REQUEST FOR CEO APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: MEDIUM SIZE PROJECT
TYPE OF TRUST FUND:GEF Trust Fund

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:	009309
Other Executing Partner(s):	Birdlife International, AZE Partnership and Secretariat (American Bird Conservancy - ABC), Ministerio del Medio Ambiente (Chile), Ministry of Environment, Sea, Ecology and Forest (Madagascar), Ministry of Environment (Brazil)	Submission Date:	14.07.2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	BD	Project Duration(Months)	36
Name of parent programme (if applicable):		Agency Fee (US$):	$182,667

A. INDICATIVE FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK:

Focal Area Objectives	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Financing ($)	Indicative Co-financing ($)
BD-1	GEFTF	1,130,655	3,491,571
BD-2	GEFTF	792,158	1,305,600
Total project costs		1,922,813	4,797,171

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 160,000 ha of AZE sites, and improved conservation status of 27 AZE species at a total of five demonstration sites in Brazil, Chile, and Madagascar, and at an additional 10 sites globally.	Output 1.1.1. Habitat conservation for *Merulaxis stresemanni* in Bandeiras, Brazil, strengthened through improved forest protection and restoration with community support to sustain long-term conservation. Output 1.1.2. Chile: at Isla Mocha Reserve, for *Eupsophus insularis* and at Mehuin 1 and Mehuin 2 for *Eupsophus*	GEFTF	1,010,664	2,624,790

			migueli and *Insuetophrynus acarpicus* respectively, habitat conservation enhanced through strengthened protection status and implementation of newly created or existing (Isla Mocha) management plans. Output 1.1.3. At Tsitongambarika, Madagascar, habitat of two plant and 11 newly-discovered frog and reptile 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 120,000 ha will gain enhanced protection through additional projects, informed by progress at the three demonstration projects			
Component 2. Mainstreaming of AZE site conservation in national policy and regulatory frameworks, and into safeguard policies of financial institutions	TA	Outcome 2.1. The conservation of threatened species and the protection of AZE sites are mainstreamed into the safeguard policies of key financial institutions such as Equator Principles Financial Institutions and Multilateral Development Banks to minimize the impact of development projects on AZE sites.	Output 2.1.1. Improved 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. 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. Output 2.1.3. Capacity of AZE members to partner with lending institutions strengthened and national AZE networks enhanced through outreach and training	GEFTF	816,008	1,932,809

			programs. Output 2.1.4. Staff in private financial institutions trained in use of AZE tools and data. Output 2.1.5. Synergies identified and AZE site conservation opportunities mainstreamed with existing and planned donor/agency and private sector financing programs.			
		Outcome 2.2: AZE site conservation is mainstreamed into national biodiversity strategies, in support of CBD targets.	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. Output 2.2.2. Technical guidance documents (based on the strategies developed under 2.2.1) inform and support incorporation of AZE priorities in the development of further NBSAPs and PoWPA Action Plans globally. Output 2.2.3. Consolidated and strengthened national AZE partnerships use project outputs to support NBSAP and PoWPA processes, national CBD reporting and enhanced AZE site conservation through targeted capacity development and outreach programs			
				Sub-Total		$1,826,672	4,557,599
Project management cost (5%)				GEFTF	96,141	239,572
Total project costs					**$1,922,813**	**4,797,171**

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

Sources of Co-financing for baseline project	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount ($)
NGO	BirdLife International	Cash	748,244

NGO	BirdLife International	In kind	645,187
NGO	American Bird Conservancy (AZE Secretariat)	Cash	300,000
NGO	American Bird Conservancy (AZE Secretariat)	In Kind	1,200,000
NGO	AZE Partners: Asity Madagascar	In kind	250,000
NGO	AZE Partners: Fundacao Biodiversitas	In kind	385,000
NGO	Rio Tinto QMM	Cash	300,000
NGO	Rio Tinto QMM	In kind	95,000
Multilateral	UNEP	In kind	200,000
Governments	Brazil	In kind	300,000
Governments	Chile MMA	Cash	93,040
Governments	Chile MMA	In kind	112,560
Governments	Chile CONAF	Cash	7,700
Governments	Chile CONAF	In kind	10,440
Governments	Madagascar	In kind	150,000
Total Co-financing			**4,797,171**

D. GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY[1]

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal area	Country Name/Global	Grant amount ($) (a)	Agency Fee ($) (b)	Total ($) (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. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount ($)	Cofinancing ($)	Project Total ($)
International consultants	171,816	225,000	396,816
Local consultants	269,582	162,500	432,082
Total	**441,398**	**387,500**	**828,898**

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

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

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

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

A1. National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc. NA

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

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage. NA

A4. Describe the project baseline and the problem(s) that the intervention seeks to address: NA

A.5. Incremental / Additional cost reasoning. NA

A6. Risks, including climate change risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design:

Identified Risks	Category	Impact	Likelihood	Risk Assessment	Mitigation 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.	Strategic	High	Moderately Likely	Medium	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 to facilitate government support for conservation activities in partnership with the AZE members and partners, 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. This risk appears to be strongest in Madagascar, in view of the 2009-2013 political crisis, but has been reduced by the recent election, and by the long-term involvement of key government officials in conservation efforts. Conservation policy directions including the new Protected Areas initiative have been largely maintained (albeit sometimes interrupted) through several changes of government including the recent crisis.	Political	High	Moderately Likely	Medium	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. The present government has committed to place the conservation of natural capital, always with the participation of local communities, at the heart of the national strategy for sustainable development, and similar policies have been maintained through several earlier changes of Government, and so are considered likely to be maintained.
3. Unwillingness to cooperate and sacrifice local or national interests for the achievement of global environmental benefits and conservation of AZE sites.	Strategic	Medium	Moderately Likely	Low	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. In Madagascar, local communities around Tsitongambarika have endorsed PA creation under appropriate governance through KOMFITA, and pilot projects have shown strong willingness to adopt sustainable development practices and reduce or abandon deforestation

