



GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

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: Mainstreaming Conservation of Migratory Soaring Birds into Key Productive Sectors along the Rift Valley / Red Sea flyway [Tranche II of a GEF-3 project]			
Country(ies):	To receive GEF funding for national and regional activities: Jordan, Egypt, Lebanon, Ethiopia and Sudan ¹ . To receive GEF funding only for regional activities: Eritrea, Djibouti.	GEF Project ID: ²	1028 Tranche I 9491 Tranche II
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	1878
Other Executing Partner(s):	BirdLife International	Submission Date:	11 May 2016
		Resubmission Date:	09 May 2017 13 July 2017
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration (Months)	60
Integrated Approach Pilot	N/A	Corporate Program: SGP <input type="checkbox"/>	
Name of Parent Program	N/A	Agency Fee (\$)	N/A ³

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES⁴

Focal Area Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
Under the original GEF-3 Operational Programmes and Outputs: OP-1 on Arid and Semi-arid Zone Ecosystems – Output c) Sectoral integration and Output e) Institutional strengthening; OP-2 on Coastal, Marine, and Freshwater Ecosystems – Output b) Sectoral integration and Output e) Institutional strengthening. <u>Under GEF-6 the project would fall under: Objective 4, Programme 9: Managing the Human-Biodiversity Interface</u> , with Outcome 9.1 Increased area of production landscapes and seascapes that integrate conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into management; and Outcome 9.2 Sector policies and regulatory frameworks incorporate biodiversity considerations		GEF-TF	3,500,000	10,534,885
Total project costs			3,500,000	10,534,885

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Project Objective: Conservation management objectives and actions for Migratory Soaring Birds are mainstreamed effectively into the hunting, energy, agriculture, waste management and tourism sectors along the Rift Valley/Red Sea flyway, making this a safer route for soaring birds						
Project Components/Programs	Financing Type	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Financing (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
1. Raised awareness of the flyway and altered social	TA	1.1. Public “visibility” of the flyway and MSBs increased: at least 15 articles or other	1.1 Concept of MSB Flyway established and promoted. 1.2 RFF promotes mainstreaming of MSB considerations and moves	GEF TF	770,509.27	719,285

¹ In Sudan the project will work with and through the Sudanese Wildlife Society - no funding will be provided to the Government of Sudan or its authorities.

² Project ID number remains the same as the assigned PIF number.

³ Agency fees for both project tranches were transferred at the time of approval of the umbrella program. The present request only covers the remaining project grant of \$3,500,000 set aside for Tranche II.

⁴ When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on [GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF](#) and [CBIT programming directions](#).

and cultural behaviours among target groups that threaten MSBs in the key sectors, decision-makers and the general public		substantive media releases highlighting MSBs and flyway importance, per country each year by the end of the project. 1.2 MSB project/RFF ⁵ website is a source of information for public, politicians and production sectors. 1.3 RFF is the <i>locus</i> of decision-making for conservation policies, plans and activities to coordinate MSB conservation efforts along the flyway.	from being the “custodian” of the MSB project to being the “custodian of the flyway”. 1.3 Targeted awareness and media / social media campaigns on MSB flyway issues designed and carried out. 1.4 Coordination of Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) and African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (AEWA) translated into sector activities and actions.			
2. <u>New</u> : Content, tools and capacity developed and delivered to mainstream MSBs/Flyway concept into sector processes, practices and programmes. <i>(Pooled from the original 2nd and 3rd Components:</i> <i>2. Increased national and regional capacity to effect mainstreaming and application of Flyway concept.</i> <i>3. Content and tools to enhance flyway-friendly practice developed, delivered and mainstreamed effectively into sector processes and programs)</i>	TA	2.1 Capacity of national BirdLife partners and other key national stakeholders in government, private sector and civil society to mainstream MSB/flyway issues increased. 2.2 Ecological/conservation status of Flyway monitored and showing local improvements and/or significant reduction of harmful development impacts at target sites. 2.3 Mainstreaming and intervention methodologies for reducing harmful impacts on MSB/Flyway tested, validated and implemented through “vehicles” in target countries in key sectors (at least 8, in hunting, energy, agriculture, tourism and waste management).	2.1 Capacity of national partners strengthened to develop and promote concept of Flyway, respond to new opportunities and monitor content standards. 2.2 Capacity of national government and private sector institutions strengthened to understand, promote and adopt “flyway friendly” practices. 2.3 MSB-related technical content and guidelines developed, especially for targeted key sectors (energy, agriculture and pesticide use, hunting, tourism and waste management) 2.4 MSB project content and guidelines tested, adapted and implemented through appropriate sector reform vehicle projects and programmes along the flyway. 2.5 Regular surveillance of Flyway and MSB conservation status and of known and emerging threats, including to predict impacts on MSBs of sector developments and to identify other potential project target sectors and vehicles.	GEF TF	1,977,000.00	8,500,000
3. Learning, evaluation, adaptive management and upscaling	TA	3.1 M&E of socioeconomic and environmental impacts at regional and site level tracked. 3.2 Adaptive project management reflects M&E recommendations.	3.1 Project monitoring, evaluation, reporting and dissemination frameworks and structures established and operational at regional level and at selected sites, to fully and regularly assess quantitative and qualitative environmental and socio-economic impacts of all interventions.	GEF TF	544,734.11	719,286

