Log No. 98-564

GEFSEC Project Tracking System

Response Due Date: 01/04/98

Correspondence Description

Addressed to: *Mr. Kenneth King*	Correspondence Date: 12/18/98
Date Received: 12/18/98	Organization: UNEP
From: Sheila Aggarwal-Khan	

Assigned To: M. Ramos

Status: Open

Type: Memorandum
Topic: PDF B: Global: Management of Agrobiodiversity for Sustainable Land Use and Global Environmental Benefits

Action Instructions

☐ For Bilateral meeting
☐ For information only. No action needed.
☐ Please handle/respond on behalf of Mr. Kenneth King and provide a copy.
☐ Please handle/respond on behalf of Mr. Mohamed El-Ashry and provide a copy.
☐ Please prepare a draft response and return to Program Coordinator
☐ Please reply directly and provide a copy.
☒ Please review and/or technical comments

Special Instructions

Information Copies Sent To:

K. Kumari, H. Acquay, W. Lusigi, M. Cruz, J. Taylor

Projects File Room Location:

Note: A copy/original of the document is being sent directly to your attention.

Please return this page with a copy of the incoming correspondence and the reply/action taken to Program File Manager (GEFSEC Projcet File Room) before or by due date with the original copy of the correspondence and the reply/action.

United Nations Environment Programme
برنامج الأمم المتحدة للبيئة · 联合国环境规划署
PROGRAMME DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT · PROGRAMA DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA EL MEDIO AMBIENTE
ПРОГРАММА ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ ПО ОКРУЖАЮЩЕЙ СРЕДЕ
UNEP

MEMORANDUM

To : Kenneth King
Assistant CEO
Attn: Programme Coordination
GEF Secretariat
Washington D.C., USA
Fax: (1 202) 522 3240

Lars Vidaeus, WB/GEF
Washington DC, USA
Fax: (1 522) 3456

Rafael Asenjo, UNDP/GEF
New York, USA
Fax: (1 212) 906 6998

Hamdallah Zedan, SCBD
Montreal, Canada
Fax: (1 514) 288 6588

Madhav Gadgil, STAP
Bangalore, India
Fax: 91 80 334 1683

Date: 18 Dec, 98

Drafter SAK

Through:

Room: P224
Extension: 3265

From: for Sheila Aggarwal-Khan
Officer-in-Charge
UNEP GEF Co-ordination Office

Reference: BD PDFB

Subject: Biodiversity PDF B on Agrodiversityoject submission

As per the discussions at the 1 December 1998 Bilateral Review , please find attached the PDF B on "Management of Agrobiodiversity for Sustainable Land Use and Global Environmental Benefits". The revised version was also sent to Mr. Ramos on December 15, 1998.

UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
PROPOSAL FOR PROJECT DEVELOPMENT & PREPARATION FACILITY (PDF)
BLOCK B GRANT

Project title:	Management of Agrobiodiversity for Sustainable Land Use and Global Environmental Benefits
Implementing Agency:	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
Executing Agency:	Tropical Soil Biology and Fertility Programme (TSBF) in collaboration with National Executing Agencies: Xalapa University, Mexico; Universidade Federal de Lavras, Brazil; Universite de Cocody, Cote d'Ivoire; Makerere University, Uganda; National Museums, Kenya; Jawaharlal Nehru University, India; Universitas Lampung, Indonesia;
Countries:	Global (Brazil, Côte d'Ivoire, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Uganda).
GEF Focal Area:	Biodiversity, Operational Programmes #3 (Forest Ecosystems) and #4 (Mountain Ecosystems).
PDF-B funding requested:	**$248,000**
PDF-B Associated Co-funding:	**UNEP $12,000** **TSBF $ 36,000**
Block A grant awarded:	Yes.
Estimated starting date:	Project: October 1999 PFD-B: January 1999
Project Duration:	5 years (full project) 4 months (PDF-B)

1. BACKGROUND

1. It is a general hypothesis that the process of agricultural intensification results in a loss of biological diversity. The root causes behind this are complex, but at the farm level are associated with progressive specialisation in production and the substitution of biological functions with petro-chemical energy sources and manufactured inputs. This project will examine the impact of agricultural development on a unique component of biological diversity - that of the soil biota - with the aim of developing and implementing recommendations for sustainable use of biological diversity important to agriculture.

