



**REQUEST FOR: CEO ENDORSEMNT
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: Improving Forest and Protected Area Management in Trinidad and Tobago | | | |
| Country(ies): | Trinidad and Tobago | GEF Project ID: ¹ | 4769 |
| GEF Agency(ies): | FAO | GEF Agency Project ID: | 615421 |
| Other Executing Partner(s): | Ministry of Environment and Water Resources (MEWR); Forestry Division ² ; Tobago House Assembly; and selected local NGOs and other institutions | Submission Date: | March 12, 2014 |
| GEF Focal Area (s): | BD | Project Duration(Months) | 48 |
| Name of Parent Program (if applicable): | | Project Agency Fee (\$): | 279,000 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/> | | |

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK³

| Focal Area Objectives | Expected FA Outcomes | Expected FA Outputs | Trust Fund | Grant Amount (\$) | Co-financing (\$) |
|----------------------------|---|---|------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| BD-1 | Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas. Indicator 1.1: Protected area management effectiveness score as recorded by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool | Output 1.1. New protected areas (6) and coverage (98,452 ha) of unprotected ecosystems Output 1.2. Coverage (33) of unprotected threatened species | GEFTF | 1,917,404 | 25,546,172 |
| BD-1 | Outcome 1.2: Increased revenue for protected area systems to meet total expenditures required for management. Indicator 1.2: Funding gap for management of protected area systems as recorded by financing scorecards. | Output 1.3. Sustainable financing plans (one covering entire 214,000 ha). | GEFTF | 872,596 | 2,173,902 |
| Total project costs | | | | 2,790,000 | 27,720,074 |

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² until the Forest and Protected Areas Management Authority (FPAMA) is established and operational

³ Refer to the Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework when completing Table A.

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To conserve biodiversity in Trinidad and Tobago by consolidating the protected area system and enhancing capacity and finance for conservation management.

| Project Component | Grant Type | Expected Outcomes | Expected Outputs | Trust Fund | Grant Amount (\$) | Confirmed Co-financing (\$) |
|--|------------|---|---|------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Improvements to the legal and institutional arrangements for PA management. | TA | <p>1.1 Protected area system consolidated to streamline and simplify management and ensure adequate coverage of all important ecosystems.</p> <p>Indicator: 98,452 ha of new PAs formally designated under the new system.</p> <p>1.2. Management of the 6 new PAs improved.</p> <p>Indicator: Management effectiveness score for the 6 new PAs (as recorded by the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool)</p> <p>1.3 Biodiversity conservation of unprotected species is strengthened at six pilot sites covering</p> | <p>1.1.1. Draft national legislation prepared for forests, wildlife and PA management (marine and terrestrial)</p> <p>1.1.2. National PAs system plan agreed and published (214,000 ha).</p> <p>1.1.3 A minimum of six new sites designated as formal PAs under the new legislation (expected to cover about 98,452 ha)</p> <p>1.2.1 FPAMA staff (about 100) trained in current best practices in PA management and biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>1.2.2 MIS developed and implemented for PA monitoring and assessment and reporting to international conventions.</p> <p>1.2.3 Ecological research and monitoring programme to guide PA management.</p> <p>1.2.4 Public education and awareness programme implemented.</p> <p>1.3.1 Information about biodiversity in the six pilot sites collected and analysed every year.</p> <p>1.3.2 Management plans produced for the six pilot sites.</p> | GEFTF | 1,642,953 | 12,820,853 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|--|-------|---------|------------|
| | | about 98,452 ha. Indicator: condition of habitat and 33 threatened species improved. | 1.3.3 Threats to biodiversity conservation identified and appropriate actions taken. | | | |
| 2. Improvements to infrastructure for biodiversity conservation and forest restoration. | Inv | 2.1 FPAMA staff have the resources and infrastructure necessary for effective PA management. Indicator: Improvement in GEF tracking tool score for equipment and facilities | 2.1.1 Visitor facilities upgraded and maintained. 2.1.2 Equipment for protection activities is upgraded. 2.1.3 Degraded areas, identified as a priority in management plans, are rehabilitated for habitat enrichment (500 ha). | GEFTF | 246,000 | 13,829,450 |
| 3. Development and testing of sustainable financing system | TA | 3.1 Sustainable financing system reduces funding gap and supports the long-term management of the PA system. Indicator: Financial sustainability score card in GEF BD Tracking Tool improved 3.2 Annual funding gap for management of PA system reduced by end of the project. Indicator: Annual funding gap for managing PA system reduced by USD 100,000 | 3.1.1 FPA Fund established through legislation and board of trustees appointed. 3.1.2 Operating procedures and manuals agreed and produced 3.1.3 FPAMA staff (70) trained in operation of the new system. 3.1.4 Senior staff and PA managers (25) trained in budget planning, tourism revenue management and innovative financing techniques. 3.2.1 Funding requirements for management of PA system assessed and agreed. 3.2.2 Strategic plan for sustainable financing produced. 3.2.3 System of user fees designed, piloted and operating in two PAs. 3.2.4 Other forest revenues evaluated and revised where appropriate. | GEFTF | 594,282 | 215,770 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|----|---|--|-------|------------------|-------------------|
| | | | 3.2.5 FPA Fund capitalised by implementation of the new financing system. | | | |
| 4. Monitoring and evaluation and information dissemination | TA | 4.1. Project implementation based on results based management and application of project findings and lessons learned in future operations facilitated. | 4.1.1 Project monitoring system operating providing systematic information on progress in meeting project outcome and output targets. 4.1.2 Midterm and final evaluations conducted. 4.1.3 Project-related "best-practices" and "lessons-learned" published. 4.1.4 Website to share the experience and information dissemination. | GEFTF | 175,405 | 180,667 |
| Subtotal | | | | | 2,658,640 | 27,046,740 |
| Project management Cost (PMC) ⁴ | | | | GEFTF | 131,360 | 673,334 |
| Total project costs | | | | | 2,790,000 | 27,720,074 |