⁵ Regional Flyway Facility

		3.3 Project lessons, best practices and case studies analysed, codified and disseminated nationally and internationally for replication in other sites along the flyway and beyond 3.4 The flyway is integrated into global conservation efforts and newly raised / assigned financing allows the application of lessons learned from demonstration activities in other sites along the flyway.	3.2 Flyway/RFF adaptive management framework developed. 3.3 RFF fully absorbed into BirdLife International. 3.4 Selected learning and knowledge management products developed. 3.5 Coherent financial plan developed for the RFF including key funding areas, sources of financing, financing gaps, financial strategy for flyway conservation activities. 3.6 Targeted promotion and fundraising through BirdLife at international events such as the annual BirdLife Bird Fair.			
Subtotal					3,292,243.3	9,938,571
Project Management Cost (PMC)				GEF TF	207,756.6	596,314
Total Project Costs					3,500,000	10,534,885

C. CONFIRMED SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
National Government(s)	National Renewable Energy Authority (Egypt)	In-kind	3,500,000
	Ministry of Municipality Affairs (Jordan)	In-kind	2,000,000
Private Sector	JAZ Hotels and Resorts (Egypt)	In-kind	2,000,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	100,000
CSO	Pesticide Action Nexus Association	In-kind	121,609
	Ethiopian Wildlife and Natural History Society	In-kind	122,500
	Sudanese Wildlife Society	In-kind	15,000
	Society for the Protection of Nature in Lebanon	In-kind	116,500
NGO	BirdLife International	In-kind	1,458,085
NGO	BirdLife International	Grant	797,956
Others	Horn of Africa Regional Environment Centre and Network	In-kind	303,235
Total Co-financing			10,534,885

NB: Please see the co-financing letters in Annex 7 of the PRODOC

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, COUNTRY, FOCAL AREA AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country Name/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total (c)=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Regional	BD		3,500,000	0*	3,500,000
Total Grant Resources					3,500,000	0*	3,500,000

*: All agency fees were already received at the beginning of Tranche I.

E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS⁶

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets
1. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society	Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares	1,000,000 hectares

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT? N/A

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF⁷

A.1. Project Description. Elaborate on: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed; 2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects, 3) the proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area⁸ strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project, 4) [incremental/additional cost reasoning](#) and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, CBIT and [co-financing](#); 5) [global environmental benefits](#) (GEFTF) and/or [adaptation benefits](#) (LDCF/SCCF); and 6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

1. The *Mainstreaming Conservation of Migratory Soaring Birds into Key Productive Sectors along the Rift Valley/Red Sea Flyway* (MSB project⁹) is a GEF-3 project conceived from the onset to consist of two funding Tranches under one 10-year umbrella programme. Tranche I has now been completed. A condition for the release of Tranche II GEF financing was the submission to GEF Council of a second GEF CEO Endorsement Request with the accompanying Project Document following an independent evaluation. Originally conceived as a Terminal Evaluation of Tranche I this was changed to a Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the overall programme¹⁰. This MTR was completed in 2015-2016 and the project rated as SATISFACTORY. MTR and the Final PIR for 2015-2016 are attached to the submission as evidence of the completion of Tranche I.

