



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Coastal and Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)			
Country(ies):	Guatemala	GEF Project ID: ¹	4716
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4639
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources of Guatemala (MARN); National Council of Protected Areas (CONAP)	Submission Date:	August 29, 2013
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	60 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Agency Fee (\$):	535,455
➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/>			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-1	Outcome 1.1. Outcome 1.2.	Output 1.1. Output 1.2. Output 1.3.	GEF TF	5,354,545	16,190,535
Total project costs				5,354,545	16,190,535

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To promote the conservation and long-term sustainable use of marine and coastal biodiversity (BD) of global importance through effectively and equitably managed marine-coastal protected areas (MPAs), which will contribute to improving the economic welfare of the Guatemalan population.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Strengthening the MPA legal, policy, and financial frameworks for the protection of marine-coastal BD and its sustainable use.	TA	– 164,297.40 hectares (ha) of marine and coastal areas under protection by MPAs in the Pacific. – Increase from three (3) to five (5) multiple-use MPAs declared and included in the Protected Areas System of Guatemala (SIGAP) – Legal and regulatory framework facilitates the conservation and sustainable use of BD in the MPAs and buffer zones – Increase by 50% in the	– Two (2) new multiple-use MPAs (IUCN Category VI) gazetted. – Congressional Decree legalizes the expansions of three (3) existing MPAs. – Reforms of the Mangrove Regulations of the National Forest Institute (INAB) and CONAP promote mangrove conservation and its sustainable use. – An integrated Marine-Coastal Management Program (MCMP) is	GEFTF	990,000.00	1,302,970.00

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

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

		<p>total annual budget from the central government assigned to the management of the MPAs and amount of financial resources received annually from private sources for the MPAs' management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Improvement from 7.73% to 32.73% in the financial capacity of the three existing MPAs according to that established through the total average score in the Financial Sustainability Scorecard. 	<p>developed facilitating: a) creation of the National Administrative Council for Maritime Affairs; b) the implementation of the Policy for the Integrated Management of Marine-Coastal Zones (PMCG) and development plans to enhance the protection and sustainable use of marine-coastal BD; c) effective MPA management; and d) the development of policy guidelines on the Fisheries Act (MAGA) and the National Reserves Act (OCRET) to reduce threats to marine-coastal BD and organize government and non-government sectors to support conservation efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Strategic Guideline 8.3 of Guatemala's PMCG improves inter-institutional coordination, define common goals, roles, and co-responsibilities, and participatory and financial mechanisms for marine-coastal management in ten (10) coastal municipalities. – Coastal land lease rates (OCRET) established for the financial sustainability of MPAs. – Business plans developed and/or updated for the two (2) new and three (3) expanded MPAs. – Municipal investment plans support MPA management through unused budgeted resources by municipalities. 			
2. Strengthening the institutional and individual capacities for effective management of MPAs and the conservation and sustainable use of	TA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Improvement by 15% in the management effectiveness of three (3) existing MPAs as measured through the METT scorecard: a) La Chorrera Private Natural 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Marine units within the MARN and CONAP are established for improving MPA planning and management. – Management plans for three (3) expanded MPAs 	GEFTF	1,753,000.00	4,463,140.00

marine-coastal BD.		<p>Reserve – Manchón Guamuchal RAMSAR site: from 10% to 25%; b) Sipacate-Naranjo National Park: from 26% to 41%; c) Monterrico Multiple-Use Natural Reserve: from 40% to 55%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Two (2) management plans updated and three (3) management plans developed for existing and new MPAs. – Improvement by 20% in the capacity development indicators for MPAs management and the conservation and sustainable use of marine-coastal BD according to the total score of UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard (national government: 4 agencies; local government: 9 municipalities; private sector and civil society: 5 agencies) (Baseline scores are included in Annex A: Project Results Framework). – Staff from national and local governments, private sectors, and civil society, including women, trained in monitoring and control of threats to marine and coastal BD: CONAP: 30, MARN: 40, INAB: 5, OCRET: 3, DIPESCA: 15, Defence Ministry/Navy: 10, municipalities: 20, NGOs: 50, local associations: 110, Ports Commission: 10. – Increase in the number of monitoring, control, and surveillance plans (from 0 to 5; one/MPA /year during 5 years) and patrolling events (from 0 to 120 per MPA; 2/month /MPA during 5 years). 	<p>and for two (2) new MPAs are developed and aligned with the municipal participatory land and marine-coastal use plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Participatory resource use and management strategy for three (3) marine-coastal zones in the Pacific include the permitted uses and restrictions for marine-coastal BD and MPAs in ten (10) municipalities and mechanisms for conflict resolution and accountability. – Strengthened capacity of national and local government institutions (CONAP, MARN, INAB, OCRET, DIPESCA, the Navy, and municipalities), private sector groups (fisheries, urban development, tourism, maritime ports/transportation), and civil society organizations (non-governmental MPA co-administrators and local communities) in MPAs' management and the conservation and sustainable use of marine-coastal BD. – Extension support to small-scale artisanal fisheries for implementation of BD-friendly practices. – A technical-scientific information system related to coastal and marine ecosystems and MPA management contributes to the monitoring and control of threats to marine-coastal BD. 			
3. Addressing threats from key sectors (fisheries, maritime ports/transportation,	TA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Coverage of key marine-coastal ecosystems in five (5) MPAs and their buffer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Three (3) cooperation agreements between MPA authorities (CONAP and municipalities) and the 	GEFTF	2,344,000.00	9,572,950.01

and urban development) in order to strengthen MPAs' management and the conservation and sustainable use of marine-and coastal BD in the Pacific region of Guatemala.	<p>zones is maintained (estuaries: 1,715 ha; coastal lagoons: 2,141 ha; herbaceous wetlands: 8,138 ha; sandy beaches: 21,135 ha; muddy beaches: 3,858 ha).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 165,000 hatchlings released per reproductive period of the sea turtle <i>Lepidochelys olivacea</i> in the nesting beaches of the Pacific. – Minimum sizes of commercially important species in four (4) multiple-use MPAs and their buffer zones in conformance with FAO regulations: white shrimp (<i>Litopenaeus vannamei</i>): 3 g or 6.6 cm; blue shrimp (<i>Penaeus stylirostris</i>): 3 g or 6.6 cm; brown shrimp (<i>Farfantepenaeus californiensis</i>): 3 g or 6.6 cm; and hammerhead shark (<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>): 220 cm total length for females and 178 cm for males. – Improvement by 20% in the average income received by fishermen implementing BD-friendly fishing practices. – 12,803.10 ha of mangroves in five (5) MPAs and their buffer zones: a) Sipacate – Naranjo National Park: 1,936.22 ha; b) Monterrico Multiple-Use Natural Reserve: 2,664.32 ha; c) La Chorrera Private Natural Reserve – RAMSAR site Manchón Guamuchal: 5,028.53 ha; d) Hawaii Multiple-Use Area: 1,753.44 ha; and e) Las Lisas – La Barrona: 1,420.59 ha 	<p>urban development, fisheries, and maritime ports/transportation sectors include conservation/management committees to oversee the conservation and sustainable use of BD in four (4) MPAs and their buffer areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ballast water management program and fee system. – Program for the prevention, reduction, and control of land-based contamination of MPAs and buffer areas defined jointly with municipalities, local communities, and key private sector groups (maritime transportation, agro-industry, tourism, and urban development). – Strategies for reducing vulnerability and the impacts of CC to BD and ecosystem services in five (5) MPAs and their buffer areas. – BD-friendly fishing practices reduce the impacts on two (2) key species of local importance (small-scale artisanal fisheries) and three (3) species of commercial importance in multiple use MPAs and their buffer zones. – Participatory conservation, rehabilitation, and sustainable use of mangroves in MPAs and buffer areas of the Pacific coast favor mangrove protection and the design of riparian conservation corridors. 			
Subtotal				5,087,000.00	15,339,060.01
Project management Cost (PMC) ³			GEFTF	267,545.00	851,474.99
Total project costs				5,354,545.00	16,190,535.00

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

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

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	CONAP	Grant	2,036,901.47
National Government	CONAP	In-kind	293,158.71
National Government	DIPESCA/MAGA	Grant	512,966.92
National Government	DIPESCA/MAGA	In-kind	71,814.90
National Government	INFOM	Grant	3,000,000.00
National Government	INFOM	In-kind	7,500,000.00
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	2,775,693.00
Total Co-financing			16,190,535.00

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

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

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	44,012.00	0	44,012.00
National/Local Consultants	61,066.00	0	61,066.00

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

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

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

A.1 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: UNDP has a Framework and the project is aligned with it.

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

Under the baseline scenario efforts to reduce the multiple threats facing the marine-coastal BD of the Guatemala Pacific will be insufficient. Additionally, it is not likely that new MPAs would be created or expanded in the near future, and as a result, key areas for conservation of BD of global, national, and local importance would continue to lack protection and natural systems will continue to be degraded. The following areas are related to the expected outcomes of the project, and form the baseline project.

