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: Integrated Semenawi and Debubawi Bahri-Buri-Irrori- Hawakil Protected Area System for Conservation of Biodiversity and Mitigation of Land Degradation			
Country :	Eritrea	GEF Project ID:[1]	4559
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID: (PIMS)	4816
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry Land, Water and Environment	Submission Date:	28 October 2013
GEF Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Project Duration (Months)	84
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): ➢ For SFM/REDD+ ☐ ➢ For SGP ☐		Agency Fee ($):	587,800

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

FA Objectives	FA Outcomes	FA Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF ($)	Indicative co-fin, ($)
BD-1 Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems	1.1 Improved management effectiveness of new protected areas; • Indicator: Protected Area Management Effectiveness score as recorded by the METT Tool	• Output 1: New protected areas (2) & coverage (643,000 ha) of unprotected ecosystems • Output 2: New Protected Areas (1) and coverage (6,100) of unprotected threatened species (one species, the African wild ass)	GEF TF	BD: 2,444,989.58 LD: 2,463,925.72 CC: 969,084.70	BD: 4,248,789.77 LD 4,329,524.00 CC: 1,871,686.23
		Total project costs		**5,878,000**	**10,450,000**

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To create policy and institutional conditions for the Operationalisation of the Protected Area System in Eritrea

[1] Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

Component	*Type*	*Expected Outcomes*	*Expected Outputs*	*GEF $*	*CoFin $*
An enabling policy and institutional environment for protected area establishment and management is emplaced	TA	• Governance framework for the incorporation of PA and conservation into Eritrea's development established • Institutional collaboration for effective management of PA increased; • Human and financial resources provided to operationalize PA management	1.1 National government law/proclamation legalizing the application of IUCN based designations for establishment of terrestrial and marine protected areas. 1.2 National administration for protected areas management established and funded 1.3 National biodiversity conservation monitoring program implemented and funded 1.4 National strategy for protected area conservation and financing completed and updated annually 1.5 National protected area regulatory implementation guidelines completed and implemented 1.6 National biodiversity conservation training program for at protected area, national, and university levels.	800,000	1,045,000
Experience built through the development and management of the 3 PA sites		• Biodiversity loss and human-induced degradation halted in three effectively managed protected areas (measured by PA System Scorecard); • Sustainable financing for the 3 PA secured (measured by PA System Financial Scorecard; • The African wild ass, and Soemmering and Dorcas gazelle populations in the Buri Peninsula remain stable (measured through monitoring of these species' populations and distributions)	**2.1:** Three new PA, covering 649,100 ha, formally established and management arrangements (partnership) agreed among national government organizations, *zoba*, judiciary, private sector, and other technical and financial partners (Buri-Irrori-Hawakil Islands-514,000 ha; Semienawi/Debubawi Bahri – 129,000 ha; Bara'soli – 6,100 ha) ; **2.2:** Physical delineation of the three PA done and core infrastructure put in place (border markings, administration centre, outposts) **2.3:** Management and business plans that includes 3-year general work plans published and implementation initiated (plan takes climate change risks into consideration, specifies conservation and livelihood targets, and financial and tourism development plan); **2.4:** PA staff skill sets for managing the 3 PA being developed to cover all conservation functions (climate change risks, adaptation, enforcement, policing, reporting, survey/monitoring work, participatory management). 2.5 Integrated and inclusive management mechanisms established and operational at each site.	2,800,000	3,590,000
SLM/SFM reduces vulnerability and pressure on PA and improve livelihoods		• Communities adjacent to the PA improve perception of their livelihood stake in the good stewardship of biological resources (measured through the periodic and independent application of the 'Most Significant Change' (MSC) technique); • Communities adjacent to the 3 PA adopt improved "climate proofed" SLM/SFM practices in 6,000 ha (measured through LD-PMAT); • Vulnerability of communities reduced through adoption of adaptation measures and income generating activities	**3.1:** Management plans for the 6,000 ha within and adjacent to the 3 PA formulated and provide the basis for a "climate proofed" SFM/SLM practices in the buffer zones (including zoning for water, grazing and fishing based on resource inventories, definition of sustainable off-takes, and, adaptation measures): **3.2:**A system for the effective implementation of the buffer zone management plans in place including appropriate institutional arrangements for collaboration, consultation mechanisms for collaboration and conflict resolution; **3.3:** Resource users, local groups and associations as well as municipal entities strengthened in their planning and decision-making capacity related to sustainable resource use, adaptation/mitigation and conservation (skills) **3.3:** Sustainable income generating opportunities (including in efforts to reclaim land degradation, e.g. reforestation, of Protected Areas) identified and relevant groups supported to adopt them; **3.4:**Land use and tenure/stewardship rights articulation at the local level provides incentives to communities for "climate-safe" conservation-	2,019,000	4,700,000

			compatible resource use, including in PA buffer zones; **3.5:** A system for monitoring biological resources and socio-economic conditions in community managed areas is in place and provides relevant and scientifically-based information on the state of biodiversity and livelihoods in the buffer zones (particularly regarding adaptation, mitigation, conservation and wellbeing)		
Project Management				259,000	1,115,000
Total				5,878,000	10,450,000

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

Sources of Co-financing	**Name of Co-financier**	**Type of Co-financing**	**Amount**
Government	GoE	Cash	3,400,000
Government	GoE	In Kind	4,050,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Cash	3,000,000
Total Co-financing			**10,450,000**

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

GEF AGENCY	**TYPE**	**Focal Area**	**Country**		**Grant Amount** (a)	**Agency Fee** (b)	**Total** c=a+b
UNDP	GEF	BD	Eritrea		2,444,989.58	244,498.96	2,689,488.54
UNDP	GEF	LD	Eritrea		2,463,925.72	246,392.57	2,710,318.29
UNDP	GEF	CC	Eritrea		969,084.70	96,908.47	1,065,993.17
Total GEF Resources					**5,878,000.00**	**587,800.00**	**6,465,800.00**

E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	**Grant Amount ($)**	**Cofinancing ($)**	**Project Total ($)**
International Consultants	39,000		39,000
National/Local Consultants	52,225	52,225	104,450

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT? NO

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF[2]

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: **-- N/A**

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities **-- N/A**

A.3. The GEF Agency's comparative advantage **-- N/A**

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

1. Although there was no significant change, the Project Document (attached) now provides substantially more detailed analysis of the baseline than was provided in the PIF. This detail is reproduced in the paragraphs below.

