



PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)
PROJECT TYPE: MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEFTF

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title:	Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE): Conserving Earth's Most Irreplaceable Sites for Endangered Biodiversity		
Country(ies):	Global	GEF Project ID	5201
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	00930
Other Executing Partner(s):	Birdlife International, AZE Partnership and Secretariat (American Bird Conservancy - ABC), Ministerio del Medio Ambiente (Chile), Ministry of Environment (Madagascar), Ministry of Environment (Brazil)	Submission Date: Resubmission Date: Resubmission Date:	09 Nov 2012 23 January 2014 27 March 2014
GEF Focal Area (s):	BD	Project Duration (Months)	36
Name of parent program (if applicable): ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/>		Agency Fee (\$):	182,667

A. INDICATIVE FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK:

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Indicative Financing from relevant TF (GEF/LDCF/SCCF) (\$)	Indicative Cofinancing (\$)
BD-1	Outcome 1.1 Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas	Output 1. Establishment/strengthening of AZE protected areas and enhanced conservation of more than 160,000 ha of inadequately protected sites	1,130,655	3,600,000
BD-2	Outcome 2.2 Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks	Output 2. Policies and regulatory frameworks incorporating AZE guidelines (demonstrated in three countries and scaled up globally)	792,158	800,000
Total project costs			1,922,813	4,400,000

B. INDICATIVE PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To prevent species extinctions at priority sites identified through the Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE)						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Co-financing (\$)
Component 1. Protected areas and AZE site-level management at globally important sites	TA	Outcome 1.1. Creation and improved management effectiveness of protected areas covering 120,000 ha, and improved conservation status of a bird <i>Merulaxis stresemanni</i> ; 6 frogs: <i>Eupsophus spp.</i> , <i>Boophis sp.</i> , <i>Mantidactylus spp.</i> , <i>Insuetophrynus sp.</i> ; a day gecko <i>Phelsuma sp.</i> ; and a snake <i>Liophidium sp.</i> - new to science; at a total of five demonstration sites in Brazil, Chile, and Madagascar. This will then be scaled up globally at an additional 10 sites covering an additional 40,000 ha.	Output 1.1.1. Habitat conservation for <i>Merulaxis stresemanni</i> in Bandeiras, Brazil, strengthened through improved infrastructure and community support to sustain long-term conservation and forest protection. Output 1.1.2. In Chile, at Isla Mocha Reserve in Chile, for <i>Eupsophus insularis</i> and at Mehuin 1 and Mehuin 2 for <i>Eupsophus migueli</i> and <i>Insuetophrynus acarpicus</i> respectively, habitat conservation enhanced through strengthened protection status and implementation of newly created or updated (Isla Mocha) management plans. Output 1.1.3. At Tsitongambarika, Madagascar, habitat of six newly- discovered species is enhanced through a co-managed protected area and the implementation of a management and financing plan with a private sector partner. Output 1.1.4. An additional 10 AZE sites covering a minimum of 40,000 additional ha will gain enhanced protection through additional projects using the three demonstration projects as models.	GEFTF	Total 975,992 STAR 975,992	3,600,000
Component 2.	TA	Outcome 2.1. The conservation	Output 2.1.1. Improved	GEF	Total	400,000

<p>Mainstreaming of AZE site conservation in national policy and regulatory frameworks and into safeguard policies of MDBs and the private sector</p>		<p>of threatened species and the protection of AZE sites is mainstreamed, through explicit reference, into the safeguard policies of Multilateral Development Banks and key private sector institutions such as Equator Principle Banks.</p>	<p>awareness of and accessibility to AZE data online for relevant decision-makers to facilitate mainstreaming, including updated global AZE site list and global site status assessment.</p>	<p>TF</p>	<p>855,258 STAR 116,484 Global 738,774</p>	
		<p>Outcome 2.2. AZE site conservation is mainstreamed into national biodiversity strategies, in support of CBD targets.</p>	<p>Output 2.1.2. Technical guidance documents based on 2.1.1, to inform and support the incorporation of AZE species and site considerations into EIA and safeguard policies.</p> <p>Output 2.1.3. Capacity of AZE members to partner with lending institutions strengthened and national AZE networks enhanced through outreach and training programs.</p> <p>2.1.4. Staff in financial institutions trained in use of AZE tools and data.</p> <p>Output 2.1.5. Synergies identified and AZE site conservation opportunities mainstreamed with existing and planned donor/agency and private sector financing programs.</p> <p>Output 2.2.1. Development and implementation of at least three pilot National AZE Strategies (Brazil, Chile, and Madagascar) mainstreamed into NBSAPs and PoWPA Action Plans, and plans developed and adopted for long-term financing and sustainability.</p> <p>Output 2.2.2. Technical guidance documents (based on the strategies developed under 2.2.1) to inform and support incorporation of</p>			

			AZE priorities in the development of further NBSAPs and PoPWPA Action Plans globally. Output 2.2.3. Consolidated and strengthened national AZE partnerships providing input to NPSAP and PoWPA processes and national CBD reporting through targeted capacity development and outreach programs (such as national AZE workshops and training courses). 2.2.4. At least five countries take steps to enhance AZE site conservation based on project outputs, e.g. with support from LifeWeb and AZE NGO partners.			
Subtotal					1,831,250	4,000,000
Project management cost (5%)				GEF TF	Total 91,563 STAR 54,624 Global 36,939	400,000
Total project costs					1,922,813	4,400,000

C. INDICATIVE CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME IF AVAILABLE, (\$)

Sources of Cofinancing	Name of Cofinancier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
CSO	BirdLife International	In-kind	1,200,000
CSO	BirdLife International	Cash	300,000
CSO	American Bird Conservancy (AZE Secretariat)	In-kind	1,200,000
CSO	American Bird Conservancy (AZE Secretariat)	Cash	300,000
CSO	AZE Partners	In-kind	800,000
Government	National Government of Chile, Madagascar, Brazil	In-kind	500,000
GEF Agency	UNEP	In-kind	100,000
Total Co-financing			4,400,000

D. GEF/LDCF/SCCF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal area	Country name/Global	Grant amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total c=a+b
UNEP	GEFTF	BD	Global	775,713	73,692	849,405

