



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Conservation, sustainable use of biodiversity, and maintenance of ecosystem services in protected wetlands of international importance.			
Country (ies):	El Salvador	GEF Project ID: ¹	5749
GEF Agency (ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5257
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources (MARN)	Submission Date:	1 st Dec 2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration (Months)	48
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	N/A	Project Agency Fee (\$):	208,219
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/> 			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)*	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-1	Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas	Output 1.1. New protected areas (number) and coverage (hectares) of unprotected ecosystems.	GEFTF	2,191,781.00	8,914,666.55
Total project costs				2,191,781.00	8,914,666.55

* Applying the STAR flexibility mechanism of GEF-5, resources for a total of US\$ 1,364,583 of CC STAR allocation are being channeled to the BD focal area, inclusive of the corresponding contribution to Project Management Cost. Thus, for the FSP a total amount of \$2,191,781 of BD resources are being allocated. Amounts including fees are shown in Table D.

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: Promote the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance of ecosystem services through the creation of new protected wetlands of international importance and the improved management of existing protected wetlands.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Expanded protected wetland coverage and strengthened institutional and individual capacities for the effective management of protected wetlands of international importance (PWII)	TA	<u>Expansion of wetland areas of international importance under protection (PWII)</u> – Coverage of the National Protected Areas System (NPAS) resulting from the creation of three (3) new multiple-use protected areas (MUPAs) increases from 95,785.61 hectares (ha) to	– Three (3) new MUPAS gazetted: a) Jiquilisco Bay wetland (40 islands and surrounding waters); b) Islas de Golfo de Fonseca (Martín Pérez Island, Pirigallo or Meanguerita Island, Ilca Island, Periquito Island and part of the surroundings of Meanguera Island); c) Olomega	GEF TF	500,000.00	1,750,000.00

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

	<p>133,495.07 ha (37,709.46 new protected ha)³</p> <p><u>Management effectiveness of existing PWII improved</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Change in the management effectiveness of three (3) PWIIs measured through the METT scorecard: a) Jiquilisco Bay PWII: from 49% to 59%; b) Olomega Lake PWII: from 32% to 42%; and c) Jocotal Lagoon PWII: from 31% to 41% <p><u>Individual and institutional capacity for management of PWII enhanced</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Sixty (60) staff members from the MARN, municipalities, the MAG, and local organizations trained in the sustainable management of the PWIIs – Change in the capacity development indicators for the sustainable management of the PWIIs according to the total score of the UNDP-GEF Capacity Development Scorecard: a) <u>National Government</u>: MARN: from 45.24% to 66.67%; MAG: from 54.76% to 66.67%; b) <u>Local Government and Organizations</u>: Jiquilisco Municipal Environmental Unit (MEU): from 30.95% to 57.14%; San Dionisio MEU: from 35.71% to 57.14%; Concepción Batres MEU: from 28.57% to 54.76%; Jucuarán MEU: from 28.57% to 57.14%; El Tránsito MEU: from 33.33% to 59.52%; Management of the Inter-municipal Association of Jiquilisco Bay (ASIBAHIA): from 33.33% to 54.76%; and Jiquilisco Bay Territorial Action Group (GAT-CBJ): from 40.48% to 57.14% 	<p>Complex (Olomeguita Island, Tierra Blanca, and sectors of the La Chiricana or San Antonio Silva).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Management plans for up to three (3) PWIIs updated or developed. – Wetlands inventory for El Salvador is updated. – The institutional and individual capacities of the MARN and other relevant institutions within the SIMANA (municipalities and the MAG) strengthened, contributing to the sustainable management of the PWIIs. – Properly equipped wetland staff and volunteers enable the timely detection and notification of floods and landslides associated with climate change in three (3) PWIIs. – Local governance program empowers local communities and municipal authorities to sustainably manage the PWIIs. – Economic environmental compensation from local development projects that alter the surrounding environment support PWII management. – Business plans for new and existing wetland PAs developed. – Financial mechanisms are validated onsite and serve to increase the level of funding for three (3) PWIIs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visitor entrance fee scheme piloted and revenues channelized into existing wetland PAs. • PPP increases revenues from tourism in wetland PAs. 		
--	---	---	--	--

³ 1. Jiquilisco Bay Islands: 40 islands and the water body surrounding them (33,305.25 ha); 2. Olomega Complex: Olomeguita Island, Tierra Blanca, and the La Chiricana or San Antonio Silva area (4,119.00 ha); 3. Fonseca Gulf Islands: Four (4) islands (Martín Pérez, Pirigallo or Meanguerita, Ilca, and Isla Periquito islands) and areas surrounding the Meanguera Island (285.21 ha).

		<p><u>Financial sustainability of existing PWII improved</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Increase from 20% to 41% in the financial sustainability of three (3) PWIIs according to that established through the total average score in the UNDP/GEF Financial Sustainability Scorecard⁴ – Reduction in the financial gap (USD) to cover the basic management costs of the three (3) PWIIs: a) Jiquilisco Bay PWII: from \$222,160 to \$166,620; b) El Jocotal Lagoon PWII: from \$173,199 to \$129,899; and c) Olomega Lagoon PWII: from \$244,677 to \$183,508 – Five (5) environmental compensation agreements established – Increase in total annual revenue generation for three (3) PWIIs disaggregated by source: a) Environmental economic compensation: from \$0 to \$100,00; b) Entry fees for visitors: from \$0 to \$30,000; and Public-Private Partnerships (PPP): from \$0 to \$30,000 				
2. Addressing threats to biodiversity, including the presence of invasive species and solid waste and agrochemicals originating in the buffer areas of the PWIIs.	TA	<p><u>Improved coordination among authorities with jurisdiction over activities influencing wetland management and PAs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Three (3) municipal cooperation agreements and three (3) new cooperation agreements between MARN and MAG, MOP, and CEL, established and operating contribute to the continued presence of key indicator species in four (4) protected areas (PAs) in the Jiquilisco Bay Complex and Jocotal Lagoon PWIIs in the lower watershed of the San Miguel Río Grande: a) Normandía and Chaguantique PA: <i>Amazona auropalliata</i>, <i>Ateles geoffroyi</i>; b) El Tercio PA: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Six (6) inter-institutional cooperation agreements (MARN, MAG, CEL, MOP, and the municipalities) established, including conservation and management committees for monitoring the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in at least three (3) PAs of the Jocotal and the Jiquilisco Bay PWIIs. – Program for the prevention, reduction, and control of contamination stemming from agricultural activities (e.g., agrochemicals and manure) and human settlements (solid wastes) in two PWIIs (Jiquilisco Bay and Jocotal 	GEF TF	1,587,410.00	6,718,936.55

⁴ a) Legal, regulatory, and institutional framework: from 30% to 46%; b) Business planning and tools for managing cost-effectiveness: from 8% to 42%; and c) Tools for income generation and allocation: from 17% to 34%.

	<p><i>Crocodylus acutus</i>; c) Jiquilisco Bay Area (includes San Sebastián Island): <i>Andara grandis</i>, <i>Amazona auropalliata</i>, <i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i> and <i>Crocodylus acutus</i>; and d) Jocotal Lagoon Area: <i>Amazona auropalliata</i>, <i>Crocodylus acutus</i></p> <p><u>Reduced threats to PWII through improved pollution and waste management</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Twenty (20) farms implementing best management practices (BMP) for the reduction of cattle ranching wastes in three (3) PWIIs, including farms run by women - Sixty (60) farms implementing BMP for the reduction of agricultural wastes in three (3) PWIIs, including farms run by women - Reduction by 50% in the amount of solid waste accumulated in the Jiquilisco Bay PWII (kg/ha) (target will be confirmed during the first year of the project) <p><u>Reduced threats to PWII through improved control of invasive fauna and flora</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2,000 tons/year-wetland of water hyacinth (<i>Eichornia crassipes</i>) removed from the Olomega Lagoon and Jocotal Lagoon PWIIs - Decreased abundance (number of individuals) of the cormorant duck (<i>Phalacrocorax brasilianus</i>) in the Olomega Lagoon, the Jocotal Lagoon, and the Jiquilisco Bay PWIIs (baseline and target will be established during the first year of the project) <p><u>Conservation of mangroves supported by sustainable use and rehabilitation of associated forest</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stable coverage (18,720 	<p>Lagoon) and their buffer areas defined jointly with the municipalities, local communities, and the private sector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Incentives program, including green certification for reduced use of agrochemicals in sugar cane cultivation and sustainable livestock management, promotes biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices and water-related resource use in the buffer areas of five (5) PAs of the Jocotal Lagoon and the Jiquilisco Bay PWIIs. - Standards in place to regulate human activities that affect the PWIIs. - Information monitoring system in place facilitates decision making to reduce the threats to three (3) PWIIs and articulated with the EIS of the MARN. - Protocol developed to reduce the threats to biodiversity in PWIIs, including contamination from agrochemicals, livestock waste, and household and urban solid waste. - Strategies for controlling invasive species (water hyacinth [<i>Eichornia crassipes</i>] and the Neotropic cormorant [<i>Phalacrocorax brasilianus</i>]) piloted in three (3) PWIIs and their buffer areas: Jiquilisco Bay Complex, the Olomega Lake, and the Jocotal Lagoon. - Participatory plans developed for the conservation and sustainable use of mangroves and floodplain forest in the Jiquilisco Bay and associated freshwater lagoons in the lower Rio Grande de San Miguel watershed. 			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<i>ha) of mangroves in the Jiquilisco Bay PWII and associated freshwater lagoons</i>	– Participatory rehabilitation of at least 500 ha of dry forest associated with mangroves allows the protection of key habitat for migratory species.				
				Subtotal		2,087,410.00	8,468,936.55
				Project management Cost (PMC) ⁵	GEF TF	104,371.00	445,730.00
				Total project costs		2,191,781.00	8,914,666.55

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
Bilateral Aid Agency (ies)	Fund of the Initiative of the Americas (FIAES)	Cash	2,850,000.00
Bilateral Aid Agency (ies)	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH	Cash	1,500,000.00
Foundation	Istituto Sindacale per la Cooperazione allo Sviluppo (ISCOS)	Cash	1,600,000.00
National Government	Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources (MARN)	Cash	2,106,666.55
National Government	Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources (MARN)	In-kind	848,000.00
GEF Agency	United Nations Development Program	Cash	10,000.00
Total Co-financing			8,914,666.55

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEFTF	Biodiversity	El Salvador	945,586	89,831	1,035,417
UNDP	GEFTF	Climate Change	El Salvador	1,246,195	118,388	1,364,583
Total Grant Resources				2,191,781	208,219	2,400,000

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	26,250	0	26,250
National/Local Consultants	463,055	0	463,055

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? NA

⁵ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁶

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.: NA

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities: NA

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage: NA

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

1. The project design is aligned with the original PIF. The project’s strategy, including the structure of the project components, closely resembles the PIF that was approved by the GEF. The following changes were made, which do not represent a departure from the project’s strategy as defined originally in the PIF and it will not have an impact on the funds (GEF and co-financing) originally budgeted.