SUMMARY OF BASELINE:

2. Modern Eritrea does not have a protected-area system and/or any protected areas. In 2006, the Government recognized the right of the Ministry of Agriculture and the Minister of Marine Resources to establish protected areas. The 2006 Forestry and Wildlife Conservation and Development Proclamation states that the MoA may establish and manage terrestrial protected areas. The 2006 Fisheries Proclamation states that the Ministry of Marine Resource may establish marine protected areas. Eritrea has made initial steps to identify potential protected areas. The FAO – GoE Technical Assistance Program undertook a pre-investment study in 1997 identifying potential protected areas as did a 2006 IUCN survey. The recently completed and GEF supported coastal zone conservation project (ECMIB) identified and prioritized several proposed marine protected areas. As noted in the Project Document's Section 2.8 (Project Consistency with National Priorities/Plans) and Annex F (pilot site descriptions), each of the sites identified are very high priorities for conservation.

3. From the nation's inception in the early 1990's, Eritrea has done many things to promote biodiversity and habitat conservation. The country has a national soil conservation program (part of the National Food Security Program) in which the government invests upwards of US$ 4 million annually. Under this program, a total ban on cutting live trees, hunting or the capture of wild animals and also on charcoal making was introduced and is still in force. Within capacity and financial constraints, government staff monitors wildlife. MoA experts in collaboration with experts from IUCN have since 2000 studied the population dynamics of African wild ass. Forest guards and forestry and wildlife inspectors employed at site level by the MoA protect many locations identified as potential protected areas. In 2007, Eritrea began providing training to forest and wildlife inspectors and scouts twice each year. There are currently 155 forest and wildlife inspectors spread throughout the country. Although regulations are incomplete, Eritrea has been practicing and enforcing some regulatory actions to preserve marine ecosystems. The export of live corals and spear fishing were banned in the 1990's. Trawling is limited to a depth of greater than 30m. A Marine Resources Database and monitoring programs had been established in areas selected as hot spots for protection. Integrated Coastal Area Management (ICAM) capacity was built by the CMI biodiversity project in 2007 with an Integrated Coastal Area Management Plan produced. A memorandum of understanding is signed with Indian Ocean and South East Asia (IOSEA) on marine turtle and dugong conservation. However, to date, no protected area has yet to be designated and/or operationalized.

GLOBAL SIGNIFICANCE:

4. Eritrea is part of both the Eastern African Highlands and Horn of Africa global biodiversity hotspots. The nation benefits from a highly diverse range of globally unique and significant terrestrial ecosystems. These include: East Sudanian savannah, Ethiopian/Eritrean highland forests, Ethiopian/Eritrean highland grasslands and woodlands, Ethiopian/Eritrean xeric grasslands and shrub, Somali Acacia-Commiphora bush and thickets, and Sahelian Acacia savannah. Eritrea is endowed with vast marine resources. Many consider this region one of the earth's most important repositories of marine biodiversity. The nation has nearly 2,000 km of fairly relatively pristine Red Sea coastline (1,000 mainland and 1,000 island). The nation's

[2] 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

thousands of kilometers of undeveloped and under-exploited coastal areas are defined by diverse mangrove, coral reef, sea grass and intertidal habitats. The Red Sea has perhaps the world's highest-level endemism and the highest species diversity west of Indonesia. There are over 1,100 fish species and 44 genera of hard corals being recorded.

Threat #1: Habitat Loss and Competition.

5. The primary threat to wildlife in Eritrea is habitat loss. Unsustainable grazing, cultivation, and forestry practices drive this threat. Emerging drivers of habitat loss include mining and tourism development.

Threat #2: Overexploitation or "Direct Take".

6. As noted, the rate of deforestation is unsustainable. There is some evidence of limited harvest of rare plants for food and medicine. The direct harvest most other terrestrial biodiversity is relatively low. Eritrea endured many years of armed conflict. Wildlife numbers declined substantially during this period. Terrestrial wildlife has been slow to recover because of the difficult climate and limited habitat. Marine resources are very vulnerable to over-harvest by both subsistence and commercial fishing enterprises.

Threat #3: Climate Change.

7. There is little data regarding the impact of climate change to Eritrea's globally significant biodiversity. However, the impacts are quite easy to intuit. Climate change will certainly compound and accelerate the reduction of ecosystem resilience. With the quality of most habitats already degraded and/or facing imminent threats, there is little resilience within the system to withstand the addition of climate change's negative impacts. The unfortunate result will be ecologically untenable.

Barrier #1: Limited capacity to design and implement a regulatory framework to support establishment of a national system of conservation areas.

8. Eritrea does not currently have the institutional capacity required to design and implement the laws and policies required to support the establishment of a national system of conservation areas.

Barrier #2: Limited experience and capacity to successfully establish and manage conservation areas.

9. There is no practical knowledge and/or experience with the successful establishment and management of conservation areas. This compounds the policy and institutional barrier.

Barrier #3: Limited rural community capacity to maintain ecosystem services and conserve biodiversity.

10. There is a need to improve the existing fishing, farming and grazing techniques and innovate new technologies that respond to the needs of resource users as well as environmental protection and conservation. This is particularly challenging in Eritrea where rates of poverty and resource dependence are high and on-the-ground resource management is limited. Traditional natural resource management practices have largely fallen into decline. A range of projects and institutions promote individual activities related to sustainable land management, but none have targeted the development of comprehensive models that support the important conservation elements of SLM.

A. 5. The incremental activities requested for GEF financing and the associated global environmental benefits to be delivered by the project.

11. There were no real changes to the incremental activities but refinement occurred with both tables A (Focal Area Framework) and B (Project Framework). In Table A, the outputs were clarified to indicate that 3 new PAs covering 649,100 as follows:

    - Output 1: New protected areas (2) & coverage (643,000 ha) of unprotected ecosystems
    - Output 2: New Protected Areas (1) and coverage (6,100) of unprotected threatened species (one species, the African wild ass)

12. In Table B (Project Framework) the following refinements were made to improve the logic and cohesiveness of the results chain (activities to outputs to results to impacts):

    - Under Component One: Outputs as described within the PIF were reformulated and incorporated within a series of outputs much more likely to deliver impact and change to address the identified barriers. For instance, the PIF proposed output of a "national dialog on the importance of PA's" did not move far enough to address the barrier. Primary stakeholders already agree that PA's are needed, they need GEF assistance to actually formulate and adopt a regulatory framework to establish this PA system.
    - Under Component Two: Nearly all outputs were strengthened. The Output "sustainable sport hunting and tourism operations" was integrated within the planning process. Rather than presume that these activities are

required to address the barrier, it is far better to first engage stakeholders in an inclusive and informed manner to strategically identify gaps and required methods for addressing these gaps. For instance, during the project development phase it was determined that local residents in nearly all project areas are very much opposed to sport hunting and worked diligently to suspend sport hunting within the project area.

13. With extremely limited resources, Eritrea has worked hard to set the stage and create a baseline for the implementation of this long-awaited project. Eritrea is endowed with wonderful biodiversity. However, the country has not been unable to remove the barriers between the current situation and the objective of creating a national system of conservation areas. Moving this situation forward towards the long-term vision requires outside investment.