					where support can be directed. In Brazil, private landowners and local Governments have confirmed their willingness to cooperate in establishing Private Nature Reserves and complying with Forest Code in reforestation programmes. In Chile, no major risks of this type are known.
4. Opportunities to influence IFI policies fail to occur during lifespan of project	Operational	High	Moderately likely	Medium	Success does not depend on all IFI policies being open for complete review. The number of IFIs is large and, although policies of each one are rarely reviewed, it is expected that some will be during the period. The project will engage on the basis of international best-practice approaches that IFIs have committed to in their environmental policies; this can be done through a case-by-case approach by forming close relationships with IFI environmental specialists to influence the decision-making and requirements on EIAs/SEAs. The project will also collect evidence of how weak policies affect the outcome of a project and revive the information when reviews are underway.
5. Insufficient awareness of climate change and adaptation issues affecting AZE sites among key stakeholders including national and local government officials and local communities. Unanticipated events such as severe droughts can impact project activities, such as reforestation at the Brazilian site.	Operational	Medium	Moderately Likely	Low	Climate change and adaptation will be incorporated into conservation planning at national level (such as NBSAPs and PoWPA APs) and 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. Extreme events during project implementation such as severe droughts will entail some flexibility in approach so that fire risk management is prioritized, and failure of replanting efforts is avoided through appropriate steps.
6. Communities resident in areas surrounding target AZE sites may not be supportive of conservation plans. This may arise from lack of awareness of the significance of such sites, as well as the potential for government restrictions on land uses and access to natural resources in order to ensure habitat and species protection	Operational	High	Moderately Likely	Medium	A comprehensive community outreach plan for each target AZE site will be developed and implemented. At the Madagascar site, this, and consequent actions, will be based on the existing Social and Environmental Safeguards Plan based on comprehensive community consultation with and approval by local communities. The generation of socio-economic benefits will be emphasized as part of the establishment and management of target AZE sites. 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 may not be adequately taken into account by conservation and development plans	Operational	Low	Moderately Likely	Low	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. Where applicable, priority in job creation, capacity building and project-related income generation activities will be given to the disadvantaged social groups, including women's groups, within the

for AZE sites.					surrounding communities.

A7. Coordination with other GEF financed initiatives

Linkages and synergies will be sought through coordination with the GEF projects listed in **Table 4** below. In each country, the Ministry of Environment leads implementation of the relevant GEF and most non-GEF initiatives. Such coordination by the Ministry facilitates the integration of activities across projects and cultivates opportunities for collaboration across sectors and project partners.

UNEP ensures close collaboration and synergetic impact with other UNEP-led or –supported global and national initiatives, especially those offering opportunities for synergistic impacts such as its NBSAP programme, and the the NBSAP Forum.

Table 4. Coordination and collaboration with other GEF-financed interventions

GEF Financed Initiatives / Interventions	How collaboration with the project will be ensured
Brazil	
UNDP/GEF Project #5053 National Biodiversity Planning to Support the Implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan. CEO Approved August 2012.	To update the Brazilian National Biodiversity Strategy in a participatory manner by defining national goals, targets, and associated capacity-building and financing strategies taking into account contributions from Government and civil society assessments of the threats that currently cause loss of biodiversity in Brazil and incorporating the global guidelines of the CBD Strategic Plan 2011-2020. NEA is Brazilian Ministry of Environment, as for the current AZE project. Coordination will be achieved through the Ministry of Environment and cross representation on national project committees.
UNDP/GEF Project #5091 Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into NTFP and AFS Production Practices in Multiple-Use Forest Landscapes of High Conservation Value. CEO Endorsed October 2014.	The biodiversity of Brazilian multiple-use forest landscapes of high conservation value is conserved through a strengthened sustainable use management framework for non-timber forest products (NTFP) and agro-forestry systems (AFS). The project´s objective is to ensure that the biodiversity of Brazilian multiple-use forest landscapes of high conservation value is conserved through a strengthened sustainable use management framework for non-timber forest products (NTFP) and agro-forestry systems (AFS). It will support Brazil's goal of promoting the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity while reducing poverty and increasing resilience in the rural areas, which are governmental objectives stated in public policies and programs. The project will conserve biodiversity in key forest landscapes - Amazon, Caatinga and Cerrado. The latter two biomes contain high levels of endemism and contain numerous threatened species and AZE sites that will benefit directly from project activities. NEA is EMBRAPA (Brazilian Agricultural Research Agency). The present project will coordinate with project 5091 and any followup through MMA.
World Bank/GEF # 2641 Project Title: Sustainable Cerrado Initiative. IA approved March 2010.	This project approved during the fourth GEF replenishment began execution in 2010. The Sustainable Cerrado Initiative is an umbrella Program which adopts two-phased approach with multi-project grants. The main objective is to promote the increase of the biodiversity conservation and improve the management of the natural resources of Cerrado biome by supporting appropriate policies and practices. The project is coordinated by the Brazilian Ministry of the Environment and is being executed together with the Secretary of the Environment and Water Resources of the State of Goiás, ICMBio, the Secretary of Water Resources, and Tocantins State. The project supported 17 studies targeted at the creation of 2,253,448 hectares of protected areas. The project helped create of three new federal protected areas, three state protected areas and 19 private protected areas in the Cerrado biome, covering an area of 483,151 hectares. Other activities included producing videos of the Cerrado biome's riches, along with its traditional people and threatened species; the improvement of the mapping systems and the monitoring of the cover and biodiversity use of the biome; support events to share Cerrado foods and promote meetings of the traditional populations. The present project will coordinate with project 2641 and any followup through MMA.
IADB/GEF Project # 4859 Consolidation of the National System of Conservation Units and enhanced Flora and Fauna Protection. GEF Council approved June 2012.	This project developed under the National Program for Consolidation of Protected Areas (PNUC) is coordinated by the Department of Protected Areas of the Secretariat of Biodiversity and Forests, Brazilian Ministry of the Environment. At the moment, the project is in its final stage of negotiation with the GEF and the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB). The GEF-TER Project aims to implement the Protected Areas under the SNUC in the Caatinga, Pantanal and Pampa biomes, adding efforts to the LifeWeb project (Estruturação do Sistema Nacional de Unidades de Conservação). It was approved during the fifth GEF replenishment to support the conservation