PIF Outputs (Component 1)	Project Document Outputs (Component 1)
<i>Output 1.1. Scientific characterization, local consultations, boundary demarcation, and gazettal of two (2) new MUPAs protected wetlands: a) Jiquilisco Bay wetland and upriver protected wetlands (Jocotal, Olomega) and b) Islas del Golfo de Fonseca (Periquito, Pirigallo, Ilca, and Martín Pérez).</i>	<p><i>Output 1.1. Three new multiple-use PAs gazzeted: a) Jiquilisco Bay wetland (40 islands and surrounding waters); b) Islas de Golfo de Fonseca (Martín Pérez Island, Pirigallo or Meanguerita Island, Ilca Island, Periquito Island and part of the surroundings of Meangueta Island); c) Olomega Complex (Olomeguita Island, Tierra Blanca, and sectors of the La Chiricana or San Antonio Silva).</i></p> <p>The number of PAs to be established through the project was increased from two to three, for a total of 37,709.46 ha of new protected wetlands (up from 20,000 ha estimated in the PIF).</p>
<i>Output 1.2 – Management plans for up to three (3) PWII updated</i>	<p><i>Output 1.2 – Management plans for up to three (3) PWIIs updated or developed</i></p> <p>Updating the management plans for three (3) existing PWIIs (Jiquilisco Bay Complex, Olomega Lake, and the El Jocotal Lagoon) was proposed at the time of the PIF. However, the management plans for the Olomega Lake PWII and the El Jocotal Lagoon PWII will be updated through an initiative (2015) funded by the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) for the sustainable management of these PWIIs. Instead, the project proposed herein will update/develop the management plans for the Jaltepeque Complex PWII, which is hydrologically and ecologically connected to the Jiquilisco Bay Complex to the west, and the Golfo de Fonseca Islands, which will be established as a new</p>

⁶ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

	protected area through the project.
<i>Output 1.7 – Economic environmental compensation from local development projects that alter the surrounding environment and wetland mitigation banking support PWII management.</i>	<p><i>Output 1.7 – Economic environmental compensation from local development projects that alter the surrounding environment support PWII management.</i></p> <p>A feasibility analysis was completed during the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) that determined wetland mitigation banking as a financial strategy to support PWII management is not feasible in El Salvador due to the lack of related legislation and the potential market for wetland banking; thus, wetland mitigation banking has not been considered in the final project design. PPG activities indicated that economic environmental compensation is the only mechanism currently available in El Salvador to restore or rehabilitate areas where unavoidable impacts of development activities have occurred or may occur. The Environmental Law (1998; Article 5) states that compensation must be made at the site of impact, or in neighboring areas that are conducive to its replacement or in other recovery areas. Thus, economic environmental compensation will be the only mechanism for mobilizing resources to support PWII management.</p>
PIF Outputs (Component 2)	Project Document Outputs (Component 2)
<i>Output 2.1. At least three inter-institutional cooperation agreements (MARN, MAG, municipalities, Department of Housing and Urban Development [VVDU]) established, including conservation and management committees for monitoring the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in at least four PAs of the Jocotal and the Jiquilisco Bay PWII (the PAs are mentioned in the text), as well as their buffer areas.</i>	<p><i>Output 2.1. Six (6) inter-institutional cooperation agreements (MARN, MAG, CEL, MOP, and the municipalities) established, including conservation and management committees for monitoring the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in at least three PAs of the Jocotal Lagoon and the Jiquilisco Bay PWIIs.</i></p> <p>The institutions to establish cooperation agreements for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the prioritized PWIIs were revised and updated based on the roles that they will play in reducing threats to the wetlands. A total of six (6) agreements (i.e., three [3] municipal agreements for managing invasive species and solid wastes and three [3] new agreements between the MARN and the MAG, MOP, and CEL) will be established during the life of the project. In addition, the number of PAs where activities will be implemented was reduced from four (4) to three (3) based on the feasibility of establishing the agreements and the impact that they will have for reducing threats.</p>
<i>Output 2.3. Incentives program, including green certification for reduced use of agrochemicals in sugar cane cultivation and sustainable livestock management (other incentives to be defined during the PPG phase), promotes biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices and water-related resource use in the buffer areas of four PAs of the Jocotal Lagoon and the Jiquilisco Bay PWII</i>	<p><i>Output 2.3. Incentives program, including green certification for reduced use of agrochemicals in sugar cane cultivation and sustainable livestock management promotes biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices and water-related resource use in the buffer areas of five PAs of the Jocotal Lagoon and the Jiquilisco Bay PWIIs.</i></p> <p>The number of PAs where incentives will be implemented was increased from four to five to increase the opportunity for using incentives to reduce threats from non-sustainable agricultural and cattle ranching activities.</p>

2. In addition, information regarding the global environmental benefits was detailed as follows:

3. The project will contribute to the protection of globally, regionally, and nationally endangered and vulnerable species. Globally important species include the American crocodile (*Crocodylus acutus*) and sea turtles, including the hawksbill sea turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*), the green sea turtle (*Chelonia mydas*), the olive ridley sea turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*), and the leatherback sea turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*). Regionally vulnerable migratory birds include the Buff-breasted Sandpiper (*Tryngites subruficollis*) and the Yellow-naped Parrot (*Amazona auropalliata*). Nationally threatened and endangered species include the snail kite (*Rostrhamus sociabilis*), the wood stork (*Mycteria americana*), the muscovy duck (*Cairina moschata*), the anhinga (*Anhinga anhinga*), the least bittern (*Ixobrychus exilis*), the pinnated bittern (*Botaurus pinnatus*), the cichlid (*Cichlasoma guija*), the frog (*Plectrohyla guatemalensis*), and the spider monkey (*Ateles geoffroyi*), which is the only primate living in El Salvador. Other species include the bivalves *Nephronaias* sp. and *Mycetopoda subsinuata*, as well as mollusks from the Golfo de Fonseca islands, some of which are only found in that part of the country; and the Pacific seahorse (*Hippocampus ingens*), a vulnerable species. The project will contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of tree species such as mahogany (*Swietenia microphylla*), cedar (*Cedrela salvadorensis* and *C. odorata*), mangroves (*Rhizophora mangle*, *Laguncularia racemosa*, and *Avicennia* spp.), and the freshwater mangrove (*Bravaisia integerrima*), a nationally endangered species.

4. The project will also contribute to the protection of habitat for numerous globally important species, including estuarine vegetation and beaches used by sea turtles for nesting, and wetlands and seasonal flooded areas that serve as feeding and resting areas for significant concentrations of migratory and local waterfowl. The Olomega Lake PWII has been reported to serve as habitat for more than 8,000 individuals of waterfowl, most of them belonging to the Anatidae family (e.g., *Dendrocygna autumnalis*, *D. bicolor*, *Anas discors*, *A. clypeata*, *A. americana*, *Aythya affinis*, *Cairina moschata*, and *Oxyura jamaicensis*). In the El Bajon Island, Jiquilisco Bay Complex PWII, the project will contribute to the protection of the only nesting colony of the black skimmer (*Rynchops niger*) in El Salvador; this island also serves as an important site for the reproduction of the American oystercatcher (*Haematopus palliatus*).⁷ Similarly, the project will contribute to the protection of the seasonally saturated forest present in the Normandía PA (Jiquilisco Bay Complex PWII), which serves as the last refuge for the spider monkey (*Ateles geoffroyi*) in the country. In the Jiquilisco Bay Complex PWII, the project will contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of 18,270 ha of mangroves, which provide food, and shelter, and serve as breeding and nurturing area for many species of crustaceans, mollusks, and fish. The mangrove forest contributes to maintaining the productivity of the coastal waters, and to sustaining the industrial and artisanal fisheries of El Salvador.

5. The wetlands function as reservoirs of water and areas of reproduction for numerous fish species, some of which are of significant importance for local economies. Species such as the tilapia (*Oreochromis* spp.), the cichlid (*Parachromis managuense*), the characid (*Astyanax aeneus*), and the catfish (*Arius guatemalensis*) are commonly sold by women in local markets or nearby urban areas.⁸ Finally, the wetlands buffer the effects of aquatic contamination and extreme climatological events, and in the case of the mangroves, they help to control coastal erosion.

6. To assess the project impact on the conservation of biodiversity of global importance, the project design includes the monitoring of key indicator species in four (4) PAs in the Jiquilisco Bay and Jocotal Lagoon HP II Complex, as follows: a) Normandía and Chaguantique PA: *Amazona auropalliata*, *Ateles geoffroyi*; b) El Tercio PA: *Crocodylus acutus*; c) San Sebastián Island (Jiquilisco Bay Area): *Andara grandis*, *Amazona auropalliata*, *Eretmochelys imbricata*, and *Crocodylus acutus*; and d) Jocotal Lagoon Area: *Amazona auropalliata* and *Crocodylus acutus*.

7. By project's end the following global environmental benefits will be delivered:

- Three (3) new MUPAs covering 37,709.46 ha.
- Continued presence of key indicator species in four (4) PAs in the Jiquilisco Bay Complex and the Jocotal Lagoon PWII.

⁷ MARN/AECID. 2004. Complejo Bahía de Jiquilisco. Propuesta de Sitio RAMSAR. El Salvador;

⁸ MARN. 2012. Ficha Informativa de los Humedales RAMSAR: ANP Jocotal. El Salvador.

- Reduced threats to the three prioritized PWIIs, including: a) reduction by 50% in the amount of solid waste accumulated in the Jiquilisco Bay PWII; b) removal of 2,000 tons/year-wetland of water hyacinth (*Eichornia crassipes*) from the Olomega Lagoon and Jocotal Lagoon PWII; and c) reduction of the abundance of the cormorant duck (*Phalacrocorax brasilianus*) in the Olomega Lagoon, the Jocotal Lagoon, and the Jiquilisco Bay PWII.
- Stable coverage of mangroves (18,720 ha) in the Jiquilisco Bay PWII and associated freshwater lagoons.
- 500 ha of rehabilitated dry forest that serve as key habitat for migratory birds and other species associated with the mangroves restore ecologic functions and increase ecosystem productivity.

