



# REQUEST FOR CEO APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: MEDIUM SIZE PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Initial Steps for Establishment of the National Protected Areas Network in Iraq			
Country(ies):	Iraq	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	5392
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	1069
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Environment of Iraq	Resubmission Date:	18/09/2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	48
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Project Agency Fee (\$):	116,885
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul>			

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>2</sup>

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD 1	Outcome 1.1 Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas	Output 1. New protected areas (2) and coverage (224,000 ha) of unprotected ecosystems	GEF TF	1,230,365	3,450,000
<b>Total project costs</b>				<b>1,230,365</b>	<b>3,450,000</b>

### B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

**Project Objective:** Develop and start implementing the plan for the establishment of a national Network of Protected Areas in Iraq

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Co-financing (\$)
1. Design of Protected Areas System and institutional strengthening	TA	1.1 The first Protected Areas Network for Iraq is designed. Existing information and prior studies in the country, Inventory of the Key Biodiversity Areas of Iraq, NBSAP results, international best practice, and relevant regional examples in PA	1.1.1 site-specific baseline ecological and land-use surveys and data collection through ground surveys and remote sensing are conducted at priority sites, to support the development of the first national network of Protected Areas.  1.1.2 A detailed plan for the establishment of a national	GEF TF	150,000	600,000

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

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

		<p>management are reviewed as the basis for the plan.</p> <p>1.2 The required national professional capacity is in place to support all steps in the process of development of the first comprehensive PA Network in Iraq</p>	<p>network of protected areas, including institutional set-up and supporting legal framework. Recent KBA studies, as well as experience and best practice on Protected Areas management at regional level is gathered and used as the basis to develop the plan.</p> <p>1.1.3 A costed Strategy and Action Plan for the institutional, legal and operational set-up of a national network of Protected Areas is developed in consultation with all stakeholders and under the leadership of the MOE</p> <p>1.1.4 Essential new legislation required for the establishment of a PAN in Iraq is drafted and included in the national legislative system</p> <p>1.2.1 A Training Needs Assessment (TNA) for staff of MOE at central (institutional) as well as local level (at the two priority sites covered in component 2), and involving other strategic partners, is carried out at project inception, providing the basis for an integrated training and institutional strengthening programme</p> <p>1.2.2 The Capacity Building programme is implemented (on the basis of 1.2.1), covering top priority areas (ref section A.1.3), some of which are already pre-identified by the MOE. The Training Programme will entail a combination of on-the-job and formal training carried out in collaboration with national conservation NGOs and regional conservation training institutions.</p>			
2. Protected Areas Network implementation	TA/INV (GEF) & INV (co-fin)	2.1 Protected Areas Network implementation is started, with the establishment of two priority Protected Areas	2.1.1 The essential infrastructure, staff, equipment and outline management plans for the 2 priority PAs of (1) Dalmaj marshes in Qadissiya (100,000 ha) and Wasit governorates and (2)	GEF TF	862,473	2,400,000

			Teeb area in Maysan governorate (124,000) are established, serving as an initial model for other PAs in the country.			
3. Public Awareness	TA	3.1 The level of understanding, consensus and awareness within relevant government sectors, other stakeholders including the wider public on the social, economic, ecosystem services, and environmental conservation values provided by a viable PA network is enhanced	3.1.1 Public awareness and outreach strategy developed and implemented, to publicize and support the main objectives and values of the PAN within (a) other relevant line Ministries and government bodies, with a focus on decision-makers, and (b) the wider public including local community groups  3.1.2 MOE website developed to include/enhance the section on Protected Areas, managed and sustained by the MOE.  3.1.3 Targeted thematic outreach materials and technical toolkits (electronic and/or printed) are developed and published to support the public awareness and communication strategy (3.1.1)	GEF TF	97,904	150,000
<b>Sub-Total</b>					<b>1,110,377</b>	<b>3,150,000</b>
<b>Project management cost</b>				<b>GEF TF</b>	<b>119,988</b>	<b>300,000</b>
<b>Total project costs</b>					<b>1,230,365</b>	<b>3,450,000</b>

### C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming co-financing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
National Government	Iraq Ministry of Environment	Cash	2,800,930
National Government	Iraq Ministry of Environment	In-kind	549,070
UNEP	UNEP/Division of Environmental Policy Implementation	In-kind	100,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>3,450,000</b>

### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
UNEP	GEFTF	BD	Iraq	1,230,365	116,885	1,347,250
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				<b>1,230,365</b>	<b>116,885</b>	<b>1,347,250</b>

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> Indicate fees related to this project.