GEF Financed Initiatives / Interventions	How collaboration with the project will be ensured
	actions in this three biomes not yet covered my GEF supported projects. The project has the following components: i) Creation of new protected areas; ii) Implementation and management of 14 P.A.; iii) Restoration of deteriorated landscapes in priority areas– inside and surrounding P.A.; iv) Management of threatened species ; v) Integration and community relations. The present project will coordinate with project 4859 and any followup through MMA.
World Bank/GEF Project # 4085. Amazon Region Protected Areas Program – ARPA. IA approved February 2012.	This project is the second phase of the ARPA program. It will make a major contribution to protecting Amazon forest biodiversity through the definition of priority areas for protection followed by the creation, establishment, consolidation and long-term maintenance of protected areas. The creation and consolidation of protected areas has proved to be a viable strategy to reduce biodiversity loss in the Brazilian Amazon, as well to reduce deforestation. Protected areas are valuable tools for the protection of the long-term ecological integrity of biodiversity-rich areas, the containment of anthropogenic pressures and the promotion of the sustainable use of forests and other ecosystems' natural resources. Although the Amazon region is not currently an area of high AZE site density like the Atlantic Forest Biome, the ARPA project is one of the most important experiences concerning protected area projects in Brazil and the lessons learned until now can be useful for the development of the AZE-GEF project activities. Tools used in the ARPA Project will be applicable and useful to the AZE-GEF project, such as the Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Area Management or Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Areas Management (RAPPAM).
Chile	
UNDP GEF Project 2772: Building a comprehensive National Protected Area System for Chile: a financial and operational framework. Completed.	Developed the legal, strategic and operational framework for the sustainable financing of a new integrated National System of Protected Areas; assessed and tested revenue generation mechanisms for increasing funding levels of new PAs; established new partnerships to share management costs with public funding entities and productive sectors. National executing partner was the National Commission for the Environment (CONAMA), with which the present project will also work, ensuring coordination with activities following up the earlier project.
UNDP/GEF Project (ID 4330) Strengthening National Frameworks for Invasive Alien Species (IAS) Governance - Piloting in Juan Fernandez Archipelago. IA Approved November 2012.	This project aims to build national frameworks and institutional capacities to control the introduction and spread of IAS through trade, travel and transportation. This is done through pilot surveillance and control measures project on the Juan Fernández Archipelago, an environment of high biodiversity threatened by IAS. One of the lines of action to implement this project is to "Develop and implement a regulatory, institutional and financial framework for combating major IAS affecting the conservation of biodiversity" for which it is proposed to: • **DEVELOP AN INTEGRATED NATIONAL PROGRAMME FOR CONTROL OF INVASIVE ALIEN SPECIES (PEEI)** • **DEFINE LEGAL AND REGULATORY MECHANISMS TO SUPPORT THE IAS MANAGEMENT AND ALLOW THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PEEI.** • **STRENGTHEN THE OPERATING COMMITTEE FOR THE CONTROL OF INVASIVE SPECIES (COCEI).** • **STRENGTHEN THE CAPACITIES OF INSTITUTIONS AND SECTORS RELATED TO THE MANAGEMENT OF IAS.** • **MANAGE A PLAN OF FINANCING; MECHANISMS AND RESOURCE MOBILIZATION FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PEEI.** • **REPLICATE THE MANAGEMENT OF INVASIVE ALIEN SPECIES IN OTHER CHILEAN ISLANDS AND PROTECTED AREAS**

GEF Financed Initiatives / Interventions	How collaboration with the project will be ensured
	Among the actions of this GEF Project, Isla Mocha was identified as one of the islands on which to develop specific actions, an d information on this is included in the baseline analysis. The Ministry of Environment is the NEA for both the AZE Project and this one, facilitating integration and collaborative discussion through national project committees.
FAO/GEF Project 5429 Mainstreaming the conservation, sustainable use and valuation of Critically Threatened species and endangered agricultural ecosystems into development-frontier production landscapes of the Arica and Parinacota, and Biobío regions. PPG phase, submission expected April 2015	The project will be carried out in two regions of Chile, Arica and Parinacota, and Biobío. Isla Mocha is in the Biobío Region. Although this project does not designate activities at the two sites outlined in the AZE-GEF project for Chile, work will be carried out to benefit several highly threatened species, including one species that may be added to the AZE list, the Chilean Woodstar *Eulidia yarrelii* (a Critically Endangered hummingbird). The Ministry of Environment is the NEA for both the AZE Project and this one, facilitating integration and collaborative discussion through national project committees.
Madagascar	
UNEP/GEF Project # 5351. Strengthening the Network of New Protected Areas in Madagascar Status: Council Approved	The objective is that the system of New Protected Areas (NPAs) is effective, it adequately represents marine/costal, freshwater and terrestrial ecosystems (including the previously under-represented mangrove ecosystems), and it supports good site management, the sustainable exploitation of site resources, improved lifestyles for people around sites, and the ability of economic actors to obtain sustainable benefits from sites. The DCBSAP of the MEEF is the executive partner of this project. As Tsitongambarika is a new protected area, DCBSAP is also among its stakeholders. The SAPM Commission will ensure information exchange and collaboration.
UNDP/GEF Project # 3687. Madagascar's Network of Managed Resource Protected Areas Status: Under Implementation	Aims to expand the PA system of Madagascar by developing a network of managed resource protected areas in underrepresented ecological landscapes, co-managed by local government and communities and integrated into the regional development framework. MEEMF is among the executive partners of the project. Asity Madagascar, Fanamby NGO, Missouri Botanical Garden, The Peregrine Fund and WWF are the main partners; all are likely national AZE partners in the future, and so experience of this project will facilitate the coordination and information sharing between the two projects. The Asity Madagascar site is located in a wetland complex in NW Madagascar, but its governance is similar to that being developed at Tsitongambarika, demonstration site for the AZE project.
UNEP/GEF Project # 5352. Conservation of Key Threatened Endemic and Economically Valuable species in Madagascar Status: Council Approved	The objective of this project is that key threatened, endemic and valuable flora and fauna species are conserved and sustainably utilized in the local socio-economy; generally a different set of species compared to AZE. The Executing Agency is again MEEMF and the main partners are The Peregrine Fund, Kew Gardens, WCS, Asity Madagascar, Conservation International, MBG, Madagascar Voakajy and Madagascar National Parks; again there is strong overlap in membership with the proposed AZE alliance, favoring collaboration and information-sharing between these two projects.
UNDP/GEF Project # 1929. Participatory Sustainable Land Management in the Grassland	Aims to reverse land degradation and improve living conditions in the Bongolava Region of Western Madagascar through participatory sustainable management of the grasslands. The Executing Agency is the Ministry of Environment, Ecology and

GEF Financed Initiatives / Interventions	How collaboration with the project will be ensured
Plateaus of Western Madagascar Status: Project Completion	Forests. Information sharing, collaboration and coordination with other projects will be assured by the Ministry, although overlap with the AZE project is relatively limited.
UNDP/GEF Project #5486. A Landscape Approach to Conserving and Managing Threatened Biodiversity in Madagascar with a Focus on the Atsimo-Andrefana Spiny and Dry Forest Landscape Status: Council Approved	Aims to protect biodiversity in the Atsimo-Andrefana (arid SW) Landscape from current and emerging threats, and to use it sustainably, by developing collaborative governance framework for sectoral mainstreaming and devolved natural resource management. Executing partners are MEEMF, the Tany Meva Foundation and Environmental Management Support Service (SAGE). The Ministry will facitate information sharing, lesson learning, coordination and communication with other projects incuding the AZE project of which it is also focal point.
Global	Coordination of the UNEP led initiatives below is coordinated through regular meetings of the UNEP GEF Biodiversity/Land Degradation/Biosafety team and its Portfolio Manager
UNEP/GEF Project #4513. Support to GEF Eligible Parties (LDCs & SIDs) for the Revision of the NBSAPs and Development of Fifth National Report to the CBD - Phase 1. IA Approved March 2012.	See: http://www.thegef.org/gef/project_detail?projID=4513 The main objective of this project is to enable GEF eligible LDCs and SIDs to revise the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and to develop the Fifth National Report to the CBD.
UNEP/GEF Proejct #4623. Support to GEF Eligible Parties (LDCs & SIDs) for the Revision of the NBSAPs and Development of Fifth National Report to the CBD - Phase II. IA Approved March 2012.	See: http://www.thegef.org/gef/project_detail?projID=4623 With the overarching goal of integrating CBD Obligations into National Planning Processes through Enabling Activities, the main objective of this project is to enable GEF eligible LDCs and SIDs to revise the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and to develop the Fifth National Report to the CBD.
UNEP/GEF Project # 5730. Mainstreaming Biodiversity Information into the Heart of Government Decision Making. GEF Council approved May 2014.	See: http://www.thegef.org/gef/project_detail?projID=5730 The project aims to help governments to achieve sustainable development by bringing biodiversity to the heart of government decision-making using actionable environmental information. Decision makers clearly understand how biodiversity information can be used to inform key decision points or processes, and are able to access necessary information in a timely manner within formats and processes that are relevant to their priorities.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE

B.1 How stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation

In the Project Document, please reference Section 2.5 Stakeholder mapping and Analysis; Section 4 Institutional Framework and Implementation Arrangements and Section 5 Stakeholder Participation.

In Brazil, site level work will be communicated among local communities through workshops and trainings. Materials and events associated with youth guide and tourism training as well as tree nursery and reforestation will provide opportunities to offer broad context to AZE site work. Prior to this project, Fundacao Biodiversitas has produced a video describing the importance of the Mata do Pasarinho Reserve and Atlantic Forest, as well as a field guide to avifauna in the area. These materials have been used to train 120 teachers and raise awareness among 1,500 students to date. Within this project's tourism activities, day trips from local schools are planned to continue

environmental outreach with students and teachers. Local schools represent the impoverished communities of Ribeirão and Canada, about 90 families, surrounding the reserve and represent the future populace in the area.

Community residents, including women, will be employed through a community-run reforestation business. The business uses a plant nursery located on the reserve and residents are paid for their labor filling bags with soil, seeding bags, watering and weeding seedlings, as well as eventual transplanting and maintenance of saplings within the reserve. The skills provided through direct employment in reforestation will likely allow some local residents to earn future income. This project aims to promote reforestation on large properties surrounding the reserve in compliance with the with the Brazilian Forest Code and other environmental laws, which is expected to translate in additional job opportunities for the community reforestation cooperative. Continued outreach with local communities, scaling up of a cooperative reforestation business and employment from tourism opportunities (eg transportation, reserve cooks, bird guides) will provide income to local communities. Communities that are knowledgeable of the benefits of the reserve will reduce long-term pressure on forests and provide environmental sustainability assuring the survival of the species and the Atlantic Forest habitat.

In Chile, project design on Isla Mocha seeks to improve the management of a national protected area for an endangered amphibian through reduced pressure on fuel wood harvest within the reserve. Working with local communities to identify alternative, less impactful strategies, will facilitate the persistence of forested habitat within the reserve. Current projects on the Pink-footed Shearwater, implemented by Oikonos and coordinated with CONAF and MMA, have been largely successful in garnering public support with active inclusion of local communities. Efforts to increase protection of Isla Mocha as a national park will further support environmental sustainability and help attract increased funding for protected area operating expenses. The Isla Mocha community will be involved through continued participation on the Isla Mocha Reserve Advisory Council, and associated workshops and meetings specifically organized for the residents of the island, with emphasis on fishing groups, residents who gather firewood and families of school children. Representatives of the Advisory Council will be invited to participate in Technical Committee meetings.

In Mehuin, project activities will be communicated locally through meetings and training courses for actors from the community, as well as representatives of the municipalities. Working with landowners models will be more directly undertaken from the Regional Secretariat of MMA in the Region of Los Ríos. One of the planned activities is the generation of a site conservation plan using a participatory process that involves all local stakeholders. The process of developing this plan will raise interest and awareness regarding conservation of amphibians and protection of the sites. In addition to local operating forestry businesses will be engaged in the project to evaluate best practices that could be employed to reduce the risk of sedimentation in the watercourse amphibian species inhabit.

In Madagascar, the major stakeholders in the project committed to work with the project through, and following, attendance at the national consultation workshops. Additional stakeholders to be involved in implementation at the nation level include other parts of MEEMF such as the DGE, whose director had delegated DIDE as the appropriate project focal point. Asity Madagascar will be responsible for AZE site and species data. The DIDE will be technically supported by Asity Madagascar in the establishment of a national AZE Alliance (formal, Government-convened) or network (less formal). Other conservation organizations will also be involved through the Steering Committee.
A specific task for the decentralized services in MEEMF, such as DREEF and Regional Forestry Service, is to monitor compliance with the law in collaboration with the Protected Area co-managers, KOMFITA and Asity Madagascar, reinforced by the security services (police and gendarmerie) in case of serious offences (such as highly organised logging by outsiders). Other decentralized services will be engaged to ensure consistency of actions with regional planning and development.

KOMFITA, representing local communities, will be continuously involved in site management, its position strengthened through management capacity development of its member organisations, the CoBas. Target villagers at the site are identified based on surveys of whole households (i.e. taking into account needs of men, women and children) presented in the social and environmental safeguards plan; those benefiting are those identified as being

the most vulnerable. The project will also coordinate with Rio Tinto QMM community development activities in the region which include compensation for impacts of the mining project.

B2. Socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF). As a background information, read Mainstreaming Gender at the GEF.":

Poverty alleviation is encompassed in project design through the establishment of mechanisms for securing alternative livelihoods. The project will support the realization of benefits for communities at the demonstration sites through involvement in site management, sustainable resource use and alternative livelihood schemes. This is outlined in several specific activities.

In order to ensure socio-economic benefits and their sustainability, local level activities will be carried out with the participation of local stakeholders, with full consideration given to gender dimensions. 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. Integration of gender concerns has been specifically referenced in the indicators for outputs 1.1.4 and 2.2.1. Section 3.1 of the Project Document addresses these concerns more fully.

B3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

Each project outcome will contribute towards AZE trigger species/site conservation through cost-effective approaches that build on substantial existing efforts led by the AZE Secretariat and BirdLife International at global level, and by national governments and other stakeholders in the three selected demonstration countries. This continuity of effort and use of existing partnerships to a large degree involves very limited start-up costs and enhances the efficiency of project implementation. These substantial baseline efforts will be supported by major cofinancing inputs, especially from the global project partner organizations and participating national governments. The project will also facilitate the wider promulgation of the AZE mainstreaming approach, following approaches to at least 20 other countries in collaboration with the CBD Secretariat.