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 (source) | Type of Co-financing | Co-financing Amount (\$) |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| National Government | GORTT | Grant | 1,185,134 |
| National Government | GORTT | In-kind | 1,086,528 |
| National Government | Green Fund | Grant | 22,563,078 |
| Donor | European Union | Grant | 2,135,334 |
| GEF Agency | FAO | Grant | 550,000 |
| GEF Agency | FAO | In-kind | 200,000 |
| Total Co-financing | | | 27,720,074 |

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL, AREA AND COUNTRY

| GEF Agency | Type of Trust Fund | Focal Area | Country Name/ Global | (in \$) | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------|------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| | | | | Grant Amount (a) | Agency Fee (b) | Total c=a+b |
| FAO | GEFTF | BD | Trinidad and Tobago | 2,790,000 | 279,000 | 3,069,000 |
| Total Grant Resources | | | | 2,790,000 | 279,000 | 3,069,000 |

⁴ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

| Component | Grant Amount (\$) | Co-financing (\$) | Project Total (\$) |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| National Consultants | 725,344 | 176,667 | 902,011 |
| International consultants | 105,000 | | 105,000 |

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT?

(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).

NA

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁵

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

No major changes since the submission of the PIF. See sub-section 1.1.5 of the FAO Project Document.

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

No major changes since the submission of PIF.

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:

No major changes since the submission of PIF. Updated information provided in sub-section 1.1.2 of the FAO Project Document.

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

Based on PPG studies and analyses, the description of the baseline project and specific threats and barriers to biodiversity conservation has been strengthened. Key elements of the baseline funding changed (see sub-section 1.1.1 (a) of the FAO Project Document) as a result of detailed project planning and discussion with diverse stakeholders.

1. The Green Fund: The co-financing from Green Fund increased dramatically because of (1) the alignment of their activities with the project activities and (2) the eligibility of many project activities for co-financing under the Green Fund. As an outcome of the trainings to CBOs and NGOs planned in the project, opportunities exist to capitalise/leverage more funds from the Green Fund during project implementation.

2. Other co-financing from Trinidad and Tobago government: The revised contributions are shown in the table below. In addition, the expenditure for staff currently employed will be contributed to the FPA Fund.