UNEP	GEFTF	BD	Chile	260,274	24,726	285,000
UNEP	GEFTF	BD	Madagascar	445,205	42,295	487,500
UNEP	GEFTF	BD	Brazil	441,621	41,954	483,575
Total Grant Resources				1,922,813	182,667	2,105,480

E. PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG)

PPG Category	Amount Requested (\$)	Agency Fee for PPG (\$)
(up to) \$100k for projects up to and including \$3 million	77,187	7,333

PPG AMOUNT REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES)

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Focal area	Country Name/Global	(in \$)		
				PPG (a)	Agency Fee(b)	Total c = a + b
UNEP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Global	37,072	3,522	40,594
UNEP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Chile	13,699	1,301	15,000
UNEP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Madagascar	11,416	1,085	12,501
UNEP	GEFTF	Biodiversity	Brazil	15,000	1,425	16,425
Total PPG Amount				77,187	7,333	84,520

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. PROJECT OVERVIEW

A.1. Project Description

A. 1.1 Global Environmental Problems, root causes, and barriers that need to be addressed

The Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE), a joint initiative of biodiversity conservation organizations from around the world, aims to prevent extinctions by identifying and safeguarding key sites, each one of which is the last remaining refuge of one or more Endangered or Critically Endangered species. These key sites are amongst the most important if global biodiversity loss is to be halted and reversed. The two key root causes of threat to these sites and species are habitat loss caused by small scale deforestation and the presence of invasive species. Of particular concern to AZE is that species with tiny global ranges are especially vulnerable to such external threats.

AZE uses the following criteria to identify priority sites (a site must meet all three to qualify):

1. Endangerment. An AZE site must contain at least one Endangered (EN) or Critically Endangered (CR) species, as listed on the IUCN Red List.
2. Irreplaceability. An AZE site should only be designated if it is the sole area where an EN or CR species occurs, contains the overwhelmingly significant known resident population (>95%) of the EN or CR species, or contains the overwhelmingly significant known population (>95%) for one life history segment (e.g. breeding or wintering) of the EN or CR species.

3. Discreteness. The area must have a definable boundary within which the character of habitats, biological communities, and/or management issues have more in common with each other than they do with those in adjacent areas.

Barriers to improving the status of AZE species include:

- Conservation efforts are primarily focused on ecosystems and large areas of habitat and may miss irreplaceable sites for highly unique, threatened species which often occupy relatively small areas.
- Local natural resource managers often have insufficient knowledge of AZE species, and even if they know of them, capacity to conserve them is often lacking.
- Local communities are unaware of the global uniqueness and importance of the AZE species in their area, and have few alternatives to their current practices that may threaten AZE species.
- Investment strategies of lending institutions may pay insufficient attention to globally irreplaceable sites for biodiversity conservation due a lack of access to AZE data.

A.1.2 Baseline Scenario and any associated baseline projects

Given the multiple project components, this section is organized to provide baseline data relevant to the respective outcomes from the Indicative Project Framework above. This system continues throughout the PIF. In some cases the sections specify content by country, while others just separate national and global components where national activities are similar across the project countries.

Outcome 1.1. Creation and improved management effectiveness of protected areas covering 120,000 ha, and improved conservation status of 1) *Merulaxis stresemanni*, 2) *Eupsophus insularis*, and 3) six frogs (*Eupsophus spp.*, *Insuetophrynus sp.*, *Boophis sp.* and *Mantidactylus spp.*), a day gecko (*Phelsuma sp.*), and a snake (*Liophidium sp.*) new to science; at a total of three demonstration sites in Brazil, Chile, and Madagascar. This will then be scaled up globally at an additional 10 sites covering an additional 40,000 ha.

Brazil: The bird, *Merulaxis stresemanni* has an estimated global population of between 10 and 15 individuals is threatened by fire, logging, and habitat clearance for pastures and agriculture. The extent of its known current habitat is 5,000 ha of partially fragmented forest, with 4,300 ha unprotected and only 700 ha currently protected in a private reserve with a single guard and insufficient equipment and infrastructure.

Chile: Isla Mocha National Reserve is the only site for the Critically Endangered frog, *Eupsophus insularis*. There is no baseline population trend due to a paucity of records and a lack of repeated surveys. Key threats are habitat loss caused by wood collection and cattle ranching, although the impact and pace of these threats is unquantified. The species occurs within an existing reserve which is

2,368 ha in extent and covers 45% of the island, primarily in the higher forested areas. The reserve has two staff but resources to survey and protect the AZE trigger species are lacking. Approximately 800 people live on the island, some of whom reside within the reserve boundary. Two additional sites, Mehuin 1 and 2, totaling some 60,000 hectares, are the sites for *Eupsophus migueli* and *Insuetophrynus acarpicus*, also critically endangered frog species. The threats at these sites derive from loss of habitat mainly due to destruction of native forests, agricultural bad practices, presence of domestic cattle and pets, and decreasing flows in rivers and wetlands, with resulting loss of vegetation. The remoteness of these unprotected sites will require interventions to ascertain the baseline situations under the project preparation phase. Chile is presently developing a national strategy to protect amphibians.

Madagascar: Tsitongambarika Forest (60,000 ha), the target project site in Madagascar, is the largest block of lowland rainforest in the south of the country. Since 2005 it has been shown to hold exceptional levels of endemism, e.g. four frogs (*Boophis* sp. and *Mantidactylus* spp.), a day gecko (*Phelsuma* sp.), and a snake (*Liophidium* sp.). All believed to be new to science are restricted to the site. The forest and its biodiversity are threatened by shifting cultivation by a very poor local population, as well as by illegal logging and hunting; however, local communities are receptive to schemes to enhance natural resource management and promote alternative livelihoods. The site has been declared a temporary protected area. It has a management plan, a governance system for co-management, and a program to offset biodiversity loss resulting from a Rio Tinto-operated mine in nearby littoral forest, but all of these need effort, integration and resources to move forward.

Global: To date, AZE has identified 587 sites that are the sole remaining habitats for 920 of the world's most threatened species. Of these, 40% are currently unprotected. As mentioned previously, the key threats to AZE sites and species are habitat loss caused by small scale deforestation, and invasive species. NGOs are working to provide direct protection to these sites and 17 private reserves at AZE sites have been created in the past decade in Latin America alone, and there is great potential to further expand this with support from private donors (see for example ABC's [Latin American Bird Reserve Network](#)). The CBD Aichi targets also present a unique opportunity to scale up protection for AZE sites, but access to data and lack of information on AZE sites currently hamper efforts to safeguard them from development projects and to include them in NBSAPs and PoWPA Action Plans. AZE has, however, developed an MOU with CBD and begun to engage with CBD in providing AZE information to signatory nations for inclusion on NBSAPs.