**F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:**

<b>Component</b>	<b>Grant Amount (\$)</b>	<b>Cofinancing (\$)</b>	<b>Project Total (\$)</b>
International Consultants	193,865	0	193,865
National/Local Consultants	215,300	72,000	287,300

**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 PIF<sup>3</sup>**

**A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.**

Not applicable - same as in PIF

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

Not applicable

**A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:**

Not applicable – same as in PIF but additional information in section 2.7 subsection 2.7.3 of the produc

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

Following the PPG data collection and analyses, the description of the problem and the baseline has been improved. Please see sections 2.6 in the project document.

**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 incremental reasoning has been refined based on PPG analyses. Refer to section 3.7 in the project document.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

**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:**

The description of the risk analysis and risk management has been deepened with much emphasis on the ongoing conflict in the country. In addition to the MoE making itself ready to manage these risks, UNEP will also use its regional office for West Asia (ROWA) to co-manage project implementation. Please see sections 3.5 in the project document.

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

Not Applicable - Same as the original PIF in section A.4

**B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:**

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

Stakeholder engagement is a pillar of the sustainability of the PAN of Iraq, and will be pursued during the project execution and beyond. Despite the difficult situation of the country, the Iraqi Government and the MoEn are committed to promoting a participatory approach for environmental and biodiversity protection as a vital and critical element of social cohesion and of future economic development of Iraq. In this view, the support of regional and international organizations (UNEP, IUCN, WCMC and other regional organizations of the Middle East area like CAMRE) will strengthen the effort of national institutions towards biodiversity protection and sustainable use of resources in Iraq. Promoting project ownership of key national and local stakeholders through strong stakeholder engagement will enable the MoEn to carry out activities in country, identify and solve conflicts that could arise in the planning process and establishment of Protected Areas and ultimately achieve the project objectives

During the initial stage of project execution, a stakeholder analysis will be used for stakeholder engagement planning in order to carry out project activities with a participatory approach from the first steps until completion, and promote ownership of the PAN at all institutional levels.

Stakeholder engagement will be achieved through the following initiatives:

- Use of existing institutional mechanisms for consultation and decision-making (National Committee on Protected Areas, national and local technical committees, established Protected Area Management Authorities according Regulations on PAs etc.);
- Holding national workshops, aimed at involving key stakeholders in the PAN planning and decision making process from the earliest stages of project implementation, as well as in the PAN implementation at the two selected priority sites;
- Holding local workshops and use targeted multi-media communication tools for involvement of consultation and engagement of local government and communities and relevant groups, including involvement of vulnerable groups of local communities (women, young people, unemployed) in the PAN implementation at the two selected priority sites;
- On the job training activities, in order to promote awareness on biodiversity, knowledge sharing and establishing networking and communication between local, national and international entities;
- Promoting specific on site activities for establishing a favorable environment and empowering local communities and involve other stakeholders (NGOs, scientific community, private sectors etc.) in the PAN implementation at the two selected priority sites;.

Please see details in sections 2.5 and section 5 of the project document on stakeholder participation.

**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):**

The PAN planning process (Component 1) will involve key stakeholder at national and governorate level and will include a wide range capacity building assessment, aimed at promoting integration of PAs into the national and provincial planning framework.

The PAN implementation at two pilot sites of Dalmaj and Teeb will (Component 2) will create a living lab for addressing the existing social, financial and organisational difficulties and obstacles to establishment of effective management structures in Protected Areas. Under the supervision of UNEP-ROWA and with the support of a strong team of experts from international organizations (UNEP, IUCN, WCMC and others) the national Team will bring about a new ambitious model of shared management of PAs according to international guidelines and best practices, with the aim of promoting local ownership, active participation of local communities and enhancement of benefits and trade-offs of multi-purpose management.