3. Co-financing from the European Union: This will be used mainly for boundary demarcation and development of MIS.

⁵ For question 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

3. FAO's contribution: The amount committed in PIF remains the same, but the activities planned changed as in the table below.

| Co-financing sources from baseline project | Brief Description of Co-funded Baseline Project Activities* | Type of Co-financing | Amount (US\$) |
|--|---|----------------------|-------------------|
| National Government- Ministry of the Environment and Water Resources | Evolve new legislation, plans and strategies to support the management of the network of PAs. Develop a new Forestry and Protected Areas Fund and design a user fee system. Procure equipment, construct new facilities and update the existing ones Support innovative initiatives to develop new PAs and improve their management, including the development of MIS, ecological research, public education programme, management plans etc. | In-kind | 1,086,528 |
| | | Cash | 1,185,134 |
| National Government - The Green Fund | Restoration and augmentation of degraded ecosystems Habitat enrichment/rehabilitation in PAs Ecotourism development in PAs Capacity development of PA staff and stakeholders Recovery and stabilization of threatened/exploited species | Cash | 22,563,078 |
| The European Union | Boundary demarcation for PA improvement Support to develop MIS | Cash | 2,135,334 |
| FAO | Realign the institutions with fragmented responsibilities for effective PA management (TCP (F) on Forestry institutional reforms -with MEWR (January to December, 2014) Ensure long-term productivity of lowland tropical forests in the Caribbean- Regional project (October, 2013 to October, 2016). Assist the policy development (TCP on assistance to development of agriculture sector policy- with the Ministry of Food Production (January, 2014 to December, 2015) Local capacity building to suit the needs of results based PA management (FAO staff time and other expenses during the project period) | Cash | 50,000 |
| | | In-kind | 50,000 |
| | | Cash | 300,000 |
| | | Cash | 200,000 |
| | | In-kind | 150,000 |
| TOTAL | | | 27,720,074 |

*see more details in section 4.3 and sub-section 1.1.1 of the FAO 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:

No major changes since the submission of the PIF. Updated information provided in sub-section 1.1.1 (c) of the FAO Project Document.

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 risks identified during project preparation and measures to address these risks are detailed in section 3.2 and Appendix 4 of the FAO Project Document. The risks that are rated as medium to high probability and could have adverse impact on the achievement of the project objective are briefly explained below.

- Poor coordination between government agencies and other project stakeholders can be a major risk resulting in the continuation of poor enforcement and environmental degradation. This risk will be mitigated by utilizing the already established multi-stakeholder committee, training and awareness-raising project activities that will include all relevant agencies and the agreements and MoU signed detailing out clearly the implementation arrangements.
- Delay in transforming to the new institution as outlined in the PA policy (FPMA) can delay the project progress. This risk will be mitigated by reprioritizing the actions in the work plan to implement the activities first in those PAs with high stakeholder support, and by engaging effectively with the Forestry Division staff to make them understand the benefits of the project
- Resistance to new regulations in PAs could result in current threats to biodiversity further decreasing the key species. This risk will be mitigated through the effective involvement of key stakeholders in designing the new regulations, utilizing appropriate modern and traditional enforcement mechanisms, raising of awareness at local level and provision of alternative livelihood and new employment opportunities
- Uncontrolled tourism growth would lead to increased degradation of habitats and pollution. Conducting carrying capacity assessment as part of ecotourism planning and using it as a basis for enforcing site-limits, and providing practical guidelines to tour operators will mitigate this risk.

A.7 Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

There are only a few ongoing GEF projects in Trinidad and Tobago and none of them seem to have close links with the proposed project activities. This limits the coordination possibilities. However, coordination will be ensured with the GEF projects shown in table below. Coordination will also be sought with other GEF projects in the region (e.g. Jamaica) to draw lessons for developing fees from tourism development projects, international tourist fees, water service fees, donations, PA entrance fees and other payments for environmental services (PES).