14. The GEF alternative will address the three primary barriers restricting Eritrea from establishing an effective conservation system to safeguard globally significant biodiversity. By clearing the regulatory barrier, the GEF investment will facilitate the expansion of conserved land and seascapes. This will include incorporating some of the world's best preserved marine areas, globally unique African highlands, and the habitat needs of wide ranging species such as African wild ass and a host of migratory birds. By removing the existing capacity barrier, the GEF investment will help ensure the existence of the skills and knowledge required to establish, manage and expand conservation areas into the future. Rural communities will be empowered with the tools required to maintain and enhance their quality of life, improving the maintenance of ecosystem services while addressing identified biodiversity threats. Links between successful conservation of biodiversity and economic benefits accruing to the local communities will be quantified and demonstrated. The GEF alternative will allow for conservation to be based upon a spectrum of land and marine use designations, designed to give policy makers the tools required to conserve large, ecologically viable areas. The immediate result will be an effective regime of national conservation areas covering over one million hectares of currently un-represented ecosystems (649,100 ha terrestrial and 360,000 marine). Additional results will include reduction of immediate threats to several species, a more harmonized management regime, a strong institutional framework and focal point designed specifically to support conservation and protected areas, prototypes of a suite of management improvement tools to prepare protected area managers, and an efficient and informed management system. Improvement management pathways will be institutionalized and lessons learned will be amplified throughout the national system of conservation areas. The government agencies at all levels will be motivated to integrate conservation objectives within their planning and policy frameworks. None of these elements critical to effective conservation would likely be realized without GEF inputs.

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/Assumptions	Rating Impact/ Probability High: 5Low: 1	Mitigation Measure

Risk/Assumptions	Rating Impact/ Probability High: 5Low: 1	Mitigation Measure
Capacity is too low to implement project. The low absorptive capacity results in significant delays in implementation.	Impact: 3 Prob: 3	There are several very capable professionals in Eritrea. Many in the Ministry of Marine Resources benefited from previous GEF investments. Some, like the Department of Forestry and Wildlife, have worked for years with national and international conservation experts. However, this field is not deep. Eritrea has an acute shortage of skilled human power for the development and implementation of conservation areas. The project is designed with a technically strong and supportive project management team. The project is set-up to build capacity within existing ranks and to provide training opportunities, including formal college and vocational training, for up and coming conservation professionals. The project's exit strategy is critical for all components and activities. This strategy will help insure that successful work implemented during the project period does not abruptly stop at the time of project close. A draft exit strategy will be completed prior to the project's mid-term review. This will make certain that the project is formulating an exit strategy from the start and on-track to implement this strategy well prior to project close.
The Government of Eritrea does not establish the three pilot sites as protected areas.	Impact: 4 Prob: 3	As noted, Eritrea has identified many locations for conservation areas but has yet to formally recognize any. This is largely due to the barriers this project is designed to address. However, there is a risk that the government will not move forward with designation of the three pilot sites. This project is set up to alleviate this risk. Outcome One (enabling environment) is designed to create a much more cohesive approach to protected area design and establishment. The project is designed so that investments under Outcome Two do not move forward until the protected area designation is finalized. To accommodate any delays in designating the protected areas, the project period has been extended from 60 months to 72 months. Outcome Three is designed to move forward regardless of Outcomes One and Two. This will serve to mobilize and build the conservation capacity and awareness of local resource users as a foundation for future protected area establishment. This multi-pronged approach should help make certain that resources are not expended without realization of the project's core conservation objectives.
The Government of Eritrea does not to allocate sufficient resources to maintain the protected area system	Impact 4 Prob 3	This project is focused upon setting in place a national conservation program that is built around protected areas, fits local absorptive capacities, and allows for the gradual increase in sophistication of conservation approaches as financing becomes available in the future. Eritrea is currently cash poor. Rapidly expanding mineral development may quickly change the financial equation. Regardless, national institutions and local stakeholders are very excited about the prospects of this project. They are eager to see conservation of this scale and seriousness occur. In addition, the government recognizes the cost savings (e.g., improved water resource management, increased food security, etc.) associated with the social and ecological benefits delivered by this project. The project has been designed to catalyze the initial establishment of the protected areas. A key aspect of the project design at all three outcome levels is setting in place programs that are feasible to continue given the financial capacities and realities of the local situation. Again, the exit strategy will be critical to the hand-over process. This includes setting in place exit strategies for continuation of management activities, prioritizing and costing those activities, and identifying cost-effective way for their funding.
Institutional agreements	Impact 3	Addressing this risk is one of the central pillars to the project. Each of the

Risk/Assumptions	Rating Impact/ Probability High: 5Low: 1	Mitigation Measure
among key ministries and other stakeholders and partners do not function properly, thereby undermining protected area governance	Prob 2	outcomes and associated activities are designed to set in place a framework for more integration which is more cooperative, efficient, and cost-effective. The formation of resilient and sustainable partnerships among organizations – this is strongly supported and has emerged independently from the government organizations involved in this project; mechanisms for conflict resolution will be established from the outset; the monitoring and evaluation framework will be sufficiently sensitive to determine partnership functionality. Already, during the project design period, these institutions began the process of working more closely in order to achieve the shared desire of seeing conservation succeed.
Participation of all key stakeholders, particularly communities, is not achieved.	Impact 3 Prob 2	Rural Eritrea is sparsely populated. However, these persons are generally very poor and entirely reliant upon the natural world for their subsistence. Working with these persons to improve their resilience and quality of life is paramount. The project is and will continue to work closely with resource users within the three pilot site locations to make certain that interventions are designed to maintain ecosystem services that deliver benefits to both humans and wildlife. Any conservation program risks alienating local resource users. This project has and will continue to address this challenge through a smart project design that is predicated upon inclusiveness.
Severity of climate change impacts undermine conservation effectiveness, increasing pressures for already food-insecure populations and accelerating depletion of globally significant biodiversity and associated habitat	Impact 3 Prob 5	The project will strengthen the resilience of Eritrea's terrestrial and marine ecosystems to climate change impacts. Ecosystem functionality is currently at a bare minimum with water stress, species loss, deforestation, and general habitat degradation. This makes Eritrea highly vulnerable to climate change. By improving ecosystem-based conservation approaches and establishment of improved management objectives and standards, the project will help create the elasticity and ecological safeguards required to strengthen the capacity of Eritrea's natural systems to continue to function, adapt, and provide resilience in spite of climate change induced impacts.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

15. The project is built upon the key conclusions and lessons learned from the UNDP/GEF "Eritrea Conservation Management of Eritrea's Coastal, Marine and Island Biodiversity" project (ECMIB) completed in early 2008. The ECMIB focused upon four objectives: 1: Up-to-date biodiversity information is used in CMI planning and management activities; 2: Awareness increased at all levels (community groups, managers, administrators, and private sector) of the need for, the benefits of, and mechanisms to sustainably use and manage Eritrea's coastal, marine and island biodiversity resources; 3: Policies for ICM programs developed and ICM approaches implemented in priority areas; and, 4: A core of a national MPA network and species conservation programme established, and management of exotic species improved. The ECMIB project struggled during its first five years of implementation and was nearly closed at the mid-term evaluation. However, management challenges were addressed and the project made a dramatic turn-around prior to project completion, generating excellent lessons for the currently proposed project. The project indeed managed to complete most activities and achieve all objectives except for Objective 4 related to establishment of a marine protected area network. The final evaluation reported that the project simply did not have the time to complete the activity. It is this task that will be taken forward by the proposed project.