In Outcome 1.1, the project will demonstrate effective management of five AZE sites in the three demonstration countries, and facilitate enhanced protection of an additional 10 sites. Thus the protection and management of at least 15 AZE sites covering a combined total of at least 160,000 ha will be enhanced through the project intervention through a GEF investment of approximately US$1 million, averaging some US$ 6.10 per hectare over the project lifetime and matched by some US$ 2.6 million in cofinancing. The conservation of these sites will benefit a wide range of globally threatened species in addition to the target AZE species (see the site profiles in Appendix 15).

In Outcome 2.1, the conservation of threatened species and the protection of AZE sites will be 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. This will involve major improvements in the scope and online accessibility of AZE datasets for global users, making use of the global partner organizations' major capacity for such work, and ongoing cofinanced support for the maintenance of such data. Thus GEF's inputs will be a minor portion of the overall cost of the development and maintenance of such online databases. The awareness raising, capacity building and facilitation of MDB safeguard policy improvements to incorporate AZE species/sites will also represent a cost-efficient approach towards achieving global conservation outcomes, with expected co-benefits for other globally significant species and ecosystems.

In Outcome 2.2, the project's approach of mainstreaming AZE trigger species conservation into national NBSAPs, PoWPA Action Plans and national policies, as well as demonstrating the development of national AZE strategies is highly cost-effective in that it will have broad impacts at national level, enabling a more effective approach to AZE

species and site conservation in key countries, and paving the way for its replication across the world through CBD-led NBSAP and PoWPA updating processes and national initiatives.

The total GEF investment of US$1,922.813 for this project will leverage US$ 4.3 million in cofinancing, a ratio of 2.29, with additional co-financing inputs anticipated during project implementation.

Finally, the recognition associated with involvement in an international project and receipt of GEF resources channeled through a UN implementing agency is a source of pride for national, regional and local project partners, which often facilitates the necessary political commitment to take difficult decisions on issues such as expanding the PA network, upgrading PA protection status, inter-agency coordination to reduce external pressures on PAs, the adoption of more environmentally friendly practices in related sectors, and concessions on land uses; a particularly cost-efficient contribution to biodiversity conservation.

C. BUDGETED M&E PLAN

UNEP will be responsible for managing the mid-term review/evaluation and the terminal evaluation. The Project Manager and partners will participate actively in the process. The project will be reviewed or evaluated at mid-term. The purpose of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) or Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is to provide an independent assessment of project performance at mid-term, to analyze whether the project is on track, what problems and challenges the project is encountering, and which corrective actions are required so that the project can achieve its intended outcomes by project completion in the most efficient and sustainable way. In addition, it will verify information gathered through the GEF tracking tools.

The project Steering Committee will participate in the MTR or MTE and develop a management response to the evaluation recommendations along with an implementation plan. It is the responsibility of the UNEP Task Manager to monitor whether the agreed recommendations are being implemented. An MTR is managed by the UNEP Task Manager. An MTE is managed by the Evaluation Office (EO) of UNEP. The EO will determine whether an MTE is required or an MTR is sufficient.

An independent terminal evaluation (TE) will take place at the end of project implementation. The EO will be responsible for the TE and liaise with the UNEP Task Manager throughout the process. The TE will provide an independent assessment of project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine the likelihood of impact and sustainability. It will have two primary purposes:

i. to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and
ii. to promote learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UNEP and executing partners.

While a TE should review use of project funds against budget, it would be the role of a financial audit to assess probity (i.e. correctness, integrity etc.) of expenditure and transactions. The TE report will be sent to project stakeholders for comments. Formal comments on the report will be shared by the EO in an open and transparent manner. The project performance will be assessed against standard evaluation criteria using a six point rating scheme. The final determination of project ratings will be made by the EO when the report is finalised. The evaluation report will be publically disclosed and will be followed by a recommendation compliance process.

The direct costs of reviews and evaluations will be charged against the project evaluation budget.

The GEF tracking tools are attached as **Appendix 14**. These will be updated at mid-term and at the end of the project and will be made available to the GEF Secretariat along with the project PIR report. As mentioned above the mid-term and terminal evaluation will verify the information of the tracking tool.

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, SEA, ECOLOGY 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 CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	**Signature**	**Date *(Month, day, year)***	**Project Contact Person**	**Telephone**	**Email Address**
J. Christophe Bouvier Director, Office for Operations and Corporate Services, UNEP GEF Coordination Office +254-20-7623880 christophe.bouvier@unep.org		July 14, 2015	Kristin Mclaughlin Task Manager	+1-202-974-1312	Kristin.mclaughlin@unep.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Project's Development Goal: To contribute to the global achievement of CBD Aichi Target 12 by improving the conservation status of AZE listed species

Objective/ Outcomes	SMART Indicators				Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	**Baseline**	**Mid-Term Target**	**End of Project Target**		
Objective: To prevent species extinctions at priority sites identified through the Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE)	**Indicator 0.1**: AZE is mainstreamed into national biodiversity strategies and action plans and MDB policies, as indicated by the BD2 Tracking Tool (**Appendix 14a**)	See the GEF BD2 Tracking Tool (**Appendix 14a**). Two NBSAPs (Brazil and Philippines), and four PoWPA Action Plans (Vietnam, Nauru, Indonesia, and the Philippines) currently explicitly mention AZE (i.e., a total of five countries with AZE referenced in at least one of the key documents). UNEP has made contact with countries for which they are providing NBSAP support requesting inclusion of AZE.	See the GEF BD2 Tracking Tool (**Appendix 14a).** All CBD Focal Points have received from the CBD Secretariat notification requesting information on Protected Areas representativeness including AZE sites Direct contacts made between AZE staff and responsible parties regarding inclusion of AZE in NBSAPs, CBD National Reports, and/or PoWPA Action Plans for at least 20 countries.	See the GEF BD2 Tracking Tool (**Appendix 14a**). At least nine countries include AZE in at least one of the following: NBSAPs, CBD National Reports and/or PoWPA Action Plans as direct result of project inputs.	GEF BD2 Tracking Tool completed at project preparation stage, midterm and project completion. Updated NBSAPs, CBD National Reports, and/or PoWPA Action Plans include AZE.	Scheduling of NBSAP and PoWPA revisions and MDB policy updates permits incorporation of AZE provisions within the project period.
Component 1: Protected areas and AZE site-level management at globally important sites						
Outcome 1.1. Creation and improved management effectiveness of protected areas covering 160,000 ha of AZE sites, and improved conservation status of 27 AZE species at a total of five demonstration sites in Brazil, Chile, and Madagascar, and at an additional 10 sites globally.						
Outputs for Outcome 1.1: **Output 1.1.1.** Habitat conservation for *Merulaxis stresemanni* in Bandeiras, Brazil, strengthened through improved forest protection and restoration with community support to sustain long-term conservation. **Output 1.1.2.** Chile: at Isla Mocha Reserve, for *Eupsophus insularis* and at Mehuin 1 and Mehuin 2 for *Eupsophus migueli* and *Insuetophrynus acarpicus* respectively, habitat conservation enhanced through strengthened protection status and implementation of newly created or existing (Isla Mocha) management plans. **Output 1.1.3.** At Tsitongambarika, Madagascar, habitat of two plant and 11 newly-discovered frog and reptile 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 120,000 ha will gain enhanced protection through additional						