| Project | GEF ID | Likely coordination areas |
|--|--------|--|
| Integrating Watershed and Coastal Area Management (IWCAM) in the Small Island Developing States of the Caribbean | 1254 | This project was completed in 2011. However, lessons learnt from capacity building will be sought through coordination with from project partners (e.g. CANARI) in Trinidad and Tobago. |
| Mitigating the Threats of Invasive Alien Species in the Insular Caribbean | 3183 | This project is completed. However links were established during project preparation to learn from the project outcomes achieved. Coordination with COPE, CABI etc is likely to yield this during project implementation. |
| Project for Ecosystem Services (ProEcoServ) | 3807 | This project is expected to finish in the first year of implementation of the proposed project. However, coordination will be sought to learn from the experiences and making the outputs useful to the proposed project activities (e.g. PES based on spatial mapping of ecosystem services completed in the project). Another area will be to build on the partnerships built for public-private cooperation for ecosystem management. Also, the lessons learnt in involving |

| | | |
|--|------|--|
| | | local communities (in decision making processes on ecosystem services and designing PES) will be used while preparing the sustainable financing plan in the project. |
| Catalyzing Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the Sustainable Management of Shared Living Marine Resources in the Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystems | 5542 | Collaboration to evolve best practices suited to the national context following Ecosystem-Based Management (EBM) approach. Also sharing lessons learnt and resources related to the Information Management System regarding marine resources. Coordination with the project implementing agents will be sought to establish stakeholder partnerships and joint efforts in capacity building. Lessons will be shared on generating alternate livelihoods. Coordination will also be sought for better management of reefs and habitat restoration in the MPA in Tobago. |
| Sustainable Management of By catch in Latin America and Caribbean Trawl Fisheries | 5304 | Lessons of participatory co-management and utilization of technical advisory groups. Possible cost-sharing in relation to co-management arrangements or institutional support enabling fishing communities or fishers to participate in management. Effective coordination will be sought to share experiences of participatory management and adopt best practices to support sustainable livelihoods. Particularly, the project will seek common areas under component 3 of the project 'diversifying sustainable livelihood'. |

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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

During project preparation, several consultations were held with diverse stakeholders, government agencies, NGOs, donors etc. Based on the feedback received from these and from the inception, midterm and terminal workshops (total of six events) during project preparation, the stakeholders were identified to play different roles in the project.

This project is a national project and as such requires the leadership and the participation of state agencies, the Tobago House of Assembly (THA), and the local government corporations. The main institutional partners will be Ministry of Environment and Water Resources (MEWR) and THA. Specific units who will be responsible for project implementation under MEWR are the Forestry Division (N.B. once the Forest and Protected Area Management Authority (FPAMA) is established and operational, the responsibility will be handed over to FPAMA), Environmental Policy and Planning Division (EPPD) and Environmental Management Authority (EMA). The units under THA are the Department of Natural Resources and the Environment (DNRE) and Marine Resources and Fisheries Department (MRFD).

A multi-stakeholder Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be established to guide and oversee implementation of the project. The PSC chair will be nominated by MEWR in consultation with THA and PSC members. The Committee's composition will include representation from the Permanent Secretary (MEWR), the Tobago House of Assembly, the Environmental Management Authority, the Conservator of Forests of the Forestry Division (or FPAMA), FAOTT, COPE, NGOs/CBOs, UWI, IMA etc. The PSC may co-opt ad hoc representatives from the other partners from related projects, relevant government departments (tourism, fisheries, TCPD, Ministry of Local Government etc.), industry, energy companies, EPPD etc. as may be necessary.

The project will promote the adoption of the broadest range of stakeholder engagement tools as envisaged in the National PA policy including the delegation of appropriate management responsibilities to governmental and non-governmental stakeholders and the development of agreements/MOUs between the State, CBOs/NGOs and private landowners that facilitate such arrangements.

Participation by stakeholders in PA management and development is not a novel approach in TT, but successful co-management models are limited. Although there have been some informal efforts, for example by the Forestry Division and by the EMA with development of stakeholder management committees, a number of key challenges remain to institutionalising participatory PA management that will be addressed in the project, including via:

- Developing enabling policies and legislation, including formal and informal policies and operational plans within government agencies
- Building capacity of government agencies to facilitate participatory approaches to natural resources management
- Building capacity of other stakeholders, including local communities, to be able to effectively engage in participatory processes
- Developing structures and mechanisms for effective stakeholder engagement, including via stakeholder committees and MOUs.