16. The ECMIB generated draft guidelines for national marine protected areas and other outputs that will be very useful as a baseline for this proposed project. This includes the formulation of the draft National Coastal Policy and the draft Integrated Coastal Area management proclamations. There is also draft National Coastal Policy (DNCP) that discusses marine protected areas in Eritrea. Areas designated as protected areas are "outstanding remarkable areas and biologically important public lands that are habitats of rare and endangered species of plants and animals, biogeographic zones and related ecosystems, whether terrestrial, wetland or marine". The draft Integrated Coastal Area Management proclamation of 2006 intends to endow local government units with greater responsibility and capacity to manage environment and natural resources.

17. The Government of Eritrea with the support of UNDP is implementing the GEF "SIP SLM Pilot Project". The five-year project commenced in 2010. The US$ 4 million project has a US$ 1.8 million GEF investment. Major cofounders include NORAD, UNDP, and GoE. Project activity will directly affect 28 villages in the Central Highlands Zone. A portion of this area overlaps with the proposed protected areas project.

18. The SIP SLM Pilot Project has four outcomes: Outcome 1: Replicable models of SLM are developed and representative communities use them to manage land in 15 villages of the central highland that are representative of the major agro-ecological zone for Central highlands, reducing the rate of land degradation. Outcome 2: A system of knowledge management (KM) for SLM is developed and used to achieve SLM through mainstreaming of SLM principles into the regional and national development programs, projects, strategies, policies and legislation. Outcome 3: Capacity for adoption of improved land management techniques and for upscaling to non-project areas provided at all levels. The project's emphasis upon SLM skills training, improved enabling environment, and knowledge management link nicely with this proposed project's need to strengthen the SLM/SFM capacity of rural communities living in and/or near protected areas. These projects implemented through UNDP will be closely aligned and synergized.

19. Eritrea is in the early processes of implementing a five year (2012 – 2017) US$ 6.2 million Adaptation Fund Project "Climate Change Adaptation Programme in water and agriculture in Anseba Region, Eritrea". The project is very focused upon and will be implemented in two sub-zobas (Haboro and Hamelmalo) of Anseba. This region does not overlap with the proposed protected area project. The AF project is very focused upon brick and mortar interventions. There are four outcomes: 1: Increased water availability and erosion control through floodwater harvesting and irrigation technologies; 2: Enhanced climate-resilient agricultural and livestock production; 3: Improved climate risk information and climate monitoring used to raise awareness of and enhance community preparedness to climate change hazards; 4: Lessons learned and shared and policy influenced through knowledge management system. Under the AF project, floodwater will be harvested, water storage will be developed and soil erosion control measures and irrigation will be introduced. Climate-smart technology will be implemented; including drought-resistant and early maturing crops, by means of enhanced extension services. Rangeland management systems will be enhanced. Improved information on climate change risks will be generated and integrated into farmer and pastoralist practices. The programme will improve knowledge and understanding of climate change impacts among stakeholders, develop a community-based early warning system to reduce climate risks, and an action research approach linking traditional and scientific knowledge through the use of seasonal forecasts. The AF and proposed protected area project will build synergies, particularly in terms of coordinating training program activities and lessons learned.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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

20. The preparatory phase of the project represented an extraordinarily strong emphasis on stakeholder participation. During project design, interviews were held with literally hundreds of potentially impacted and benefitting rural private and government stakeholders. The project was generated in full light and discussion with government officials representing nearly every Ministry. A formal team of hired national consultants and national volunteers were instrumental in all aspects of project design, including vetting final approaches with peers. For a comprehensive description of activities and analysis of stakeholders, please see the Project Document at Annex E.

21. This same inclusive approach will be carried forward and amplified during project implementation. Stakeholder involvement is critical to the effective achievement of all outcomes. The project innovates mechanisms for inclusion at national, regional and local levels. This includes particular attention paid to issues of gender. The project steering committee (board) enjoys representation from all major stakeholder organizations. The project will also benefit from the creation of provincial, basin, and protected area consultative committees designed specifically to encourage and facilitate more broad-based stakeholder involvement with wetlands conservation decision-making. The table below gives a detailed description of the major categories of stakeholders identified and the nature of their involvement in the project. For an extended summary of the institutional context, please the Project Document's Annex B and Annex C.

Stakeholder Organization	Relevance to Project
Government	
Ministry of Agriculture	Would be responsible for conservation in the terrestrial environment - provisionally constituting the area down to the high watermark; the MOA constitutes the lead institution for the overall coordination and management of PAS In connection with the PAs system, it is expected to introduce environmentally friendly farming systems (cropping systems, livestock husbandry) and management of terrestrial ecosystems at large and within and around the peripheries of the PAs. Moreover, it reviews budget allocations, oversees implementation of the community plantation forestry Program using indigenous species which supports the use of forest management through protection contracts and reforestation activities. Furthermore, it will undertake stocktaking assessment and conduct monitoring and evaluation on the dynamics of the vegetation within and around the PAs; carries out surveys, plans and develops investment projects for establishing Forests.
Ministry of Marine Resources (MoMR)	The MoMR has an overall management and regulatory function, and M&E of the Coastal and marine eco-systems. It also undertakes stocktaking assessment on the status of plant and animal species as well as the marine environment at large. Hence it will have direct contribution in the implementation of the proposed project particularly to those adjacent to the sea (Coastal and marine areas management) MoMR will work in close cooperation with DOE. It will contribute to the project through administration and management of coast and Marine PAs. The Ministry of Fisheries would be responsible for the planning and conservation of the marine environment and will be the lead agency for the Marine Protected Area.
The Ministry of Land water and Environment (MoLWE)	The MLWE would be responsible for developing standards and ensuring that environmentally sustainable practices are pursued in the development of the PAS. This ministry will have lead role in coordinating institutions involved in the PA systems. Department of Environment (DOE) being a focal for the two UN environmental conventions (UNFCCC, CBD) Hence, it will have a say in the overall implementation of the project. The Department of Land prepares Land Use plan for the PAs, and takes the lead to oversee land allocation for different purposes and regulate Land Use planning, and monitor its proper implementation in and around the PAS. It has overall regulatory functions at all levels.
Forestry and Wildlife Authority (FWA)	FWA is a recently instituted organization with the mandate of managing and coordination issues related to forestry and wildlife. It is potentially one of the lead agencies of the project outputs in collaboration to all stakeholders. The Authority particularly focuses whether the activities are implemented at ground.
Ministry of Information (MoI)	The project will cooperate with MoI on public awareness issues through radio, newspapers and TV. Other lessons from different sources could also be a good media of awareness.
Ministry of Finance (MoF)	The MoF is a key partner in reviewing and approving budgets; it will assist the project in reviewing and, where necessary, revising financial regulations and procedures to support improved and diversified financial management of PAs
Ministry of Tourism	Has the responsibility in developing tourism plans at large and eco-tourism in particular as related to access to tourists in the PAs. It will encourage in integrating the PAs within the framework of development to generation and allocation of tourism revenues. It leads Business plan in ecotourism, tourist information and promotion of ecotourism. It will also foster the promotion of educational tourism to pupil and students and raise their awareness on the role of PAs.
Local Communities	Custodians and beneficiaries of the PAS, pasturelands, forests, fishing grounds. Local communities will be participating in planning and management, especially identifying and implementing adaptation and SLM/SFM techniques, income generating activities and monitoring.
Private sector	Would be responsible for advancing business, particularly in tourism and other income generating activities. The private project will especially cultivate the participation of the private sector as sector as a critical sustainability mechanism.
Administrative Offices	Would be responsible for provision of administrative backup and services
International Development Organizations	
UNDP	The pivotal roles and responsibilities of UNDP revolve around the following issues: Ensuring professional and timely implementation of the project outcomes, outputs and activities; delivering reports and other outputs identified in the project document;