A.6. Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

Risk	Level*	Risk Mitigation Strategy
The sustainable use of biodiversity in wetlands is not a priority for new environmental authorities	L	The project staff will inform the new environmental officials about the project, its objective, progress, and achievements, as well as the project's benefits in terms of the sustainable use of the country's PWIIs and contributions to achieve national and global environmental goals. Different platforms will be used for this, such as the project's steering committee, and learning and knowledge-sharing processes that will be part of the project's monitoring and evaluation plan, site visits to the prioritized PWIIs, among others.
Weak organization and cohesion among public and private stakeholders for the control and management of invasive species	M	With MARN's support, the project will define consultation mechanisms among the sectors and stakeholders responsible for managing invasive species, as well as those who perceive an impact (e.g., fishermen), to jointly define strategies to control and reduce invasive species that affect wetlands. This participatory process will facilitate joint decision-making to reduce the presence of invasive species in the prioritized wetlands and PAs. Initiatives to further promote local involvement in the use and recycling of invasive species will be implemented, such as handicrafts (e.g., baskets and furniture), paper made from the fiber of water hyacinth, and the plant used as feed for livestock. Finally, the project will build upon past successful initiatives for the control, management, and use of this alien invasive species in the project's PWIIs as a way to build confidence among stakeholders and engage them in activities already familiar to them.
Limited interest by the agricultural sector to adopt BMPs for the prevention, reduction, and control of contamination (and thereby the reduced use of agrochemicals)	M	To encourage the adoption of BMPs by the agricultural sector to reduce the use of agrochemicals, the project will implement an incentives program consisting of a green seal for small- to medium-scale agriculture producers and cattle ranchers and the certification of biodiversity-friendly sugar cane cultivation. The green seal certification of sustainable production processes will differentiate products and influence consumer purchasing decisions with potential economic benefits for the producers who adopt BMPs. In the case of sugarcane, the project will establish synergies with CASSA, which provides credit for producers to invest in improvements at the farm level. Roundtables will be established with the participation of the producers and producer associations, and representatives of relevant institutions including MARN, MAG, municipal authorities, and community representatives to discuss issues related to the control of contamination and to agree upon the technical assistance needed for the implementation of BMPs. Finally, environmental education/awareness-raising activities will further contribute to show farmers the environmental and economic benefits of implementing BMPs to reduce the contamination of the project's PWIIs.
Limited participation of local communities and municipalities in the prevention, reduction, and	M	The basis for mitigating this risk will be the implementation of a local environmental governance and awareness program for the sustainable management of biodiversity in PWII, including the reduction of threats (prevention, reduction, and control of solid wastes). More specifically, the project will strengthen the ability and skills of local communities and the municipalities to participate in and have more control over decision-making processes regarding the conservation and the use of natural resources. In addition, the project will establish and put into operation three (3) inter-institutional cooperation agreements with municipalities of the Jiquilisco Bay area to address threats in the PWII,

control of solid wastes		including solid waste management. Traditionally in the Jiquilisco Bay area, local communities have had limited participation in solid waste management. To reverse this, the project will focus on the areas within the Jiquilisco Bay that cannot be accessed by land and that have limited solid waste collection systems. Solid waste collection centers (inorganic and organic) will be established and composting activities will be implemented as part of organic waste management, with equal participation by men and women. Finally, an environmental education/awareness-raising program will contribute to reduce the inappropriate disposal of solid wastes that end up in the bay area.
Climate change effects	M	Through the establishment of three new PAs and the improved management effectiveness of three (3) PWII and their buffer areas, the project will increase protected habitat, providing additional refuge areas for numerous species facing potential events associated with climate change. The protection of mangroves and the development of sustainable use plans will contribute to mitigating the impacts from extreme hydrometeorological events associated with climate change, the reduction of their intensity, and the prevention of erosion with benefits for the wetlands, PAs, and associated biodiversity, as well as neighboring human settlements. The project will establish a climate change monitoring team for the PWIIs, which will develop early warning actions to mitigate impacts from flooding and landslides to the wetlands and the local populations.

*L = Low; M = Medium; H = High

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives:

8. In addition to the GEF financed initiatives identified during the PIF the project will closely coordinate actions with the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)-funded initiative (2015) for the sustainable management of Olomega Lake and the El Jocotal Lagoon PWIIs. Specifically, coordination and complementary actions will be sought for the control and removal of invasive species (i.e., water hyacinth and Neotropical cormorant) and for piloting small-scale operations for the recycling of related materials (e.g., productions of baskets and furniture from water hyacinth, and to use it as feed for livestock as part of a program with cattle ranchers for the prevention, reduction, and control of contamination). The final design of the GEF FSP included an analysis of the JICA contribution to the protection and management of the Olomega Lake PWII and El Jocotal Lagoon PWII and the incremental/additional reasoning for the GEF investment was updated accordingly. Both the JICA project and the GEF project proposed herein will be coordinated by the MARN through their Division of Ecosystems and Wildlife, which will facilitate the exchange of lessons learned and avoid duplication of efforts.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation

9. A Stakeholder Participation Plan was developed during preparation to ensure that all key stakeholders are effectively engaged in project implementation.

10. Objectives of the Stakeholder Participation Plan: The development of the stakeholder participation plan had the following objectives: a) to validate with local stakeholders, the proposed project activities, including the results framework; b) to identify the basic roles and responsibilities of the main participants in the project; c) to ensure full knowledge of those involved concerning the progress and obstacles in project development and to take advantage of the experience and skills of the participants to enhance project activities; and d) to identify key instances in the project cycle where stakeholder involvement would occur. The ultimate purpose of the stakeholder participation plan will be the long-term sustainability of the project outcomes, based on transparency and the effective participation of the key stakeholders.

Organizations consulted during the project design included the following (a complete list is included in the Project Document, Annex 8.4. Stakeholder Involvement Plan):

11. Public sector organizations: Local and/or national government entities, such as the Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources (MARN), Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG), Initiative Fund for the Americas El Salvador (FIAES), Río Lempa Hydroelectric Commission (CEL), the Social Investment Fund for Local Development

(FISDL), National Registration Center (CNR), the Ministry of Tourism (MITUR), the Prosecutor General’s Office (FGR), the National Civil Police (PNC), the Ministry of Governance and Land Development, and Local Governments.

12. Productive sector organizations: Productive/business organizations that may contribute and/or participate in the project, such as sugar cane/agro-industrial business owners, agriculture and fisheries cooperatives, and shrimp and salt producers who are classified as either medium- or small-scale producers.

13. Nonprofit organizations: Principally local nongovernmental organizations (NGOs)(e.g., the Salvadoran Center of Appropriate Technology [CESTA]; the Salvadoran Women’s Movement [MSM], and Health Promotion and Education [PROMESA]).

14. Community organizations: Community Development Associations (ADESCOs), water management councils, groups of women and children, and indigenous associations, which represent the indigenous groups present in the project area (the Lencas, Kakawira, and Nahuat Pipil) and which comprise 0.1% of the total population in the Jiquilisco Bay Complex PWII, 88% of whom live in rural areas.

Stakeholder Roles in Project Implementation:

Stakeholder/ Organization	Participation in the design of the project	Participation in the execution of the project
Public sector organizations		
Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources (MARN)	Focal Point of the Convention Relative to Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar) and the CBD; participated in the development of the PIF and the UNDP’s Project Document. Provide valuable information and technical support for the final design of the project.	As the Executing Institution of the Project, the MARN will provide the general oversight and coordination for the project. The MARN will serve as the Board Director; a member of the ministry staff will serve as the National Director of the Project and will be responsible for monitoring compliance and achieving the project’s objectives. The MARN will also be charged with promoting participation and cooperation among ministries and governmental and nongovernmental “key stakeholders,” which includes the development of the three PWII Management Plans, Governance Program, Business Plans, Strategies to Control Invasive Species, and Participatory Plans for the conservation and sustainable use of mangroves, among other actions. In addition, the MARN is responsible for the National System of Natural Protected Areas (NPAs) and will lead the process to create the management plans for selected NPAs and the protocols for implementation of the financial mechanisms in these territories. It will also work jointly with the tourism sector at the national level to confront the problem of financing as a potential path to the sustainable management of wetlands.
Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG)	Through its different offices, Center for Development of Fisheries and Aquaculture (CENDEPESCA) and the National Center for Agricultural and Forestry Technology (CENTA), the MAG is one of the most important partners in the management and conservation of biodiversity in the wetlands and buffer zones; and in relation to forest resources, the management of agricultural systems and fisheries production. The MAG collaborated extensively in the preparation of the project.	Artisanal fishing is practiced in virtually all of the wetlands, for this reason the MAG-CENDEPESCA is responsible for ensuring the proper management of the fishing resources and protection of the biodiversity. As such, the MAG-CENDEPESCA will play a key role in the implementation of land-based activities for controlling invasive species in the three PWII. In addition, the MAG-CENTA will play a central role in working with the key production sectors (sugar cane, livestock, agriculture) in the design of sustainable practices with regard to reducing the use of agrochemicals, soil and water conservation tasks, and the design of agroforestry systems. The MAG will also serve as coordinator of the design of the incentives program that includes green certification for reduced use of agrochemicals in sugar cane cultivation, small- and medium-scale agriculture, sustainable cattle ranching, and responsible fishing in the buffer zones of the five NPAs of the

		Jocotal Lagoon PWII, Olomega Lagoon PWII, and Jiquilisco Bay Lagoon PWII (Chaguantique, Normandía, and El Tercio).
10 municipalities	The municipalities have been important partners in the environmental management of the wetlands' buffer zones, and in the management and control of threats to biodiversity. They have also participated in activities for the control and eradication of invasive species and in the conservation of mangroves and freshwater forest. They actively participated in the provision of information during the preparatory stages of the project.	The municipalities or municipal associations (ASIBAHIA) and their municipal environmental offices (MEU) will be key collaborators for ensuring that awareness will be raised as well as the participation of local populations in the project activities within the geographic area of the PWII, since they currently participate in and have relationships built with numerous civil society organizations. In addition, the municipalities will be key partners in the development of long-term financing schemes for managing the NPAs in the wetlands, as they have access to various financing sources. The municipalities will also play an important role in representing the interests of the community in the development of protocols to reduce threats to biodiversity, especially in the reduction of solid wastes.
Ministry of Tourism (MITUR)	Drives initiatives of micro-, small-, and medium-scale businesses in the tourism sector. MITUR provided information for the design phase of the project.	During project implementation, MITUR can provide support in the determination of the technical and financial feasibility of public-private initiatives as mechanisms to mobilize resources that contribute to the sustainable development of the NPAs and PWII.
National Registration Center (CNR)	CNR has experience in the delineation process of the NPAs for the PACAP-MARN project, whose results have served to construct the project baseline.	CNR's participation is very relevant for the delineation process and declaration of new NPAs.
Initiative Fund for the Americas El Salvador (FIAES) and Río Lempa Hydroelectric Commission (CEL)	FIAES and CEL are important allies in the provision of financial resources for environmental compensation, given their mandate in the protection of natural resources and biodiversity in wetlands. They participated in providing information for the design phase of the project.	The participation of FIAES and CEL is fundamental in the follow-up and evaluation of the initiatives for validating the mechanisms related to environmental compensation in the framework of the Cooperation Agreements with the MARN.
Prosecutor General's Office (FGR) and National Civil Police (PNC)	FGR and PNC are partners in the processes of investigation, prevention, and compliance with sanctions for illegal environmental land use management.	FGR and PNC should be considered as partners in the design of the governance program, the standards for regulating human activities that affect the PWII, and the design of protocols to reduce threats to biodiversity in the PWII.
Private sector and Civil Society Organization (CSOs)		
Producers' Associations of the sugar cane, agricultural, and fisheries sectors	These associations were consulted regarding their current practices and their willingness to support new protocols and practices for managing biodiversity in the wetlands.	Companies and associations of the cultivation and processing of sugar cane (e.g., Salvadoran Sugar Company – CASSA; and the Salvadoran Sugar Association), agriculture, and livestock, and artisanal fishing sectors will be the focuses of the campaigns to raise awareness at the national level (marine-coastal zone) as well as in the PWII. Agricultural producers, cattle ranchers, and companies dedicated to sugar cane cultivation and processing will be involved in the development and application of new protocols for managing their production systems and standards to regulate human activities, particularly for the control of contamination threatening biodiversity. They will be beneficiaries of an incentives program to promote biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices, including the certification of biodiversity-friendly sugar cane cultivation.
Community-Led Initiatives for a Sustainable Future (ECOIVA)	Key partner in the design of the PPG phase, particularly for providing baseline information with regard to restoration of the mangrove forest.	This NGO will have a principal role in the development of capacities of the community and in environmental education activities in the Jiquilisco Bay Wetland Complex. It will also have a principal role in controlling invasive species and

