeseen costs is not acceptable.

Comments are well noted and the cost associated with project staff has been appropriately reflected under PMC (*Please refer to the TBWP of UNDP prodoc, pp.70-75, & Annex D - ToR*)

UNDP Response, 20 January 2020

Both the comments have been addressed.

Review Dates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**Response to Secretariat comments**

First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation**Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

In the past two decades, a number of donor supported (e.g. GEF, ADB) protected area management projects (PA) were implemented in Sri Lanka. PA infrastructure and facilities have been developed and management plans for majority of PAs developed. These projects have also demonstrated models to engage communities in managing and benefiting from biodiversity conservation and forestry activities in buffer zones of PAs. Also with GEF support, Sri Lanka is operationalizing a unique conservation model for areas lying outside protected areas with the objective of identifying and demarcating ecologically sensitive areas with development controls to ensure that land use conforms to safeguards that protect key species and important eco-system services. However, habitat loss and over exploitation of natural resources are still significant environmental threats in Sri Lanka.

The project will 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. The project will deliver global environmental benefits through a package of measures that ensure future land use and production sector practices and decision making in the three major sectors do not compromise biodiversity and ecosystem functions. Measures will include strengthened capacity for avoiding, mitigating and offsetting biodiversity loss, compliance monitoring and enforcement; a improved coordination and governance framework for better management of biodiversity; and implementation of sustainable forest and land management, improved tourism

The project will 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. The project will deliver global environmental benefits through a package of measures that ensure

future land use and production sector practices and decision making in the three major sectors do not compromise biodiversity and ecosystem functions. Measures will include strengthened capacity for avoiding, mitigating and offsetting biodiversity loss, compliance monitoring and enforcement; a improved coordination and governance framework for better management of biodiversity; and implementation of sustainable forest and land management, improved tourism sector practices in the north and north central region, and developing incentives for communities and private sector to engage in production practices that are in line with best practices to manage and conserve biodiversity. The project targets a landscape of 70,000 ha for sustainable management, 21,000 ha of area to be restored, with potential carbon benefits of 3.5 million t of CO₂eq in GHG emission reductions.

ALIGNMENT WITH FA STRATEGY & NATIONAL PLANS:

The project is well-aligned with GEF-6 BD program 9, LD-3, and SFM objectives. The project is consistent with the National Environmental Action Plan or Haritha (Green) Lanka Strategy and Action Plan (2016-2020) and the National Strategy for Sustainable Development (2007); and with national development priorities in the areas of youth employment, rural poverty reduction, sustainable extraction of natural resources and the country's commitment to protecting key species of global environmental value through extensive network of protected areas. The project will support the implementation of key recommendations provided in recent communications. The project is in line with the NBSAP 2016-2022.

The project has an innovative approach to capacity building. Joint training to be organized will help the agencies to learn together and also find the value and niches to apply the concepts and tools through the proposed tailored training and learning-by-doing, testing out the tools and methods adapted in Component 1 of the project. In addition the project will work closely with the capacity developments proposed or carried out by other ongoing technical assistance and infrastructure development initiatives (through GEF, Govt. and Multilateral). The five year duration and consistent capacity building and engagement plus the pilot work are expected to generate adequate information, enabling environment to disseminate the knowledge and improve the understanding and thinking patterns of stakeholder groups on adopting ecosystem approaches. Incentives promoted in pilot initiatives in components 2 and 3 are expected to convince the stakeholder groups and communities on the value of new approaches and the need for sustainability and resilience to ensure the benefits of development gains.