Outcome 2.1. The conservation of threatened species and the protection of AZE sites is mainstreamed into the safeguard policies of Multilateral Development Banks and key private sector institutions such as Equator Principle Banks, to minimize the impact of development projects on AZE sites.

i). Data and capacity

Brazil: The Brazilian Alliance for Zero Extinction (BAZE) was officially established by the Ministry of the Environment in 2006. It is comprised of 40 government and non-government institutions aimed at defining and implementing conservation strategies for species severely threatened with extinction. To

date, 27 global AZE sites have been identified in Brazil. In total, 28 AZE trigger species occupy these sites (12 birds, 10 amphibians, 5 mammals, and one reptile). A further five AZE sites have been identified at the national level. Of these 32 total sites, 19 have no protected status, eight are partially protected, and five are completely protected.

Chile: Currently there is no AZE Alliance in Chile, with nine AZE sites identified globally. In total, ten AZE trigger species occupy these sites (8 amphibians and two birds). Three of the nine sites are currently confirmed as having some protected status.

Madagascar: 21 AZE sites have been identified to date but more are expected to be confirmed. At least 7 AZE members, mostly international NGOs, are already working in Madagascar, but there is not yet an a national AZE alliance or ongoing national program. Conservation actions are underway at several AZE sites, but in most cases these actions need to be scaled up to adequately address current threats to biodiversity. Since 2003 the Protected Area network has expanded from 1.7 million hectares to 4.7 million hectares, covering many of the AZE sites, with stronger local participation in management although nearly all of the new protected areas are categorised as “temporarily protected”.

Global: [AZE](#) was founded in 2000 and has 93 global member NGOs in 35 countries, with national alliances in five countries that include both NGO and government members. AZE global data is available for birds, mammals, some reptiles (turtles, tortoises, iguanas, and crocodilians), amphibians, reef-building corals, and conifers (587 sites for 920 species). This data was most recently released globally in 2010, but needs to be updated to reflect the latest information and additional taxonomic groups. This data is currently available via IBAT and directly from AZE as a set of GIS polygons, but these polygons have insufficient associated data such as would be needed for site safeguard purposes (e.g. to guide and inform development finance and EIAs). Most AZE member institutions do not interact with development project lending institutions on a very regular basis, and are not able to influence bank decision-making at the desired level due to lack of capacity and information. Staff at the World Bank, IFC, and IDB are aware of AZE and have access to the relevant (but currently limited) data. Other regional development banks and Equator Principle banks are generally unaware of AZE. A small number of synergistic projects have taken place thus far due to interactions between AZE partners and IDB/IFC including projects in Honduras and Colombia. AZE is well-placed globally to take advantage of further such opportunities, but currently lacks the capacity and resources to follow through on these.

ii). MDB and Bank Policy

Brazil: We are not aware of any MDB safeguard policies that are specific to Brazil, however, the International Finance Corporation (IFC) and Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) both explicitly refer to AZE within their relevant project safeguard guidance notes and include language in their policy documentation that encompasses AZE sites. While the inclusion in IFC policy implies inclusion in the safeguard policies of 70 additional partner banks, AZE does not have information confirming the relevance of this to Brazil at the present time. Identifying banks operating in Brazil and engaging them in AZE will be an output of this project.

Chile: The same situation applies in Chile as it does in Brazil relative to MDBs and national lending institutions.

Madagascar: The same situation applies in Madagascar as it does in Brazil relative to MDBs and national lending institutions. The African Development Bank does not yet include AZE in its safeguard policy.

Global: As mentioned above, the International Finance Corporation (IFC) and Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) both refer to AZE within their relevant project safeguard guidance notes. The inclusion in IFC policy implies inclusion in the safeguard policies of 70 additional partner “Equator Principle” banks but this needs follow up. The World Bank does not yet explicitly include AZE in its natural habitats safeguard policy but that policy is currently under review, and AZE is being considered for inclusion. The World Bank does not yet explicitly include AZE in its natural habitats safeguard policy but that policy is currently under review and AZE is being considered for inclusion. AZE is not explicitly reference in the policies of the African Development Bank, European Investment Bank, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and Asian Development Bank, although there is recognition by these financial institutions of the need to safeguard Critically Endangered Species .

Outcome 2.2. AZE site conservation is mainstreamed into national biodiversity strategies, in support of CBD targets.

i). Data and capacity

National: While a significant amount of effort has been undertaken to develop AZE gap analyses in Brazil, Colombia, India, and Mexico, there is not yet a completed AZE national strategy or financing plan included or mentioned in the NBSAP for any country. Some national site maps have been produced however (Brazil, Colombia, India), and three countries are poised to upgrade their commitments to AZE as evidenced by the STAR allocations to the current project. The section above under 2.1 provides general information on the capacity of AZE in the respective focal countries for this project.

Global: As mentioned previously, AZE has so far identified 587 sites for 920 species globally and has 93 member NGOS in 35 countries. Little interaction has taken place so far between national AZE alliances and CBD focal points regarding NBSAPs and PoWPA Action Plans although some of the larger international NGO members have been significantly engaged in CBD activities (e.g. BirdLife, ABC, Conservation International). For example, ABC/AZE facilitated a module on setting national targets and indicators within the CBD Global NBSAP workshop held in Nairobi from the 11th to the 15th of November 2013.

ii). NBSAP and PoWPA Status (see Section B.1)

Brazil: AZE is mentioned in Brazil’s NBSAP, but is not yet mentioned in Brazil’s PoWPA Action Plan. The Brazilian Alliance for Zero Extinction has worked with government agencies, including MMA and the

Chico Mendes Institute to map Brazil's AZE sites and so the baseline work to update the PoWPA Action Plan with AZE data has already been completed.

Chile: Chile's NBSAP does not yet mention AZE explicitly, however, its second objective does call for the preservation of endangered species. AZE is not yet mentioned in Chile's PoWPA Action Plan.

Madagascar: The Madagascar NBSAP does not yet mention AZE specifically, but it does call for the implementation of management systems for endangered species. AZE is not yet mentioned in Madagascar's PoWPA.