		monitoring the status and trend of populations of mangroves in the restoration processes. The Mangrove Association will also be important in procuring financing for continuing the management actions and restoration of the mangroves in the future.
Asociación Intercomunal de Comunidades Unidas para el Desarrollo Económico y Social del Bajo Lempa (ACUDESBAL) and other community-level organizations: El Borbollón Municipality in El Jocotal Lagoon and Asociación de Desarrollo Comunal Maranata (ADESCOMAR) Olomega Lagoon	These are key institutions involved in the design of the project as they provided information about the organizational and production situations in the local communities as well as their expectations with regard to the project.	These organizations will be critically important for the technical aspects of biodiversity management practices in the fishing and agricultural sectors, particularly with regard to activities for controlling the use of agrochemicals and the development of local capacity in those areas. The social organizations will participate in the development of the management plans for current and new NPAs and in the development and implementation of activities to control invasive species.
Organizations to encourage the participation of women: Salvadoran Women's Movement (MSM) and Association for the Self-Determination and Development of the Salvadoran Women (AMS)	These are key institutions to mainstream the focus of gender equity into the design of the project. They provided baseline information about the participation of women in the management of biodiversity in wetlands.	Their role is very important to ensure the participation of women in the activities related to the reduction of threats to biodiversity, including the presence of invasive species, and the generation of solid and agrochemical wastes in the buffer zones of the PWII.
Representatives of Indigenous Communities	Indigenous community representatives provided baseline information with regard to indigenous populations in the geographic area of the three PWII.	Their role is important to ensure the participation of the indigenous communities in activities related to the reduction of threats to biodiversity, including the presence of invasive species, and the generation of solid and agrochemical wastes in the buffer zones of the PWII.
Other NGOs	NGOs are important partners given their experience and direct links to the communities and local governments in the management of the NPAs and the wetlands and their buffer areas. During the preparatory process of the project NGOs have been important sources of information for the baseline.	NGOs play a central role in procuring financing for the long-term management of the NPAs and PWII. They also provide technical experience for capacity building in the governance processes and for activities around control of threats to biodiversity in wetlands.

Participation Mechanisms:

15. Three key phases for stakeholders' participation have been identified for the implementation phase of the project: planning, implementation, and evaluation. **Project planning** will include annual meetings with key stakeholders (local communities, municipal authorities, private sectors, etc.) during which annual goals will be set for each component of the project. These annual planning meetings will also serve to specify the activities that are to be funded through each co-financing source. **Project implementation** will take place according to the annual plans that are approved by the SC, which will be formed by the following agencies: MARN, MAG, and the UNDP CO. The UNDP CO will be the Executing Agency. Local stakeholders (e.g., municipalities; Family, Community, and Life Cabinets; and members of collaborative management committees) will influence the project through their participation in the implementation of specific activities. **Project evaluation** will occur annually with the participation of key stakeholders at the end of each

planning year and previous to defining the annual plan for the following year of project implementation. Also, mid-term and final evaluations will be carried out as part of the project cycle. Due to the independent nature of these evaluations, they will be key moments during the project's life when stakeholders can express their views, concerns, and assess whether the project's outcomes are being achieved and if necessary, define the course of correction.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

16. The project will ensure the direct, free, and equal participation of local stakeholders (municipalities, local communities, and farmers) in the planning and implementation of biodiversity conservation, the planning and management of protected wetlands of international importance (PWII), and the reduction of threats to biodiversity, including the presence of invasive species and solid wastes and agrochemicals originating in the buffer areas of the PWII. The project will empower local communities and municipal authorities so that they become the principal facilitators of conservation efforts within the landscapes they inhabit. In addition, the project will provide economic opportunities equally to community members regardless of their situation, which will result from the tourism-related activities in the PWII and associated protected areas (PAs). Through the reduction of contamination of the wetlands and the control of invasive species, the project will have a positive impact on the well-being of the communities that are within or surrounding the PWII as well as increase the income of local groups that depend on the use of the associated natural resources (e.g., fishermen and craftswomen).

17. Gender aspects have been incorporated into the project design to ensure the equitable distribution of project benefits among men and women. Women will be an essential part of the development and implementation of participatory management plans for three PWII. Additionally, women will be the beneficiaries of training activities for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and wetland resources. Women who are small landowners will benefit from the implementation of best practices for the management of cattle ranching and agricultural wastes in three (3) PWII. In addition, women will be given the opportunity to participate in the implementation of a small-scale pilot operation to produce handicrafts (e.g., baskets and furniture) and paper using fiber from water hyacinth. The project will employ indicators (included in Annex A: Project Results Framework) to address issues of gender inequality and will identify any cultural, social, religious or other factors that may restrict women from participating in the project and develop strategies to overcome these limitations. During the PPG, a UNDP Gender Expert from the El Salvador Country Office provided guidance, reviewed documents, and participated in project design workshops to ensure that gender aspects were incorporated into the project design.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

18. The GEF strategy (i.e., GEF alternative scenario) for promoting the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance of ecosystem services through the creation of new PWII and the improved management effectiveness of existing protected wetlands will be more cost-effective in the short and long terms than the alternative approach (i.e., business-as-usual scenario) in which a weak institutional framework and limited planning and management capacities will prevail, thereby preventing the delivery of global environmental benefits. In line with the GEF Council's guidance on assessing the cost-effectiveness of projects (Cost-Effectiveness Analysis in GEF Projects, GEF/C.25/11, April 29, 2005), a qualitative approach to identifying the alternative with the best value and feasibility for achieving the project objective was used.

19. A strategy to improve management in order to increase the conservation, sustainable use of biodiversity, and maintenance of the ecosystem services of three existing PWII (Component 1) is likely to be far more cost-effective in the long term than the alternative approach that relies on a limited institutional and individual capacity for effective PWII management and for reducing current threats to biodiversity. If this project is not implemented, the scenario that will prevail is one where the expansion of agriculture, cattle-ranching, and other non-sustainable land use practices will continue to contribute to the loss and degradation of the wetlands and associated ecosystems within the PAs. Additionally, the financial sustainability of the PWII will continue to lag behind in conservation and management needs and these will continue to rely mostly on limited government funding. By strengthening the institutional capacity of the MARN through capacity-building for improved PWII management and implementation of planning, monitoring, and enforcement strategies and tools to reduce threats (e.g., habitat loss and ecosystem transformation, contamination [livestock waste, and household and urban solid waste], presence of invasive species, and climate change), the GEF

alternative will remove the barriers that limit effective PWII management and the conservation of globally important biodiversity.

20. The project's approach to the financial sustainability of the PWII will include securing new financial support from different sources including economic environmental compensation from local development projects and business plans for new and existing wetland PAs. The project will build on the country's tourism potential by attracting more visitors to the PWII; more specifically, the project will: a) pilot a visitor entrance fee scheme and will channelize revenues into existing wetland PAs; and b) establish PPP to increase revenue from tourism in the PWII. Currently, the MARN is not taking advantage of these financial mechanisms to support PWII management, they are inefficiently implemented, or none exist, such as in the case of PA entry fees. Without the project, it is very likely that this will continue to be the case with limited biodiversity conservation benefits.

21. The strategy to deliver multiple global environmental benefits (Component 2), is cost-effective as it will ensure the effective inter-institutional cooperation between national and local environmental authorities for: a) monitoring the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in at least three PAs; b) the reduction of contamination from unsustainable agriculture, cattle ranching, and household and urban sources; and c) the control of invasive species. Under the business-as-usual scenario, the delivery of multiple global environmental benefits (i.e., conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity of global importance) will remain unlikely and will prove to be costly over time, as efforts to reduce threats to PAs and PWII will continue to be isolated efforts.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

22. Project M&E will be conducted in accordance with the established UNDP and GEF procedures and will be provided by the project team and the UNDP Country Office (CO) with support from the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Unit (RCU) in Panama City. The Project Results Framework in Annex A provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The M&E plan includes an inception report, project implementation reviews, annual review reports, mid-term and final evaluations, and audits. The following sections outline the principle components of the M&E plan and indicative cost estimates related to M&E activities. The project's M&E plan will be presented and finalized in the Project Inception Report following a collective fine-tuning of indicators, means of verification, and the full definition of project staff M&E responsibilities.

Project Inception Phase

23. A **Project Inception Workshop (IW)** will be held within the first three (3) months of project start-up with the full project team, relevant Government of El Salvador counterparts, co-financing partners, the UNDP-CO, and representation from the UNDP-GEF RCU, as well as UNDP-GEF headquarters as appropriate.

24. A fundamental objective of this IW will be to help the project team to understand and take ownership of the project's goal and objectives, as well as finalize preparation of the project's first annual work plan on the basis of the Project Results Framework and GEF Tracking Tool for Biodiversity (BD-1). This will include reviewing the results framework (indicators, means of verification, and assumptions), imparting additional detail as needed, and on the basis of this exercise, finalizing the Annual Work Plan (AWP) with precise and measurable performance indicators, and in a manner consistent with the expected outcomes for the project.

25. Additionally, the purpose and objective of the IW will be to: a) introduce project staff to the UNDP-GEF team that will support the project during its implementation, namely the CO and responsible RCU staff; b) detail the roles, support services, and complementary responsibilities of UNDP-CO and RCU staff in relation to the project team; c) provide a detailed overview of UNDP-GEF reporting and M&E requirements, with particular emphasis on the Annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) and related documentation, the Annual Project Report (APR), as well as Mid-term and Final evaluations. Equally, the IW will provide an opportunity to inform the project team on UNDP project-related budgetary planning, budget reviews including arrangements for annual audit, and mandatory budget re-phrasings.