Guatemala invests approximately \$9 million USD per year for management of the PA system (to cover recurrent and investment costs of the CONAP and the SIGAP). This is complemented by donations from development partners and a loan from the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) of \$30 million USD for the sustainable development program in Guatemala's Mayan Biosphere Reserve. In Guatemala's Pacific region there are only three MPAs that are part of the SIGAP: the Monterrico Multiple Use Area; the Sipacate-Naranjo National Park; and the La Chorrera Private Natural

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question

Reserve, which is part of the Manchón Guamuchal RAMSAR site. A fourth MPA, the Hawaii Multiple-use Area, has been proposed but its approval by Congress is still pending. Of these areas, only two have approved management plans (the Monterrico Multiple Use Area and the Sipacate-Naranjo National Park), which are outdated. An analysis developed during the PPG phase using the Financial Sustainability Scorecard (FSS; BD-1 Tracking Tool) for the three MPAs in the Pacific coast and using data from 2011 showed that the MPAs operate with a total annual budget of \$673,326.48 USD, with a financial gap of \$3,626,673.52 USD to cover the basic management cost and investments (84.3% of all financial needs).

During the PPG phase of the project, the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) for Protected Areas was used to determine the baseline scores for the three existing MPAs in the Pacific region (see Table below). The overall METT score (determined by averaging the individual MPAs) indicated deficient effectiveness in MPA management (25%). The application of the METT and the studies carried out as part of the PPG phase showed that there are weaknesses that prevent the CONAP from effectively managing its MPAs. There is a lack of skilled staff, deficient planning and monitoring and evaluation, reduced budgets, little coordination with other organizations in the conservation of marine-coastal BD and its sustainable use, and insufficient mechanisms to promote community participation in MPA planning and management.

METT scores for MPAs the Pacific coast of Guatemala.

	Name	Score
1	Monterrico Multiple-Use Natural Reserve	40%
2	Sipacate – Naranjo National Park	26%
3	La Chorrera Private Natural Reserve – Manchón Guamuchal RAMSAR site	10%

Baseline investments from the Government of Guatemala (CONAP, MARN, MAGA, INAB, OCRET, and the Ministry of Communications, Infrastructure, and Housing [MICIVI]) related to environmental protection and management in the 10 prioritized municipalities (Ocos, department of San Marcos; Retalhuleu and Champerico, department of Retalhuleu; La Gomera, department of Escuintla; Guazacapan, Taxisco, and Chiquimulilla, department of Santa Rosa; and Moyuta and Pasaco, department of Jutiapa) for the next 5 years (2014-2018) will total \$3,906,581.56 USD. Baseline investments from the Pacific coastal municipalities for coastal zone protection/land use planning and management are on the order of \$30,000 USD per year.

Additionally, the Quetzal Port Company calculates income generated from ballast water fees at close to \$2.5 million USD during the 5-year period of project implementation. The CEMA will invest \$250,000 USD between 2014 and 2018 in training and research related to marine aquaculture in the Monterrico experimental station (municipality of Taxisco). Finally, ARCAs will invest \$139,375 USD in marine and coastal wildlife protection and ecosystem conservation.

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

The project design is aligned to the original PIF. The structure of the project components closely resembles the PIF that was approved by the GEF. However, the following changes were made, which do not represent a departure from the project's strategy as defined originally in the PIF nor will they have an impact on the funds (GEF and co-financing) originally budgeted:

PIF Outputs	Project Document Outputs
Component 1	
Three (3) new multiple-use MPAs (IUCN Category VI) gazetted.	Two (2) new multiple-use MPAs (IUCN Category VI) gazetted. Instead of three (3) new MPAs the project will establish two (2) new MPAs.

Congressional Decree legalizes the expansions of two (2) existing MPAs.	<p>Congressional Decree legalizes the expansions of three (3) existing MPAs.</p> <p>Instead of expanding two (2) existing MPAs the project will expand three (3) existing MPAs. This change and the previous one will still represent a significant increase in marine-coastal ecosystems under protection and according to Guatemala's marine-coastal conservation gap analysis.</p>
Strategic Guideline 8.3 of Guatemala's Policy for the Integrated Management of Marine-Coastal Zones (PMCG) improves inter-institutional coordination, define common goals, roles, and co-responsibilities, and participative and financing mechanisms for marine-coastal management in four (4) coastal municipalities.	<p>Strategic Guideline 8.3 of Guatemala's Policy for the Integrated Management of Marine-Coastal Zones (PMCG) improves inter-institutional coordination, define common goals, roles, and co-responsibilities, and participatory and financial mechanisms for marine-coastal management in ten (10) coastal municipalities.</p> <p>The project will work in the 10 municipalities with jurisdictions over the areas where the MPAs will be created or expanded.</p>
An integrated Marine-Coastal Management Program (MCMP) is developed, facilitating: a) the implementation of the PMCG and development plans to enhance the protection and sustainable use of marine-coastal BD; b) effective MPA management; and c) the development of policy guidelines on the Fisheries Act (MAGA), the National Reserves Act (OCRET), and the Energy and Mines Act (MEM) to reduce threats to marine-coastal BD and organize government and non-government sectors to support conservation efforts.	<p>An integrated Marine-Coastal Management Program (MCMP) is developed facilitating: a) creation of the National Administrative Council for Maritime Affairs; b) the implementation of the PMCG and development plans to enhance the protection and sustainable use of marine-coastal BD; c) effective MPA management; and d) the development of policy guidelines on the Fisheries Act (MAGA) and the National Reserves Act (OCRET) to reduce threats to marine-coastal BD and organize government and non-government sectors to support conservation efforts.</p> <p>The creation of the National Administrative Council for Maritime Affairs was considered a necessary first step for the delivery of this project output. Additionally, the project will not be working with the oil sector.</p>
Business plans developed and/or updated for the three (3) new and two (2) expanded MPAs.	<p>Business plans developed and/or updated for the two (2) new and three (3) expanded MPAs.</p> <p>The total number of business plans to be developed through the project remains the same.</p>
An Action Plan for private sector voluntary financial contributions strengthens the financial sustainability of all MPAs.	<p>Municipal investment plans support MPA management through unused budgeted resources by municipalities.</p> <p>A feasibility analysis of the output originally defined in the PIF "private sector voluntary financial contributions strengthen the financial sustainability of all MPAs" indicated that this not feasible. Instead, an assessment of municipal budgets indicated that resources go unused and can be redirected to support MPA management.</p>
Component 2	
Management plans for two (2) expanded MPAs and for three (3) new MPAs are developed and aligned with the municipal participatory land and marine-coastal use plans.	<p>Management plans for three (3) expanded MPAs and for two (2) new MPAs are developed and aligned with the municipal participatory land and marine-coastal use plans.</p> <p>The total number of management plans to be developed through the project remains the same.</p>

Participatory resource use and management strategy for three (3) marine-coastal zones (one in the Caribbean and two in the Pacific) include the permitted uses and restrictions for marine-coastal BD and MPAs in twelve (12) municipalities and mechanisms for conflict resolution and accountability.	Participatory resource use and management strategy for three (3) marine-coastal zones in the Pacific include the permitted uses and restrictions for marine-coastal BD and MPAs in ten (10) municipalities and mechanisms for conflict resolution and accountability. The project will only implement actions in the Pacific coast of Guatemala, which traditionally has received less attention than the Caribbean coast. The project will work in the 10 municipalities with jurisdictions over the areas where MPAs will be created and expanded.
Strengthened capacity of national and local governments (CONAP, MARN, INAB, the Navy, and municipalities), private sectors (fisheries, energy, maritime ports/transportation), and civil society (non-governmental MPA co-administrators and local communities) in MPA management and the conservation and sustainable use of marine-coastal BD.	Strengthened capacity of national and local government institutions (CONAP, MARN, INAB, the Navy, and municipalities), private sector groups (fisheries, urban development, tourism, maritime ports/transportation), and civil society organizations (non-governmental MPA co-administrators and local communities) in MPAs' management and the conservation and sustainable use of marine-coastal BD. The project will not be working with the oil sector.
A monitoring and enforcement system for the municipalities and CONAP reduce threats to marine-coastal BD in MPAs and their buffer areas.	A technical-scientific information system related to coastal and marine ecosystems and MPA management contributes to the monitoring and control of threats to marine-coastal BD. The scope of this project output was expanded to include a technical-scientific information system that will serve as an information platform to provide information for coastal and marine ecosystems and MPA management, in addition to the monitoring and control of threats to marine-coastal BD in the MPAs.
Component 3	
Three (3) cooperation agreements between MPA authorities (CONAP and municipalities) and the energy, fisheries, and maritime ports/transportation sectors include conservation/management committees to oversee the conservation and sustainable use of BD in four (4) MPAs and their buffer areas.	Three (3) cooperation agreements between MPA authorities (CONAP and municipalities) and the urban development, fisheries, and maritime ports/transportation sectors include conservation/management committees to oversee the conservation and sustainable use of BD in four (4) MPAs and their buffer areas. The project will not be working with the oil sector.
Program for the prevention, reduction, and control of land-based contamination of MPAs and buffer areas defined jointly with municipalities, local communities, and key private sector groups (oil, maritime transportation, agro-industry, tourism, and urban development).	Program for the prevention, reduction, and control of land-based contamination of MPAs and buffer areas defined jointly with municipalities, local communities, and key private sector groups (maritime transportation, agro-industry, tourism, and urban development). The project will not be working with the oil sector.
Vulnerability analysis of the impacts of climate change (CC) to BD and ecosystem services in three (3) MPAs and their buffer areas.	Strategies for reducing vulnerability and the impacts of CC to BD and ecosystem services in five (5) MPAs and their buffer areas. The scope of this project output was expanded to include all five (5) project MPAs.