Global: In July 2013, CBD conducted an analysis of PoWPA Action Plans and NBSAPs to determine which already include AZE. It was determined that already 35 PoWPA Action Plans mention AZE criteria or an AZE site while 11 more nations stated commitment to halting extinctions; and to date, two NBSAPs (Brazil and Philippines) and four PoWPA Action Plans explicitly mention AZE (Vietnam, Nauru, Indonesia, Philippines).

A. 1. 3. The proposed alternative scenario, with a brief description of Expected Outcomes and Components of the Project

Outcome 1.1. Creation and improved management effectiveness of protected areas covering 120,000 ha, and improved conservation status of 1) *Merulaxis stresemanni*, 2) *Eupsophus insularis*, and 3) four frogs (*Boophis* sp. and *Mantidactylus* spp.), a day gecko (*Phelsuma* sp.), and a snake (*Liophidium* sp.) new to science; at a total of three demonstration sites in Brazil, Chile, and Madagascar. This will then be scaled up globally at an additional 10 sites covering an additional 40,000 ha.

Brazil: The Brazil component of the project will commence with a national workshop to refine priorities and confirm which sites are to be the focal areas for the project. The primary focal site is initially expected to be Bandeiras, where habitat conservation for *Merulaxis stresemanni* in Bandeiras, Brazil, will be strengthened through improved infrastructure and community support to sustain long-term conservation and forest protection. Although the reserve already has a full-time guard presence, sustainability tools including birdwatching tourism will be developed to finance this presence in the longer-term to eliminate small scale logging and land clearance incursions. The reserve will be expanded to include additional forest areas, and fire prevention (buffer zone fire breaks) and control programs will be developed and implemented. Community outreach will also help to build more local support for conservation of the site. Additional sites will be identified based on priorities established by the project partners.

Chile: Chile has selected three focal sites: Isla Mocha Reserve, Mehuin 1, and Mehuin 2 where habitat conservation for three different critically endangered frog species will be enhanced through the updating and implementation of the site's management plan (Isla Mocha) and enhanced protection and development of management plans for the latter two sites. Activities will include a threat assessment and mitigation strategy for the AZE trigger species, the development of education outreach and community engagement programs, and the implementation of invasive predator control that also benefits additional key species (such as the globally Vulnerable Pink-footed Shearwater *Puffinus*

creatopus), and the forest ecosystem as a whole.

Madagascar: The project in Madagascar will be articulated in two main phases, first an inclusive consultative process to define a national AZE network; and secondly, conservation interventions at one or more priority sites. Initially, the primary focal site is expected to be Tsitongambarika which provides habitat for six newly- discovered species. Conservation of the site will be enhanced through a co-managed protected area and the implementation of a management and financing plan with a private sector partner. Conservation opportunities are provided by the site's current temporary protection, sound Management Plan, governance system for co-management, and program to offset biodiversity loss from a nearby development project. Selection criteria for additional sites will include AZE conservation importance ratings, and the degree to which projects can maximize the multiple benefits derived from each intervention (e.g. contributing to other GEF focal area objectives such as SFM/REDD+, LD and CCM).

Global: An additional 10 AZE sites covering a minimum of 40,000 additional ha will gain enhanced protection through additional projects developed/implemented using the three demonstration projects as models. Both ABC and BirdLife have significant portfolios of site-based projects at AZE sites globally. See for example ABC's [Latin American Bird Reserve Network](#) which includes 17 AZE sites. The funds contributed to these projects are in the range of \$5,000,000 per annum depending on external donors. The precise sites will be selected as the project develops. However, a list of potential existing projects that could be scaled-up has been prioritized. One particular area of leverage provided by the current project will be in linking government and NGO partners in enhancing the protection of these sites. Most of the work that has taken place thus far has been conducted by NGOs, and the opportunity to pilot collaborative NGO/government projects in three countries will provide model learning opportunities for the project proponents.

Outcome 2.1. The conservation of threatened species and the protection of AZE sites is mainstreamed into the safeguard policies of Multilateral Development Banks and key private sector institutions such as Equator Principle Banks, to minimize the impact of development projects on AZE sites.

National: The project will work with national AZE alliances and the leading partners in each country to identify and engage with national and regional lending institutions operating in the respective focal countries. With GEF support, the partners will provide training and capacity-building to national partners to more actively engage in productive dialogue with lending and development agencies. The project will also ensure that the AZE global database is updated and that adequate outreach and data tools are made available to partners and banks to support decision-makers in AZE site-protection strategies. This will include improved awareness of and accessibility to AZE data online for relevant decision-makers, an updated global AZE site list and global site status assessment, technical guidance documents based on the AZE site list (including a map and GIS files), to inform and support the incorporation of AZE species and site considerations into EIA and safeguard policies. The capacity of AZE members to partner with lending institutions will be strengthened and national AZE networks enhanced through outreach and training programs. Staff in the respective financial institutions will also be trained in use of AZE tools and data. This will ultimately lead to opportunities to find synergies

between AZE site conservation needs and mitigation strategies of lenders to enhance site conservation through avoidance, mitigation, and through compensation related to nearby project impacts (it is not likely feasible to offset direct AZE site impacts due to the uniqueness and irreplaceability of these sites).

Global: The global component of this work will follow a similar strategy to the national components but will be implemented primarily by BirdLife International in coordination with AZE. This component will also engage more directly with IUCN, and IBAT in advancing the focus on AZE sites in their work to engage lending institutions and projects. Project work will include direct outreach to the World Bank, IFC, regional banks, and global Equator Principle banks such as Citibank and HSBC. The project will also explore opportunities of working through UNEP's Finance Initiative, a formal membership of over 230 financial institutions internationally including banks, investors and insurers. Presentation of AZE data and the need to include AZE sites in project safeguard strategies, will be delivered through a series of seminars, webinars, and one-on-one meetings with key staff in the lending institutions.

Outcome 2.2. AZE site conservation is mainstreamed into national biodiversity strategies, in support of CBD targets.

National: the project will ensure the development and implementation of at least three pilot National AZE Strategies (Brazil, Chile, and Madagascar) that are then mainstreamed into the respective national NBSAPs and PoWPA Action Plans, including strategies for long-term financing and sustainability. AZE will work to consolidate and strengthen national AZE partnerships to help them provide input to these NBSAP and PoWPA processes, and to assist national CBD reporting (such as through national AZE workshops and training courses). This work will be piloted nationally and scaled up globally.