2. Sustainable and profitable management of agricultural biodiversity is dependent on information -about the current status, the value (as perceived by various sectors of society), as well as the factors which drive changes in one direction or other. The Global Biodiversity Assessment represents a documentation of existing information sources, but the sections on agrobiodiversity, and in particular the below-ground components, are among the most brief.

3. The biological diversity of the organisms below-ground is often higher than that above-ground, yet has been almost totally ignored in considerations of biodiversity conservation and management even at the inventory level. Similarly, the functional role of soil biota, with the notable exception of the N-fixing bacteria, has been given relatively little attention in agricultural research. Yet, this community of bacteria, fungi, protozoa and invertebrate animals contributes a wide range of essential services to the sustainable function of all ecosystems, by acting as the primary driving agents of nutrient cycling, regulating the dynamics of soil organic matter, soil carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas emission, modifying soil physical structure and water regimes, enhancing the amount and efficiency of nutrient acquisition by the vegetation through the interaction of mycorrhiza and nitrogen fixing bacteria, and influencing plant health through the interaction of soil-borne pathogens and pests with their natural predators and parasites.

4. Agricultural intensification *sensu strictu* is taken to mean the increased use of a given area of land for agriculture, with the target of increased production per unit area per unit time. The modern trend of intensification has relied very substantially on homogenisation and specialisation of the genetic base, with increasing reliance on monocultures of a small number of crop species. This contrasts with traditional (or 'extensive') systems of land use where agricultural biodiversity is deliberately maintained and utilised to provide a wide range of products and services. The assumption that increases in the efficiency of production are dependent on specialisation has been challenged by the alternative hypothesis that more sustainable gains can be achieved through diversification. Substantial investments made in the last two decades to investigate the production potential of "intermediate" systems, such as agroforestry, inter- and rotational cropping, mixed arable-livestock farming and

other integrated forms of land-use, have shown the potential for "win-win" outcomes combining yield gains with elements contributing to system sustainability, such as increased biological diversity and natural resource conservation.

5. Changes in the below-ground biological diversity are often thought to track those in the plant component. Although there is evidence that the soil community may be more functionally resilient than the above-ground biota the biological regulation of soil processes may be severely impaired during the switch from "traditional" to "modern" agriculture and eventually substituted by the use of chemical fertilisers and increasingly mechanised tillage. The below-ground biodiversity is also affected by the increased use of pesticides and herbicides characteristic of many modern intensive systems. Loss of the associated ecosystem services contributes significantly to land degradation. Actions that directly target the joint conservation of the above-and below-ground components of biological diversity carry significant environmental benefits at the scale of both farm and landscape.

6. Global food supply has come increasingly to depend on intensive agriculture utilising high levels of external inputs. The distribution of high-input systems is however very uneven: current development trajectories in a wide range of countries commonly serve to maintain both geographical and socio-economic separation between the intensive agriculture sector, the traditional and low-input agricultural sector and the areas set aside for biodiversity conservation. In many tropical countries modernised agriculture still forms a minor component of the agricultural sector, which is commonly numerically dominated by small-scale farming utilising a variety of approaches ranging from traditionally extensive to more intensive but characterised by limited access to purchased inputs.

7. There is increasing evidence that landscape mosaics that sustain a variety of agricultural land-uses as well as components of the natural ecosystem are often more biologically diverse than those confined to any single type of land-cover, whether extensive or intensive. COP4 drew attention to the potential importance of such landscape mosaics and urged parties to undertake studies to investigate the potential importance of landscape mosaics for reducing negative effects on biodiversity. Criteria for managing such landscapes or evaluating them in terms of biodiversity conservation properties or other features of interest to various sectors of society have yet to be developed.