2. For reference, the original GEF CEO Endorsement Request in 2007 stated that: "There have been no changes to the project: only minor technical amendments in the project document in response to Technical Comments from GEF Council Members, and changes to the Management Arrangements to accommodate the multiple modality necessary to implement the project. There have been no changes to the GEF financing request"¹¹.

3. Tranche II is a direct continuation of Tranche I, and most of the background analysis and responses remain valid, like also the expected project objective, outcomes, outputs and activities. The following outlines some elements and particularly the (rather minor) changes in the project situation analysis and structure, before addressing the specific items A.1-A.8 of the CEO Endorsement Request template:

4. The original PRODOC submitted in 2007 and GEF CEO Endorsement of January 2008 explicitly encompassed eleven countries along the Rift Valley/Red Sea flyway. However, the Migratory Soaring Birds (MSB) project under Tranche I, apart from its region-wide activities, focused its national activities mainly on a subset of these eleven countries, most importantly Egypt, Jordan and Lebanon. Tranche II during its development was subjected to rigorous

⁶ Update the applicable indicators provided at PIF stage. Progress in programming against these targets for the projects per the *Corporate Results Framework* in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#), will be aggregated and reported during mid-term and at the conclusion of the replenishment period.

⁷ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF, no need to respond, please enter "NA" after the respective question.

⁸ For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project's consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which [Aichi Target\(s\)](#) the project will directly contribute to achieving..

⁹ The Mainstreaming Conservation of Migratory Soaring Birds into Key Productive Sectors Along the Rift Valley/Red Sea flyway already exists as a project having completed tranche I of the project and is therefore referred to throughout this document as the MSB project

¹⁰ Migratory Soaring Birds, UNDP ID 1878, GEF ID1028, UNDP PMIS ID 1878. Midterm Review; Final Draft 16th October 2014

¹¹ GEF CEO Letter of Approval, MSB Project, 11th December 2007, Attached Project Document.

scrutiny with regard to the countries it would cover, considering various factors including GEF eligibility and pledges for domestic co-financing. Under Tranche II support by the GEF project will be expanded to 7 flyway countries, namely Egypt, Ethiopia, Jordan, Lebanon, Sudan, Djibouti and Eritrea. Support for regional activities will be provided to all these 7 countries, while support for national-level activities will be provided to the 5 countries that have committed national-level cofinance: Egypt, Ethiopia, Jordan, Lebanon and Sudan. This reasoning is also reflected in Section 0 *Project Country Coverage* in the PRODOC. The entire PRODOC and CEO Endorsement Request are now limited to only the seven countries expected to receive GEF resources under Tranche II.

5. While much of the problem and baseline situation described in the Tranche I CEO Endorsement Request and PRODOC remain relevant today, there are also some notable changes. The implementation of the overall umbrella project (Tranche I) has started to deliver results on which Tranche II can build. The wind energy sector has emerged as a far larger threat than expected but is also contributing significant co-finance to the project, which showcases the incrementality of the project. Please refer to Section 1.4 *Threats, root causes and impacts* (§41-68) in the PRODOC for a description of the problems and related changes, and to Section 1.5. *Baseline analysis* (§69-75) in the PRODOC for a description of the new baseline and related changes.

6. In response to the MTR, the overall structure of the project was simplified. The original project design / PRODOC in 2007 was built around four components (1. Raised awareness of the flyway and altered social and cultural behaviours among target groups that threaten MSBs in the key sectors, decision-makers and the general public; 2. Increased national and regional capacity to effect mainstreaming and application of Flyway concept; 3. Content and tools to enhance flyway friendly practice developed, delivered and mainstreamed effectively into sector processes and programmes; 4: Learning, evaluation and adaptive management increased.) to deliver four expected outcomes (development of the Flyway concept to be used for “flyway friendly” promotion and double mainstreaming; building capacity of national partners and other agencies to effect double mainstreaming; the actual delivery of double mainstreaming to incorporate MSB issues into targeted sectoral programmes; and the monitoring and adaptive management of the approach).