Through involvement and participation of local communities in the PAN planning and implementation activities since the early stages of execution, the project will promote empowerment of local communities in Protected Areas management. A specific attention will be devoted to vulnerable groups (women, young and unemployed people from local communities) and targeted activities on promoting gender equality and addressing poverty will be carried out in establishing the PA management structure at the two pilot sites. These will include, but not be limited to participation in training, on the job initiatives and field activities and targeted communication/awareness activities. During the early stages of project execution, a lot more analyses will be made on gender dimensions

The project will generate significant Global Environmental benefits (GEBs) through actions both at the national and site level. At the national level, by advancing the preparations for a comprehensive and viable PA Network for the country, the project will set the stage for the long-term preservation of a vast set of globally important species and habitats in one of the most BD rich countries in the region. At the local level in the two pilot PAs, the project will ensure the protection of 8 species of global importance and marshlands and desert shrubland as habitats of global and regional importance. Once protected, the marshlands will provide the ecosystem services of the region that will translate into sustainability of socioeconomic activities emanating from this ecosystem.

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

The cost effectiveness of the project is illustrated both by its capitalisation on the existing investment (est. 5 Million USD as explained in section **Error! Reference source not found.**) and its leverage of co-financing (est. \$ 3,450,000). By the end of the Project the GEF investment will represent approximately 27% of the project costs since inception. However, the GEF funds are critical, in so much as the timing of their delivery enables the Iraqi MoEn and project partners time and resources to secure the initial steps of the PAN design and implementation. The GoI investment in the establishment of Protected Areas in Iraq and now, supported by the Project, the design of a viable network of Protected Areas and its and national management system also exemplifies cost effectiveness in that the GEF investment is leveraging support for the long term sustainable financing of the PAN.

Cost effectiveness is also enabled through the range of coordinated initiatives for biodiversity protection in the framework of international Conventions (CBD, UNESCO, Ramsar) the GoI continues to foster wherein shared learning and cross-sectoral mainstreaming is focused on.

**C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:**

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of progress in achieving project results and objectives will be done based on the targets and results indicators established in the project results framework and the annual work plans and budgets. M&E activities will follow UNEP and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and guidelines. The M&E plan, which has

been budgeted at USD 101,500 will be reviewed and updated, as necessary, during the project inception phase. This will involve: (i) review of the project's results framework; (ii) refining of outcome indicators; (iii) identification of missing baseline information and actions to be taken to collect the information; and (iv) clarification of M&E roles and responsibilities of project stakeholders. The project's M&E system will be established within the first 6 months of project implementation.

To monitor project outputs and outcomes including contributions to global environmental benefits, specific indicators have been developed in the Results Framework (see Appendix 4 of the project document). Output target indicators will be monitored on a six-monthly basis and outcome target indicators will be monitored on an annual basis if possible or as part of the mid-term and final evaluations.

Project progress will be monitored at three levels:

- Activity. Implementation of project activities will be monitored on an ongoing basis, with summaries of progress reported in project progress reports. Every six months, the semi-annual reports will record the completion of project activities. These six-monthly reports will also include a record of co-financing contributions to the project. The comparison of progress against annual work plans and budget will be an important management tool to identify, discuss and overcome any difficulties in project implementation.
- Output. The delivery of project outputs will be recorded as and when they occur. The information source will be the evidence of outputs - training workshop reports, list of participants in training activities, meeting minutes, communication material etc. The production of outputs will also be reported in the project progress reports.
- Outcomes. The achievement of project outcomes will be monitored and recorded in the project progress reports and the annual Project Implementation Reviews submitted by UNEP to GEF. To track the achievement of outcomes, the project will mainly use process indicators as the main focus of the project is on strengthening the institutional and technical capacity for sustainable management of the PAs. Outcomes related to training and capacity building will be assessed qualitatively through training evaluations and reports, personal interviews with participants, independent peer review of reports/plans produced by individuals trained by the project and other methods. For monitoring of outcomes related to changes in the physical environment and socio-economic conditions, specific surveys, field inspections and assessments will be carried out. A number of consultant inputs have been included in the project budget to deliver the required information. UNEP will also carry out periodic supervision missions to monitor progress towards the achievement of outcomes.

The costed monitoring and evaluation plan is shown in the table 1 below and is as reflected in Appendix 7 of the project document.