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">projects, informed by progress at the three demonstration projects</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Outcome 1.1.
Creation and improved management effectiveness of protected areas covering 160,000 ha of AZE sites, and improved conservation status of 17 AZE species at a total of five demonstration sites in Brazil, Chile, and Madagascar, and at an additional 10 sites globally.</td><td>Indicator 1.1.1: Management Effectiveness (METT Score)
Improved management effectiveness of 5 target AZE sites covering a baseline area of 64,102 ha, indicated by the increase in the METT assessment (see inset table and Appendix 14a):
<table>
<tr><th>AZE Site / Protected Area</th><th>METT Baseline Score (Mar 2015)</th><th>Mid-term Target</th><th>End of Project Target Score</th></tr>
<tr><td>Brazil: Mata do Passarinho Private Reserve (654 ha)</td><td>69%</td><td>75%?</td><td>91%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Chile: Isla Mocha National Reserve (2,905 ha)</td><td>62%</td><td>65%</td><td>70%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Chile: Mehuin I – Llenehue (2ha)</td><td>9%</td><td>12%</td><td>18%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Chile: Mehuin II – Isaac (42ha)</td><td>23%</td><td>30%</td><td>46%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Madagascar: Tsitongambarika Forest (proposed protected area) (60,509 ha)</td><td>58%</td><td>65%</td><td>73%</td></tr>
</table></td><td>METT Scorecards at Project Mid term and End of Project</td><td>METT gives a true and complete assessment of management effectiveness related to the achievement of site conservation goals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Indicator 1.1.2: Target AZE Site Legal Protection Status:
Increased area of 5 target AZE sites under improved legal protection (see inset table)
<table>
<tr><th>AZE Site / Protected Area</th><th>Baseline</th><th>Mid-term Target</th><th>End of Project Target</th></tr>
<tr><td>Brazil: Mata do Passarinho</td><td>Private Reserve (RPPN) and Rural Environmental Cadaster (CAR) compliant (654 ha)</td><td>Private Reserve (RPPN) and CAR compliant (1,041 ha)</td><td>Private Reserve (RPPN) and CAR compliant (1,041 ha)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Chile: Isla Mocha</td><td>National Reserve (2,905 ha)</td><td>National Reserve (2,905 ha)</td><td>National Park (c.2,905 ha)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Chile: Mehuin I & II AZE Site</td><td>Unprotected private areas: 44 ha at two Mehuin sites: Llenehue (2 ha) & Isaac (42 ha)</td><td>Land tenure studies conducted and recommendations implemented to improve protection</td><td>Participatory conservation (management) plan for Mehuin approved and under implementation</td></tr>
<tr><td>Madagascar: Tsitongambarika Forest</td><td>Proposed protected area – temporary</td><td>Protected Area (60,509 ha)</td><td>Protected Area (60,509 ha)</td></tr>
</table></td><td>Brazil: Private reserve (RPPN) and CAR registration documents to demonstrate compliance with CAR.

Chile: PA documentation to national authority; official government notifications of PA upgrading / establishment.

Madagascar: official government notification of PA establishment.</td><td>Brazil: Interest among private landowners and local Governments in establishing RPPNs and complying with Forest Code is forthcoming

Chile: Effective site management can precede lengthy process of formal declaration as protected area.

Madagascar: Government continues with confirmation of new PAs, following Promise of Sydney.</td></tr>
</table>

		protection status (60,509 ha)				
	Indicator 1.1.3: Target AZE Site Threat Response Status Measurable progress in addressing key threats at each AZE site (site specific, see inset table): **AZE Site / Protected Area** / **Baseline** / **Mid-term Target** / **End of Project Target** Brazil: Mata do Passarinho - Area of forest habitat restored in and around the reserve / 50,000 trees planted and 50 ha of habitat restored in and around Mata do Passarinho Reserve / 70,000 trees planted and 70 ha of habitat restored in and around Mata do Passarinho Reserve / 90,000 trees planted and 90 ha of habitat restored in and surrounding Mata do Passarinho Reserve Chile: Isla Mocha - Exclusion zones created for priority AZE amphibian conservation areas where wood harvesting is not permitted / Deforestation and forest degradation ongoing and causing declines in habitat quantity and quality for AZE species / Key areas for AZE species and wood harvesting identified and mapped / Zones established within the protected area for exclusion of wood harvesting activities Chile: Mehuin I & II AZE Site - Length of fencing at three properties (Teresa, Isaac and Llenehue) to restrict access to amphibian habitat in ravines, minimizing the impact from illegal logging and cattle. / Deforestation and forest degradation ongoing and causing declines in habitat quantity and quality for AZE species / Negotiations underway to allow fencing: land ownership survey and consultations / Fencing of 260 meters at two Mehuin properties (Isaac and Llenehue) restricts access to AZE amphibian habitat in ravines, minimizing impacts from illegal logging and cattle. Madagascar: Tsitongambarika Forest - Deforestation rate as the main threat to, and determinant of conservation status of, AZE species / Estimated rate 2.05% to be verified on project inception / 15% reduction in deforestation rate in project area / 35% reduction in deforestation rate in project area				Brazil: Tree measurement in representative 1 ha plots; area measurements using GPS to map restored areas. Chile: Project technical reports; measurement of fencing at Mehuin against site conservation plans. Madagascar: Project technical reports based on field observation (mid-term); official government statistics and independent assessments of deforestation rates (2018).	Chile: AZE amphibian populations can be assessed, despite their scarcity, by viable field methodologies. Madagascar: Amphibian fungus *Bd*, recently confirmed present in Madagascar, does not reach, and cause mortality to frogs in, Tsitongambarika
	Indicator 1.1.4: Measurable improvements in	All potential target sites have significant	Ten additional AZE sites identified,	Measurable improvements in conservation	Documentation of government	Lessons learned from replication sites can be