8. The development of land-use policies which reconcile agricultural, biodiversity and environmental concerns is crucial to sustainable development and is a national priority in all the countries participating in this project. Policy formulation is dependent upon the availability of information. Development of appropriate policies requires in particular reconciling the needs for meeting food-sufficiency by high levels of agricultural productivity with those for conserving biodiversity and environmental protection. A major barrier to the reconciliation

of the conflicting claims for different agricultural development trajectories is the absence of adequate information on the costs and benefits, both in economic and ecological terms, of conservation and management of higher levels of biodiversity in agricultural landscapes. Data on the below-ground component of agricultural biodiversity, with its critical function in maintaining ecosystem services, is a particularly deficient element that this project seeks to rectify.

9. The implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) with respect to conservation of biodiversity in natural and relatively undisturbed ecosystems is well underway in many countries. The importance of extending these actions to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity important to agriculture is increasingly recognized and has been detailed in the decisions III/11 and IV/6 of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD. The GEF, as the interim financial mechanism of the CBD, is in the process of responding to this COP guidance, as outlined in the GEF paper: "A Framework for GEF Activities concerning Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Important to Agriculture" (March 1998) which lays out criteria for implementation of Decisions III/11 of the COP3, the first comprehensive decision of the COP that highlighted the relationship between the impact on Biological Diversity on Agriculture and the impacts of Agriculture on Biological Diversity. Decision IV/6 of COP4 reexamined the priority themes stipulated in Decision III/11 and emphasised the need to balance production and conservation objectives in such a way as to meet the needs of expanding populations while maintaining an ecological balance.

10. At COP4, the call was specifically made for efforts to identify and promote sustainable agricultural practices, integrated landscape management of mosaics of agricultural and natural areas as well as appropriate farming systems that will reduce possible negative effects of agricultural practices on biological diversity and enhance the ecological functions provided by biological diversity to agriculture. Furthermore, all parties were invited to conduct case studies on soil biota in agriculture (Decision IV/6, paragraph 5). This project will address these concerns with particular respect to the below-ground component of agricultural biological diversity ecosystems in a representative array of tropical forest and mountain ecosystems.

11. Operational Programmes #3 and #4 respond to COP guidance requesting the GEF to fund projects that promote the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in environmentally vulnerable areas, and projects which promote the conservation and/or sustainable use of endemic species in forest and mountain ecosystems. Forests play a crucial role in maintaining global biodiversity, since they hold the majority of the world's terrestrial species and provide the most diverse sets of habitats for plants, animals and microorganisms. The maintenance of forest ecosystems is consequently crucial for the conservation of biodiversity well beyond their boundaries. Mountain ecosystems are also vulnerable and hold a very wide variety of habitats, and OP#4 focuses on

conservation or in-situ protection of biodiversity through conservation of systems of conservation areas in (inter alia) the Mesoamerican, Andean, East African and Himalayan regions.

SUMMARY OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND DESCRIPTION

12. The overall objective of the project to be refined under this PDF-B is "to develop policies that integrate the objectives of agricultural productivity and environmental protection through land-use practices that conserve and sustainably manage agricultural biodiversity with particular reference to the soil biota."

13. The expected outcomes are:

1. Improved and internationally acceptable methods for characterisation and evaluation of agricultural biodiversity and agrobiodiversity management practices at the farm and landscape scales, with particular reference to below-ground biodiversity.

2. Evaluation of the current status of conservation and sustainable management of agricultural biodiversity in a representative range of tropical forest and mountain ecosystems.

3. Recommendations, based on cost-benefit analysis, for alternative land-use practices and policies which jointly enhance the conservation and sustainable management of agricultural biodiversity and the profitable intensification of agriculture.