### PROVISION FOR EVALUATIONS

An independent Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) will be undertaken at project mid-term to review progress and effectiveness of implementation in terms of achieving the project objectives, outcomes and outputs. Findings and recommendations of this evaluation will be instrumental for bringing improvement in the overall project design and execution strategy for the remaining period of the project's term. UNEP will arrange for the MTE in consultation with the project partners. The evaluation will, *inter alia*:

- review the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation;
- analyze effectiveness of partnership arrangements;
- identify issues requiring decisions and remedial actions;
- propose any mid-course corrections and/or adjustments to the implementation strategy as necessary; and
- highlight technical achievements and lessons learned derived from project design, implementation and management.

A terminal Evaluation (TE) will be carried out within 3 months prior to the terminal review meeting of the project partners. The TE will aim to identify the project impacts and sustainability of project results and the degree of achievement of long-term results. This evaluation will also have the purpose of indicating future actions needed to sustain project results and disseminate products and best-practices within the country and to neighbouring countries.

**Table 1: Costed M&E Workplan**

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget from GEF	Budget co-finance	Time Frame
Kickoff Meeting	PM, PSC, NPT, IC	\$6,350	\$5,625	Within 1 month of project start-up
Inception Report	PM, NPT, IC	\$6,000	\$9,875	1 month after project inception meeting
Half yearly Progress Reports to UNEP	PM, PSC	11,750	\$21,425	Within 1 week of the end of reporting period
Project Steering Committee meetings				Quarterly
Reports of PSC meetings				Quarterly
PIR	PM, NPT, IC	\$25,000	\$30,000	Annually, part of reporting routine
Audit				Annually
Measurement of project indicators (outcome, progress and performance indicators, GEF tracking tools) at national and global level				Outcome indicators: start, mid and end of project Progress/perform. Indicators: annually
Publication of Lessons Learnt and other project documents				Annually, part of Semi-annual reports & Project Final Report
Co-financing report	PSU, EC, PM	\$0	\$5,725	Within 1 month of the PIR reporting period
Mid Term Review/Mid Term Evaluation (MTR/MTE)	UNEP Task Manager/UNEP Evaluation Office	\$19,400	\$9,975	At mid-point of project implementation
Terminal Evaluation	UNEP Evaluation Office	\$28,000	\$9,975	Within 6 months of end of project implementation
Project Final Report	PIU, NPC	\$5,000	\$4,000	Within 1 month of the project completion date
<b>Total M&amp;E Plan Budget</b>		<b>\$101,500</b>	<b>\$96,600</b>	

PM Project Manager  
PSC Project Steering Committee (NC-PAs)  
NPT National Project Team  
IC International Consultant  
PSU Project Support Unit  
EC External Independent Consultan




**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)
Dr Ali Al-Lami	MOE Advisor, GEF Operational Focal Point	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT OF IRAQ	03/05/2013

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

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

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Brennan Van Dyke, Director GEF Coordination Office, UNEP		September 18, 2015	Jane Gubare Nimpamya DEPI, UNEP Nairobi, Kenya	+254 207 624 629 +254 718436427	<a href="mailto:jane.Nimpamya@unep.org">jane.Nimpamya@unep.org</a>

**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).

Refer to appendix 4 on page 65 in the project document

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

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>4</sup>**

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$ 50,000			
<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>
Project inception, including: – Organizing the consultant team, deciding about task assignment and formulation of TORs – Recruiting of consultant team members – Meeting of the lead team (Project Coordinator, Lead Scientific Advisor, PPG/GEF Advisor), towards: – Reviewing and agreeing on key process requirements, steps and methods / approaches (i.e. related to GEF and UNEP standards) Preparing a project operational plan. Including timed milestones, and a work flow scheme for project management	4,800.00	3,500.00	1,300.00
Define a structured stakeholder consultation plan with participation of key stakeholders and establish a PPG Steering Committee	9,000.00	10,000.00	-1,000.00
Undertake studies and assessments through desk/field studies and stakeholder consultations	18,000.00	16,000.00	2,000.00
Stakeholder meetings (local communities)	3,000.00	2,600.00	400.00
Development of a preliminary draft PD	8,000.00	9,700.00	-1,700.00
Preliminary review of Draft PD (UNEP, MOE)	2,200.00	3,200.00	-1,000.00
Full MSP PD with all other supporting documents and annexes required, and completion of PPG activities	5,000.00	5,000.00	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 50,000</b>	<b>\$ 50,000</b>	<b>0</b>

<sup>4</sup> 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)**

Not Applicable