The Table below shows participant stakeholders and their roles. (See other details like how stakeholder participation will be ensured in sub-section 1.1.3 of the FAO Project Document).

| Stakeholder | Role(s) in the project |
|--|---|
| Government | |
| Ministry of Environment and Water Resources | Policy/legal support and assistance with creation of new authority and fund. Technical support for Government co-financing arrangements. National government oversight of project implementation. |
| Forestry Division (to become FPAMA) and Tobago House Assembly (mainly DNRE and Fisheries Department) | Implementation of all project activities in the field and support to the project staff. Support for project management/oversight and M&E. Recipients of training. |
| Environmental Policy and Planning Division | Support and advisory role in executing project activities |
| Environmental Management Authority | Policy and legal support, peer review. Partner for reforestation/habitat enrichment/biodiversity monitoring. |
| Regional Corporations | Policy and planning support. Assistance with implementation of project activities |
| Ministry of Finance | Advice on establishing and operating the FPA Fund. Technical support for Government co-financing arrangements. Support for adoption of PES systems in national accounting systems. |
| Tourism Development Corporation/Ministry of Tourism | Support for capacity development and facilities development for ecotourism. |
| Fisheries Division, Ministry of Food Production | Support for development of future MPAs and national systems plan for PAs. |
| Green Fund | Co-finance of various project activities including developing ecotourism, capacity building for PA management, strengthening PAs infrastructure, habitat and species recovery and financing PAs. Support for establishing and operating FPA Fund. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Water and Sewerage Authority (WASA) | Support for implementation of PES system. Collaborator through Mega Watershed project and for developing visitor facilities. |
| Police Service, Coast Guard, Ministry of National Security (MNS) and Judiciary | Recipients of some training activities (e.g. for law enforcement) and collaboration on PAs management involving law enforcement. |
| Fire Service Division, MNS | Support for addressing threats to biodiversity. |
| Ministry of Planning | Support for PA systems development in context of national spatial plan, and adoption of PES systems in national accounting. |
| Ministry of Community Development | Technical support for capacity building of community groups and development of community sustainable livelihoods |
| Ministry of Trade, Ministry of Labour and Small and Micro-Enterprise Development | Support for developing community enterprises and marketing sustainably harvested products from PA systems. |
| International | |
| FAO | Project management, oversight and funding. Support for project M&E. As the implementing and executing agency FAO will provide technical support including quality control of project activities and outputs. Information and knowledge sharing. Development and dissemination of lessons learned. |
| Delegation of the European Union to the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago | Financial support for various components of the project. |
| IUCN | Technical assistance. |
| NGOs, research and training institutions | |
| Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI) | Assistance in implementation of participatory approaches, development and delivery of training modules, development of sustainable community livelihoods. |
| Caribbean Network for Integrated Rural Development, Caribbean Fisheries Training and Development Institute | Development and delivery of training modules. |
| Eastern Caribbean Institute of Agriculture and Forestry, University of Trinidad and Tobago, Faculty of Natural Sciences - University of the West Indies, National Herbarium, Department of Management Studies (Tourism), Sustainable Economic Development Unit etc. (University of the West Indies), Trinidad and Tobago Hotel and Tourism Institute, Trinidad and Tobago campuses and Institute of Marine Affairs | Support for biodiversity monitoring and assessment, research, education and training. Also for development and delivery of training modules. |
| Environment Tobago, Caribbean Forest Conservation Association, Trinidad and Tobago Orchid Society, Council of Presidents for the Environment, Pointe a Pierre Wildfowl Trust, Nariva Environmental Trust, Trinidad and Tobago Ornithological Society, Trinidad and Tobago Biological Society, UWI Biological Society, Centre for Rescue of Endangered Species of Trinidad and Tobago, Zoological Society of Trinidad and Tobago, Asa Wright Nature Centre, Nature Seekers Inc., Buccoo Reef Trust, Manatee Conservation Trust, Save Our Sea Turtles TOBAGO, North East Sea Turtles, Speyside Eco Marine | Partners in implementing key project activities like biodiversity assessment and monitoring, developing modules for PA management, ecotourism development, education activities. Support for enhancing management effectiveness and developing strategies for species recovery. Sharing lessons learned and participation in selected project activities. Support to develop livelihoods from the sustainable use of biodiversity. Support for promoting ecotourism and sharing the lessons learnt. |