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

Risks to the project were updated during the PPG. The risk of short-term negative impacts on local communities livelihoods caused by restrictions on resources use was added:

Short-term negative impacts on local communities' livelihoods caused by restrictions on resource use	L	The project will have positive medium- and long-term impacts on coastal rural and urban communities; however, in the short term there may be negative impacts on local communities' livelihoods caused by restrictions on resources use when existing MPAs are expanded or new MPAs are created. To mitigate this risk, local communities will participate actively in the MPA expansion and creation processes, which will be done in close consultation with them and according to Article 11 of the Regulation of the Protected Areas Law Decree 4-89 and its amendments, which states that the establishment of PAs should consider the effects of their creation on local communities. Additionally, the development of the MPA management plans will be a participatory process, during which the local communities will be able to present their viewpoints and define the criteria for developing management strategies that consider their socioeconomic needs and so that they can gradually transition from current forms of marine-coastal resource use to more sustainable practices. Additionally, the project will provide technical support and training to facilitate changes in resource use practices. For example, the project will develop an extension support program for small-scale artisanal fisheries that will help to gradually reduce the use of non-BD-friendly fishing gear, replacing it with fishing gear that has less of an impact on marine-coastal BD. This will include: a) training for the fishermen in the use of BD-friendly fishing techniques; b) implementing BD-friendly fishing equipment and rigging on registered small-scale artisanal fishing boats; c) and determining jointly zones for protection and zones for resources use; among other activities.
--	---	---

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

The project will exchange lessons learned and experiences in skills development, local participation, and the monitoring of threats to BD and MPAs (including CC) with the GEF-funded project in Honduras *Strengthening the sub-system of coastal and marine protected areas*, with the support of the UNDP. This exchange will be facilitated through the UNDP's Senior Technical Advisor, who supervises both projects.

The project will also develop synergies with the *Conservation of Marine Resources of Central America Project* funded by the German Development Bank (KfW), which is part of the Meso-American Barrier Reef System Fund (MAR Fund) and which will fund actions in four priority coastal and marine protected areas, including the Punta de Manabique MPA in the Caribbean coast of Guatemala. More specifically, the project will coordinate actions and exchange lessons learned in three areas: financial sustainability of MPAs, management plan development, and sustainable use of marine-coastal natural resources. The development of an integrated Marine-Coastal Management Program (MCMP) (project Component 1), will contribute to the integrated management of the MPAs in both coasts of Guatemala, as well as to strengthening coordination mechanisms between the multiple stakeholders involved in marine-coastal management. The MCMP will also promote collaboration and inter-institutional support to follow up on commitments and national agreements as well as compliance with international agreements such as the CBD. As part of the institutional arrangement of the MCMP, a Technical Committee will be established and will include the MAR Fund, which facilitates the implementation of the KfW initiative and the exchange of experiences and lessons learned.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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

Stakeholder engagement in the project was initiated during the PPG and a stakeholder participation plan for the project implementation phase was defined. These are described in the following paragraphs.

Stakeholder Participation during Project Preparation

During the PPG phase of the project, key stakeholders participated in planning and project design workshops and several smaller focus group sessions and meetings. These participatory forums were the following: a) PPG phase inception workshop and b) project Results Framework Workshop. Additionally, multiple individual meetings and consultations with key national and local stakeholders were held during the PPG phase by the project team, UNDP CO, and staff from the MARN and CONAP. Descriptions of the PPG phase workshops are presented below.

Inception Workshop of the PPG Phase. The Inception Workshop was held on October 1st, 2012 in Guatemala City. The objectives of this workshop were to: a) help the PPG project team and other stakeholders to understand and take ownership of the project goals and objectives, b) ensure that the project team and other stakeholders have a clear understanding of what the PPG phase seeks to achieve as well as their own roles in successfully carrying out the PPG activities, c) re-build commitment and momentum among key stakeholders (including potential project co-financers) for the PPG phase, and d) validate the PPG Work Plan.

The participants in the PPG Phase Inception Workshop included staff from the MARN, CONAP, SEGEPLAN, TNC, UNDP CO, and the PPG project team.

Project Results Framework Workshop. The Results Framework Workshop was held on February 19-20, 2013 in Guatemala City. The objectives of this workshop were to: a) define the Results Framework, including the revised project outputs, indicators, baseline information, goals, verification mechanisms, and assumptions; b) preliminary definition of the project's activities for each outcome/output; c) define a preliminary budget for the project, including the co-financing; and d) update the PPG phase Work Plan.

The participants in the PPG Phase Inception Workshop included staff from the MARN, CONAP, INAB, OCRET, TNC, CECON, CEMA, Private Institute for Climate Change Research (ICC), UNDP CO, and the PPG project team.

Local consultations: The local CSOs and local industry groups consulted during project design included the Fishermen's Association of El Gran Pargo (*Asociación de Pescadores El Gran Pargo*) (Ocós, San Marcos), the Fishermen's Association of Champerico (*Asociación de Pescadores de Champerico*), the *Asociación Pro-Mejoramiento de la Comunidad Indígena de Las Lomas* (Chiquimilla), the National Federation of Artisanal Fishermen (*Federación Nacional de Pescadores Artesanales* – FENAPESCA) an umbrella organization of fishing committees and cooperatives, and the Artisanal Fishermen's Association of Sipacate (*Asociación de Pescadores Artesanales de Sipacate* – APASI). Women participated in all consultations, since they are active in the processing and sale of fish, and in the fish packing process for companies. In addition, consultations were made in nine (9) municipalities, including the application of the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard.

Stakeholder Participation Plan for the Project Implementation Phase

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

During the PPG phase, visits were conducted by the project team and MARN and CONAP staff to the 10 coastal municipalities in the Pacific that will participate in the project to involve the local stakeholders early on in the project design process and to identify potential partnerships with local groups, local authorities, and private sectors, for project implementation.

Summary of Stakeholder Roles in Project Implementation:

Stakeholders	Project Implementation Role
MARN	The MARN is the GEF Operational Focal Point. It will provide guidance for strengthening the regulatory and institutional frameworks for the protection of marine-coastal BD through MPAs and for their effective management (Component 1). MARN staff will benefit from training and the MARN will have a Marine-coastal Unit by project end. The MARN will be part of the project's Steering Committee.
CONAP	CONAP will play a central role in the creation/expansion of MPAs (Component 1). It will also provide technical and scientific support to project activities, including legal reform and inter-institutional coordination (Component 1), the establishment of new MPAs and the expansion of existing ones,

	management plan development, and stakeholder participation for MPA management and marine-coastal BD conservation (Components 2 and 3). CONAP staff will benefit from training and CONAP will have a Marine-coastal Unit by project end. CONAP will be part of the project's Steering Committee and will be a co-financier.
INAB	INAB will provide advice for mangrove regulation reform (Component 1) and technical support in the development of a participatory plan for the conservation and sustainable use of mangroves in Guatemala's Pacific region (Component 3).
DIPESCA-MAGA	DIPESCA-MAGA will implement actions for fisheries management and control and surveillance to be developed through Component 3. Additionally, it will provide field support and will promote the involvement of local communities, municipalities, and the fishery sector in project activities, including establishing agreements for the implementation of BD-friendly fishing practices. DIPESCA-MAGA will be part of the project's Steering Committee and will be a co-financier.
Municipal Development Institute (INFOM)	INFOM aims to support the municipalities of Guatemala in promoting their development and providing them with technical and financial assistance. Additionally, by Law (Governmental Agreement 376-97) INFOM is responsible for the development of policies and strategies for water supply and sanitation, as well as the implementation of related actions. INFOM will play a central role in coordinating actions for the participation of municipalities in the project, particularly in marine-coastal ecosystem and MPAs' management and in the prevention, reduction, and control of land-based contamination of MPAs and their buffer areas. INFOM will be part of the project's Steering Committee and will be a co-financier.
Municipalities (10)	Ocos, Retalhuleu, Champerico, La Gomera, Iztapa, Taxisco, Guazacapán, Chiquimulilla, Pasaco, and Moyuta. Will participate in the implementation of regulation for marine-coastal management (Component 1), in the alignment of MPA management plans with municipal land/coastal use plans (Components 2 and 3), the development of a monitoring and surveillance program to monitor threats to MPAs and marine BD (Component 2), the reduction of contamination in coastal areas, and will be beneficiaries of training.
Local communities and local community organizations	Will participate in the formulation of MPAs management and coastal zones plans (Component 2). Will serve as advocates in the development of participatory conservation and the sustainable use of marine-coastal BD, including mangrove ecosystems (Components 2 and 3), as well as the delivery of project benefits. Local community organizations include: Fishermen's Association of El Gran Pargo (<i>Asociación de Pescadores El Gran Pargo</i>), the Fishermen's Association of Champerico (<i>Asociación de Pescadores de Champerico</i>), <i>Asociación Pro-Mejoramiento de la Comunidad Indígena de Las Lomas</i> (Chiquimilla), the National Federation of Artisanal Fishermen (<i>Federación Nacional de Pescadores Artesanales – FENAPESCA</i>), and the Artisanal Fishermen Association of Sipacate (<i>Asociación de Pescadores Artesanales de Sipacate – APASI</i>).
Non-governmental organizations (NGOs)	Wildlife Rescue and Conservation Association (ARCAS), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), Community, Conservation, and Ecology (AKAZUL), and MAR Fund. NGOs will provide technical and scientific support to the project, as well as experience in MPA management, marine wildlife conservation and monitoring, and sustainable use of coastal-marine BD.
Universities	Universidad del Valle de Guatemala, Universidad Rafael Landívar, Universidad de San Carlos: Ocean and Aquaculture Research Center (CEMA) and Center for Conservation Studies (CECON). Universities will provide technical and scientific support to the project in coastal and marine ecosystem management, MPA management, fisheries, climate change, physical oceanography, among other areas.
Private sector	The private sector (fishing, agroindustry, tourism, urban and coastal development, and marine/ports transportation) will actively participate in the formulation of MPA management plans (Component 2), the establishment of agreements to reduce and control land-based contamination in coastal zones, the adoption of BD-friendly practices, and management of ballast water (Component 3).
Navy / Ministry of Defense	Will provide patrolling and logistics support in MPAs and their buffer areas (Component 3). Will enforce agreements and resource use norms.
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	The UNDP is the Project's Implementing Agency and will be responsible for overall project implementation through the Direct Implementation Modality (DIM).