	conservation status achieved for ten additional target AZE sites covering a minimum of 120,000 ha based on METT scores [Improvements to include equitable engagement of women, men and disadvantaged social groups taking into account their different roles and their different concerns.]	management problems and threats, impacting on AZE species. Baseline METT scores to be established for target AZE sites by project mid-term	beyond those initially targeted for project action that are appropriate to focus on for this project element, with interventions and deliverables defined and METT baseline scores established.	status achieved for ten additional target AZE sites covering a minimum of 40,000 ha based on repeat METT scores	engagement and signage, land titles or conservation agreements, community agreements, photographs of completed infrastructure, project reports, ecotourism income statements. Sex-disaggregated data to be collected for targeted communities	applied to replication sites, and project duration is sufficient to achieve initial results at replication sites
Component 2. Mainstreaming of AZE site conservation in national policy and regulatory frameworks, and into safeguard policies of financial institutions						
Outcome 2.1. The conservation of threatened species and the protection of AZE sites are mainstreamed into the safeguard policies of key financial institutions such as Equator Principles Financial Institutions and Multilateral Development Banks to minimize the impact of development projects on AZE sites.						
Outputs for Outcome 2.1: **Output 2.1.1.** Improved 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. **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. **Output 2.1.3.** Capacity of AZE members to partner with lending institutions strengthened and national AZE networks enhanced through outreach and training programs. **Output 2.1.4.** Staff in private financial institutions trained in use of AZE tools and data. **Output 2.1.5.** Synergies identified and AZE site conservation opportunities mainstreamed with existing and planned donor/agency and private sector financing programs.						
Outcome 2.1. The conservation of threatened species and the protection of AZE sites are mainstreamed into the safeguard policies of key financial institutions such as Equator Principles Financial Institutions and Multilateral	**Indicator 2.1.1:** Number of comprehensively assessed taxonomic groups for which AZE sites systematically identified	6	10	15	WBDB contains records for AZE sites (with the minimum documentation requirements including digital polygons) for each target taxonomic group	Specialist Groups and experts engage in process to identify and verify sites
	Indicator 2.1.2: Number of mapped and documented AZE sites	588	700	750	WBDB contains records for AZE sites (with the minimum documentation	Specialist Groups and experts engage in process to identify and verify sites

Development Banks to minimize the impact of development projects on AZE sites.					requirements including digital polygons)	
	Indicator 2.1.3: Number of visitors to website presenting site factsheets	500	50,000/year	100,000/year	AZE and KBA website stats on number of unique views & visitors	AZE Website visitors access and use the information presented
	Indicator 2.1.4: Number of MDB and EPFI policies referring specifically to AZE following project guidance and consequent reviews of safeguard policies.	2 Baseline and targets to be confirmed (requires survey as part of project)	5	10	Published or consultative versions of safeguard policies	Opportunities to influence IFI policies occur during lifespan of project
	Indicator 2.1.5: Number of financial institutions engaging and working with AZE member staff to use tools, data and guidance, and/or making this available for borrowers' due diligence/initial screening processes	2 Baseline and targets to be confirmed (requires survey as part of project) Some staff in WB, IFC, IDB and EIB (not other MDBs and EPFIs) aware and have access to limited data	5	10	AZE member records (meeting minutes etc), project reports, workshops, webinars Project proposals, reports and due diligence/initial screening process reports from financial institutions	IFIs are open to dialogue, uptake of guidance and information sharing
	Indicator 2.1.6: Number of AZE sites with conservation enhanced or threats averted by participating IFIs through avoidance, mitigation and/or compensation related to development project impacts	0 Baseline and targets to be confirmed (requires survey as part of project) Small number of synergistic projects with AZE partners and IDB/IFC funding	5	10	Project safeguard strategies Other project plans and strategies	
Outcome 2.2: AZE site conservation is mainstreamed into national biodiversity strategies, in support of CBD targets.						
Outputs for Outcome 2.2: **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. **Output 2.2.2.** Technical guidance documents (based on the strategies developed under 2.2.1) inform and support incorporation of AZE priorities in the development of further NBSAPs and PoWPA Action Plans globally.						

Output 2.2.3. Consolidated and strengthened national AZE partnerships use project outputs to support NBSAP and PoWPA processes, national CBD reporting and enhanced AZE site conservation through targeted capacity development and outreach programs						
Outcome 2.2: AZE site conservation is mainstreamed into national biodiversity strategies, in support of CBD targets.	**Indicator 2.2.1:** Number of endorsed and launched pilot national AZE Strategies in project countries (Brazil, Chile, Madagascar) [Strategies to include equitable engagement of women, men and disadvantaged social groups taking into account their different roles and their different concerns.]	0 No national AZE strategies exist for Chile, Brazil and Madagascar.	0 First draft of National AZE Strategy in Chile, Brazil, and Madagascar	3 National AZE Strategies for Brazil, Chile, and Madagascar endorsed and being implemented	National AZE maps as well as protected area gap analyses and strategy document produced with Government endorsement Sex-disaggregated data to be collected for targeted communities	Political support is sustained for incorporation of AZE into national policies and plans by the implementing partner governments.
	Indicator 2.2.2: Number of project countries (Brazil, Chile, Madagascar) including AZE site protection in NBSAPs/CBD National Reports, and/or PoWPA Action Plans, and other relevant national planning documents	0 Brazil: AZE is mentioned in NBSAP, but not the PoWPA Action Plan. Chile: NBSAP and PoWPA Action Plans do not mention AZE. Madagascar: NBSAP and PoWPA Action Plans do not mention AZE.	0 Draft National AZE Strategy developed with strong Government engagement and contains recommendations and timetables for inclusion of AZE in national biodiversity strategies.	3 Brazil, Chile, and Madagascar AZE site protection included in key documents, including AZE Species Action Plans (Brazil), Amphibian Conservation Plan (Chile), Species Action Plans (Madagascar)	National biodiversity planning documents include reference to and/or provision for AZE site conservation.	Political support is sustained for incorporation of AZE into national policies and plans by implementing partner governments.
	Indicator 2.2.3: Number of countries* explicitly including AZE sites and species among strategic priorities in at least one of NBSAPs, CBD National Reports, and/or PoWPA Action Plans **Excluding*	5 countries with AZE referenced in at least 1 key document • 2 NBSAPs (Brazil and Philippines) • 4 PoWPA Action Plans (Vietnam, Nauru, Indonesia,	5 All CBD Focal Points received from CBD Secretariat notification requesting information on Protected Areas representativeness including AZE sites Direct contacts	9 countries with AZE referenced in at least 1 key document	Updated NBSAPs, CBD National Reports, and/or PoWPA Action Plans include AZE.	NBSAP and PoWPA Action Plan updates or CBD National Reports are completed according to a schedule that allows AZE to be incorporated by end of project.

	Brazil, Chile and Madagascar	and Philippines)	made between AZE staff and responsible parties for at least 20 countries.			
	Indicator 2.2.4: Number of countries with national AZE partnerships strengthened through AZE mini-workshops and national strategy development workshops	0 AZE has 93 member NGOs in 35 countries, with national alliances in Brazil, Colombia, India, Mexico, and Peru. 200 member organizations in these countries. Site identification workshops conducted in Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, and Peru.	0 Relevant experts are identified and invited to participate in AZE site review processes in 5 countries.	5 AZE mini-workshops followed by at least 2 national strategy workshops** in 4-6 countries, resulting in strengthened national AZE partnerships and draft national AZE strategies	National AZE reviews and workshop reports	

**The final selection of countries for the 2 national strategy workshops will depend on the outcomes of the 4 mini workshops

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).