| | |
|--|---|
| Park Rangers, Ecological Research Institute Charlotteville, Blanchisseuse Environmental Awareness Trust, Grande Riviere Environmental Awareness Trust, Trust for Sustainable Livelihoods, Sustainable Development Network, Brasso Seco – Paria Tourism Action Committee, Network of Rural Women Producers and other NGOs and associations | |
| Trinidad Environmental Science Teachers Association | Support for developing education material. |
| Private sector (including associations) and the public | |
| Hoteliers and tour operators, Scuba diving operators, Reef boat operators, Yachting Association of Trinidad and Tobago, Trinidad and Tobago Sailing Association, Trinidad and Tobago Tour Operators Association, Trinidad and Tobago Tour Guide association, Tobago Tour Guide Association, Trinidad and Tobago Hotel and Tourism Association, Tobago Hotel and Tourism Association etc. | Support for the introduction of user fees to finance PAs and recipients of training. |
| Hunters associations (e.g. Trinidad and Tobago Hunters Association, South East Hunters Association, Tobago Sport Hunters' Association etc), Trinidad and Tobago Game Fishing Association, Trinidad and Tobago Sport Fishing Association, national and local fisher folk organizations, Toco Handicraft Association etc. | Recipients of awareness raising activities and participants in some conservation activities. Support for the introduction of user fees to finance PAs and recipients of training. |
| Local community members using resources from PAs including NTFP users (e.g. traditional medicines, craft material), subsistence farmers, fishermen, harvesters of marine products etc. | Support for developing strategies for sustainable use of biodiversity. Recipients of awareness raising activities trainings and participants in some conservation activities. |
| Energy sector companies (British Petroleum, Repsol, British Gas, Petroleum Company of Trinidad and Tobago, BHP Billiton etc.) | Contributors to development of visitor's facilities in PAs and communities in PA fringes. Logistic support for ecological studies. Support for PA systems plan development and management of PAs (e.g. regulation of access to leased areas). |
| Private land owners | Partners in conservation through MOUs. |
| Tour guides/ tour operators | Inputs to design innovative ecotourism products. Also, recipients of ecotourism training. Recipients of awareness raising activities and participants in some conservation activities. |
| Consultant firms including Eco-Engineering Consultants Ltd, Eco-Project Ltd., Kairi Consultants Ltd., Rapid Environmental Assessments Ltd. etc. | Inputs for developing ecotourism/management plans, training modules etc. Support for PAs systems plan development and management of PAs through appropriate mitigation measures for development. |
| Film producers, media, creative artists, publishers etc. | Support for developing public education material. |
| Local people living adjacent to PAs and people involved currently in tourism activities | Recipients of trainings. Target group of certain project activities (e.g. job creation by ecotourism, alternate livelihood etc) |
| The general public | Recipients of awareness raising and participants in public education activities. |

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 (LDCE/SCCF):

Most of the socioeconomic benefits of the project are likely to be modest and indirect as shown in sub-sections 1.1.3.1 and 5.1 of the FAO Project Document. The activities planned during the project (e.g. formulating ecotourism business plans and PA management plans that will include livelihood/socioeconomic studies) will identify the strategies needed to enhance local socioeconomic benefits and avoid conflicts with key stakeholders. Many economic incentive mechanisms developed (e.g. agreements with private land holdings) are likely to benefit the stakeholders around PAs during and beyond the project. Some key socioeconomic benefits are briefed below.

a. Tourism: Improved practices will help in sustaining financing to PAs and local economies and promoting further eco-friendly tourism development in the future (within the carrying capacity). These sites would offer greater experience for local people not only for enjoyment but also for education of children.

b. Off-site benefits: Improved conservation outcomes within PAs and activities to control illegal activities will yield sustained off-site benefits to local people. For example, sustainable management of wetlands and marine areas will result in better maintenance of fisheries and the maintenance of water quality. This will support the livelihood of the local communities who have only limited alternatives in Trinidad and Tobago.