Global: Based on the three national strategies developed for the three principal countries, AZE will produce technical guidance documents to inform and support incorporation of AZE priorities in the development of further NBSAPs and PoWPA Action Plans globally. AZE will also update the AZE global site data set as part of this project including a new global "report card" that will track progress towards the protection of AZE sites. It will also report on the inclusion of AZE sites in NBSAPs and PoWPA Action Plans, and the number of development projects that contact AZE for input during environmental assessments and the outcome of these consultations. Through this effort, global awareness of the importance and conservation status of AZE site network will be enhanced to support improved conservation efforts at local, national, regional and global levels. The outreach and networking capacity of the global AZE Alliance and national AZE alliances in key countries will be significantly improved to support site conservation action at all levels. Promotional materials will be developed and success stories from model national projects will also be shared. At least five countries will be encouraged to take steps to implement AZE site conservation projects including both national government and NGO partners, e.g. with support from LifeWeb and AZE NGO members.

UNEP will also facilitate the integration of AZE priorities within NBSAPs through the NBSAP forum and through the specific NBSAP revision projects for which UNEP currently serves as the GEF Implementing Agency. UNEP is responsible for supporting NBSAP revisions in some 80 countries most of them LDCs and SIDs. Furthermore, UNEP and AZE are participating members of the NBSAP Forum which provides

support for action and implementation of NBSAPs through 2020. Through the newly started global project titled "Support to GEF Eligible Countries for achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 through a globally guided NBSAPs update process" the UNEP (DEPI, DELC) and UNEP-WCMC will ensure that AZE issues are incorporated in the NBSAP revisions whether UNEP led or otherwise as follows:

- i) Through the NBSAP Forum portal (nbsapforum.net) AZE tools and relevant informative documents will be uploaded into the portal and subsequently the NBSAP country focal points will be asked to ensure incorporation into the revised NBSAPs and also in the subsequent implementation of the NBSAP.
- ii) Draft NBSAPs will be screened for AZE issues before they are finally submitted to the CBD.
- iii) AZE issues will be discussed in the global webinars which will be organized through the project "Support to GEF Eligible Countries for achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 through a globally guided NBSAPs update process" .
- iv) The UNEP DEPI NBSAP project secretariat will also provide further scrutiny to ensure that UNEP supported countries incorporate AZE into the progress and final reporting to UNEP.

The CBD LifeWeb Zero Extinction campaign has been developed to help implement site-based projects at AZE sites. AZE will provide "assistance to CBD Parties with integrating the zero extinction target into national biodiversity strategies and action plans" as agreed in its MOU with the CBD. AZE is working with national alliances in Colombia, India, Mexico, and Peru to include reference to AZE in NBSAPs for those countries, and in particular, is in discussion with CONABIO in Mexico regarding the forthcoming AZE data update and the verification of Mexican AZE sites. Following a resolution in support of AZE passed by the General Assembly at the 2012 World Conservation Congress, members of the IUCN leadership (the Director General, Species Survival Commission, and World Commission on Protected Areas chairs) wrote to CBD focal points requesting that parties "Include a gap analysis of AZE sites in your National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan to identify which sites fall within your existing protected area network and which need protection." AZE intends to follow up on this through direct contact with focal points and NBSAP authors, by providing information on AZE sites to these contacts, by developing national AZE alliances and linking them with NBSAP authors, by developing and promulgating materials and GIS data on AZE, and continuing to participate in relevant CBD fora including providing materials and resources through the NBSAP Forum and the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, and participating in regional training workshops arranged by the CBD.

A.1. 4. Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF/SCCTF and Co-Financing

Baseline scenario without GEF support: The innovative concept of AZE and the underlying strong partnership does not get sufficient traction because individual partners do not have sufficient collective resources to upscale the AZE concepts and support the development and uptake of the AZE initiative at the global level. The AZE guidelines are not yet adequately taken into account in the updating of NBSAPs and are not adopted as part of key development planning processes, leading to the continuing and irreversible loss of additional AZE species and sites, and thus not supporting the achievement of CBD Aichi Targets for 2020. At national levels, the lack of capacity, awareness,

information exchange and resourcing has impaired country ability to take needful action at priority AZE sites.

Scenario with the incremental GEF contribution: The incremental GEF contribution to conservation activities at the site level (component 1) will support the achievement of immediate and measurable global benefits by avoiding the extinction of species and deterioration/loss of critically important AZE sites, while developing pilot projects and leveraging additional site-level actions. In component 2, the capacity of the AZE partnership to complement, catalyze and build upon conservation efforts by all AZE partners will be significantly strengthened. Critical conservation planning tools and guidelines will be developed to support the achievement of CBD Target 11 and 12 through enhanced AZE site and species monitoring and conservation. Through the GEF incremental contribution, these new AZE-related materials and tools will be developed to the highest standard and will be widely disseminated and up-taken effectively and with potential for significant impact at a global scale. The incremental GEF support will also foster the more timely adoption of AZE as part of NBSAPs and its uptake as part of conservation, development planning and decision making process at global, national and local levels. It will also contribute to the development of additional capacities at the local/site level as well as globally to improve access to AZE data, build awareness and capacity to leverage actions through the AZE network and its partners at the global level – thus contributing to the delivery of significant GEBs at all AZE sites.

A.1. 5. Global Environmental Benefits

The project will generate global environmental benefits (GEBs) by directly contributing to the conservation of at least three AZE species and increased management effectiveness of their habitats at three sites in Brazil, Chile and Madagascar, and leveraging these pilot projects at additional AZE sites globally. Through the integration of AZE considerations into UN policies and the safeguard policies of multilateral development banks and private sector institutions, the potential leveraged impact to deliver GEBs is huge. Furthermore the inclusion of AZE prioritization into NBSAPs will leverage prioritization and funding of AZE action in the entire portfolio of countries updating their NBSAPs, again leveraging immense potential GEBs into the longer term. Global Environmental Benefits will also be delivered through the knock-on impact of changed behaviour and increased actions, through increased awareness and capacity. The protection of AZE species will be significant for biodiversity conservation not only for the three countries receiving direct interventions, but also globally through the integration of AZE in planning and prioritization processes.