Participation Mechanisms: Three key phases for stakeholders' participation have been identified for the implementation phase of the project: planning, implementation, and evaluation. Project planning will include annual meetings with key PA stakeholders (including members of the SC) during which annual goals will be set for each component of the project. These annual planning meetings will also serve to specify the activities that are to be funded through each co-financing source. Project implementation will take place according to the annual plans that are approved by the SC, which will be formed by the following agencies: MARN, CONAP, MAGA, INFOM, and the UNDP CO. The UNDP

CO will be the Executing Agency. Local stakeholders will have an additional mechanism to influence the project through a LSC, which will consist of appointed members, and whose composition, responsibilities, and function will be determined by the stakeholders themselves. Project evaluation will occur annually with the participation of key stakeholders at the end of each planning year and previous to defining the annual plan for the following year of project implementation. Also, mid-term and final evaluations will be carried out as part of the project cycle. Due to the independent nature of these evaluations, they will be key moments during the project's life when stakeholders can express their views, concerns, and assess whether the project's outcomes are being achieved and if necessary, define the course of correction.

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

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

In line with the GEF Council's guidance on assessing the cost-effectiveness of projects (Cost Effectiveness Analysis in GEF Projects, GEF/C.25/11, April 29, 2005), a qualitative approach to identifying the alternative with the best value and feasibility for achieving the project objective was used.

This project has been developed using cost-effectiveness criteria, and focuses on removing the legal, institutional, technical, and financial barriers that prevent the consolidation of Guatemala's MPAs and reduction of threats to marine-coastal BD. The project proposes a strategy consisting of three interrelated components that will remove these barriers by strengthening Guatemala's existing MPA legal, institutional, and financial framework for the protection and sustainable use of the country's marine-coastal BD, enhancing the institutional and individual capacities for effective MPA management and the conservation and sustainable use of marine-coastal BD, and addressing threats from key sectors to MPAs and marine-coastal BD in the Pacific region of Guatemala. The GEF alternative represents a more cost-effective approach than the alternative, in which MPA management effectiveness in the Pacific coast will not improve, MPA coverage will continue being very limited, threats to marine-coastal BD will not be addressed, and the delivery of global and national benefits will not occur. Cost-effectiveness should be achieved as described in the following paragraphs.

The non-GEF alternative is one where Guatemala will continue to make very slow progress in providing further protection to key marine-coastal ecosystem through the creation and/or expansion of MPAs. Guatemala's priority for strengthening terrestrial PAs has resulted in limited MPA coverage and representation of marine-coastal ecosystems in the SIGAP. When MPAs have been established, little consideration has been given to ecological criteria, which has been proven to be costly in terms of loss of key habitat in unprotected areas. The GEF alternative is a timely and unique opportunity to expand three (3) existing MPAs and the creation of two (2) new multiple-use MPAs (Component 1), which will allow increasing the protection of marine-coastal ecosystems from 7,042.44 ha to 164,297.40 ha, in line with the country's marine-coastal conservation gap analysis, a significant step forward in the protection of Guatemala's coastal and marine BD in the Pacific coast. The GEF alternative builds on the common interest that now exists among key government agencies (MARN, CONAP, INAB, and DIPESCA/MAGA) and coastal municipalities to further protect coastal and marine areas through multiple-use MPAs while promoting the sustainable use of marine-coastal natural resources.

Additionally, under the alternative scenario, marine and coastal BD conservation will continue to be done in a legal and institutional environment that is not conducive to enhance its protection through joint and participatory decision-making, and experience and information-sharing among the different institutions, sectors, and local organizations involved in MPA management and marine and coastal resources use. The GEF scenario is a more cost-effective option than the alternative, as it will promote legal reforms and the implementation of existing policies (Component 1) that will allow coordinated and informed efforts among key national and local stakeholders. This in turn, will allow the implementation of coordinated strategies (Components 2 and 3) to reduce threats to marine-coastal BD (e.g., loss of habitat and natural cover due to unplanned development, contamination caused by unplanned coastal development, and overexploitation of marine-coastal resources, including none-friendly fishing practices for BD) and to contribute to the sustainability of coastal and marine resources with long term-benefits for coastal populations.

Under the alternative scenario the financial sustainability of Guatemala's MPAs will remain uncertain as evidenced by the results of the application of the Financial Sustainability Scorecard (BD1-Tracking Tool). The MPAs will continue to

rely only on the allocation of limited funding by the central government, with limited opportunities to diversify and the development financial strategies that respond to the MPAs' management needs. The project's approach to the financial sustainability of MPAs will include: a) adjustments of the coastal land lease rates established through OCRET so that a percentage is redirected to support MPA management. OCRET has an annual budget of \$1.13 million USD and the project will develop mechanism for OCRET to transfer the funds that legally correspond to the CONAP; b) the development of business plans for MPAs, which will allow revenue generation by each area (e.g., ecotourism, visitors fees, and payment for environmental services) that currently does not exist, and securing resources from outside sources (government and private); and c) the investment of up to 10% of unused funds from coastal municipalities, which may amount to close to \$1 million USD annually. Additionally, a ballast water management fee system to be developed with the Quetzal Port Company may represent additional funding for MPA management; the Quetzal Port Company calculates its annual income generated from ballast water fees at close to \$0.5 million USD and the project will develop a proposal for the repayment of fees charged for the dumping of organisms, pathogens, and sediments in the ballast water of ships, specifically to the conservation and protection of the marine and coastal BD found in the Monterrico Multiple-use MPA. This strategy relies mostly on redirecting already existing funds to support MPA management, which may prove to be more cost-effective than having to depend on new funding sources that may be more uncertain.

The alternative MPA management scenario is also one in which limited skills and lack of experience of MPA managers in implementing conservation actions in coastal and marine environments and the lack of reliable information regarding the condition of marine-coastal BD places them in a disadvantageous position to face the current threats to MPAs, which will prove costly over time as future actions require larger investments when it is not possible to act on them in a timely manner. Also, MPA management plan development has not been systematic and currently MPAs do not have a management plan in place or are outdated. In addition, the lack of an effective mechanism for monitoring marine-coastal BD has prevented informed decisions being made regarding conservation through MPA management. If this scenario were to prevail it would prove to be costly over time, as decision-making for MPA management and BD conservation and its sustainable use will continue to respond only to immediate needs rather than to strategic planning.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

Project M&E will be conducted in accordance with the established UNDP and GEF procedures and will be provided by the project team and the UNDP-CO with support from the UNDP/GEF RCU in Panama City. The Project Results Framework in Section 3 provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The M&E plan includes an inception report, project implementation reviews, quarterly and annual review reports, mid-term and final evaluations, and audits. The following sections outline the principle components of the M&E plan and indicative cost estimates related to M&E activities. The project's M&E plan will be presented and finalized in the Project Inception Report following a collective fine-tuning of indicators, means of verification, and the full definition of project staff M&E responsibilities.

Project Inception Phase

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

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

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

The IW will also provide an opportunity for all parties to understand their roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference (ToRs) for project staff and decision-making structures will be discussed, as needed, in order to clarify each party's responsibilities during the project's implementation phase. The IW will also be used to plan and schedule the Tripartite Committee Reviews.

Monitoring Responsibilities and Events

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Project Monitoring Reporting

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

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

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

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

Quarterly Progress Reports outlining main updates in project progress will be provided quarterly to the local UNDP CO and the UNDP-GEF RCU by the project team. Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform and the risk log should be regularly updated in ATLAS based on the initial risk analysis included in Annex 8.1.

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

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

Technical Reports are detailed documents covering specific areas of analysis or scientific specializations within the overall project. As part of the Inception Report, the project team will prepare a draft Reports List detailing the technical reports that are expected to be prepared on key areas of activity during the course of the project, and tentative due dates. Where necessary this Reports List will be revised and updated, and included in subsequent APRs. Technical Reports

may also be prepared by external consultants and should be comprehensive and specialized analyses of clearly defined areas of research within the framework of the project and its sites. These technical reports will represent, as appropriate, the project's substantive contribution to specific areas, and will be used in efforts to disseminate relevant information and best practices at local, national, and international levels. Technical Reports have a broader function and the frequency and nature is project-specific.