4. Increased capacity for characterisation and evaluation of agrobiodiversity in stakeholder groups and relevant institutions in the participating countries.

15. To achieve these objectives, a range of activities will be undertaken both at the national and the global level:

- The methods and approaches of both the biological and economic components of the agrobiodiversity characterisation and evaluation are innovative in nature. The project objectives thus include both method testing and capacity building. Comparative assessment of methods for below-ground biodiversity characterisation and evaluation will comprise an important initial step in the project resulting in agreement on standardised methods.

- As the ultimate goal of the project is implementation of policies based on recommendations deriving from the project results, regional and national policy- and decision-makers will participate with the researchers and local communities at all stages of the project from design to completion.

- Data gathering and demonstration of development alternatives will be located at benchmark sites in each country which will each constitute an area of the landscape within which there is a land-use intensification gradient inclusive of systems with different degrees of agricultural intensification. Selection of these sites will be based on criteria to be established during the PDF-B activity.

- The sites will be characterized with respect to agricultural biodiversity, both above- and below-ground, and the functional attributes associated with the various components will be evaluated. Socio-economic methods will constitute an important part of the studies, so as to involve as many aspects of the values of agricultural biodiversity as possible. These results will lead to an increased understanding of the baseline situation in the benchmark sites, which can eventually be extended to other similar areas and make a significant contribution to the global goal of biodiversity evaluation.

- Plots will be established at the benchmark sites to demonstrate, monitor and evaluate the effects of different land-uses and management practices on agrobiodiversity. Two types of demonstration plots will be established: the first set will be concerned with modifications to current practices on productive fields that result in increases in agricultural biodiversity or improved management of present biodiversity. The second set of plots will be concerned with rehabilitation of degraded lands through management of above- and below-ground biodiversity.

- The relative costs and benefits of the recommended practices will be computed. These results will be used to evaluate alternative scenarios for agricultural intensification at both farm and landscape mosaic scales. These results will enable development of recommendations for policies that willintegrate biodiversity conservation with agricultural development.

JUSTIFICATION FOR PDF-B:

16. This PDF-B is designed to refine the project brief which was the outcome of a PDF-A. The project involves a wide range of stakeholders. The convening institutions in all the countries are Universities where the expertise in below-ground biodiversity is located. In addition to these researchers the stakeholders include: the local farming communities in the benchmark areas where the project data will be gathered and the demonstration plots located; NGOs operating in the benchmark areas; the national agricultural research and extension systems; and planners and decision makers at regional and national levels. A primary purpose of the PDF-B is to hold consultations, including meetings, between the stakeholders to ensure full engagement in project design, agreement with site selection criteria, coordination mechanisms and establish linkages between the different stakeholders that will ensure the processes of information transfer during the project.

17. The PDF-B activity is also needed to ensure that baseline information is available at all the sites on relevant policy and development criteria and for calculation of incremental costs.

18. A significant intended output of the project is to test and agree on standardised methods for below-ground biodiversity characterisation and valuation. The PDF-B will enable pre-project selection of methods and criteria for testing and validation.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PDF-B ACTIVITIES

19. The activities in the PDF-B will build on the PDF-A workshop held in April 1998 and the resulting project brief. The main activities will be national consultations and workshop and a global workshop to synthesise the outcomes of the national workshops. The results of these workshops will then feed into a revised and refined project brief for submission to the GEF.

Activity 1 : Guidelines for national consultations and workshops

A consultant will be hired to work with the Executing Agency, the National Convenors and the members of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) established under the PDF-A to develop a timetable and set of Guidelines for completing the project design and preparation of the brief. A major component of the guidelines will address the issue of mobilisation of stakeholder interests through consultations and workshops in each of the participating countries. The Guidelines will ensure compatible and high quality outcomes from the workshops and other consultations.

The Guidelines will include provisions for ensuring that issues such as stakeholder involvement, methodology for site selection and methods and data standards for incremental cost calculation are discussed to a significant level of detail for each national situation. The Guidelines will also address the issues of selection and standardisation of methods for characterising and evaluating below ground biodiversity and establish standards and methods for preparing baseline costs at the national level.