7. For Tranche II the project framework was slightly amended and expanded to incorporate more recent GEF project development standards and rigour, and to reflect the learning and evaluation of Tranche I. The changes do not really affect the project scope or content but provide a more coherent logical structure and improved monitoring framework for this new phase.

- Component 1 (as per GEF PIF and CEO Endorsement Request, equivalent to “Outcome 1” in UNDP PRODOC terminology) is maintained as follows: “Raised awareness of the flyway and altered social and cultural behaviours among target groups that threaten MSBs in the key sectors, decision-makers and the general public”.
- The former Components 2 and 3 were merged into a single new Component 2 / PRODOC Outcome 2 that captures their essence as follows: “Content, tools and capacity developed and delivered to mainstream MSBs/Flyway concept into sector processes, practices and programmes.”
- The former Component 4 became Component 3 / PRODOC Outcome 3 slightly reformulated to “Learning, evaluation, adaptive management and upscaling”.

8. The Outcomes under these new Components were reshuffled accordingly and sharpened in the process. Please refer to Table B above and to Section 2.2. *Project goal, objective, outcomes and outputs/activities* in the PRODOC.

9. In addition, the Project Results Framework (see PRODOC Section 3, pp. 62-71) has been slightly refined and updated to reflect changes in circumstances, experience gained during Tranche I, the new MTR baseline, and to improve the logical structure as a tool for project planning, implementation and M&E in line with current UNDP-GEF standards. These changes have been affected in such a way that the M&E undertaken in Tranche I remains fully relevant.

10. A further, minor change concerns the financial sustainability strategy of the Regional Flyway Facility. The original project strategy made important references to the quasi-commercial possibilities of certifying and branding/marketing “flyway friendly products”. It is noted that this was recognised as a high risk strategy in the STAP review of the Tranche I design; and indeed the MTR noted that the financing of the RFF in such a way was unlikely. This was hence modified for Tranche II and the future – the RFF’s management and operational costs will now be fully absorbed and financed through BirdLife International’s own global financing strategy. This is reflected in the new Project Output

3.5 *Coherent financial plan developed for the RFF including key funding areas, sources of financing, financing gaps, financial strategy for flyway conservation activities* - which will set out the commitments for BirdLife International and identify sources of investment funding for specific sectors and campaigns, etc

11. With regard to the project's eligibility under GEF, please refer to Section 2.3.2. *GEF eligibility and alignment* in the PRODOC. The section explains the eligibility under GEF-3 – to which there have been no changes – but also under GEF-6 to complement and update the analysis.

12. There have been no notable changes to the incremental reasoning and the global benefits remain the same – please refer to Section 2.4. *Incremental reasoning and global benefits* including Table 5 in the PRODOC. The co-finance for this Tranche II of the project (see above Table C) provides new updated figures from countries that remain at the heart of the project.

13. For a description of how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design, please refer to Section 2.5 *Cost-effectiveness* in the PRODOC (§189-192). For a description of the coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives, please see Section 2.7. *Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives* in the PRODOC.

14. UNDP's competitive advantage has expanded since Tranche I was submitted and approved in 2007. In addition to having an established permanent presence in each country targeted by the MSB Project through its Country Offices, which facilitates implementation and the engagement of both government and non-government stakeholders. UNDP has consolidated its UNDP-GEF unit and now manages a substantial GEF biodiversity project portfolio including many working on sector mainstreaming. UNDP has moreover prepared and committed to a substantive biodiversity policy framework, *UNDP's Biodiversity and Ecosystems Global Framework 2012-2020*¹², which has a strategic objective to: “*Maintain and enhance the goods and services provided by biodiversity and ecosystems in order to secure livelihoods, food, water and health, enhance resilience, conserve threatened species and their habitats, and increase carbon storage and sequestration.*”. The MSB project fits fully within the first of the three Signature Programmes: *Signature Programme 1* is “*Integrating biodiversity and ecosystem management into development planning and production sector activities to safeguard biodiversity and maintain ecosystem services that sustain human wellbeing.*” In addition, the MSB project is broadly aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan 2015-2018, by working towards the following strategic plan outcomes, outputs and indicators:

- *Outcome 1. Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded, with Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste with Output Indicator 1.3.1: Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or sub-national levels, and Output Indicator 1.3.2: Number of new jobs and livelihoods created through management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste, disaggregated by sex).*
- *Outcome 2. Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance, with Output 2.5. Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation, and Output Indicator 2.5.1. Number of countries with legal, policy and institutional frameworks in place for conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems.*

A.2. Child Project? If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

N/A

¹² UNDP (2012) The Future We Want: Biodiversity and Ecosystems— Driving Sustainable Development. UNDP Biodiversity and Ecosystems Global Framework 2012-2020.

A.3. Stakeholders. Identify key stakeholders and elaborate on how the key stakeholders engagement is incorporated in the preparation and implementation of the project. Do they include civil society organizations (yes /no)? and indigenous peoples (yes /no)? ¹³

15. Given the geographic scale of the MSB project the stakeholder relations are far-reaching and diverse. The relationships with the MSB project are in some instances quite remote from the flyway itself (e.g. the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds/RSPB, a UK registered Charity has over a million members). Arguably too, these stakeholders although distant from the flyway have tangible interest in the project (more than vague existence values) because they too have a territorial stake in the birds, albeit in their wintering or breeding grounds.

16. Please refer to PRODOC Section 2.6. *Stakeholder analysis and engagement* with its Table 6 for a breakdown of stakeholder categories, their interest in the project and their anticipated roles. §195 deals with the roles of CSO in particular.

A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Elaborate on how gender equality and women's empowerment issues are mainstreamed into the project implementation and monitoring, taking into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of women and men. In addition, 1) did the project conduct a gender analysis during project preparation (yes /no)?; 2) did the project incorporate a gender responsive project results framework, including sex-disaggregated indicators (yes /no)?; and 3) what is the share of women and men direct beneficiaries (women 40%, men 60%)? ¹⁴

17. In the original Tranche I project preparations under the GEF-3 cycle, gender was not addressed in a particular manner. During Tranche II the project will work to achieve a UNDP Gender Marker 2 rating (gender equality as a significant objective). Also BirdLife International will apply its own internal gender policies and codes of practice to the project. This will take place through a number of actions including by, but not limited to: striving for gender parity in new project, RFF, partner and government personnel recruitment, including gender considerations as appropriate in TORs; ensuring & documenting participation by and discussions with and women during all site/field visits; ensuring that women's views will be sought and taken into account through the "vehicle" projects in each country; documenting gender-balanced participation in all project activities; conducting disaggregated-by-gender spot surveys on learning levels at the end of all project workshops; requesting Birdlife partners to develop data on women in national NGO's and seek similar data in the mainstreaming contracts with partners in all the five productive sectors covering the seven countries of Tranche II; integrating gender fully into the CSO project partner capacity building process to incorporate gender equality and women's rights within these partner organizations; monitoring and reporting on gender actions and outcomes in annual PIRs and at the mid-term and end of the project.

A.5. Risk. Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

18. The Risk Assessment was redone and updated. Besides a number of Moderate risks, the greatest and only High risk perceived at this stage is that political unrest and security concerns could impact the implementation of the project in one or more of the targeted countries, weakening their ability to engage and for mainstreaming to take place; however the project has thus far demonstrated that it can continue to operate and make significant progress in situations where political and security issues represent a challenge to project implementation, such as in Egypt.

19. Please refer to Section 2.10. *Risk Assessment and Mitigation Measures* in the PRODOC, which includes the risks identified in the Tranche I PRODOC alongside new risks identified during the development of Tranche II. (This new risk assessment now complies with GEF-6 standards).

A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination. Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

¹³ As per the GEF-6 Corporate Results Framework in the GEF Programming Directions and GEF-6 Gender Core Indicators in the Gender Equality Action Plan, provide information on these specific indicators on stakeholders (including civil society organization and indigenous peoples) and gender.

¹⁴ Same as footnote 8 above.