A study documenting co-benefits of AZE conservation for ecosystem services that was recently published in the journal PLoS ONE assessed more than 500 Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) sites around the world to review the potential and realized benefits which conserving these places would provide, not just for species, but also for human well-being. The researchers determined that protecting habitats in these priority areas to halt the loss of biodiversity will yield multiple benefits to people in terms of ecosystem services such as: climate change mitigation, freshwater, the future “option value” of biodiversity, and cultural services ([click to access the study](#)).

Gender. Project planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting will be gender sensitive and respect UNEP Gender Sensitivity Guidelines. The project would further integrate the principles and approach outlined in BirdLife's gender policy which is currently being reviewed by their Council with the expectation that it will be accepted later in 2014. Training materials and courses will be gender sensitive and gender balance will be sought in workshop participation by working through AZE partnered women's groups. The project will furthermore monitor training attendance by women and men, and use this information to adjust training approaches and materials to ensure that women are able to participate fully.

A. 1. 6. Innovativeness, sustainability, and potential for scaling up

Innovation: The Project is innovative as it is the first GEF funded national/global effort to integrate AZE as a distinct priority into conservation planning at the national level, leveraging up through global opportunities to do same.

Sustainability: The project design will include strategies and activities to ensure sustainability as mandated by UNEP Sub-programme on Ecosystem Management. At the site level this includes: (i) increasing management effectiveness; (ii) maximizing ecosystem services; and (iii) generating socio-economic benefits for surrounding community groups. At the national level, activities to ensure sustainability include: (i) training and awareness raising activities, (ii) development of national AZE strategies; (iii) long term financing and sustainability plans for AZE strategy implementation. At the global level: (i) tools made available to integrate AZE priorities into lending and planning for mobilizing funds from sustainable sources, and; (ii) developing realistic strategies for future activities.

Scaling Up:

Component 1. Protected areas and AZE site-level management at globally important sites. The pilot site projects will provide opportunities to develop and implement species and site protection strategies that have much broader applicability. This will include management and site protection techniques that will contribute to the global knowledge base of how to manage AZE sites and species. Of particular interest to the project proponents is the opportunity to develop these projects in collaboration with government agency partners. Many existing AZE projects have been implemented by NGOs alone, and the possibility of adding an additional layer of official protection, coupled with the additional management expertise, and funding opportunities such as LifeWeb afforded by NGO-government collaboration, all provide a potential new model for scaling up AZE site projects at additional sites and in additional countries. GEF support for AZE will add an additional level of credibility to the initiative that may also unlock additional funding opportunities and provide encouragement to additional donors.

Component 2. Mainstreaming of AZE site conservation in national policy and regulatory frameworks and into safeguard policies of MDBs and the private sector. The Equator Principles offer an immediate opportunity to scale-up AZE site conservation into the operational procedures of 70 lending institutions operating globally. The fact that both IFC and IDB already include AZE in their safeguard policies can also provide encouragement to additional regional banks and to the World Bank to include AZE in their safeguards. These policies therefore enable the project proponents an opportunity to

leverage the project results across multiple financial institutions.

The inclusion of AZE in a small number of NBSAPs and PoWPA Action Plans provides proof of concept, and the combined engagement of UNEP, UNDP, CBD, and AZE partners in the project provides an excellent opportunity to scale the project up to include multiple NBSAPs and PoWPA action plans. By concentrating initially on the development of three model national AZE strategies that can be replicated elsewhere, the project will be able to showcase national pilot strategies in a variety of fora, such as CBD and IUCN meetings to encourage uptake by additional nations.

A.2. STAKEHOLDERS

The project will be implemented in line with established UNEP consultative procedures and those of the three national executing partner entities. The project preparation phase, as financed by a GEF project preparation grant (PPG) will be used to further define the management, coordination and consultation mechanisms. A broader stakeholder mechanism, to involve representatives of the local communities or grassroots organizations or Community Based Organizations (CBO) at the identified project sites, will be established. This will ensure the broad participation in planning, consultation and lesson learning.

Category	Stakeholders	Roles and Engagement
National Government and affiliated organizations	AZE members operate in most countries worldwide, and AZE partners interact with national and local governments and affiliated institutions.	The national government and a wide range of government-affiliated institutions will play a major role in the project and contribute a significant baseline investment upon which the GEF contribution will build.
Local and Indigenous Community Groups, including Women's groups	All relevant local indigenous community groups, including women's groups will be identified for each specific intervention at target AZE sites	Participation in consultations mechanisms and activities including policy dialogues and working groups including: project design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation. AZE members American Bird Conservancy and ProAves Colombia have particular expertise in this field through the 'Women in Conservation' program.
Private Sector	At the site level: small scale, community-based enterprises (SMEs) active within the area surrounding the target AZE site. At the national and global levels: national investors; partner banks of the IFC.	In addition to site level and global interventions engaging with private sector partners, BirdLife will seek to build on its corporate programme, its membership of the Business and Biodiversity Partnership (BBOP), and its corporate. American Bird Conservancy and its partners have special expertise in the field of ecotourism development. Private carbon investment companies will also be potential partners.
Multilateral development banks	World Bank Group (including IFC), European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Asian, African and Intra-American Development Banks	These finance institutions have (or are revising/developing) safeguard policies which seek to ensure measures are in place to manage impacts of development finance on biodiversity.
International CSOs, conservation NGOs & other conservation-oriented partners	A List of AZE partners can be viewed at: http://www.zeroextinction.org/membership.htm and http://www.zeroextinction.org/partners.html	Will be involved in monitoring and field research, training and capacity building, development of conservation policies and legal instruments, community involvement, outreach and awareness programs. All such contributions will be defined in detail for each AZE/GEF intervention, and will be supported through in-kind support as well as grants.
International Multi-lateral Environmental Agreements	CBD Secretariat, AWEA and CMS Secretariat, Ramsar Convention Secretariat, etc.	Provide linkages with relevant international processes; guidance and technical expertise to counterpart institutions in target countries; support compliance by partner countries to relevant conventions; assist in showcasing the experience and achievements of the project in international fora. BirdLife is one of five implementing partners of the Ramsar Convention, and has a memorandum of understanding with the CBD Secretariat, as does AZE.
UN and International Organizations	UNEP/DEP, UNEP/DELIC and UNEP-LifeWeb program	UNEP and its specialized partner agencies will (in addition to the GEF Implementing Agency functions played by the UNEP GEF team) provide a wide range of technical in-kind contributions to the design and implementation of the project.