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

Independent Evaluation

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

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

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

Audits

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

Learning and Knowledge Sharing

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

M&E work plan and budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$*	Time frame
Inception Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator UNDP CO UNDP GEF 	2,500 (GEF) 2,000 (CoF)	Within first two months of project start-up
Inception Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Team UNDP CO 	None	Immediately following IW
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP GEF Regional Technical Advisor/Project Coordinator will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members 	To be determined during the initial phase of implementation of the project and the IW.	Start, mid-point, and end of project
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance (measured on an annual basis)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversight by Project Coordinator Project Team 	No separate M&E cost: to be absorbed within salary and travel costs of project staff	Annually prior to APR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
APR and PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator and Team UNDP-CO UNDP-GEF 	None	Annually
Tripartite Committee Reviews and Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GoG counterparts UNDP CO UNDP GEF RCU 	None	Annually, upon receipt of APR
Steering Committee/Board Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator UNCP-CO GoG representatives 	2,500 (GEF) 3,000 (CoF) (1,100 per year)	Two times per year
Quarterly progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator and Team 	None	Quarterly
Technical reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator and Team Hired consultants as needed 	5,000 (GEF) 4,000 (CoF)	To be determined by Project Team and UNDP-CO
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator and Team UNDP- CO UNDP-GEF RCU External Consultants (evaluation team) 	47,650 (GEF) 8,000 (CoF)	At the mid-point of project implementation
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator and Team UNDP- CO UNDP-GEF RCU External Consultants (evaluation team) 	57,620 (GEF) 13,000 (CoF)	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Team UNDP-CO 	2,000 (GEF) 2,000 (CoF)	At least three months before the end of the project
Lessons learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator and Team UNDP-GEF RCU (suggested formats for documenting best practices, etc.) 	5,000 (GEF) 4,000 (CoF) (1,800 per year)	Yearly
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP-CO 	26,775 (GEF)	Yearly

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Coordinator and Team • Auditors 	(5,355 per year)	
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNDP-CO • UNDP-GEF RCU (as appropriate) • GoG representatives 	No separate M&E cost: paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
TOTAL INDICATIVE COST (*Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses)		GEF	149,045
		CoF	36,000
		Total	185,045


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

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

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Luis Armando Zurita Tablada	Minister	ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES	SEPTEMBER 11, 2011

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

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

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP-GEF Officer-in-Charge and Deputy Executive Coordinator		August 30, 2013	Santiago Carrizosa, Senior Technical Advisor, EBD	+507 302-4510	Santiago.carrizosa@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

	Indicator	Baseline	Goal (of the Indicator)	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective: To promote the conservation and long-term sustainable use of marine and coastal biodiversity (BD) of global importance through effectively and equitably managed marine-coastal protected areas (MPAs), which will contribute to improving the economic welfare of the Guatemalan population.	Total area (in hectares [ha]) of marine and coastal areas under protection by MPAs in the Pacific	– 7,042.44 ha	– 164,297.40 ha	– Databases, technical reports, and maps. – Resolution of the CONAP Council – Technical study and proposal of Law	– Political willingness and social consensus to create new MPAs and expand existing MPAs
	Change in the management effectiveness of three (3) existing MPAs as measured through the METT scorecard	– La Chorrera Private Natural Reserve – Manchón Guamuchal RAMSAR site: 10% – Sipacate – Naranjo National Park: 26% – Monterrico Multiple-Use Natural Reserve: 40%	– La Chorrera Private Natural Reserve – Manchón Guamuchal RAMSAR site: 25% – Sipacate-Naranjo National Park: 41% – Monterrico Multiple-Use Natural Reserve: 55%	– Updated METT scorecards – Annual project evaluation reports	– The Government of Guatemala (national and local), the civil sector, and the private sector maintain an interest in improving the management of the MPAs – Environmental variability is within normal ranges, including climate variability – There is effective inter-institutional coordination for reaching agreements and the establishment of MPAs
	Change in the financial capacity of the MPAs according to that established through the total average score in the UNDP/GEF Sustainability Scorecard	– Legal, regulatory, and institutional framework: 7.78% – Business planning and tools for cost-effective management: 1.69% – Tools for generating income and its allocation: 12.68% – Total: 7.73%	– Legal, regulatory, and institutional framework: 32.78% – Business planning and tools for cost-effective management: 16.69% – Tools for generating income and its allocation: 42.68% – Total: 32.73%	– Updated Financial Sustainability Scorecard	– Stable national and international economic conditions
Component 1:	Number of multiple-	– Tree (3)	– Five (5)	– Databases,	– There is

Strengthening the MPA legal, policy, and financial frameworks for the protection of marine-coastal BD and its sustainable use.	use MPAs declared and included in the SIGAP			technical reports, and maps. – Resolution of the CONAP Council – Technical study and proposal of Law	willingness by the decision-makers to declare new MPAs – Social consensus
	Legal and regulatory framework facilitates the conservation and sustainable use of BD in the MPAs and buffer zones	– Regulations for Mangroves from the National Forest Institute – INAB, CONAP, and OCRET – Fishing Regulations (Law of Fishing and Aquaculture) (DIPESCA and MARN) – Strategic Line 8.3 for the Policy for the Integrated Management of Marine-Coastal Areas in Guatemala (PMCG) and the National Hydrographic Commission (Vice Ministry of the Ocean – Defense Ministry)	– Regulatory reforms regarding the use and management of mangroves (INAB-CONAP-OCRET) – Proposed reforms to the Law of Fishing and Aquaculture – Implementation of the Strategic Line 8.3 of the PMCG (to strengthen governance mechanisms)	– Government agreement on regulating the use and management of mangroves (INAB-CONAP) – Inter-institutional agreements – Reports of compliance of the Marine-Coastal Management Program (MCPM)	– There is political willingness to make and implement reforms – Interinstitutional coordination is optimal – There is legal feasibility
	Total annual budget from the central government (USD) assigned to the management of the MPAs and amount of financial resources received annually from private sources for the MPAs' management	– \$673,326.48	– \$1,009,989.72 (50% increase)	– Updated Financial Sustainability Scorecard – Databases with financial and accounting information of the MPAs	

Outputs:

- 1.1. Two (2) new multiple-use MPAs (IUCN Category VI) gazetted.
- 1.2. Congressional Decree legalizes the expansions of three (3) existing MPAs.
- 1.3. Reforms of the Mangrove Regulations of the National Forest Institute – INAB and CONAP promote mangrove conservation and its sustainable use.
- 1.4. An integrated Marine-Coastal Management Program (MCMP) is developed facilitating: a) creation of the National Administrative Council for Maritime Affairs; b) the implementation of the PMCG and development plans to enhance the protection and sustainable use of marine-coastal BD; c) effective MPA management; and d) the development of policy guidelines on the Fisheries Act (MAGA) and the National Reserves Act (OCRET) to reduce threats to marine-coastal BD and organize government and non-government sectors to support conservation efforts.
- 1.5. Strategic Guideline 8.3 of Guatemala's Policy for the Integrated Management of Marine-Coastal Zones (PMCG) improves inter-institutional coordination, define common goals, roles, and co-responsibilities, and participatory and financial mechanisms for marine-coastal management in ten (10) coastal municipalities.
- 1.6. Coastal land lease rates (OCRET) established for the financial sustainability of MPAs.

1.7. Business plans developed and/or updated for the two (2) new and three (3) expanded MPAs.					
1.8. Municipal investment plans support MPA management through unused budgeted resources by municipalities.					
Component 2: Strengthening the institutional and individual capacities for effective management of MPAs and the conservation and sustainable use of marine-coastal BD.	Change in the capacity development indicators for MPAs management and the conservation and sustainable use of marine-coastal BD according to the total score of UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard (national and local government, private sector and civil society)	<u>National Government</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MARN: 42.86% - CONAP: 45.24% - INAB: 61.54% - DIPESCA: 43.59% <u>Municipalities</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Retalhuleu: 5.56% - Champerico: 25% - La Gomera: 44.44% - Iztapa: 0.00% - Taxisco: 47.22% - Guazacapan: 2.78% - Chiquimulilla: 36.11% - Pasaco: 27.78% - Moyuta: 38.39% <u>Civil Society</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NGO (ARCAS): 63.89% - Fishermen's Association of Champerico: 11.11% - Fishermen's Association of El Gran Pargo: 0.00% - Champerico ports companies: 4.76% - CECON: 57.14% 	<u>National Government</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MARN: 62.86% - CONAP: 65.24% - INAB: 81.54% - DIPESCA: 63.59% <u>Municipalities</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Retalhuleu: 25.56% - Champerico: 45% - La Gomera: 64.44% - Iztapa: 20% - Taxisco: 67.22% - Guazacapan: 22.78% - Chiquimulilla: 56.11% - Pasaco: 47.78% - Moyuta: 58.39% <u>Civil Society</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NGO (ARCAS): 83.89% - Fishermen's Association of Champerico: 31.11% - Fishermen's Association of El Gran Pargo: 20% - Champerico ports companies: 24.76% - CECON: 77.14% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updated Capacity Development Scorecard - Project evaluation reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Institutional climate is conducive to coordinating efforts of national and local stakeholders around the MPAs.
	Number of management plans for existing and new MPAs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Two (2) existing management plans outdated: Sipacate – Naranjo National Park (2002 – 2006) and Monterrico Multiple-Use Natural Reserve (2000 – 2005) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Three (3) new management plans - Two (2) management plans updated: Sipacate – Naranjo National Park and Monterrico Multiple-Use Natural Reserve 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approved management plan documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consensus among government, private sector, and civil society stakeholders to jointly develop the management plans for MPAs.
	Number of staff from national and local governments, private sectors, and civil society, including women, trained in monitoring and control of threats to marine and coastal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CONAP: 14 - MARN: 6 - OCRET: 0 - DIPESCA: 5 - Municipalities: 0 - NGOs: 12 - Local associations: 50 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CONAP: 30 - MARN: 40 - OCRET: 3 - DIPESCA: 15 - Municipalities: 20 (2 x 10 municipalities) - NGOs: 50 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minutes and databases from the training events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monitoring of marine-coastal BD accepted as part of the management activities of the MPAs and their buffer zones