Activity 2: National consultations and workshops

National workshops involving the full range of stakeholders in the project will be held in each of the seven participating countries. The workshops will be preceded by consultations between the convening institutions and the different groups of stakeholders as appropriate, as well as preparation of necessary documentation. The stakeholders include representatives of the local farming communities and NGOs in the benchmark areas, the University researchers with expertise in agrobiodiversity and socioeconomic analysis, researchers and decision makers from the national agricultural research and extension system and planners and decision makers in the agricultural and environmental sectors of national government.

The consultations and workshops will be conducted using the Guidelines developed under Activity 1. The matters addressed at the workshops will include:

- Visits of the stakeholders to potential sites and discussion and evaluation of the suggested criteria for site selection; in all cases the sites will be selected to represent a range of agricultural intensification examples characteristic of the agroecological zone in the benchmark area;
- A workplan for site selection, agreed in consultation with local communities and national agricultural agencies and institutions;
- Initial documentation of the baseline conditions of agrobiodiversity and agricultural development at the benchmarks;
- Documentation of relevant policies influencing agricultural development, conservation of biodiversity and management of agrobiodiversity;
- Calculations of baseline investments and incremental costs associated with below-ground biodiversity testing and utilisation;
- Assessments of potential agricultural intensification scenarios for the benchmark areas, including those utlising biological diversification;
- Comments by national researchers on methods for below-ground biodiversity assessments and valuation to be tested in the project.
- Assessments of national training and capacity building needs.

An important outcome for the workshops will also be to complete agreements on the responsibilities for coordination of national project activities and establish mechanisms and channels for information and knowledge flow and dissemination. This will in particular include means for the participation of national and regional decision makers in the various stages of project design, implementation and evaluation, with the target of increasing the impact of the results at the policy formulation stage.

Recommendations will also be made for global coordination and for the modalities and procedures for linking the national databases to the global information system which will, after start up, be maintained by TSBF.

Activity 3: Global synthesis and methodology workshop

A global workshop will be held following completion of Activity 2. Stakeholders to be involved in the global workshop include local and national representatives selected at the national workshops, together with selected members of the TAG.

The first objective of this meeting will be to synthesise the outcomes from the national consultations and workshops and reach agreement for each of the items discussed. In addition to the reconciliation of the issues listed for attention at the national consultations a topic of specific global significance is that of the resources and mechanisms for global coordination and the membership and terms of reference of the TAG. The incremental cost analysis will be refined and put into the global context. The co-financing agreements will be consolidated.

The second sector of the global workshop will be concerned with methods. Outcome 1 of the project (a targetted research component) is the development of standards for methods for below-ground agrobiodiversity characterisation and evaluation. The workshop participants will be tasked with agreeing on a selection of methods to be tested together with the design of the testing procedures to be used.

Activity 4: Refinement of Project Brief
The outcomes of the national and global workshops will be synthesised into a refined project brief which meets the concerns of the GEF. After approval by the Technical Advisory Group, and UNEP to ensure conformity with GEF requirements, this will be submitted to GEF for approval.

ELIGIBILITY

20. All the participating countries have ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity. The project has furthermore been endorsed by the GEF Focal Points in all the seven countries.

    Brazil: Roberto Jaguaribe, Secretaria de Assuntos Internacionais, Ministeria do Planejamento e Orçcamento. Endorsed October 13, 1997.

    Côte d'Ivoire: Kone Alimata Diaby, Caisse Autonome d'Amortissement. Endorsed July 3, 1997.

    India: Geeta Narayan, Under Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs. Endorsed December 2, 1998.

    Indonesia: Aca Sugandhy, Asiste Minister 1, MenNEG LH. Endorsed August 31, 1997.

    Kenya: D. N. Kinyanjui, Deputy Director, National Environment Secretariat. Endorsed July 8, 1998.