A.3 Risks

Identified Risk	Proposed risk management measures
1. Weak coordination among ministerial bodies and lack of support from national governments at the national and local level to support the conservation of AZE sites - Level – M	Building on the lessons of other GEF projects it will be critical to foster government ownership from the onset. Practical measures to pre-empt this risk will be to establish coordination mechanisms comprised of both civil society and government personnel. Government staff will also be involved on relevant local Steering Committees and governance structures. To ensure sustainability, measures will be taken for the government to support conservation activities in partnership with the AZE network, after the project cycle has ended. Effective inter-ministerial bodies such as Madagascar’s SAPM Commission will help to mitigate this risk.
2. Government turnover leading to changes in political direction Level – M	To counter this risk it is essential foster a sense of Return on Investment and demonstrate how the conservation of AZE sites benefits national interests. Particular attention needs to be devoted to sustaining government engagement through a combination of high level, public, and working level meetings to leverage maximum political commitment. All major agreements should be clearly documented and signed off by relevant government agencies. This risk can be minimized by ensuring that staff at a variety of levels are engaged in national AZE discussions. This risk appears strongest in Madagascar, in view of the 2009-2013 political crisis, but is reduced by the recent election, and by the long-term involvement of key Government officials.
3. Unwillingness to cooperate and sacrifice local or national interests for the achievement of global environmental benefits and conservation of AZE sites - Level - L	A well-designed communications strategy at the global level, and at each site, will provide the foundation for project success, networking among AZE sites’ practitioners, while highlighting the benefits of measures to improve biodiversity conservation and habitat quality across boundaries.
4. Suboptimal capacity building efforts to support the conservation of AZE sites - Level – M	A sound and well-designed capacity building component will provide the foundation for project success, networking among AZE sites’ practitioners, while also highlighting the benefits of potential measures to improve biodiversity conservation and habitat quality across boundaries.
5. Insufficient awareness of climate change and adaptation issues affecting AZE sites - Level – L	Climate change and adaptation will be incorporated into management planning at the site level, and mainstreamed into awareness and capacity building tools to be developed by the project. A recent study suggests that existing prioritization methods such as the Red List that informs AZE are in fact good predictors of climate change risk.
6. Communities resident in areas surrounding target AZE sites are not supportive of conservation plans – Level - M	A comprehensive community outreach plan for each target AZE site will be developed and implemented. The generation of socio-economic benefits will be emphasized as part of the establishment and management of target AZE site. Where applicable, priority in job creation and capacity building will be given to the disadvantaged social groups, including women’s groups, within the surrounding community.
7. The needs and priorities of the more disadvantaged groups of society, including Indigenous groups and Women Groups are not adequately taken into account by conservation and development plans for AZE sites – Level – L	Stakeholder consultation and involvement mechanisms at all levels to be ensured during the project preparation, design and implementation of the overall project with highlighted features in site level interventions.

A.4. COORDINATION. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELEVANT GEF FINANCED AND OTHER INITIATIVES

Brazil: In Brazil, the national project will be coordinated through a partnership between Ministério do Meio Ambiente, Instituto Chico Mendes de Conservação da Biodiversidade, and the Brazilian Alliance for Zero Extinction (BAZE). Potential additional major site project partners include Biodiversitas, SAVE Brasil, and American Bird Conservancy; site-level co-financing is expected to be provided by PetroBras. The precise mechanism for project implementation will be finalized during the Project Preparation Grant phase. It is expected to include a workshop between project participants to plan out project

strategy and disbursements as well as potential coordination with other GEF-supported projects and UNDP that is supporting the Brazil NBSAP. At that point, the partners will also review additional site-based efforts for potential inclusion in the project, as well as develop a framework for a national AZE strategy.

Chile: In Chile, the national project will be coordinated and implemented by Chile's Ministry of the Environment. The precise mechanism for project implementation will be finalized during the Project Preparation Grant phase. It is expected to include a workshop between project participants to plan out project strategy, disbursements and broader coordination. Potential additional participants include Corporación Nacional Forestal, Reserva Nacional Isla Mocha, Oikonos, Island Conservation, and American Bird Conservancy. Co-financing will be provided by the Chilean Ministry of the Environment. While the principle focus for the project will be Isla Mocha, the partners will also review additional site-based efforts for potential inclusion in the project, as well as developing the national strategy.

Madagascar: In Madagascar, the project will be overseen by a national AZE Steering Committee, which will be established under the project. The Steering Committee is expected to be chaired by the General Directorate of Environment and will liaise closely with the Commission on the new Protected Areas System of Madagascar (SAPM Commission). This Commission oversees the process by which New PAs are being created, and participation in the project will ensure integration with the critically important New PA initiative, which is however in great need of further support. Members are expected to include BirdLife International (represented by Asity Madagascar), Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust, The Peregrine Fund, Madagasikara Voakajy and others. Detailed implementation arrangements including coordination with other GEF initiatives will be determined during project development. A consultative, stepwise approach will begin with project development activities to confirm the sites and the partnership arrangements for implementation of national level activities. The Ministry of Environment and Forests and the SAPM Commission will be supported by Asity Madagascar (BirdLife partner in Madagascar), which can play a leading role in close collaboration with all national AZE partners. The Government of Madagascar is currently launching a series of GEF projects under GEF 5. The SAPM Commission, Ministry of Environment and Forests, and General Directorate of Environment, with support from UNEP, will ensure coordination and synergies across all these GEF 5 projects. The national AZE Steering Committee is certain to have overlapping membership with the SAPM Commission. Projects of greatest relevance are: "Strengthening the Network of New Protected Areas in Madagascar" (in which Asity Madagascar, BirdLife Partner NGO in Madagascar, is an implementing partner); "Conservation of Key Threatened Endemic and Economically Valuable species in Madagascar", "Participatory Sustainable Land Management in the Grassland Plateaus of Western Madagascar"; and "Integrating climate change adaptation into marine resources and biodiversity conservation". Close national-level coordination will be needed especially with the first two, as they are most likely to include action at AZE sites and Endangered or Critically Endangered (but not necessarily AZE) species; the GEF OFP assessed and confirmed complementarity before endorsing this project. The project will also coordinate directly with UNDP in Madagascar, implementing agency for the first project (above) and a key partner in the implementation of the National Environmental Action Plan and NBSAP. At the site level, coordination with other initiatives will be guaranteed through the biodiversity offsets implementation partnership (including Rio Tinto, BirdLife, Asity Madagascar and Missouri Botanical Garden, working at several sites in SE Madagascar), the Tsitongambarika 'Task

Force' of local conservation and development organisations, and frequent contact with local Government authorities under the agreed co-management governance structure for the PA.