	Assisting and supporting project implementing institution and other relevant stakeholders in organizing, coordinating and hosting project meetings at all levels; manage and take the responsibility of financial, administration to realize the envisioned targets. It will also establish effective network between project national stakeholders, international organizations and the donors.
Civil Society (NGO's, etc.)	
National Union of Eritrean Women (NUEW)	Would be responsible for mobilizing women for participation in project planning and implementation. NUEW will be critical in mobilizing local communities (especially women) in identifying and implementing adaptation, SLM/SFM techniques and income generating activities. Also in participation in planning and monitoring.
Academic and Scientific Organizations	
Hamelmalo Agricultural College (HAC)	One of the lead agricultural institute which could cooperate with the project during its business management plan by undertaking Stalk taking assessment of the floral and fauna, sharing knowledge on SLM and SFM practices. It has also interest to use the site as demonstration for students and farmers
Eritrea Institute of Technology: Department of Biology	Could cooperate with the project during its business management plan by undertaking Stalk taking assessment of the floral and fauna, sharing knowledge on marine environment. Could support the project in Herbarium collection, identification of species
National Agricultural Research Systems (NARS)	Preservation of the Genetic materials in the gene bank.
Marine Science Technology COMAT)	Coastal and marine biodiversity studies Use the site as demonstration site for students
Local and Indigenous Communities	
Traditional Leaders	Traditional leaders, particular in the Afar regions, will be critical to the success or failure of this project. Within the Aoli and Buri regions, Afar chiefs are largely responsible for making decisions regarding land use, including grazing and fisheries.
Local communities (villages)	Inhabitants within the PAs and surroundings will be made aware of the issues and invited to take part in the decision making process. Their cooperation will be sought in implementing project activities including protection and alternative income development (ecotourism, sustainable harvesting of natural resources), awareness raising, Sustainable use of the protected area, Protection against intruders etc. Custodians and beneficiaries of the PAS, pasturelands, forests, fishing grounds. Local communities will participate in planning and management, especially identifying and implementing adaptation and SLM/SFM techniques, income generating activities and monitoring.
Private Sector	
Tourist Services	Development of small- and medium -scale tourist service providing hotels and restaurants and associated travel and curio goods need to be licensed and operate as per the guidelines of the ministry of tourism. This component is an essential element in the sustainability of the PAs in generating income to manage them properly. Would participate in promoting business, particularly in tourism and other income generating activities. The private project will especially cultivate the participation of the private sector as sector as a critical sustainability mechanism.

22. The project will be executed under NEX according to the standards and regulation for UNDP cooperation in Eritrea. Ministry of National Development and Ministry of Land, Water and Environment will sign the project document with UNDP and will be accountable to UNDP for an efficient and effective use of project resources and the achievement of the project goals, objectives and outcomes according to the approved work plan. The Ministry of Land, Water and Environment is the GEF focal point and will help oversee implementation. Project Executing Agency will be Forestry and Wildlife Authority.

23. The duration of the project will be seven (7) years. The Project will comprise the following management, oversight and coordination structures: (i) A Project Board with strategic decision-making, non-executive powers would tentatively be composed of representatives of the government, UNDP and the GEF focal point(s). Other members may be co-opted at the discretion of the permanent membership. The GEF Project

coordinators from other partner projects, including GEF funded projects, will be invited to participate in sessions as observers to ensure proper project coordination and cross-fertilization if necessary. (ii)) A Project Management Unit (PMU) will be responsible for directing, supervising and coordinating the project implementation. The PMU will be located within the Forestry and Wildlife Authority (FWA) in Asmara.

24. In terms of key Project staff, a nominated senior Forestry and Wildlife Authority (FWA) staff will become the National Project Director, while a National Project Manager (PM) (full-time) will be contracted by the Project Board based on a recruitment process and will be responsible for the day-to-day Project implementation, leading and managing the PMU. In addition to the Project Manager, the PMU will be composed of the following staff: administrative assistant (part-time) and accountant (part-time). Administrative and professional personnel collaborating as advisors will interact on an ongoing basis with the NPM and the PMU technical and professional teams, according to needs arising during project implementation. An important and common part of the staff TORs will be to identify measures on how to sustain the capacity development activities and results beyond the Project duration. The initial part of these measures will be integrated into the project work plans.

25. A 6-month Inception Phase will be used to carefully plan the whole project implementation process, culminating in the Inception Workshop. In addition, the necessary communication structures will be established between the main project components and partners to ensure optimal coordination and that key stakeholders are in full agreement with project objectives and hence committed towards the outcomes to be achieved.

26. UNDP will provide technical support to the PMU and will be responsible for the required budget revisions, donor reporting, advance of funds, and monitoring of the project. UNDP will act as the GEF Implementing Agency for this project and as such the responsibility for managing GEF funds will be administered by UNDP CO. During the first year of project, UNDP will use the cash advance and direct payment modality and build capacity within PMU and hosting institution to facilitate Cash advances. Based on the progress and results of the HACT micro assessment in 2014 UNDP in the second year will utilize the Cash advance modality of funds to the PMU. At the end of each three-month period, the PMU will submit a report on activities and a financial report for expenses incurred along with a request for funds for the next period. UNDP will also facilitate communication between the PMU, the Implementing Partner and the GEF as and if required. Other services support that UNDP can offer is outlined in the Implementation Support Services (ISS).