26. The IW will also provide an opportunity for all parties to understand their roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference (ToR) for project staff and decision-making structures will be discussed, as

needed, in order to clarify each party's responsibilities during the project's implementation phase. The IW will also be used to plan and schedule the Tripartite Committee (TC) Reviews.

Monitoring Responsibilities and Events

27. A detailed schedule of project review meetings will be developed by the project management in consultation with project implementation partners and stakeholder representatives and incorporated in the Project Inception Report. Such a schedule will include: a) tentative timeframes for TC Reviews, Steering Committee (SC) (or relevant advisory and/or coordination mechanisms); and b) project-related M&E activities.

28. **Day-to-day monitoring** of implementation progress will be the responsibility of the PC based on the project's AWP and its indicators. The PC will inform the UNDP-CO of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely and remedial fashion. The PC will fine-tune the progress and performance/impact indicators of the project in consultation with the full project team at the IW with support from UNDP-CO and assisted by the UNDP-GEF RCU. Specific targets for the first-year implementation progress indicators together with their means of verification will be developed at this workshop. These will be used to assess whether implementation is proceeding at the intended pace and in the right direction and will form part of the AWP. Targets and indicators for subsequent years will be defined annually as part of the internal evaluation and planning processes undertaken by the project team.

29. Measurement of impact indicators related to global benefits will occur according to the schedules defined through specific studies that are to form part of the project's activities and specified in the Project Results Framework.

30. **Periodic monitoring** of implementation progress will be undertaken by the UNDP-CO through quarterly meetings with the project implementation team, or more frequently as deemed necessary. This will allow parties to take stock of and to troubleshoot any problems pertaining to the project in a timely fashion to ensure the timely implementation of project activities. The UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RCU, as appropriate, will conduct yearly visits to the project's field sites, or more often based on an agreed upon schedule to be detailed in the project's Inception Report and AWPs to assess first-hand project progress. Any other member of the SC can also take part in these trips, as decided by the SC. A Field Visit Report will be prepared by the UNDP-CO and circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team, all SC members, and UNDP-GEF.

31. **Annual monitoring** will occur through the TC Reviews. This is the highest policy-level meeting of the parties directly involved in the implementation of a project. The project will be subject to TC review at least once every year. The first such meeting will be held within the first twelve (12) months of the start of full implementation. The project proponent will prepare an APR and submit it to UNDP-CO and the UNDP-GEF regional office at least two weeks prior to the TC for review and comments.

32. The APR will be used as one of the basic documents for discussions in the TC. The PC will present the APR to the TC, highlighting policy issues and recommendations for the decision of the TC participants. The PC will also inform the participants of any agreement reached by stakeholders during the APR preparation on how to resolve operational issues. Separate reviews of each project component may also be conducted if necessary. The TC has the authority to suspend disbursement if project performance benchmarks are not met. Benchmarks will be developed at the IW, based on delivery rates and qualitative assessments of achievements of outputs.

33. The **Terminal TC Review** is held in the last month of project operations. The PC is responsible for preparing the Terminal Report and submitting it to UNDP-CO and to UNDP-GEF RCU. It shall be prepared in draft at least two months in advance of the TC meeting in order to allow review, and will serve as the basis for discussions in the TC meeting. The terminal TC review considers the implementation of the project as a whole, paying particular attention to whether the project has achieved its stated objectives and contributed to the broader environmental objective. It decides whether any actions are still necessary, particularly in relation to sustainability of project results, and acts as a vehicle through which lessons learned can be captured to feed into other projects being implemented.

Project Monitoring Reporting

34. The TC, in conjunction with the UNDP-GEF extended team, will be responsible for the preparation and submission of the following reports that form part of the monitoring process and that are mandatory.

35. A Project **Inception Report** (IR) will be prepared immediately following the IW. It will include a detailed First Year/AWP divided in quarterly timeframes detailing the activities and progress indicators that will guide implementation during the first year of the project. This work plan will include the dates of specific field visits, support missions from the UNDP-CO or the RCU or consultants, as well as timeframes for meetings of the project's decision-making structures. The IR will also include the detailed project budget for the first full year of implementation, prepared on the basis of the AWP, and including any M&E requirements to effectively measure project performance during the targeted 12-month timeframe. The IR will include a more detailed narrative on the institutional roles, responsibilities, coordinating actions, and feedback mechanisms of project-related partners. In addition, a section will be included on progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities and an update of any changed external conditions that may affect project implementation. When finalized, the IR will be circulated to project counterparts who will be given a period of one calendar month in which to respond with comments or queries. Prior to the IR's circulation, the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF's RCU will review the document.

36. The **Annual Project Report** (APR) is a UNDP requirement and part of UNDP-CO central oversight, monitoring, and project management. It is a self-assessment report by the project management to the CO and provides input to the country office reporting process and the Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR), as well as forming a key input to the TC Review. An APR will be prepared on an annual basis prior to the TC review, to reflect progress achieved in meeting the project's AWP and assess performance of the project in contributing to intended outcomes through outputs and partnership work. The format of the APR is flexible but should include the following sections: a) project risks, issues, and adaptive management; b) project progress against pre-defined indicators and targets, c) outcome performance; and d) lessons learned and best practices.

37. The **Project Implementation Review** (PIR) is an annual monitoring process mandated by the GEF. It has become an essential management and monitoring tool for project managers and offers the main vehicle for extracting lessons from ongoing projects. Once the project has been under implementation for one year, a PIR must be completed by the CO together with the project management. The PIR can be prepared any time during the year and ideally prior to the TC review. The PIR should then be discussed in the TC meeting so that the result would be a PIR that has been agreed upon by the project, the Implementing Partner, UNDP-CO, and the RCU in Panama. The individual PIRs are collected, reviewed, and analyzed by the RCU prior to sending them to the focal area clusters at the UNDP-GEF headquarters. In light of the similarities of both APR and PIR, UNDP-GEF has prepared a harmonized format for reference.

38. Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform and the risk log should be regularly updated in ATLAS based on the initial risk analysis included in Annex 8.1 of the UNDP Project Document.

39. **Specific Thematic Reports** focusing on specific issues or areas of activity will be prepared by the project team when requested by UNDP, UNDP-GEF, or the Implementing Partner. The request for a Thematic Report will be provided to the project team in written form by UNDP and will clearly state the issue or activities that need to be reported on. These reports can be used as a form of lessons learned exercise, specific oversight in key areas, or as troubleshooting exercises to evaluate and overcome obstacles and difficulties encountered. UNDP is requested to minimize its requests for Thematic Reports, and when such are necessary will allow reasonable timeframes for their preparation by the project team.

40. A **Project Terminal Report** will be prepared by the project team during the last three (3) months of the project. This comprehensive report will summarize all activities, achievements, and outputs of the project; lessons learned; objectives met or not achieved; structures and systems implemented, etc.; and will be the definitive statement of the project's activities during its lifetime. It will also layout recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's activities.

41. **Technical Reports** are detailed documents covering specific areas of analysis or scientific specializations within the overall project. As part of the IR, the project team will prepare a draft Reports List detailing the technical reports that are expected to be prepared on key areas of activity during the course of the project, and tentative due dates. Where necessary this Reports List will be revised and updated, and included in subsequent APRs. Technical Reports may also be prepared by external consultants and should be comprehensive and specialized analyses of clearly defined areas of research within the framework of the project and its sites. These technical reports will represent, as appropriate, the project's substantive contribution to specific areas, and will be used in efforts to disseminate relevant information and

best practices at local, national, and international levels. Technical Reports have a broader function and the frequency and nature is project-specific.

42. **Project Publications** will form a key method of crystallizing and disseminating the results and achievements of the project. These publications may be scientific or informational texts on the activities and achievements of the project in the form of journal articles or multimedia publications. These publications can be based on Technical Reports, depending upon the relevance and scientific worth of these reports, or may be summaries or compilations of a series of Technical Reports and other research. The project team will determine if any of the Technical Reports merit formal publication, and (in consultation with UNDP, the Government of El Salvador, and other relevant stakeholder groups) will also plan and produce these publications in a consistent and recognizable format. Project resources will need to be defined and allocated for these activities as appropriate and in a manner commensurate with the project's budget

Independent Evaluation

43. The project will be subjected to at least two independent external evaluations as follows:

44. An independent **Mid-Term Evaluation** will be undertaken at exactly the mid-point of the project lifetime. The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency, and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation, and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, ToR, and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The ToR for this Mid-Term Evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP-CO based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF RCU. The management response of the evaluation will be uploaded to the UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). All GEF Tracking Tools for the project will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle.

45. An independent **Final Evaluation** will take place three months prior to the terminal Steering Committee meeting, and will focus on the same issues as the Mid-Term Evaluation. The Final Evaluation will also look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. The Final Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response, which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the UNDP ERC. The ToR for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP-CO based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF RCU. All GEF Tracking Tools for the project will also be completed during the final evaluation.

Audit Clause

46. The project will be audited in accordance with the UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies.

Learning and Knowledge Sharing

47. Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through a number of existing information sharing networks and forums. In addition, the project will participate, as relevant and appropriate, in UNDP-GEF sponsored networks, organized for Senior Personnel working on projects that share common characteristics. UNDP-GEF RCU has established an electronic platform for sharing lessons between the project managers. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based, and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation through lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Identifying and analyzing lessons learned is an ongoing process, and the need to communicate such lessons as one of the project's central contributions is a requirement to be delivered not less frequently than once every twelve (12) months. UNDP-GEF shall provide a format and assist the project team in categorizing, documenting, and reporting on lessons learned. Specifically, the project will ensure coordination in terms of avoiding overlap, sharing best practices, and generating knowledge products of best practices for biodiversity conservation with the current projects of El Salvador's portfolio.

M&E work plan and budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$*		Time frame
Inception Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator UNDP CO UNDP GEF 	GEF: \$1,000 COF: \$1,000		Within first two months of project start-up
Inception Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Team UNDP CO 	None		Immediately following IW
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP GEF Regional Technical Advisor/Project Coordinator will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members 	To be determined during the initial phase of implementation of the project and the IW.		Start, mid-point, and end of project
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance (measured on an annual basis)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversight by Project Coordinator Project Team 	No separate M&E cost: to be absorbed within salary and travel costs of project staff		Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
APR and PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator and Team UNDP-CO UNDP-GEF 	None		Annually
Tripartite Committee Reviews and Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government of El Salvador counterparts UNDP CO UNDP GEF RCU 	None		Annually, upon receipt of APR
Project Board Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator UNCP-CO Government of El Salvador representatives 	GEF: \$1,540 COF: \$1,540		Two times per year
Quarterly progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator and Team 	None		Quarterly
Technical reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator and Team Hired consultants as needed 	GEF: \$4,000 COF: \$4,000		To be determined by Project Team and UNDP-CO
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator and Team UNDP- CO UNDP-GEF RCU External Consultants (i.e., evaluation team) 	GEF: \$23,600 COF: \$10,000		At the mid-point of project implementation
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator and Team UNDP- CO UNDP-GEF RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	GEF: \$29,325 COF: \$15,000		At least three months before the end of project implementation
Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Team UNDP-CO Hired consultants as needed 	None		At least three months before the end of the project
Lessons learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator and Team UNDP-GEF RCU (suggested formats for documenting best practices, etc.) 	GEF: \$3,000 COF: \$2,000		Yearly
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP-CO Project Coordinator and Team 	GEF: \$10,960 (\$2,740 per year)		Yearly
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP-CO UNDP-GEF RCU (as appropriate) Government of El Salvador representatives 	No separate M&E cost: paid from IA fees and operational budget		Yearly
TOTAL INDICATIVE COST (*Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses)	GEF		\$73,425	
	Cofinancing		\$33,540	
	Total		\$106,965	


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Herman Rosa Chávez	Minister	Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources	February 6, 2014

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP-GEF, Executive Coordinator		1 st December 2015	Santiago Carrizosa, Senior Technical Advisor, EBD	+507 302-4510	Santiago.carrizosa@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).