c. Community empowerment: Participatory approaches developed under the project are likely to enhance the social capital and will lead to deeper involvement of local people in conservation activities in future. Bringing down conflicts over resource access and management (by proper communication and participatory strategies) during the project will minimize the frictions in future.

d. Long-term jobs: At least 20 new jobs will be created by developing ecotourism. The Forest and Protected Area Fund will also contribute to the creation of long-term jobs.

e. Food security and improved livelihood: Protected area management improvements brought in by the project are likely to sustain the livelihoods of local people in PA fringes. Combining ecotourism and PA management will lead to more income-generating opportunities through sustainably managed forest/fisheries resources (e.g. craft, fish, honey, herbal remedies, food and beverage etc), micro-enterprises (e.g. wildlife farming) etc. As the consequence of interventions like controlled fishing, hunting etc., the project will ensure sustainable supply of food. At least 50 people's livelihood will be supported by sustainable use of PA resources. Alternate livelihood measures streamlined during the project will also contribute to better living standards of local people (e.g. micro-enterprises).

f. Gender equality and mainstreaming: During project preparation, two types of gender inequalities were identified in effective management of PA; (i) women have less opportunities for effective participation and representation at all levels and (ii) social standing of women are determined by males. Considering the proposals from stakeholders for improvement, this project incorporates a participatory approach integrating the perspective on gender, particularly of youth and women, in all project activities (e.g. activity 3 and 4, output 1.3.2, activity 8 output 1.3.3 etc.). The project will identify those areas/activities that require special attention to foster the active participation of women and their capacity building (e.g. activity 4 and 6, output 1.2.4). It provides opportunities for both genders to participate in PA development and decision-making pertaining to sustainable supply of PA resources. Project partners will be trained in ensuring adequate representation of gender (e.g. activity 4, output 1.2.1 and activity 7, output 1.2.3). Reporting on project activities, outputs and outcomes will also be disaggregated by gender (where applicable). The outcomes of these interventions are likely to sustain and improve the gender equality beyond project cycle.

The table below shows how the benefits delivered at national and local level will support in achieving the global environmental benefits.

| Benefit | Beneficiary | How this will support delivery of GEBs? |
|---|---|---|
| Increased employment through FPA Fund, ecotourism and other biodiversity-friendly businesses etc. | Local people living around PAs Local people who overexploit resources | This will strengthen local support for conservation of the species of global importance including the 33 species mentioned in the FAO Project Document as globally threatened, such as the globally critically endangered <i>Pipile pipile</i> . |
| Support sustainable livelihood through provision of sustainable food (fisheries, wild game meat etc.) | Local people living around PAs, regional and global users of migratory resources (e.g. fish, cetaceans, reptiles and birds) | This will prevent the overexploitation of resources and reduction of keystone species (e.g. keystone predators, dispersers, pollinators and herbivorous species) to ecologically extinct levels. This will reduce major threats (e.g. fishing, hunting etc) and increase resiliency and help in stabilizing the population of |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | globally threatened species. |
| Increased opportunities for recreation that improves the well-being of the society. | Residents of Trinidad and Tobago | Residents who are convinced of the benefits will support political commitments for prioritizing biodiversity conservation for delivering GEBs. Educational opportunities will support conservation efforts and strengthen cultural relationships with PAs and the species therein. |
| Social empowerment for local communities, user groups and environmental NGOs concerned with PAs and biodiversity conservation | NGOs/CBOs/other key stakeholders | The civil society organizations will be in a stronger position to articulate support for PAs and species of global importance, to defend the gains made in PAs management and to develop greater buy-in among their members for the process of managing globally important biodiversity. |
| Improvements in sustainable delivery of ecosystem services (freshwater, flood regulation/erosion control, shoreline protection etc) | Local people living around PAs, other residents of Trinidad and Tobago | Local stakeholders realize the relevance of these services, which will in turn increase support for conservation of globally important species/ecosystems and processes. Linking delivery of fresh water and possible PES schemes will increase the explicit value of watersheds in Trinidad and Tobago in national accounting. This may justify increases in financial allocation to actions and programmes that will lead to delivery of GEBs, including sustainable PA management and biodiversity conservation. |
| Gender equality and mainstreaming | Local people living around PAs and other residents of Trinidad and Tobago | More balanced gender representation in management of PAs and biodiversity conservation will ensure better participation of currently under-represented groups, in the management of these resources. This may strengthen the conservation efforts to deliver GEBs through increasing the range of stakeholders responsible for their resource use. |
| Stakeholders feel like owners of forests through participation in PA management | Local people living around PAs | Reduced conflicts over resource access and management reduce current threats to PA management and thus secure globally relevant biodiversity. This will also increase acceptability of approaches to engage private landowners in biodiversity conservation, by raising the acceptance of easements for biodiversity due to increased trust among stakeholders and the Government. |
| More cash income by compensation, shared benefits, corporate social responsibilities of energy companies, and other corporate users of goods and services originating from PAs | Local people living around PAs | Effective public-private partnerships will increase the acceptance of such models for managing public resources and providing better protection for globally significant biodiversity. It will attract more support from the business sector for biodiversity conservation. |
| More awareness regarding biodiversity conservation (through public education and awareness raising activities) | Local people living around PAs and other residents of Trinidad and Tobago | People will understand better the benefits of biodiversity conservation and how they can contribute to social welfare/livelihood. This will sustain the delivery of GEBs, by increasing the acceptance of financial investments in PAs and recognition of the |