B.2. 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

27. Eritrea is a bastion of species wealth and diversity. The country has a diverse geography ranging from below sea level to over 3,000 meters. The nation's thousands of kilometers of undeveloped and under-exploited coastal areas are rich with mangroves, coral reefs and sea grass beds with great biological diversity and remarkable numbers of endemic species. These are some of the only reefs in the world to currently evincing resilience to climate change. The central highlands house some of the last remaining tropical coniferous and broad leaved forest along the Horn of Africa, including species such as Juniperus Procera and Olea Africana. The coastal wetlands of Eritrea provide refuge for hundreds of thousands of birds representing hundreds of species. The lowland areas have the last viable population of African wild ass. None of this habitat critically important to Eritrea's internationally valuable biodiversity benefits from formal protection. The project will contribute to the mitigation of climate change, e.g., conservation of forests, grasslands, and mangroves. The project will result in the conservation of major land and seascapes representing each of these highland, lowland, and marine ecosystems. The project will set in place mechanisms for additional habitat to be included in an ever expanding and strengthened system of protected areas.

28. Eritrea stands to benefit greatly from this project. The nation will receive the international support required to move forward with national objectives to conserve biodiversity and associated ecosystem services. Eritrea's rich biodiversity heritage will be conserved for the use and enjoyment of future generations. Ecosystem services critical to the provisioning of water, marine resources, forest resources, mitigation of natural disasters, and climate change resilience will be preserved. Arresting current resource degradation (water, land, forests) trends in the project areas will create more productive pastures and fisheries, resulting in local livelihood improvements, greater food security, and increased incomes for men and women in

degraded areas. In the future, protected areas could be poised to become tourism attractions, creating jobs and increasing incomes.

29. With capacities built for protected areas establishment and management under all three outcomes, the country will improve the ability to launch similar conservation efforts in other geographic areas. The capacity to move forward with the conservation of additional habitats and species will have both global and national benefits. As government agencies are more closely aligned and coordinated, the impacts of a strengthened regulatory and institutional framework will be amplified through other sectors such as forestry, soil, agriculture and water management. Management and decision-making will become more efficient and effective. As a result of emplaced monitoring capacities, the nation will have a much stronger knowledge base upon which to build informed policy and management decision-making.

30. The results of community involvement and capacity building efforts, and particularly the impacts of Outcome Three, will be replicated nationally. This will enhance the ability of hundreds of thousands of Eritreans to elevate their ability to maintain ecosystem services through improved conservation and wise-use of land, water, and biodiversity resources. Ideally, this ability will result in an improved quality of life for numerous communities as measured by greater food security and reduced vulnerability to external forces such as climate change.

31. Approximately 35,000 people live within and/or proximate to the proposed project areas. These local residents will reap the immediate benefits of improved conservation of the natural resources upon which their existence depends. This will include efforts at each site to empower rural communities to alleviate threats identified during the project design phase. This includes mitigating the negative impacts of over-harvest, grazing and cultivation, forest loss, infrastructure development, and climate change. As detailed in the project document annex, most of these persons are very poor. Their daily lives and livelihoods are tied directly to the land and sea. Growing human populations are placing increasing burdens upon the upland, lowland, and marine ecosystems within the project domain. These persons are becoming progressively more vulnerable as unsustainable resource management practices and emerging climate change threats take their toll.

32. The protected areas will encompass large areas while applying a spectrum of conservation zones. Pathways will be created to integrate local traditional knowledge while upholding national conservation objectives. Residents will be provided with the tools required to enhance and maintain, rather than degrade, critical ecosystem services. The project will assist and empower local residents to reduce their vulnerabilities to climate change. The project has set in place numerous mechanisms to inform and engage stakeholders of on-going activity, fostering an environment of full disclosure. This strong emphasis upon stakeholder involvement will ensure that any emerging environmental and/or social risks are identified early. This will greatly assist local stakeholders to implement early mitigation measures. Community members will have greater information upon which to inform decision-making. The field school models will endow rural community members with advanced skills. These training programs will be tailored specifically to elevate local constraints by applying proven international principles and practices. Management planning regimes for both protected areas (Outcome 2) and resource use (Outcome 3) will establish real pathways to apply improved capacities and increase economic and food security.

33. The project is designed with very special consideration given to ensuring that benefits are equitably distributed across gender lines. As detailed in the project document's comprehensive assessment found in the annex, some of the poorest of Eritrea's rural poor are women and women headed households. At the same time, these persons are often disenfranchised from opportunities to capitalize upon capacity building efforts and/or participate fully in decision-making processes. Approximately thirty-percent of households in Eritrea are headed by women. On average, female employees earn less than half the amount than males. A majority of poor women in the rural areas are engaged in low-paying manual labor. Female-headed households have fewer household assets including livestock. Rural women are less likely to be literate. Approximately 40% leave school at an early stage due to marriage. Rural women often do not receive antenatal care and suffer from poor nutrition.

34. For these reasons, the project will set in place specific women field school cohorts as detailed in Outcome 3. These women cohorts will benefit from access to training programs designed specifically for the needs of rural women. In addition, special attention will be made to include women within national level training and capacity building programs. Project strategic planning at inception as well as for Outcome specific activities will pay special attention to issues of gender, including incorporation of special chapters and/or sections dedicated to identifying gender specific challenges and mitigation measures related to protected

areas conservation, climate change vulnerabilities, and sustainable land, forest, and marine resource management. The project's hiring practices will be highly inclusive, making certain that women are afforded equal opportunities to access key positions both within newly established and existing government agencies (e.g., protected area administrations) and project posts. Implemented training programs will provide a forum for women to build their capacities to understand their potential, ability and the importance of conserving ecosystem functionality and services. This will be achieved through gender specific peer-to-peer and formalized learning. Women will benefit from greater access to decision making and livelihood improvements, including food security. The project will initially benefit many hundreds of women within the project area. The impacts will be amplified as established programs and lessons-learned are up-scaled nationally.

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

35. This project represents a total GEF investment of approximately US$ 6 million. This investment is coupled with another US$ 3 million in cash from UNDP that will be used to directly support GEF desired outcomes. Together, this investment will catalyze the improved use of annual conservation investments by the Eritrean government of US$ 10 million. Although this may seem small, for an economically challenged country, this is a very large portion of their annual expenditures.

36. During project design, several alternative scenarios were considered from the point of view of cost-effectiveness. These included construction of well sites, creation of large hydrological infrastructure, extensive purchase of hardware and other tactical equipment, construction of major facilities for administration and tourism, restoration programs, and expensive international training programs. Stakeholders eventually abandoned these options after carefully considering conservation priorities relevant to a limited budget. In the end, the highly precise and, therefore, cost-effective investment rested on a number of principles, each integrated within the activities and expenditures of this proposed project. The relatively small investment is targeted to catalyze a substantial course change.