	Indicator	Baseline	Goal (of the Indicator)	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions
<p>Project Objective: Promote the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance of ecosystem services through the creation of new protected wetlands of international importance (PWII) and the improved management of existing protected wetlands.</p>	<p>Coverage (ha) of the National System of Protected Areas resulting from the creation of three (3) new multiple-use protected areas (MUPAs)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 95,785.61 ha 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 133,495.07 ha (37,709.46 new ha) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Official gazette - Technical reports and publications of the the MARN - Project monitoring and evaluation reports - National Registration Center (CNR) cadastral records 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a local and national commitment to create three new multiple-use PAs - Environmental variability, including climate change within normal ranges - Effective protection and control measures - Sampling efforts are optimal
	<p>Presence of key indicator species in four (4) PAs in the Jiquilisco Bay and Jocotal Lagoon HPII Complex in the lower watershed of the San Miguel Río Grande</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Normandía and Chaguantique PA: <i>Amazona auropalliata</i>, <i>Ateles geoffroyi</i> - El Tercio PA: <i>Crocodylus acutus</i> - Jiquilisco Bay Area (includes San Sebastián Island): <i>Andara grandis</i>, <i>Amazona auropalliata</i>, <i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i> and <i>Crocodylus acutus</i> - Jocotal Lagoon Area: <i>Amazona auropalliata</i>, <i>Crocodylus acutus</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Normandía and Chaguantique PA: <i>Amazona auropalliata</i>, <i>Ateles geoffroyi</i> - El Tercio PA: <i>Crocodylus acutus</i> - Jiquilisco Bay Area (includes San Sebastián Island): <i>Andara grandis</i>, <i>Amazona auropalliata</i>, <i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i> and <i>Crocodylus acutus</i> - Jocotal Lagoon Area: <i>Amazona auropalliata</i>, <i>Crocodylus acutus</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Biological censuses and field notes - Monitoring reports/databases 	
	<p>Change in the management effectiveness of three (3) PWIIs measured through the METT scorecard</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jiquilisco Bay PWII: 49% - Olomega Lake PWII: 33% - Jocotal Lagoon PWII: 31% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jiquilisco Bay PWII: 59% - Olomega Lake PWII: 43% - Jocotal Lagoon PWII: 41% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updated METT - Project monitoring and evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations 	
	<p>Change in the financial sustainability of three (3) PWIIs according to that established through the total average score in the UNDP/GEF Financial Sustainability Scorecard</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal, regulatory, and institutional framework: 30% - Business planning and tools for managing cost-effectiveness: 8% - Tools for income generation and allocation: 17% - Total: 20% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal, regulatory, and institutional framework: 46% - Business planning and tools for managing cost-effectiveness: 42% - Tools for income generation and allocation: 34% - Total: 41% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updated Financial Sustainability Scorecard - Project monitoring and evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations 	

<p>Outcome 1: Expanded protected wetland coverage and strengthened institutional and individual capacities for the effective management of PWIIs.</p>	<p>Representativeness (%) of the wetland ecosystems in the National System of Natural Protected Areas by wetland type</p>	<p>– X% (The baseline and target will be determined during the first year of project implementation using LIDAR images obtained as part of the MARN cofinancing)</p>	<p>– Baseline + X%</p>	<p>– GIS databases and maps – Technical reports and scientific publications – Executive decrees declaring PAs</p>	<p>– There is willingness by the decision-makers to declare new wetland PAs</p>
	<p>Number of new wetland PAs that form part of the National System of Natural Protected Areas</p>	<p>– Zero (0)</p>	<p>– Three (3): <u>1. Jiquilisco Bay Islands:</u> 40 islands and the water body surrounding them; <u>2. Olomega Complex:</u> Olomeguita Island, Tierra Blanca, and the La Chiricana or San Antonio Silva area; <u>3. Islas del Golfo de Fonseca Gulf Islands:</u> Four (4) islands (Martín Pérez, Pirigallo or Meanguerita, Ica, and Isla Periquito islands) and areas surrounding the Meanguera Island</p>	<p>– Proposals for the creation of new wetland PAs – Official gazette</p>	
	<p>Change in the capacity development indicators for the sustainable management of the PWIIs according to the total score of the UNDP-GEF Capacity Development Scorecard</p>	<p><u>National Government</u> - MARN*: 45.24% - MAG**: 54.76% <u>Local Government</u> - Jiquilisco MEU: 30.95% - San Dionisio MEU: 35.71% - Concepción Batres MEU: 28.57% - Jucuarán MEU: 28.57% - El Tránsito MEU: 33.33% - ASIBAHIA: 33.33% <u>Multi-stakeholder platforms</u> - Jiquilisco Bay Territorial Action Group (GAT-CBJ): 40.48%</p> <p>*General Directorate of Ecosystems and Wildlife (DGEVS); Wetlands, Natural Protected Areas, and Biological Corridor Unit;</p>	<p><u>National Government</u> - MARN*: 66.67% - MAG**: 66.67% <u>Local Government</u> - Jiquilisco MEU: 57.14% - San Dionisio MEU: 57.14% - Concepción Batres MEU: 54.76% - Jucuarán MEU: 57.14% - El Tránsito MEU: 59.52% - ASIBAHIA: 54.76% <u>Multi-stakeholder platforms</u> - Jiquilisco Bay Territorial Action Group (GAT-CBJ): 57.14%</p> <p>* DGEVS; Wetlands, Natural Protected Areas, and Biological Corridor Unit; Resources Protection Unit; DGGA; Environmental Assessment and Compliance; General</p>	<p>– Updated Capacity Development Scorecard updated – Project monitoring and evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations</p>	<p>– National technical staff apply new knowledge and skills in an appropriate manner – There is stability in the human resources within the national agencies that benefit from the capacity-building activities</p>

	Resources Protection Unit; General Directorate of Environmental Governance (DGGG); Environmental Assessment and Compliance; General Directorate of Citizen and Municipal Services ** General Directorate of Forest, Watershed, and Irrigation Planning	Directorate of Citizen and Municipal Services ** General Directorate of Forest, Watershed, and Irrigation Planning		
Number of staff from the MARN, municipalities, the MAG, and local organizations, including women, trained in the sustainable management of the PWIIs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MARN: 0 - MAG: 0 <u>Local Government</u> - Jiquilisco MEU: 0 - Puerto El Triunfo MEU: 0 - San Dionisio MEU: 0 - Concepción Batres MEU: 0 - Jucuarán MEU: 0 - El Tránsito MEU: 0 - San Miguel MEU: 0 - Chirilagua MEU: 0 - El Carmen MEU: 0 - Local Environmental Police: 10 - Navy: 0 - ASIBAHIA: 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MARN: 20 - MAG: 6 <u>Local Government</u> - Jiquilisco MEU: 2 - Puerto El Triunfo MEU: 2 - San Dionisio MEU: 2 - Concepción Batres MEU: 2 - Jucuarán MEU: 2 - El Tránsito MEU: 2 - San Miguel MEU: 2 - Chirilagua MEU: 2 - El Carmen MEU: 2 - Local Environmental Police: 10 - Navy: 4 - ASIBAHIA: 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minutes and databases from project training events - Project monitoring and evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations 	
Change in the financial gap (USD) to cover the basic management costs of the three (3) PWIIs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jiquilisco Bay PWII: \$222,160 - El Jocotal Lagoon PWII: \$173,199 - Olomega Lagoon PWII: \$244,677 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jiquilisco Bay PWII: \$166,620 - HPII Laguna El Jocotal: \$129,899 - Olomega Lagoon PWII: \$183,508 (Reduction of 25% in each of the three cases) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updated Financial Sustainability Scorecard - Annual financial balances - Project monitoring and evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stable national and international economic conditions allow a sustained flow of new resources - Effective capture and channeling of new resources to finance PWII management, including agreement by MARN that new revenues from gate
Number of environmental compensation agreements established	- 0	- 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Signed agreements - Execution reports - Technical documents (economic valuations, analysis of protocols) 	

	Total annual revenue generation for three (3) PWIIs disaggregated by source	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environmental economic compensation: \$0 - Entry fees for visitors: \$0 - PPP: \$0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environmental economic compensation: \$100,000 - Entry fees for visitors: \$30,000 - PPP: \$30,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial Sustainability Scorecard updated - Annual financial balances - Project monitoring and evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and financial evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> fees and PPPs can be fully retained by the individual PAs in which they are generated. - Income from compensation is also reinvested inside the target PAs and includes sufficient surplus for proactive management of PAs beyond what is needed to prevent negative impacts from new developments.
Outputs:					
<p>1.1. Three (3) new multiple-use PAs gazzeted: a) Jiquilisco Bay wetland (40 islands and surrounding waters); b) Islas de Golfo de Fonseca (Martín Pérez Island, Pirigallo or Meanguerita Island, Ilca Island, Periquito Island and part of the surroundings of Meanguera Island); c) Olomega Complex (Olomeguita Island, Tierra Blanca, and sectors of the La Chiricana or San Antonio Silva).</p> <p>1.2. Management plans for up to three (3) PWIIs updated or developed.</p> <p>1.3. Wetlands inventory for El Salvador is updated.</p> <p>1.4. The institutional and individual capacities of the MARN and other relevant institutions within the SIMANA (municipalities and the MAG) strengthened, contributing to the sustainable management of the PWIIs.</p> <p>1.5. Properly equipped wetland staff and volunteers enable the timely detection and notification of floods and landslides associated with climate change in three (3) PWIIs.</p> <p>1.6. Local governance program empowers local communities and municipal authorities to sustainably manage the PWIIs.</p> <p>1.7. Economic environmental compensation from local development projects that alter the surrounding environment support PWII management.</p> <p>1.8. Business plans for new and existing wetland PAs developed.</p> <p>1.9. Financial mechanisms are validated onsite and serve to increase the level of funding for three (3) PWIIs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visitor entrance fee scheme piloted and revenues channelized into existing wetland PAs. • PPP increases revenues from tourism in wetland PAs. 					
Outcome 2: Addressing threats to biodiversity, including the presence of invasive species and solid waste and agrochemicals originating in the buffer areas of the PWIIs.	Number of inter-institutional cooperation agreements established and operating for the management of the PWIIs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Three (3) municipal agreements for managing invasive species. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Three (3) municipal agreements for managing invasive species and solid waste. - Three (3) new agreements with MAG, MOP, and CEL. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agreements signed and made official (MARN, MAG, MOP, CEL, and municipalities) - Meeting minutes (attendance list, photographs, and event notes developed) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a will among the parties for inter-institutional cooperation (signing of agreements and implementation) for the management of the PWIIs. - Changes in the municipal