	BD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Defense Ministry: 2 – Ports Commission: 4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Local associations: 110 – Defense Ministry: 10 – Ports Commission: 10 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Effective coordination between national and local authorities
	Increase in the number of monitoring, control, and surveillance plans and patrolling events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Monitoring work plans: 0 – Patrolling events: 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Work plans: 5 (one/MPA/year during 5 years) – Patrolling events: 120 per MPA (2/month/MPA during 5 years) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Monthly/annual work and patrol programs – Patrolling reports 	
Outputs: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1. Marine units within the MARN and CONAP are established for improving MPA planning and management. 2.2. Management plans for three (3) expanded MPAs and for two (2) new MPAs are developed and aligned with the municipal participatory land and marine-coastal use plans. 2.3. Participatory resource use and management strategy for three (3) marine-coastal zones in the Pacific include the permitted uses and restrictions for marine-coastal BD and MPAs in ten (10) municipalities and mechanisms for conflict resolution and accountability. 2.4. Strengthened capacity of national and local government institutions (CONAP, MARN, INAB, OCRET, DIPESCA, the Navy, and municipalities), private sector groups (fisheries, urban development, tourism, maritime ports/transportation), and civil society organizations (non-governmental MPA co-administrators and local communities) in MPAs' management and the conservation and sustainable use of marine-coastal BD. 2.5. Extension support to small-scale artisanal fisheries for implementation of BD-friendly practices. 2.6. A technical-scientific information system related to coastal and marine ecosystems and MPA management contributes to the monitoring and control of threats to marine-coastal BD. 					
Component 3: Addressing threats from key sectors (fisheries, maritime ports/transportation, and urban development) in order to strengthen MPAs' management and the conservation and sustainable use of marine- and coastal BD in the Pacific region of Guatemala.	Coverage (ha) of key marine-coastal ecosystems in five (5) MPAs and their buffer zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Estuaries: 1,715 ha – Coastal lagoons: 2,141 ha – Herbaceous wetlands: 8,138 ha – Sandy beaches: 21,135 ha – Muddy beaches: 3,858 ha 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Current levels are maintained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – GIS: Databases and maps – Technical reports and publications – Project monitoring and evaluation reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – There is a commitment at the local level and by the productive sectors for the conservation and sustainable use of marine-coastal BD – Effective monitoring and control
	Number of hatchlings released per reproductive period of the sea turtle <i>Lepidochelys olivacea</i> in the nesting beaches of the Pacific	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 150,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 165,000 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Field notes – Monitoring databases – Project technical reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Sampling efforts are optimal
	Minimum sizes (cm) of select fish species in four (4) multiple-use MPAs and their buffer	<u>Commercially important species:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – White Shrimp (<i>Litopenaeus vannamei</i>) 	<u>Commercially important species:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – White Shrimp (<i>Litopenaeus vannamei</i>): 3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Field notes – Monitoring databases – Project technical 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – There is a commitment by the local and commercial

	zones in conformance with FAO regulations ⁵	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Blue Shrimp (<i>Penaeus stylirostris</i>) – Brown Shrimp (<i>Farfantepenaeus californiensis</i>) – Hammerhead Shark (<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> g or 6.6 cm. – Blue Shrimp (<i>Penaeus stylirostris</i>): 3 g or 6.6 cm. – Brown Shrimp (<i>Farfantepenaeus californiensis</i>): 3 g or 6.6 cm. – Hammerhead Shark (<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>): 220 cm total length for females and 178 cm for males. 	reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> fishermen for the sustainable use of fishing resources (minimum sizes allowed) – Effective monitoring and control – Sampling efforts are optimal
	Change in average income received by fishermen implementing BD-friendly fishing practices.	– 0%	– 20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Annual surveys of fishermen's income – Project monitoring and evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluation reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The fishermen are interested in participating – Stable market – Sampling efforts are optimal
	Coverage of mangroves in five (5) MPAs and their buffer zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 4,004.67 ha: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Sipacate – Naranjo National Park: 1,682.32 ha; b. Monterrico Multiple-Use Natural Reserve: 1,412.77 ha; c. La Chorrera Private Natural Reserve – RAMSAR site Manchón Guamuchal: 909.58 ha d. Hawaii Multiple-Use Area: 0 e. Las Lisas – La Barrona: 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 12,803.10 ha: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Sipacate – Naranjo National Park: 1,936.22 ha. b. Monterrico Multiple-Use Natural Reserve: 2,664.32 ha. c. La Chorrera Private Natural Reserve – RAMSAR site Manchón Guamuchal: 5,028.53 ha. d. Hawaii Multiple-Use Area: 1,753.44 ha. e. Las Lisas – La Barrona: 1,420.59 ha. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – GIS: Databases and maps – Technical reports and publications – Project monitoring and evaluation reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – There is a commitment at the local level and with the productive sectors for the conservation and sustainable use of mangroves in the Pacific – Environmental variability, including climate change, within normal ranges – Effective monitoring and control
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>3.1. Three (3) cooperation agreements between MPA authorities (CONAP and municipalities) and the urban development, fisheries, and maritime ports/transportation sectors include conservation/management committees to oversee the conservation and sustainable use of BD in four (4) MPAs and their buffer areas.</p> <p>3.2. Ballast water management program and fee system.</p>					

⁵ The regulation proposed by the FAO is aimed at the minimum sizes; in the case of fisheries maximum sizes are not considered, since the concern with the stocks of fish is that the organisms reach at least their initial reproduction size, which allows them to maintain stable populations. For other species there are no regulations regarding sizes.

- 3.3. Program for the prevention, reduction, and control of land-based contamination of MPAs and buffer areas defined jointly with municipalities, local communities, and key private sector groups (maritime transportation, agro-industry, tourism, and urban development).
- 3.4. Strategies for reducing vulnerability and the impacts of CC to BD and ecosystem services in five (5) MPAs and their buffer areas.
- 3.5. BD-friendly fishing practices reduce the impacts on two (2) key species of local importance (small-scale artisanal fisheries) and three (3) species of commercial importance in multiple use MPAs and their buffer zones.
- 3.6. Participatory conservation, rehabilitation, and sustainable use of mangroves in MPAs and buffer areas of the Pacific coast favor mangrove protection and the design of riparian conservation corridors.

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

Reviewer's comments	Responses	References
Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion, November 2011.		
<p>1. On financial sustainability, please address three questions:</p> <p>A. Outcome 1.3 is to increase funding from "government and non-government sources" for MPAs by 10%. Why was this figure chosen? Will it be sufficient to manage a 116% increase in MPA coverage?</p> <p>B. Please describe how the adjustment of coastal land lease rates will be accomplished and estimates of increased revenue.</p> <p>C. The proposal mentions that the project will develop and implement an "action plan to encourage voluntary financial contributions from the private sector." At CEO endorsement please provide justification as to whether such voluntary schemes are likely to work in Guatemala, based on experience with other cases.</p>	<p>A. An analysis developed during the PPG phase using the Financial Sustainability Scorecard (FSS; BD-1 Tracking Tool) for the three MPAs in the Pacific coast and using data from 2011 showed that the MPAs operate with a total annual budget of \$673,326.48 USD, with a financial gap of \$3,626,673.52 USD needed to cover the basic management cost (84.3% of all financial needs). Based on this analysis, the initial figure of a 10% increase in funding from government and non-government sources was revised and increased to 50%.</p> <p>B. By Law, the State has reserved ownership of 3 km of land that is measured beginning at the high tide mark. These national land reserves are managed by Bureau of State Land Reserves (OCRET), which is part of the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Food (MAGA). The project will contribute to the financial sustainability of MPAs through adjustments of the coastal land lease rates established through the OCRET so that a percentage is redirected to support MPAs' management. Currently OCRET has an annual budget of \$1.13 million USD and the project will develop mechanisms for OCRET/MAGA to transfer the funds that legally correspond to the CONAP. To this end, the project will put together a technical team consisting of an expert in negotiations, a financial expert, and an expert in marine-coastal issues to facilitate all negotiations, and define the increases above current OCRET rates. To achieve the general increase from OCRET's earnings, the team will define the mechanisms for the transfer of funds and establish procedures to ensure that the transferred funds are effectively invested in the MPAs' management. It is understood that, in order to comply with the law, this revenue will be transferred from OCRET/MAGA to the CONAP. The PPG estimates indicated that an increase of the lease collection fees by OCRET will result in the transfer of at least \$0.25 million USD annually to the CONAP.</p> <p>C. A feasibility analysis of the output originally defined in the PIF "private sector voluntary financial contributions strengthen the financial sustainability of all MPAs" indicated that this is not currently feasible in Guatemala. Instead, an assessment of municipal budgets indicated that resources go unused and can be redirected to support MPAs' management. During the PPG an evaluation of the funds used by the 10 municipalities with jurisdictions over the areas where the MPAs will be created or expanded was performed. These municipalities were identified as leaving close to \$10 million USD unused in their budgets on an annual basis. The project will negotiate with the coastal municipalities to direct up to 10% of the unused funds to the management of the project's MPAs.</p>	<p>Project Document Strategy: objective, outputs/activities</p>
<p>2. On socioeconomic benefits, the document should include at least one</p>	<p>Two socioeconomic indicators relevant to the socioeconomic benefits to be provided by the project were included in the</p>	<p>CEO Request: En Ann</p>