20. Following the recommendations of the MTR, the project management arrangements will be different in Tranche II. During Tranche I the management arrangements were overly complex and involved national execution arrangements in each country implementing a “vehicle”. This arrangement required each country to have a dedicated project management unit (PMU) and hindered the establishment of a network of CSOs along the flyway coordinating MSB conservation efforts and resources through the Regional Flyway Facility. In Tranche II implementation will be through BirdLife International, as implementing partner under UNDP’s NGO implementation modality. The Regional Flyway Facility, already a direct project result from Tranche I, will *inter alia* also continue to serve as the Regional Project Management/Coordination Unit¹⁵. Please refer to Section 5 *Management Arrangements* in the PROOC for further details.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7 Benefits. Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

21. Developing a common vision in which ecological sustainability/resilience underpins social and economic development are at the core of the projects activities. Through mainstreaming the conservation of MSBs into the five targeted sectors along the flyway (particularly in the energy, waste, agriculture and tourism sectors) the project will ensure that economic and social development can progress without detriment to ecosystems and biodiversity.

22. The specific socio-economic and development benefits generated by the project depend largely on the particular sector. In tourism, the economic benefits are most direct, because the conservation of the ecosystem and landscape values that (nature) tourism relies on are maintained and because the marketing of soaring bird viewing (incl. through the certification scheme) can represent an additional market value. In the (renewable) energy sector, the mitigation measurements will on the one hand represent costs to the developers/operators, by adapting the construction and operation of especially wind farms; however an early integration of highly appropriate mitigation measures can also speed up approval (EIA) processes during construction and operations and reduce the risk of costly *ex post* amendments when more biodiversity-friendly legislation is enacted in the future. In agriculture, the economic and health benefit of low-input/conservation agriculture is well established, as it reduces the regular investment in chemical inputs and because of a reduced pesticide load – good for birds and people. The development benefits of enhanced waste management are linked to aesthetics and landscape value for tourists and locals, and generate health benefits especially where the POP-generating burning of plastics is avoided.

23. At the same time it would be too simplistic to over-accentuate the project’s economic gains along the flyway – it is important to stay true to the strategic nature of this project.

24. To affect these changes, the project is mostly working through CSOs in the seven targeted flyway countries. The levels of governance within these countries varies – and in some it is difficult to develop and operate strong CSOs (e.g. Eritrea, Egypt). The project will continue to work in all of these countries with a broad civil society development agenda (particularly as it relates to conservation) by building the capacity of these organizations and promoting their development as far as possible within the national regulatory framework. In this way it will raise the profile of CSOs in a positive way and in most instances by partnering with state agencies and institutions to further sustainable socio-economic development.

25. During Tranche II the MSB project will work to achieve a UNDP Gender Marker 2 rating (gender equality as a significant objective). Also BirdLife International will apply its own internal gender policies and codes of practice to the project. For details, please refer to Section 2.11. *Gender mainstreaming* in the PRODOC (§229).

26. The Global Environmental Benefit expected from GEF financing for Tranche II of the MSB project is that the populations of at least thirty-seven globally threatened species of MSBs using the flyway remain stable or increase. Seven of these species have between 50 and 100 % of their world populations passing through the flyway. While these species are the focus of considerable conservation efforts in their northern and southern ranges encompassing northern

¹⁵ Except in Egypt where this responsibility is carried out by the Nature Conservation Sector (NCS), Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (EEAA).

Europe and Central Asia to Southern Africa, the flyway remains a critical bottleneck through which the sum of all this endeavor must pass twice yearly for survival. Unless the Rift Valley / Red Sea flyway can be made safe for MSBs during their autumn and spring migration, now and in the future, all this endeavor, the sum of all this human effort, financial, material, intellectual and emotional may be lost.