31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	March 24, 2014 By the time of the submission of the MSP, please identify the funding and replication strategy for the 10 additional sites covering 40,000 hectares. The replication strategy should include the elements of AZE site conservation that are unique to managing these small sites and that distinguish the interventions from standard conservation practice, if there are clear distinctions and activities that are "AZE-specific". Within the replication strategy, please consider including opportunities for catalyzing conservation action beyond AZE sites and in broader landscapes using AZE sites as a stepping-stone for site-based action, as appropriate within each participating country. This stepping-stone approach should also be considered within the context of advancing AZE site conservation in the safeguard policies of the MDBs and commercial banks. That is, AZE site prioritization within safeguard policies might provide opportunities for a more expansive conservation dialogue and broader integration of biodiversity priorities within safeguard policies. During the project design process, we encourage the proponents to consider this possibility within Component Two as it is further developed.	The Replication strategy for Components 1 and 2 is outlined under Section 3.9 - Replication (page 75) and will be further reinforced by the communications and outreach strategy to be developed, as described in Section 3.10 – Public Awareness, communications and mainstreaming (page 77) which also outlines replication strategy for demonstration sites. Para 97 references the global need and opportunity in the context of the role of demonstration sites in replication. The stepping stone approach with respect to advancing AZE site conservation policies within safeguard policies is considered in the roll out of outputs 2.1.2 – 2.1.5 on pages 54-55 of the Project Document.

Responses to GEF Secretariat review at CEO Endorsement – Received on May 28, 2015 & July 1, 2015

Comments	Responses	Reference in Project Document
14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear? It still remains unclear how this project will learn from the different experiences at AZE sites. AZE conservation programs are not fundamentally different from other conservation initiatives, thus should provide lessons to other conservation projects in order to achieve broader impacts. Please add activities to collect, synthesize and disseminate the knowledge generated by this project both from the pilot and scaling-up sites, and please include these activities in the budget.	Agreed: text added on collection, synthesis and dissemination of lessons in relevant section. This was in fact intended and budgeted through staff contributions of Species conservation manager and Conservation strategy advisor, Meetings/Conferences, and Publications and Training materials; therefore budget is unchanged.	3.10. Public awareness, communications and mainstreaming strategy, new para 244
19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? As mentioned at the PIF approval, "AZE site prioritization within safeguard policies might provide opportunities for a more expansive conservation dialogue and broader	Site-level biodiversity priorites advocated by BirdLife and ABC/AZE include Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas and Key Biodiversity Areas, of which AZE sites are a high-priority subset. Wider conservation dialogue and broader integration of biodiversity priorities	Output 2.1.2, para 167 and 168 (and minor edits to text elsewhere)

integration of biodiversity priorities within safeguard policies." For component 2 this project should be not be focused on AZE-only trainings or tools but rather coordinating with existing initiatives to make biodiversity data accessible and more importantly used by financial institutions. In fact, there is a danger that AZE-only training or tools would create a false sense that non-AZE sites are not of concern for biodiversity. Please provide greater information about how this project will coordinate with existing initiatives (such as providing better data or support for IBAT) and how it will leverage organizations such as IFC and IDB that already use AZE in decision-making. In addition, please include other site level biodiversity priorities in addition to AZE sites in trainings and tools.	within safeguard policies will be promoted through existing IBA and KBA frameworks, including associated training and advocacy. The IFIs that have already incorporated AZEs in their safeguards will be approached independently with a separate strategy. IADB is aware of AZEs but has not incorporated AZEs in their safeguards. IADB will therefore belong to the list of IFIs that require engagement on safeguard incorporation. IFC and EIB include AZEs in their safeguards, but need the references and data linkages need updating and elaborating, a process in which IBAT will be key.	
24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? As stated when the PIF was approved, more consideration needs to be given to how the scaling up sites will be funded and financial sustainability of pilot sites ensured. "By the time of the submission of the MSP, please identify the funding and replication strategy for the 10 additional sites covering 40,000 hectares."	The 10 additional sites covering 40,000 hectares will be identified through a selection process involving the Project Steering Committee in year 1, rather than at CEO approval stage. However, we have elaborated the long-list of sites presented as Prodoc Table 6 with a brief account of financing possibilities to demonstrate that these are 'live' priorities and projects/programs. For any site, CBD LifeWeb Zero Extinction Campaign may be an option for replication at AZE sites, based on strong interest in CBD in the project.	Table 6 elaborated, and para 157
25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided. July 1, 2015 No, the additional co-financing is very welcome, but there is no documentation for the co-financing from the government of Madagascar.	The Madagascar co-financing letter was presented at page 12 of Appendix 11.	Page 12 of Appendix 11.
27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? Please resubmit tracking tools as Excel files as required. July 1, 2015 Please make the following additions/corrections to the tracking tools: - Brazil TT - fill out the first section	Yes, provided in excel format Tracking Tools have been revised as per recommendations.	

- Chile TT - please completely fill out sections I, II, III of tab 1. Under other designations of conservation importance, all the sites should be listed as AZE sites. Please explain why the questions highlighted in yellow for Llenehu are NA or put zero if that it is the appropriate score.		
28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? Please include a budget for the M&E Plan. The project budget currently shows the MTR budget as blank. July 1, 2015. Cleared. However, please note that a MTR is a requirement of a GEF project and not an option as implied in Annex B in the response to this question.	Budgeted $15,000 to reflect a desk review plus one sample country visit (to be selected by Steering Committee) if an evaluation is deemed needed by the Steering Committee. The June 8, 2015 Results-Based Management GEF Trust Fund and LDCF/SCCF Reporting Guidelines reads as follows: *"**Mid-Term Review (MTR) Requirements: Mid-term reviews are required for all full-size projects and are encouraged for medium-sized projects, where appropriate and feasible."***	$15,000 allocation in revised budget (Appendix 1 and 7)
(No GEFSEC comment)	Additional cofinancing commitments confirmed since submission to GEFSEC, now added to documentation	Prodoc (cover sheet, 7.2, appendices 2 & 3, CEO Endorsement request
33. July 1, 2015 The improvements were very much welcome, but there are remaining issues with the tracking tools and cofinancing letters.	Please see responses above	

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

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: **100,000 USD**			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	***GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount ($)100,000***		
	Budgeted Amount	***Amount Spent To date***	***Amount Committed***
Local Consultants	4,800	4,800	0
International & Regional Consultants	59,004	59,004	0
Travel	10,100	10,100	0
Meetings and Workshops	2,400	2,400	0
Supplies	883	883	0
Total	**77,187**	**77,187**	0