					administrations involved do not affect the established agreements.
Number of farms implementing best practices for the management of cattle ranching wastes in three (3) PWIIs, including farms run by women.	- 0	- 20		- Reports and field notes/measurements, including information about women's participation in initiatives to control contamination - Databases of the benefitting farms	- Sampling efforts are optimal - Effective monitoring, control, and surveillance - Community leaders, NGOs, the private sector, and the municipalities provide support for the control of invasive species
Number of farms implementing best practices for the management of agricultural wastes in three (3) PWIIs, including farms run by women.	- 0	- 60		- Technical reports about the quality of the sites	
Solid waste accumulated (kg/ha) in the Jiquilisco Bay PWII	- X (Baseline and target will be established during the first year of the project)	- Baseline - X (a reduction of 50% is estimated)			
Volume (tons/year) of water hyacinth (<i>Eichornia crassipes</i>) removed from the Olomega Lagoon and Jocotal Lagoon PWIIs	- 0	- 2,000 tons/year per wetland		- Reports and field notes/measurements - Databases - Project annual technical reports	
Abundance (number of individuals) of the cormorant duck (<i>Phalacrocorax brasilianus</i>) in the Olomega Lagoon, the Jocotal Lagoon, and the Jiquilisco Bay PWIIs	- Jocotal Lagoon PWII: X - Jiquilisco Bay PWII: X - Olomega Lagoon PWII: X (Baseline and target will be established during the first year of the project)	- Jocotal Lagoon PWII: Baseline - X - Jiquilisco Bay PWII: Baseline - X - Olomega Lagoon PWII: Baseline - X		- Reports and field notes/measurements Databases - Project technical reports	
Coverage of mangroves in the Jiquilisco Bay PWII and associated freshwater lagoons	- 18,720 ha	- 18,720 ha		- Remote sensing data - Maps - Technical documents (FIR)	- There is a commitment at the local level and by the productive sectors for the

					conservation and sustainable use of mangroves in the Jiquilisco Bay PWII and associated freshwater lagoons – Environmental variability, including climate change, is within the normal range – Effective control and surveillance
--	--	--	--	--	---

Outputs:

- 2.1. Six (6) inter-institutional cooperation agreements (MARN, MAG, CEL, MOP, and the municipalities) established, including conservation and management committees for monitoring the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in at least three (3) PAs of the Jocotal and the Jiquilisco Bay PWIIs.
- 2.2. Program for the prevention, reduction, and control of contamination stemming from agricultural activities (e.g., agrochemicals and manure) and human settlements (solid wastes) in two PWIIs (Jiquilisco Bay and Jocotal Lagoon) and their buffer areas defined jointly with the municipalities, local communities, and the private sector.
- 2.3. Incentives program, including green certification for reduced use of agrochemicals in sugar cane cultivation and sustainable livestock management, promotes biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices and water-related resource use in the buffer areas of five (5) PAs of the Jocotal Lagoon and the Jiquilisco Bay PWIIs.
- 2.4. Standards in place to regulate human activities that affect the PWIIs.
- 2.5. Information monitoring system in place facilitates decision making to reduce the threats to three (3) PWIIs and articulated with the EIS of the MARN.
- 2.6. Protocol developed to reduce the threats to biodiversity in PWIIs, including contamination from agrochemicals, livestock waste, and household and urban solid waste.
- 2.7. Strategies for controlling invasive species (water hyacinth [*Eichornia crassipes*] and the Neotropic cormorant [*Phalacrocorax brasilianus*]) piloted in three (3) PWIIs and their buffer areas: Jiquilisco Bay Complex, the Olomega Lake, and the Jocotal Lagoon.
- 2.8. Participatory plans developed for the conservation and sustainable use of mangroves and floodplain forest in the Jiquilisco Bay and associated freshwater lagoons in the lower Rio Grande de San Miguel watershed.
- 2.9. Participatory rehabilitation of at least 500 ha of dry forest associated with mangroves allows the protection of key habitat for migratory species.

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

Reviewer's comments	Responses	Reference
Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion: March 20, 2014; March 26, 2014		
<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p> <p>Adequate, but improve this considerably by the time of CEO endorsement</p>	<p>As suggested, the analysis of the global environmental benefits to be delivered by the project was improved. During the PPG, assessments regarding the biodiversity present in each of the three prioritized PWIIs that will benefit from the project were completed. In addition, the baseline and targets of project benefits were updated and/or established and incorporated as part of the final project design.</p> <p>With regard to the incremental/additional reasoning, the baseline investments were revised during the PPG and the barriers were validated. It should be mentioned that as part of the baseline, the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) will finance an initiative for the sustainable management of the Olomega Lake PWII and the El Jocotal Lagoon PWII. The final design of the GEF FSP included an analysis of the JICA contribution to the protection and management of these two PWIIs and the incremental/additional reasoning for the GEF investment was updated. This included updating some of the project's outputs as outlined in Section A.5. Incremental/Additional cost reasoning of this CEO Endorsement Request. The detailed project strategy (i.e., GEF increment) is described in the UNDP Project Document, Section 2.4. Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities.</p>	<p>– CEO Endorsement Request, Section Incremental/ Additional cost reasoning</p> <p>– Project Document Section 2.4. Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities</p>
STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF). Date of screening: May 03, 2014		
<p>1. Overall, the project framework is coherent and well structured. The links between the problem, barriers and the proposed outcomes and outputs are understood but could be made clearer. STAP would propose that the Objective be reworded to reflect the GEBs of the wetlands. Some items listed as Outputs (such as under 1.1.1 scientific characterization, local consultations, boundary demarcation) are not specifically Outputs in the view of this reviewer, rather activities leading to an Output. In addition, there is also some confusion between outcomes and indicators, which should be revisited in the preparation of the final project document. For example, Outcome 2.1 should be related to the improvement in the coordination of efforts among relevant authorities who influence the management of wetlands and the PAs</p>	<p>The Objective has been retained, but the GEBs are now more clearly highlighted at several points in the Project Document and as described in Part II, Section A.5 of this CEO Endorsement Request.</p> <p>Output 1.1.1 was reworded as follows: <i>Three new multiple-use PAs gazetted.</i></p> <p>In addition, as the reviewer acknowledges, further work on the indicators and overall results framework was undertaken during the PPG. As suggested, Outcome 2.1 was related to the improvement in the coordination of efforts among relevant authorities who influence the management of wetlands and the PAs as follows: Three (3) municipal cooperation agreements and three (3) new cooperation agreements among MARN and MAG, MOP, and CEL established and operating contribute to the continued presence of key indicator species in four (4) protected areas (PAs) in the Jiquilisco Bay Complex and Jocotal Lagoon PWIIs in the lower watershed of the San Miguel Río Grande: a) Normandía and Chaguantique PA: <i>Amazona auropalliata</i>, <i>Ateles geoffroyi</i>; b) El Tercio PA: <i>Crocodylus acutus</i>; c) Jiquilisco Bay Area (includes San Sebastián Island): <i>Andara grandis</i>, <i>Amazona</i></p>	<p>– CEO Endorsement Request, Part II, Section A.5 of this Project Framework Document Annex A: Results Framework Part II, Section Incremental/Additional cost reasoning.</p>

<p>(identified as Barrier 2). What is presented as Outcome 2.1 in the proposal is that numbers of yet to be determined key indicator species remains stable. In this regard, the focus of Component 2 could be adjusted to address the identified barrier the lack of coordination among relevant authorities. It is acknowledged that further work on the indicators and overall results framework will be undertaken during the PPG.</p>	<p><i>auropalliata</i>, <i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i> and <i>Crocodylus acutus</i>; and d) Jocotal Lagoon Area: <i>Amazona auropalliata</i>, <i>Crocodylus acutus</i>.</p>	
<p>2. The overall problem, threats, and principal barriers are well defined and described. While the root causes are not presented explicitly, they are integrated for the most part into the table of barriers (par. 7). In addition, the baseline activities are well summarized, as is the baseline scenario. The GEBs are evident although at times these are inferred rather than explicit. The incremental cost reasoning is presented clearly.</p>	<p>As suggested, the root causes were made explicit in the UNDP Project Document; these include: a) Poverty and population growth; b) Uncontrolled expansion of the agriculture, aquaculture, cattle ranching, and urban areas; c) Lack of harmonization of national policies, regulations, and sectoral laws; d) Institutional weakness for effective monitoring and control; and e) Deficient regulation of land use, water, and the extraction of natural resources. Please refer to Section 1.2: Threats to biodiversity, impacts, and root causes of the Project Document for a detailed description of the root causes.</p> <p>In addition, a more detailed and precise description of the GEBs was completed during the PPG and included in Section A.5. Incremental/Additional cost reasoning of this CEO Endorsement Request.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – CEO Endorsement Request, Section A.5: Incremental /Additional cost reasoning – Project Document, Section 1.2: Threats to biodiversity, impacts, and root causes
<p>3. The proposed project presents elements, which are innovative, at least at the national level. The rationale for expecting sustainability of the project's results is outlined adequately and the project has potential for scaling up at the regional level.</p>	<p>Thank you to the reviewer for his/her comment.</p>	
<p>4. The primary stakeholders are clearly defined as are their roles. No discussion is presented, however, on how gender considerations will be integrated into the project's further design and implementation. This will require consideration during the PPG.</p>	<p>Gender aspects have been incorporated into the project design to ensure the equitable distribution of project benefits between men and women. During the PPG, a UNDP Gender Expert from the El Salvador Country Office provided guidance, reviewed documents, and participated in project design workshops to ensure that gender aspects were incorporated into the project design.</p> <p>Genders aspects to strengthen social and environmental sustainability have been considered as part of the UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards (SES) for project implementation. The project will achieve the following: a) employ indicators (included in Annex A: Project Results Framework) to address issues of gender inequality; 2) identify any cultural, social, religious, or other factors that may restrict women from participating and develop strategies to overcome these limitations; and c) ensure that the project reaches a score of at least 2 in UNDP ATLAS Gender Marker (outputs that have gender equality as a "significant" objective).</p> <p>Women will be an essential part of the development and implementation of participatory management plans for</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – CEO Endorsement Request, Section B.2: Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions – Project Document, throughout – Social and Environmental Screening Report for UNDP PIMS 5257