37. Paramount was the desire to build the regulatory, management and financial capacity required for Eritrea to independently maintain effective conservation efforts. This catalytic effect coupled with the objective of sustainability makes the GEF investment highly cost-effective. The project's relatively small investment will serve to help Eritrean conservationists elevate to the level required to sustain conservation into the future. This incremental movement has to date been absent. The project's investments will result in the conservation of vast land and seascapes. The value alone of Eritrea's natural marine treasure is almost immeasurable. Not making this investment would risk the irretrievable loss of these biodiversity resources. The project will set in place the national capacities required to manage, monitor and ultimately conserve this international and national treasure. To further increase cost-effectiveness, each of the full-time project staff persons will be housed within the government departments. This will insure that capacity building is taking place on a daily basis. In addition, this will make certain that the government is well positioned to absorb lessons learned and carry forward and expand the coverage of project outcomes and outputs. The result is a relatively small amount of financing potentially will leverage the long-term conservation of critical landscapes and associated global benefits.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:

38. The project will be monitored through the following M& E activities. The M& E budget is provided in the table below.

PROJECT START:

39. A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 6 months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP country office and where appropriate/feasible regional technical policy and program advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan.

40. The Inception Workshop will address a number of key issues including: (a) Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. (b) Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RCU staff vis à vis the project team. (c) Discuss the roles, functions, and

responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. (d) The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed. (e) Based on the project results framework and the relevant GEF Tracking Tool if appropriate, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks. (f) Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled. (g) Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit. (h) Plan and schedule Project Board meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organization structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first Project Board meeting should be held within the first 2 months following the inception workshop.

41. An Inception Workshop report is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION WORKPLAN:

42. Immediately following the inception workshop, the project will be tasked with generating a strategic workplan. The workplan will outline the general timeframe for completion of key project outputs and achievement of outcomes as detailed within this project document. The workplan will map and help guide project activity from inception to completion. This will include process indicators to monitor project activity. These time-bound indicators will serve as benchmarks to measure progress towards achievement of intended project outcomes and outputs. The updated workplan and related progress report will be submitted annually to the Project Board and UNDP/RTA for review. To ensure smooth transition between project design and inception, the inception workshop and work planning process will benefit from the input of parties responsible for the design of the original project, including as appropriate relevant technical advisors.

QUARTERLY PROGRESS MONITORING:

43. Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform. Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Note that for UNDP GEF projects, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as revolving funds, microfinance schemes, or capitalization of ESCOs are automatically classified as critical on the basis of their innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical). Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot. Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

ANNUALLY (ANNUAL PROJECT REVIEW/PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS (APR/PIR)):

44. This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements. The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following: (a) Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative); (b) Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual); (c) Lesson learned/good practice; (d) AWP and other expenditure reports; (e) Risk and adaptive management; (f) ATLAS QPR; (g) Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

PERIODIC MONITORING THROUGH SITE VISITS:

45. UNDP CO and the UNDP RCU will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the Project Board may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RCU and will be circulated no more than one month after the visit to the project team and Project Board members.

MID-TERM OF PROJECT CYCLE:

46. The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation during the mid-point of project implementation. (October - November 2016). The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made toward 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 and terms of reference of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document.

47. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. The terms of reference will be completed one-year before the planned mid-term. The international evaluator/team leader will be recruited directly by the Regional Coordinating Unit of UNDP-GEF. The international independent expert will be recruited at least eight-months prior to the planned commencement of the mid-term evaluation. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle.

END OF PROJECT:

48. An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final Project Board meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF.

49. The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response that should be uploaded to PIMS and to the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation. During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results.

LEARNING AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING:

50. Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

AUDIT CLAUSE:

51. The Audit will be conducted according to UNDP financial regulations, rules and audit policies.

M&E WORKPLAN AND BUDGET

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US$ Excluding project team staff time	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	Project Manager UNDP CO, UNDP GEF GEF operational / political focal points	Indicative cost: $50,000	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of	Project Manager will oversee the	To be finalized in	Start, mid and end of

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US$ Excluding project team staff time	Time frame
Verification of project results.	hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members.	Inception Phase and Workshop. $ 75,000	project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on *output and implementation*	Oversight by Project Manager Project team	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	Project manager and team UNDP CO UNDP RTA UNDP EEG GEF operational focal point	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	Project manager and team	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	Project manager and team UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) GEF operational focal point	Indicative cost: $50,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	Project manager and team UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) GEF operational focal point	Indicative cost: $50,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	Project manager and team UNDP CO Local consultant GEF operational focal point	None	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	UNDP CO Project manager and team	Indicative cost -per year: $3,000	Yearly
Visits to field sites	UNDP CO UNDP RCU (as appropriate) Government representatives GEF operational focal point	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US$ 285,000 (+/- 5% of total budget)	

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:
Operational Focal Point endorsement letter attached with this form.

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE
Mogos Wolde-Yohannis	Director General and GEF Political and Operational FP	ministry of land, water and environment	09/09/2013

B. GEF AGENCY 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	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adrian Dinu, UNDP-GEF Officer-in-Charge and Deputy Executive Coordinator		October 28, 2013	Veronica Muthui, RTA EBD	+27 12 354 8124	veronica.muthui@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).

Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Assumptions
Project Objective: Create policy and institutional conditions to operationalize the national protected area system	Total hectares legally designated as a national protected area conforming to basic IUCN standards/categories	Terrestrial: 0 Marine: 0	Terrestrial: 649,100 ha Marine: 360,000 ha	Laws proclaiming protected area establishment. Annual national protected area management reports. National protected area conservation strategy and update.	National support for establishment of international standard protected areas to conserve globally significant biodiversity will remain steadfast.
	Total annual government financing for management and conservation of national protected area system.	Baseline: US$ 0	Target: US$ 1,000,000/annual* * cumulative for national PA administration and individual PA management	National government budget reports. Annual national protected area management reports. National protected area conservation strategy and update.	
	Total hectares of critical habitat conserved within newly established national protected areas.	Hectares of: Native highland forest: 0 Native mangrove: 0 African wild ass habitat: 0 Turtle nesting sites: 0 Sea grass: 0	Hectares of: Native highland forest: 55,000 Native mangrove: 12,000 African wild ass habitat: 80,000 Turtle nesting sites: 1300 Sea grass: 2,300	Annual national protected area management reports. National protected area conservation strategy and update. Results of national biodiversity conservation monitoring program.	
Outcome 1: Establishment of protected area policy and institutional frameworks to operationalize national protected areas system	National government law /proclamation legalizing the application of IUCN based designations for establishment of terrestrial and marine protected areas.	Baseline: 0	Target: 1	National law register	National support for establishment of international standard protected areas to conserve globally significant biodiversity will remain steadfast.