    Mexico: Ricardo Ochoa, Direction de Organismos Financieros Internacionales. Endorsed July 28, 1997.

    Uganda: C. M. Kassami, Permanent secretary, Ministry of Economic Development. Endorsed July 31, 1997.

NATIONAL LEVEL SUPPORT

21. Management of biodiversity associated with agriculture has been a largely ignored target of both research and policy but increased awareness of this topic has led to gathering support for this neglected area. Co-financing to the order of $7 million has been proposed by the participating countries during the project preparation stage, with a further $2 million coming from international sources. All the countries participating in the project have national policies that seek to

combine agricultural development with biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resource management, although in some cases these aims remain relatively dis-aggregated.

22. In Brazil the major concern, as expressed in the GEF-funded National Programme of Biological Diversity, is the loss of biodiversity in the Amazon region, and the depletion of soil fertility following conversion of forest to pastures and other agricultural uses. The introduction of profitable agroforestry systems or plantation provides alternatives, but a full assessment of the environmental and economic implications remains a priority. Decree No. 1541 of 1995 seeks an Integrated National Policy for the Legal Amazon Region which includes improved articulation of the economic (including agricultural), social and environmental dimensions.

23. In Côte d'Ivoire the National Environment Action Plan of 1992 established a series of programmes to address issues of environmental protection. Sustainable approaches to agricultural development were felt to be of primary concern and explicit links were made between this programme and that focused on biodiversity conservation. The need for integrated management of environmental information was also stressed. The National Programme for the Management of the Environment and Natural Resources (PNGERNAT) which was assisted by UNDP's Capacity 21 furthermore aims at strengthening the national capacity to support actions undertaken by the Government, local communities and NGOs for the protection of the environment. The UNEP/GEF Biodiversity Enabling Activities for Côte d'Ivoire aim at preparing a National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan to fully take the strategic objectives of the CBD into account in the NEAP.

24. In India the Ninth Five -Year Plan (1997-2002) set up the twin goals of economic development and environmental conservation, with a particular recognition of the country's rich biodiversity heritage. The National Conservation Policy and the Policy Statement on Environment and Development issued by the Ministry of environment and Forests in 1992 also stated these concerns and required the retention of two thirds of the area under forest in the mountain zones. This places pressure on the agricultural sector of the mountainous regions to increase the efficiency of production on the permitted areas at a time where soil fertility depletion and other constraints are increasing.

25. In Indonesia, act No 5/1994 addresses the ratification of the Convention on Biological Diversity by stating that the general objective of biodiversity conservation is to manage biodiversity in a sustainable manner, based on resource carrying capacity, community participation, equitable sharing of benefits and a holistic knowledge system. The Indonesian Agenda 21 policy, which emerged from this, acknowledges that at the national level no specific agency has been assigned to manage biodiversity as a whole and the authority has been spread over several institutions. The Act also sets aside 10 % of the

natural ecosystems in the country for conservation purposes and instructs that conservation of biodiversity outside protected areas, in rural areas and other zones must also be undertaken. At the regional level, the ASEAN group of countries has recognised the importance of cross-sectoral linkages between biodiversity conservation, sustainable land use and environmental stability. The formation of ASEANET, a mechanism for information sharing and training in taxonomy and policy implementation is currently under consideration.

26. Kenya's National Environment Action Plan (NEAP) and National Food Policy Plan (1994) both address issues related to agricultural intensification such as reducing the levels of agrochemical use by adoption of biological techniques for pest control and fertilisation. The NEAP stresses the need to involve farmers and other land-users in policy development and goes on to say that biological resources should be treated as capital resources and invested in accordingly to prevent depletion. The GEF-supported Biodiversity Data Management Plan for Kenya identifies the scattered nature of data and the lack of adequate equipment as the major problems facing an integrated biodiversity data management in the country.