	three (3) PWIIs. Additionally, women will be the beneficiaries of training activities for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and wetland resources. Women who are small landowners will benefit from the implementation of best practices for the management of cattle ranching and agricultural wastes in three (3) PWIIs. Women will be given the opportunity to participate in the implementation of a small-scale pilot operation to produce handicrafts (e.g., baskets and furniture) and paper using fiber from the water hyacinth.	
5. The presented risks are realistically defined and assessed and the proposed mitigation measures are reasonable. Climate change is recognized as one of the risks “as the likely future effects of climate change in El Salvador are significant to extreme. However, there are undoubtedly other risks than those presented. While lack of consensus in dealing with invasive species is identified as a risk, other previously identified threats and pressures and how they may pose a risk are not identified or addressed. On page 5, par, 4, 8 threats are identified. Some of these will present risks that are different from "lack of consensus." These should be defined and assessed including realistic mitigation measures proposed for managing them.	Projects risk were revised and updated as suggested. Please refer to Section A.6. of this CEO Endorsement Request regarding project risks and measures that address these risks.	– CEO Endorsement Request, Section .6: Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks of this CEO Endorsement Request
6. This project should dovetail well with other relevant initiatives, although the precise nature of coordinating mechanisms or processes will need to be defined during the PPG.	In addition to the GEF-financed initiatives identified during the PIF, which were validated during the PPG, the project will closely coordinate actions with the JICA-funded initiative (2015) for the sustainable management of the Olomega Lake and El Jocotal Lagoon PWIIs. Specifically, coordination and complementary actions will be sought for the control and removal of invasive species (i.e., water hyacinth and Neotropical cormorant) and for piloting small-scale operations for the recycling of related materials (e.g., p baskets and furniture from water hyacinth, use of the water hyacinth to feed livestock as part of a program with cattle ranchers for the prevention, reduction, and control of contamination). Both the JICA project and the GEF project proposed herein will be coordinated by the MARN through its Division of Ecosystems and Wildlife, which will facilitate exchange of lessons learned and avoid duplication of efforts.	– CEO Endorsement Request, Section A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives
Compilation of Comments Submitted by Council Members on the May 2014 Work Program		
<i>Canada’s Comments</i>		
We are pleased to see the project’s inclusion of a wetland banking mechanism, which will allow for the conservation of wetlands as compensation for development in	Thank you to the reviewer for his/her comment, whilst noting that compensation for development will take the form of compensation payments and not of wetland banking, following feasibility studies of these options in the PPG phase.	

<p>other wetlands while ensuring net positive environmental benefits. We also appreciate the proposal's comprehensive identification of how it will contribute to various Aichi Targets, with detailed explanations and recommend that this set the standard for future proposals. We look forward to the lessons learned from this project and encourage knowledge dissemination for similar projects in other GEF recipient countries.</p>		
<p>Germany's Comments</p>		
<p>1. Outdated management plans are briefly mentioned as hindering factors for effective conservation. However, throughout the PIF, management plans are hardly mentioned. Germany suggests addressing this issue by stating how the project goals and activities will feed into improved management plans.</p>	<p>The project will update and develop the management plans for three (3) PWIIs (Jiquilisco Bay Complex, Jaltepeque Complex, and Gulf of Fonseca Islands) under the coordination of the MARN and following its technical guidelines for management plan development. The management plans will serve as the governing documents for biodiversity conservation, land use planning and management, threat reduction (including contamination and presence of invasive species), and natural resources use for the PWIIs and their associated PAs. The development of the management plans will be a participatory process during which the local communities, farmers living around the PWIIs, municipal governments, and other local and regional stakeholders present their viewpoints and define the criteria for developing a proposal with ecological, socioeconomic, and cultural relevance, and taking into account the interests and different needs of men and women.</p>	<p>– Project Document, Section 2.4. Project objective, outcomes, and outputs /activities</p>
<p>2. Germany agrees with the STAP recommendation to revise the links between barriers, outcomes, and outputs. Some of the outputs seem to be activities (for example 1.1.1.) while others are formulated as goals.</p>	<p>Please see the response to STAP's comment No. 1.</p>	
<p>3. We recommend reformulating Outcome 2.1 to address the identified barrier of ineffective programs and strategies and lack of coordination.</p>	<p>Please see the response to STAP's comment No. 1.</p>	
<p>4. The project seeks to engage different stakeholders from various sectors including farmers, fishers, and private companies who are not fully reflected in the stakeholder list (A.2).</p>	<p>A detailed stakeholder analysis and consultation process was undertaken during the PPG for each of the three (3) prioritized PWIIs. In addition, a Stakeholder Participation Plan was developed to ensure that all key stakeholders are effectively engaged in project implementation. A summary of the organizations consulted during the project design phase is mentioned in Section B.1. Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation, of this CEO Endorsement Request (a complete list is included in the Project Document, Annex 8.4. Stakeholder Involvement Plan).</p>	<p>– CEO Endorsement Request, Section B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation</p>
<p>5. The project will address financial limitations via, among many other actions, charging higher entrance fees</p>	<p>During the PPG the level of services offered by each conservation area (i.e., the three [3] prioritized PWIIs and their associated PAs) and the status of the visitors fess</p>	<p>– Project Document, Section 2.4. Project objective, outcomes,</p>

<p>to protected areas. This is a well-documented and successful strategy if protected areas offer satisfactory services for their visitors (clean sanitary services, rest areas, marked paths). For establishing appropriate fees Germany recommends assessing the level of services offered by the conservation areas in question and conduct willingness to pay surveys to complement the planned benchmarking exercises.</p>	<p>was assessed. The main reason why the PWIIs and their associated PAs are not generating revenue from tourism/visitors fees, which already have approved visitor fees by the Ministry of Finance upon recommendation from the MARN, is because these fees are not currently being collected by the PA authorities, despite the fact that in some cases, such as the Jiquilisco Bay Complex PWII, there is some basic infrastructure and services in place (i.e., ranger’s office, control/access points, and nature trails [although they are in need of improvement]) to support tourism. The Jocotal Lagoon PA has an abundance of natural attractions to make it a top ecotourism destination in El Salvador; however, the PA’s visitor infrastructure is not well developed. For example, this PA has an information center but it is currently not equipped to receive visitors. The existing infrastructure and level of services for visitors currently offered at the Olomega Lake PWII is almost non-existent.</p> <p>Accordingly, a visitor entrance fee scheme will be piloted in the Jiquilisco Bay Complex PWII and the Jocotal Lagoon PWII where tourism is active. The project will overcome existing barriers that prevent the PWIIs from generating revenue from tourism/visitors fees by providing the PA staff with the necessary training, information tools, and improved infrastructure and services to better serve visitors. In addition, visitor fees will be collected and agreements will be established with local community members for their participation in these tourism pilot initiatives. The PPG estimates indicate that the total annual revenue generated from these pilot initiatives will increase from \$0 to \$30,000.</p>	<p>and outputs /activities</p>
<p>6. Gender aspects should be included in a more specific form</p>	<p>Gender aspects have been incorporated into the project design to ensure the equitable distribution of project benefits between men and women. During the PPG, a UNDP Gender Expert from the El Salvador Country Office provided guidance, reviewed documents, and participated in the project design workshops to ensure that gender aspects were incorporated into the project design.</p> <p>Gender aspects to strengthen social and environmental sustainability have been considered as part of the UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards (SES) for project implementation. The project will achieve the following: a) employ indicators (included in Annex A: Project Results Framework) to address issues of gender inequality; 2) identify any cultural, social, religious, or other factors that may restrict women from participating and develop strategies to overcome these limitations; and c) ensure that the project reaches a score of at least 2 in UNDP ATLAS Gender Marker (Outputs that have gender equality as a “significant” objective).</p> <p>Women will be an essential part of the development and implementation of participatory management plans for three [3] PWIIs. Additionally, women will be the beneficiaries of training activities for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and wetland resources. Women who are small landowners will benefit</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CEO Endorsement Request, Section B.2: Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions - Project Document, throughout - Social and Environmental Screening Report for UNDP PIMS 5257

	from the implementation of best practices for the management of cattle ranching and agricultural wastes in three (3) PWIIs. In addition, women will be given the opportunity to participate in the implementation of a small-scale pilot operation to produce handicrafts (e.g., baskets and furniture) and paper using fiber from water hyacinth.	
<i>USA's Comments</i>		
1. In the final project proposal, we request the UNDP include more information with respect to how waste will be reduced. The ability to reduce wastes depends greatly on the characteristics of the waste stream and domestic capacity to reduce wastes. Additionally, a discussion of how the project will overcome barriers to waste reduction will also be helpful.	The project will focus on localities within the Jiquilisco Bay that cannot be accessed by land and that have limited solid waste collection systems (Pirrayita and Jobal Rancho Viejo) or that have a large influx of tourism (El Espino). More specifically, the project will support solid waste collection activities using boats. Solid waste collection activities will be carried out twice a month during the rainy season and once a month during the dry season. Collection centers for solid wastes (inorganic and organic) will be established, and composting activities will be implemented as part of organic waste management, with the equal participation of men and women. These activities will include the active participation of the local communities and the municipalities within the Jiquilisco Bay (San Dionisio, Jiquilisco, Usulután, Puerto El Triunfo Concepción Batres, and Jucuarán). Traditionally, local communities have had limited participation in solid waste management. An environmental education and awareness-raising program targeting the upstream local communities will contribute to reducing the inappropriate disposal of solid wastes that end up in the bay area.	– Project Document, Section 2.4. Project objective, outcomes, and outputs /activities
2. We are pleased to see that this project is being developed with the support of the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC). In the final project proposal, it may be important to consider that while the second compact was approved by the MCC board in 2013, the compact has not yet been signed to date. Fomilenio2 and the mentioned investments in the marine coastal zone will be on hold until the compact is signed.	The Second Compact (MCC/Fomilenio2) was signed on September 30, 2014, and constitutes a baseline investment of the project (approximately \$20 million USD to be invested in the Jiquilisco Bay area).	– Project Document, Section 1.6. Baseline analysis
While the participation of civil society organizations is recognized and included in the PIF, efforts to identify the presence of indigenous people (or their absence) are not described. Therefore, in the final project proposal, we request that this information be included.	The indigenous groups present in the project area are the Lencas, Kakawira, and Nahuat Pipil, which comprise 0.1% of the total population in the Jiquilisco Bay Complex PWII, 88% of whom live in rural areas. There are no indigenous groups present in the Jocotal Lagoon and Olomega Lake PWIIs. Indigenous organizations of the Jiquilisco Bay Complex PWII were consulted about the project during the PPG phase.	– CEO Endorsement Request, Section B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁹

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$91,325			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
A. Technical review	55,200	48,040	
B. Institutional arrangement, monitoring and evaluation	32,550	8,250	23,750
C. Validation workshop	3,575	8,785	2,500
Total	91,325	65,075	26,250

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

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

⁹ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