Global: The project will be executed by BirdLife International working in partnership with the AZE Secretariat (American Bird Conservancy). It is envisaged that BirdLife will lead in relation to global safeguard work and implementation in Madagascar, and ABC will lead on work with the NBSAPs and supporting the development of national AZE alliances, as well as implementation of the project in Brazil and Chile. The project will be developed with and overseen by the AZE Steering Committee, currently Chaired by American Bird Conservancy. The global AZE Steering Committee comprises representatives of the main organizations involved in project implementation, and relevant parallel initiatives and donors may also be invited to participate. The Steering Committee will (a) guide and oversee the project's technical progress and performance on the data update, (b) coordinate the roles and contributions of AZE partners and their respective initiatives in the project to link national strategies to global benefits, and (c) ensure that the project remains focused on its key outcomes. AZE will liaise directly with GEF Sec to ensure close coordination with relevant GEF-supported projects.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:

B.1. NATIONAL STRATEGIES AND PLANS OR REPORTS AND ASSESSMENTS UNDER RELEVANT CONVENTIONS, IF APPLICABLE, I.E. NAPAS, NAPS, NBSAPs, NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS, TNAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, ETC.:

As earlier noted, Brazil's NBSAP's second objective is to promote the conservation of species diversity, which is further supported by goals that envision 100% of threatened species effectively conserved in Protected Areas and reducing by 25% the threatened species on the national list. Brazil's 4th national report to the CBD on its NBSAP specifically references in their national biodiversity targets, a goal of 100% of threatened species effectively conserved in protected Areas and "all species officially recognized as threatened with extinction in Brazil the object of action plans and active advisory groups".

Chile's NBSAP's second objective calls for the preservation of species, and specifically to prioritize conservation efforts for endangered species. Chile's 4th national report references the extinction of at least two species of vertebrates, and prioritizes the development of policies to protected species in danger of extinction and to promote actions to recuperate the most threatened species.

Madagascar's last NBSAP dates to 2002 and specifically called for the implementation of management systems for endangered species (IUCN Red List and CITES). Madagascar's 4th national report references extinction as a consequence of threats to biodiversity, recommending urgent intervention and short-term measures.

Globally, this project is designed to contribute to several targets set out in CBD Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011 – 2020 (the 'Aichi Targets'). Most notably it will contribute to Target 12 (By 2020, the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained).

B.2. GEF FOCAL AREA AND/OR FUND STRATEGIES, ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND PRIORITIES:

The proposed project is fully consistent with both the overall goal of the BD Focal Area strategy as well as the Biodiversity Program's First Strategic Objective (BD-1) which aims to improve the sustainability of Protected Area Systems. Specifically, the project promotes objectives three and four of BD-1 through i) the enhancement of threatened species representation via the creation and effective management of new protected areas that extends the coverage of threatened species in protected area systems, while improving the coverage of their spatial range, and ii) improving the overall management effectiveness of existing protected areas, including across trans-boundary areas. The project also supports BD Objective 2: Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors and will contribute to the achievement of Outcome 2.2 "Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks" through the development of policies and regulations (globally, regionally, and nationally – including governments and lending institutions) governing sectoral activities that integrate biodiversity conservation in the project target areas as recorded by the GEF tracking tool as a score.

B.3. THE GEF AGENCY'S COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE TO IMPLEMENT THIS PROJECT:

Please see Section A.1.3, Outcome 2.1 referencing the potential of mainstreaming AZE priorities through UNEP's Finance Initiative, and Outcome 2.2 outlining UNEP's role with respect to integration of AZE priorities within NBSAPs. UNEP recently concluded its implementation of the GEF financed project "Communities of Conservation: Safeguarding the World's Most Threatened Species" which piloted innovative mechanisms, e.g. Rare Pride Campaigns, concurrent with agreements for watershed services, in efforts to improve the status of priority habitats for threatened species identified by AZE. Valuable lessons from the implantation and impact of this effort will inform aspects of the design of the proposed project.

UNEP falls under the category of non-resident agencies in the UN system and as such works through a network of regional offices rather than country offices. Technical and site specific backstopping will thus be provided for Brazil and Chile through UNEP GEF staff hosted by UNEP's Regional office for Latin America and the Caribbean (ROLAC) located in Panama with the additional support of UNEP's Office for Brazil.

UNEP has a history of working with Madagascar on various GEF and non-GEF activities. UNEP has worked with Government of Madagascar on five national GEF projects, mainly Enabling Activities, across all Focal Areas and on ten regional GEF projects covering all GEF focal areas. The UN country team is currently developing a new UNDAF, and UNEP (through the Regional Office for Africa) is supporting the UNCT to mainstream environment and climate change issues into the UNDAF. In addition, UNEP is opening a Liaison Office in Madagascar that will increase country presence which will be helpful in facilitating coordination, project implementation and contacts with partners at the country level. UNEP HQ is also located within the same sub-region, thus allowing a cost-effective support and regular country visits by UNEP HQ staff.

IA and EA functions are clearly differentiated and separated through commissioning of project administration tasks to an external executing agency, a standard practice for UNEP which has been applied successfully in GEF projects and UNEP’s program of work as well. In this case, for global and in-country project management it will have the collaboration of partners’ network.

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 template. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Ximena George-Nascimento Lara	GEF Operational Focal Point	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT OF CHILE	25 March 2014
Rodrigo Martins Viera	GEF Operational Focal Point	MINISTRY OF PLANNING, BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT OF BRAZIL	13 January 2014
Ralalaharisoa Christine Edmée	General Director of Environment	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS	15 March 2013

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 project identification and preparation.					
Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Brennan VanDyke, Director, GEF Coordination Office, UNEP, Nairobi		27 March 2014	Kristin Mclaughlin Task Manager	+1-202-974-1312	Kristin.mclaughlin@unep.org