tangible socioeconomic indicator, and related target, relevant to the socioeconomic benefits to be provided by the project. If feasible, an indicator that is gender disaggregate-able would be welcomed.	project's results framework: a) Number of staff from national and local governments, private sectors, and civil society, including women, trained in monitoring and control of threats to marine and coastal BD. b) Change in average income received by fishermen implementing BD-friendly fishing practices (Target: 20%).	Project Framework	Results
3. Participation: Please list the local CSOs and local industry groups (e.g. fishing cooperatives) that were consulted during project design. Describe how the proponent has involved men and women in different ways during the preparation of the project.	The local CSOs and local industry groups consulted during project design included the Fishermen's Association of El Gran Pargo (<i>Asociación de Pescadores El Gran Pargo</i>) (Ocos, San Marcos), the Fishermen's Association of Champerico (<i>Asociación de Pescadores de Champerico</i>), and <i>Asociación Pro-Mejoramiento de la Comunidad Indígena de Las Lomas</i> (Chiquimilla), the National Federation of Artisanal Fishermen (<i>Federación Nacional de Pescadores Artesanales</i> – FENAPESCA) an umbrella organization of fishing committees and cooperatives; and the Artisanal Fishermen Association of Sipacate (<i>Asociación de Pescadores Artesanales de Sipacate</i> – APASI). Since women are active in the processing and sale of fish and in the fish-packing process, they participated in all consultations.	CEO Endorsement Request: Part II: Project Justification (B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation).	
4. Adaptation & Cofinancing: Please explain how the expected \$5 million grant from the Adaptation Fund (which is presently at concept stage) relates to this project. While the executing agency will be the same, the AF will fund efforts in a different region with different stakeholders. If there is an overlap, please explain and only count as co-financing the funding that is related to the baseline or increment of the GEF project.	There is no overlap between this GEF-funded project and the Adaptation Fund project; therefore, the Adaptation Fund project will not be co-financing this GEF initiative.		
26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? UNDP will provide \$607,000 in grant co-financing for this project. At CEO endorsement: please explain what this will support.	The co-financing to be provided by UNDP was increased to \$2,775,693 in grants as follows: a) <i>Integration of Ecosystem Services in Development Planning in Guatemala</i> (\$1,000,000): The project will contribute to the integration of the environmental dimension into the different levels of the National Planning System through the articulation of ecosystem services and social demand for environmental goods and services, with a territorial development approach promoted in the planning process. Locally, three plans will be implemented for territorial land use and management through the protection and sustainable use of the mangrove ecosystem in the Pacific coast where the GEF-funded project MPAs and their buffer zones are located. b) <i>Food Insecurity: a threat to the Human Security of the Poqomam People Settled in the Dry Corridor</i> (\$1,000,000): Apply a human security approach for the protection and empowerment of families in El Camarón and Las Mesonas micro-basins, San Luis Jilotepeque, in the department of Jalapa, Guatemala. Food security in the upper watershed areas will prevent migration to coastal areas and prevent further pressure on MPAs and marine-coastal BD.	Co-financing letter.	

	c) <i>Establishing Holistic Development Planning in Guatemala</i> (\$775,693): Through this project UNDP has supported the Secretary of Planning and Programming of the Presidency (SEGEPLAN) to develop national methodologies for territorial/spatial planning, as well as instruments such as the geographical reference planning system. The Pacific Coast Development Plan will support this initiative through participatory multi-stakeholder formulation.	
LDCE/SCCF Work Program: Comments from Council Members (Reference GEF GEF/IS/25), February 2012		
<u>Canada Comments</u>		
All of the biodiversity projects being proposed should provide information on how they relate to the country's obligations to the CBD, particularly the Aichi Targets. As presented, the PIFs <u>is</u> not clear on how it will help the country meet the Aichi targets. The project proponents should provide this information in the final project proposals.	<p>The project will contribute to meet the Aichi Target 11: "By 2020, at least 17 percent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 percent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes."</p> <p>Currently, there are only four MPAs within the Protected Areas System of Guatemala (SIGAP), which cover 158,920.44 ha (only 4.5% of the SIGAP). The project will contribute to overcoming this limitation by creating two (2) new MPAs and expanding three (3) existing MPAs in the Pacific region, following the recommendation of Guatemala's marine conservation gap analysis, and increasing to 323,217.84 ha (9.28% of the SIGAP) the coastal and marine ecosystems under protection.</p>	
<u>Denmark Comments</u>		
The measures to promote long-term economic sustainability and welfare, envisaged as an outcome of the project, may imply trade-offs for local communities' livelihoods in the shorter term. The project should therefore include a strategy of how to mitigate potential negative socio-economic impacts and promote alternatives to unsustainable practices where such are discouraged.	<p>The expansion and/or creation of MPAs will include consultation with local stakeholders (e.g., fishermen, community organizations, and municipal governments) to ensure that: a) their views and needs are considered, b) a reduction in potential conflicts, and c) the identification of areas for short- and long-term cooperation. More specifically, the two (2) new areas to be created by the project will be multiple-use MPAs (IUCN Category VI), which will allow the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources and minimize the possibility of adverse social effects that may result from potential restrictions on resource use.</p> <p>In the case of fishermen, the project will implement an extension support program for small-scale artisanal fisheries to promote the use of BD-friendly practices and the sustainable use of fisheries resources. This program will help to gradually reduce the use of non-BD-friendly fishing gear, replacing it with fishing gear that has less of an impact on marine-coastal BD and minimizing potentially negative "trade-offs" for fishermen.</p>	Project Document: 2. Strategy: Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities
The considerations regarding financial sustainability of the MPA's are crucial but, as experience shows, this is also an ambitious goal compared to a projects lifetime. Therefore it is suggested to carefully balance the	The number of areas to be designated as new multiple-use MPAs was reduced from 3 to 2. This makes the support that the project can provide more realistic in terms of financial sustainability.	CEO Endorsement Request: Part 1: Project information (B Project framework)

number/areas to be designated as new PA's to the activities that the project realistically will be able to support and prospects to achieve a reasonable level of sustainability.		
The proposed co-financing arrangement with participation of a number of national sector institutions and international donors is welcomed. The mechanisms to ensure effective coordination and harmonization could, however, be more explicitly described.	The project co-financiers are CONAP, DIPESCA/MAGA, and INFOM, all of whom are national-sector institutions, and the UNDP. These institutions will be members of the project's Steering Committee (or Project Board), which will ensure effective coordination and harmonization. These agencies, including the UNDP through the country office, already have experience working together, which will facilitate coordination and decision-making.	Project Document: 5. Management Arrangements
In view of the identified threats to the marine and coastal eco-systems deriving from important economic sectors, active collaboration based on formal agreements with sector representatives of marine transport, fisheries, energy & mining, etc., and effective enforcement measures are important elements to ensure protection of the MPAs.	<p>Formal agreements will be established with three sectors as follows:</p> <p>a) <u>Agreement for Control of Ballast Water</u>: this agreement will allow the development and implementation of actions to manage ballast water in order to extract or neutralize alien invasive species and pathogens present in the ballast water and sediment that constitute a threat for the MPAs and the marine-coastal BD in Guatemala. The agreement will be signed between the National Port Company, the MARN, and the CONAP; these three institutions will be responsible for implementation and compliance through the conservation and management committee that will be established for this purpose.</p> <p>b) <u>Agreement for the prevention, reduction, and control of land-based contamination in coastal and marine areas</u>: this agreement will allow the reduction, management, and control of solid and liquid wastes to reduce the threat of contamination to the Monterrico Natural Reserve Multiple-use MPA and its coastal and marine BD. The main stakeholders who will participate in this agreement are the MARN, CONAP, INFOM, the municipalities, the Quetzal Port Company, private associations (hotels), and representatives of civil society (fishermen's associations, environmental committees, and COCODES). These stakeholders, jointly with the MARN, will carry out a participatory process to achieve basic consensus, shared proposals, and implement specific actions for the reduction, management, and control of solid and liquid wastes within the agreement's framework.</p> <p>c) <u>Agreement for the reduction of threats from artisanal fishing</u>: this agreement will lead to the: a) development of a program to monitor and control the use of non-BD-friendly practices, and b) promotion of sustainable artisanal fishing practices in order to maintain populations of fish species that are of local value, which will contribute to food security, mitigate poverty, and reduce the vulnerability of the families and communities of fishermen who fish in the Monterrico Natural Reserve Multiple-use MPA and the Sipacate-Naranjo MPA and their buffer zones. The cooperatives and associations of fishermen, DIPESCA-MAGA, MARN, and the CONAP will participate in the agreement. These agencies and associations will be responsible for overseeing its application and compliance, and will form a conservation and management committee for this purpose.</p>	Project Document: 2. Strategy: Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities.