	Number of wildlife monitoring surveys/studies conducted and reported annually by protected area administration for key species and habitats within national protected areas.	Number of annual surveys, assessments, and reports for: Wild ass: 0 Mangrove: 0 Land use/degradation: 0 Forest cover: 0 Turtle nests: 0 Water quantity/quality: 0 Marine fisheries: 0 Coral reef : 0 Sea grass: 0	Number of annual surveys, assessments, and reports completed for: Wild ass: 7 Mangrove: 8 Land use/degradation: 5 Forest cover: 7 Turtle nests:7 Water quantity/quality: 7 Marine fisheries: 7 Coral reef : 7 Sea grass: 7	Results of national monitoring program. National protected areas management strategy and annual updates.	Human resource capacity and interest remains high in order to fill required positions. Key government ministries and agencies are able to agree to form and function of protected area administration (e.g., division of responsibilities between terrestrial and marine protected areas). This agreement provides for efficient and effective management without undue duplication of effort.
	Capacity gap bridged measured by number of trained professional staff employed full-time by the Government as part of the protected areas administration to manage the national protected area system compared to numbers required to run the operations.	Baseline: 0	Target: 10* * Terrestrial and Marine PA's	National protected areas management strategy and annual updates. Physical verification. Review of staffing plan and recruitment.	
	Number of national protected area conservation strategies and annual reports completed and updated by the national protected area administration(s).	Strategies: 0 Annual status reports: 0	Strategies: 2 Annual status reports: 4	National strategy and updates. Project reports.	
	Number of Eritreans annually enrolled in national university accredited biodiversity conservation training course.	Baseline: 0	Target: 30		
Outputs: 1.1 Regulatory framework for protected areas management 1.2 National administration for protected areas management					

1.3 National biodiversity conservation monitoring program 1.4 National strategy for protected area conservation and financing 1.5 National protected area regulatory implementation guidelines 1.6 National biodiversity conservation training program					
Outcome 2: Emplacement of management capacity and experience required operationalize national protected area system	METT scores for at least three marine/terrestrial protected areas increase by 25%	METT Scores: Semenawi and Debubawi Bahri: 29 Buri: 32 Bera'sole Bay: 22	METT Scores: Semenawi and Debubawi Bahri: 80 Buri: 82 Bera'sole Bay: 71	METT scores will be tabulated by project staff at mid-term and final.	Protected areas will be officially designated in a timely manner. Best possible international/national staff will be recruited for implementation and Government will support international staff with permits required to completed necessary fieldwork.
	Number of protected area management and business plans operational, assessed and updated by each protected area administration.	Semenawi and Debubawi Bahri: 0 Buri: 0 Bera'sole Bay: 0	Semenawi and Debubawi Bahri: 3 Buri: 3 Bera'sole Bay: 3	Project reports. Physical verification of plan completion.	
	Number of trained professional staff employed full-time by the Government to manage individual protected areas.	Semenawi and Debubawi Bahri: 0 Buri: 0 Bera'sole Bay: 0	Semenawi and Debubawi Bahri: 10 Buri: 15 Bera'sole Bay: 5	Project reports. Physical verification of staffing plan and recruitment.	
	Individual protected areas receive annual financial support adequate to implement PA management plan priorities and conserve globally significant species.	Total annual government PA budget: Semenawi and Debubawi Bahri: 0 Buri: 0 Bera'sole Bay: 0	Total annual government PA budget: Semenawi and Debubawi Bahri: US$ 250,000 Buri: US$ 300,000 Bera'sole Bay: US$ 100,000	Project reports. Government reports. Physical verification. Updated protected area management and business plans. National protected areas conservation strategy.	
Outputs 2.1 Three new protected areas officially recognized and launched 2.2 Model training program implemented for protected area management and staff 2.3 Three model protected area management plans 2.4 Three model protected area business plans 2.5 Integrated and inclusive management mechanisms established					

Outcome 3: Generation of SLM/SFM capacity required to support national system of protected areas	Number of project area residents who are participating members of farm/fisheries field (FFS) schools.	Men: 0 Women: 0	Men: 750 Women: 750	FFS participation reports Project reports	Community level support and enthusiasm for improved livelihoods coupled with conservation of critical ecosystem services will be maintained. Best possible international/national staff will be recruited for implementation and Government will support international staff with permits required to completed necessary fieldwork.
	Number of FFS participant households and women reporting increased levels of food security.	FFS households: 0 FFS Women: 0	FFS households: 500 FFS Women: 500	The project will design and implement a formal survey to monitor and evaluate project impact upon food security as a measurement of ecosystem services security and climate change resilience. The tool will be dis-aggregated by gender. The survey will adapt established international assessment tools, apply these annually and incorporate findings within project progress reports	
	Number of farm and fishing field school participants adopting ecosystem conservation practices as detailed in the community ecosystem services conservation plans.	Baseline: 0	Target: 1,000	Community ecosystem services conservation strategy implementation reports. FFS participation reports Model ecosystem services model conservation measure reports.	
	Total hectares of native forest cover within the Green Belt.	Baseline: 31,680 ha	Target: 55,000 ha	Results of national monitoring program. National protected areas conservation strategy and updates. Protected area management plans and updates. Results of community monitoring programs.	

	Surface water quality/quantity of main upland streams improved to more closely meet needs of natural ecosystem function.	Water quality/quantity target sites and baseline standards TBD at inception	Water quality/quantity target sites and standards TBD at inception.	Results of national monitoring program. National protected areas conservation strategy and updates. Protected area management plans and updates. Results of community monitoring programs.	
	Total number of grazing species found within project's coastal areas.	Numbers of: African wild ass: ≈ 200 Dorcas Gazelle: TBD Soemmoring Gazelle: TBD	Numbers of: African wild ass: ≈ 250 Dorcas Gazelle: TBD Soemmoring Gazelle: TBD	Results of annual Eritrea/IUCN supported surveys. Results of national monitoring program. National protected areas conservation strategy and updates. Protected area management plans and updates. Results of community monitoring programs.	
Outputs 3.1 Farm/Fishing Field Schools established to build local SLM/SFM capacity 3.2 Sustainable resource management plans 3.3 Implementation of model ecosystem service conservation measures					

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

Comments	Response	Reference in documents
Comments from the GEF Secretariat		
All comments provided at PIF stage were addressed prior to final PIF approval.		
Comments from STAP Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies): approved with changes		
All comments provided at PIF stage were addressed prior to final PIF approval.		
Comments from GEF SEC at CEO Endorsement		
To be addressed when received		

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS[3]

A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

None

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: $150,000			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	***GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount ($)***		
	Budgeted Amount	***Amount Spent To date***	***Amount Committed***
Activity 1 – Project Preparation*	150,000	149,000	1,000
Total	**150,000**	**149,000**	**1,000**

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

N/A

[3] 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.