27. Mexico is a megadiversity country, but the rates of deforestation are among the highest in the world. The Mexican Environmental programme (1995-2000) seeks to combine sustainable rural development with conservation of biodiversity and environmental concerns in general by aiming at providing the appropriate tools for the implementation of a restoration and ecological recovery process in order to promote the social and economic development in the country.

28. Uganda's National Environment Action Plan of 1995 embraces a National Environment Management Policy which is a framework to guide environmental and natural resource management. One sector specifically targets the incorporation of costs of producing or maintaining natural resources into costs incurred by and benefits derived from resource users through the use of appropriate mechanisms. In close association with this the Agricultural Sector Policy seeks to promote farming systems and land use practices that conserve and enhance land productivity in an environmentally sustainable manner. An important mechanism within this policy is that of Environmental Information Management in relation to biodiversity, soil conservation, fuelwood supply and demand and pollution control.

OUTPUTS OF THE PDF

29. The main output of the PDF-B activities will be a refined project brief for submission to the GEF. Other outputs are as follows:

- Guidelines for National Consultations and Workshops. This document will provide an approach for mobilising the interests and expertise of national stakeholders.

- Reports form National Workshops - including:
  - Analysis of stakeholder interests and participation in project design and implementation including plans for dissemination and use of results by key target groups (local communities, national decision makers) in each country;
  - Analysis of current policies/plans that may have an impact on agrodiversity and that should factor into the implementation of the full project; Criteria used for site selection;
  - Baseline description of the benchmark areas and incremental cost analysis for each participating country;
  - Analysis of potential alternative pathways for agricultural intensification in each benchmark area.

- Report of global workshop which will include in addition to the global synthesis of the recommendations from the national workshops :
  - Summary of methods for characterisation of below-ground biodiversity with agreement for a protocol for comparative testing in the project. Proposal for methods for conducting cost and benefit analysis of conservation and management of below-ground and other components of agricultural biodiversity;
  - Recommendations and costings for global coordination and management of the project;
  - Terms of reference and membership of the Technical Advisory Group.

SPECIAL FEATURES

30. This PDF-B is a continuation of the activities conducted under a PDF-A grant awarded in December 1997.

ITEMS TO BE FINANCED BY THE PDF

31. Tables 1 and 2 show the support requested from the GEF, and the allocation of resources to the activities outlined above. The PDF grant will be used primarily to finance the convening of the national and global workshops and to finalise the refined project brief.

EXPECTED DURATION OF THE PDF ACTIVITIES

32. The PDF-B activities are expected to begin in January 1999 and to be terminated in May 1999.

COST TABLE

Table 1: By project activity

Activity	GEF Contribution (US$)	Co-financing (in cash and kind)	
		UNEP	TSBF
Activity 1: Guidelines for national workshops	10,000	2,000	12,000
Activity 2: National workshops	180,500	4,000	6,000
Activity 3: Global workshop	49,000	3,000	6,000
Activity 4: Finalization of refined project brief	8,500	3,000	12,000
TOTAL	**248,000**	**12,000**	**36,000**

Note:

1. Co-financing from TSBF is for staff time and support services. Additional co-financing of costs in kind of staff time and institutional support from the participating countries has not been costed.

Table 2: By cost Centre

1. Consultant	29,000
2. National workshops	140,000
3. Global workshop	45,000
4. Travel	28,000
5. Communications & Reporting costs	6,000
TOTAL	**248,000**

Notes:

1. Consultancy costed at $6,500 per month for four months plus $3,000 support charges. In Table 1 the consultant cost (including travel) is spread across activities.

2. National workshops costed at $20,000 per country for travel, accommodation, field expenses, travel costs for convenors, support charges, etc.

3. Global workshop: costs for two representatives from each country plus about five members of the Project Technical Advisory Group (TAG).

4. Travel is for attendance of consultant, project coordinator and/or selected members of the TAG at each of the national workshops (to ensure continuity) and for additional consultations in Europe and North America.