A.8 Knowledge Management. Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

27. Results from the project will be disseminated both within and beyond the project intervention zone through a number of existing information sharing networks and forums and in particular the RFF website and the BirdLife network. On-going internal assessment by RFF staff will help to collate lessons learned, and will seek to identify what the project team considers to be useful and practical information to gather and analyze. Because this requires additional effort, time and funds, an associated budget has been included for this under Component/Outcome 3. 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. The UNDP-GEF team through its M&E and KM teams shares lessons between projects. 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. Identifying and analyzing lessons learned is an on-going 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 months. UNDP-GEF shall provide a format and assist the team in categorizing, documenting and reporting on lessons learned. Capturing and sharing knowledge and lessons learned will constitute an important component of the project and an essential way to ensure sustainability and replicability of project achievements. This project element cuts across all project components. It is also noteworthy that many field areas are unable to receive electronic information. Therefore reliance on printed materials will be high.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:

B.1 Consistency with National Priorities. Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.:

28. All countries in the Rift Valley/Red Sea migratory flyway region have National Environmental Action Plans (NEAPs), National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and/or other relevant strategies (wildlife or coastal/marine policies/strategies, etc.) with biodiversity elements relevant to the conservation of migratory birds – including most notably the thirty-seven key species of soaring birds at the core of the project. **There have been no significant changes to the relevance of the MSB project regarding these national strategies or plans since its original design.** The most notable change is that between the original approval of the project and the present CEO Endorsement Request for Tranche II, many CBD parties have developed new NBSAPs and National Reports on Biodiversity in response to the CBD COP-10 decisions in 2010 including the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. In general these later-generation documents have seen stronger references to migratory (soaring) birds and the flyway.

29. Moreover, all project countries have ratified either or both the CMS¹⁶ and AEW¹⁷, which commit the Parties to action to conserve migratory species and their habitats, including concerted action between Range States. AEW specifically covers several MSBs (storks, pelicans, cranes) and Resolution 7.5 of the 7th COP¹⁸ of the CMS details potential negative impacts of wind turbines on migratory birds and calls on Parties to take action (identifying areas where migrant birds are vulnerable, strengthening impact assessments).

¹⁶ UN (“Bonn”) Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals

¹⁷ African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement (under CMS)

¹⁸ 7th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the CMS, Bonn, 18-24 September 2002

30. Please refer to Sections 2.3. *GEF country eligibility and strategic alignment* (§163-174) and 2.8. *Project consistency with national priorities and plans* (§199-204) in the PRODOC for more detail.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

31. Project M&E procedures will be designed and conducted by the RFF and the UNDP-CO, with support from the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Unit (RCU) in Istanbul, in accordance with established BirdLife International and UNDP-GEF procedures. The Project Results Framework (Section 3 in the PRODOC, pp 62-71) contains objective and outcome level impact indicators and measures of performance for evaluating project implementation, along with their corresponding means of verification. The GEF BD-Mainstreaming (SO2) Tracking Tool will also be used to monitor progress, as well as a GEF / UNDP / BirdLife Capacity Development Scorecard. These provide the basis on which the project's M&E system will continue to function – building on Tranche I.


32. The M&E plan includes: inception report, project implementation reviews, quarterly and annual review reports, a Mid-Term Review of Tranche II, as well as a Terminal Evaluation (of Tranche II and the overall umbrella programme). The project's M&E Plan will be presented and finalized in the Inception Report following a collective fine-tuning of indicators, means of verification, and the full definition of project staff M&E responsibilities, as appropriate.

33. Please refer to PRODOC Section 6 *Monitoring Framework and Evaluation* for a detailed description and for an indicative budget for M&E activities. The section also contains details on Learning and Knowledge Sharing and on Communications.

PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY(IES)

A. GEF Agency(ies) certification

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person Telephone Email Address
Adriana Dinu UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator		09 May 2017	Yves de Soye UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor T +33 682 75 89 44 yves.desoye@undp.org

ANNEXES

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).

Please refer to Section 3 *Project Results Framework* in the PRODOC (pp. 62-71)

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).

The comments of the GEF SEC review of May 2016 are addressed through the Response Matrix annexed to this resubmission.

Aside from the need to submit Tranche II to GEF Council for re-endorsement, which is hereby met, no other questions remain to be addressed from either GEF SEC, Council or STAP.

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

This is not applicable for this submission for Tranche II because all project preparations were concluded for the submission of Tranche I that led to the approval of the umbrella programme. No new GEF financing was received for the preparation of Tranche II.

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

N/A