<p>The indicated participatory approach is appreciated and decisive for success in a multi-stakeholder context as the one described. However, the mechanisms and processes for participation are rather cursory described, and mention could have been made of the possible obligations to carry out consultation processes, among others as concerns the right free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples and local communities living in the areas of potential new MPAs (i.a. as established in the Convention on Biological Diversity and the ILO Convention 169 that has constitutional status in Guatemala).</p>	<p>The mechanisms and processes for participation and consultation are described in Part II: Project Justification (B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation) of this CEO Endorsement. Local CSOs and local industry groups consulted during the project design included the Fishermen's Association of El Gran Pargo (<i>Asociación de Pescadores El Gran Pargo</i>) (Ocós, San Marcos), the Fishermen's Association of Champerico (<i>Asociación de Pescadores de Champerico</i>), the <i>Asociación Pro-Mejoramiento de la Comunidad Indígena de Las Lomas</i> (Chiquimilla), the National Federation of Artisanal Fishermen (<i>Federación Nacional de Pescadores Artesanales</i> – FENAPESCA), an umbrella organization of fishing committees and cooperatives, and the Artisanal Fishermen Association of Sipacate (<i>Asociación de Pescadores Artesanales de Sipacate</i> – APASI). Women participated in all consultations, since they are active in the processing and sale of artisanal fish, and in the fish-packing process. In addition, consultations were made in nine (9) municipalities (mayoral offices), including the application of the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard.</p> <p>Additionally, as part of the project's management arrangements, local stakeholders will also participate in the project through a <i>Local Steering Committee</i> (LSC), which will consist of appointed members, and whose composition (including women), responsibilities, and function will be determined by the stakeholders themselves. The LSC will meet regularly to discuss the project's progress and to communicate interests and concerns to the Project Coordinator. The LSC may also have a seat on the project Steering Committee.</p>	<p>CEO Endorsement Request: Part II: Project Justification (B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation).</p> <p>Project Document: 5. Management Arrangements</p>
<p><u>France Comments</u></p>		
<p>The project is very well developed but concentrates mainly on the Pacific coast. It is understood that the German KfW is supporting the main MPA of the Caribbean coast, but that doesn't mean that some coordination (particularly on institutional support to CONAP, management effectiveness tools, trainings, etc) should not be coordinated with what will be done on Caribbean coast. Another way to ask the question is to wonder why the Punta de Manabique MPA with KfW assistance is not integrated within this proposal to form a more global assistance to Marine protected areas of Guatemala?</p>	<p>The project will focus its actions in the Pacific coast of Guatemala, which traditionally has received less attention than the Caribbean coast. However, actions from project Component 1 will have influence in both coasts. More specifically, the development of an integrated Marine-Coastal Management Program (MCMP) will contribute to the integrated management of the MPAs in both coasts, as well as to strengthening coordination mechanisms between the multiple stakeholders involved in marine-coastal management, collaboration, and inter-institutional support, which will support following up on commitments and national agreements as well as compliance with international agreements such as the CBD. As part of the institutional arrangement of the MCMP, a Technical Committee will be established and will include MAR Fund, which facilitates the implementation of the KfW initiative.</p> <p>Additionally, it was identified in the PIF that the project will also develop synergies with the Conservation of Marine Resources of Central America Project funded by the German Development Bank (KfW), which is part of the Meso-American Barrier Reef System Fund (MAR Fund) and that will fund actions in four priority coastal and marine protected areas, including the Punta de Manabique MPA. More specifically, the project will coordinate actions and exchange lessons learned in three areas: financial</p>	<p>CEO Endorsement Request: A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives.</p> <p>Project Document: 2. Strategy: Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities.</p>

	sustainability of MPAs, management plan development, and sustainable use of marine-coastal natural resources.	
Little information is provided on any issues with indigenous communities in the project areas. This project could support the effort made recently by CONAP and FUNDAECO to increase the involvement of local indigenous communities in Protected Areas co-management schemes. The current PA laws in Guatemala don't allow local communities to participate in PAs co-management schemes. Previous pilot projects were implemented with the help of Netherland and France and demonstrated that co-management schemes were feasible (examples are already in places in the Izabal Province).	<p>The Pacific coast is not historically considered an indigenous territory. Indigenous peoples in the areas to be established as new MPAs (Hawaii Multiple-use Area and Las Lisas-La Barrona Multiple-use Area) make up only 1% of the population. Such is also the case in two of the three MPAs to be expanded (Monterrico Natural Reserve Multiple-use Area and La Chorrera Private Natural Reserve). In the third site (Sipacate-Naranjo National Park), indigenous peoples make up 6% of the population. Most of the population of the Pacific coast consists of ladino or mestizo groups who are engaged mainly in agriculture, fisheries, and livestock production activities, as well as groups of merchants of other ethnicities. Therefore, the project does not make reference to indigenous communities but rather to local communities.</p> <p>CONAP has a long history of promoting co-management schemes of protected areas, including municipalities, academic institutions, and NGOs. The processes or mechanisms to approve and establish new MPAs include the identification of the agency or agencies that will manage the MPA (could be CONAP through its Executive Secretariat or entrusted to other national public or private non-profit entities through an agreement or other legal mechanism).</p>	Project Document: 1.1. Context and global significance (Socioeconomic context); and, 2. Strategy: Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities.
STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF), date of screening: Not provided		
Under Components 1, 2 and 3, the impacts of the various interests that need to be well understood in order to enhance MPA management could be considered within the emerging framework of Marine Spatial Planning (see for example Douvere, F. (2008). Marine Policy 32:762-771.)	<p>The project has been designed to overcome some of the limitations outlined in the Douvere paper including: a) a spatial and temporal overlap of human activities and their objectives, causing conflicts (user-user and user-environment conflicts) in the coastal and marine environment; b) a lack of connection between the various authorities responsible for individual activities or the protection and management of the environment as a whole; c) a lack of connection between offshore activities and resource use and onshore communities who are dependent on them; and d) a lack of conservation of biologically and ecologically sensitive marine areas.</p> <p>The project's components were defined so that strengthened MPA legal, institutional, and financial frameworks (Component 1) will allow effective coordination between relevant stakeholders (public and private) in the implementation of specific conservation and sustainable use of marine-coastal BD actions (Components 2 and 3). Although this design does not specifically incorporate the framework of marine spatial planning, it does incorporate elements that envision the protection and management of MPAs and marine-coastal BD within the context of the wider seascape/landscape for the delivery of global, national, and local environment benefits.</p>	Project Document: 2. Strategy
Component 3 includes work to determine BD friendly fisheries practices, which would presumably enhance conditions compatible with current shrimp export certification. In order to enable comparison of the	Thank you for the recommendation. Consultations were carried out during the PPG phase and it was determined that the certification premium is not enough incentive for the artisanal fishermen to adopt certification schemes. Thus, fisheries certification was not considered as part of the final project design.	

proposed biodiversity-friendly fishing practices to those practised elsewhere, STAP recommends that the proponents consider adopting methodology compatible with possible future fisheries certification and which builds in the interests of the artisanal fishing community. Several recent publications are available, e.g. J. Alder, et al. (2010), Marine Policy 34 (2010) 468–476; Sainsbury, K. (2010), FAO Technical Paper 533.		
Finally, similar to advice provided for the Honduras MPA project (GEF ID 4708) STAP wishes to underscore the likely synergies in capacity development, data collection and research, and in lessons learned which exist between these two projects.	As suggested by the STAP members, the project will exchange lessons learned and experiences in capacity development, local participation, and the monitoring of threats to BD and MPAs (including CC) with the GEF-funded project (GEF ID 4708) in Honduras <i>Strengthening the sub-system of coastal and marine protected areas</i> , with the support of the UNDP. This exchange will be facilitated through the UNDP's Senior Technical Advisor in charge of supervising both projects.	CEO Endorsement Request: A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁶

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

There were no significant findings that affected the project design. Other than the risks identified since the PIF, for which risk mitigation measures have been defined, there are no significant concerns that might affect project implementation.

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 90,909			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
1. Assessment of the existing legal and financial framework of the project.	14,820.00	14,379.93	440.07
2. Baseline and conservation targets for marine-coastal biodiversity.	14,820.00	8,111.48	6,708.52
3. MPA socioeconomic characterization and capacity needs.	14,819.00	9,254.25	5,564.75
4. Final preparation of project proposal, including feasibility analysis and budget.	46,450.00	24,423.21	22,026.79
Total	90,909.00	56,168.87	34,740.13

⁶ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

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

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

NA