Demonstrating to the public how biodiversity conservation can lead to local socioeconomic benefits (as listed above) would minimize the risks of resistance to newer restrictions and evolution of new systems.

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

Cost effectiveness is detailed in Section 2.6 of the FAO Project Document. Key elements of cost-effectiveness are described below.

1. Selecting cost-effective conservation tools: Investment in PAs pays significant down-stream dividends and safeguards species that carry great option values. Building institutional and sustainable financing improvements are the most cost-effective approach to avoid more costly conservation expenditures for habitat restoration and species re-introduction at a later stage. Following this principle, this project design includes creation of a few cost-effective conservation tools like PA management plans, ecotourism business plans, and co-management models etc., which do not exist currently in PAs.

The establishment of FPA Fund is preferable to the alternative of a one-off endowment when FPMA is established. The project will improve the capacities of the PA staff and relevant stakeholders to manage PAs effectively and develop ecotourism products. Wherever possible, training of trainers was the cost-effective approach in capacity development.

2. Better focus for GEF financing and high level of co-financing by the government: The project will build upon the existing baseline activities, national and local capacities (very limited), and available infrastructure. Co-financing commitments were sought for most of the activities during project planning to ensure country ownership. The project builds on the existing government efforts to expand the national PA system and strengthen the capacity of the institutions governing PAs to set biodiversity conservation priorities that comply with international standards. Careful consideration was therefore given where GEF funds should be invested (mostly for capacity development and bringing external expertise). Due to detailed project planning during PPG phase with diverse stakeholders, co-financing indicated in PIF went up by 142%. Considering conservation priorities set by TT and a limited project budget, the most strategic and cost-effective investments were integrated to the project design.

3. Cost-effective approach in selection of project sites: Several alternative scenarios were considered from the point of view of cost-effectiveness during project preparation like the selection of project sites. Six project sites were selected considering their ability to conserve a maximum area of key habitats and species and make conservation more efficient and cost-effective. Specifically, these areas contain important representation of several lowland and upland forest communities on both islands (Nelson, 2013), and when integrated into the proposed national system of PAs, have the potential to sustain viable populations of keystone vertebrates (e.g. the Trinidad piping guan) on the islands (Nelson, 2013). In addition, several of these areas (e.g. Matura, Caroni Swamp, Main Ridge Tobago and the North-East Tobago MPA) have traditionally been the focus of ecotourism activities in the country, and have the greatest potential for the development of economically self-sustaining management systems.

The selection of these areas was based on limiting project expenses by choosing diverse sites representing a wide spectrum of conservation challenges and opportunities so that they can act as replicable models. With the range of ecological systems represented in these 6 areas (from coral reefs and offshore islands to montane forest and seasonal lowland forests and mangrove forests and freshwater marshes) the development of management systems in these PAs will allow for management models which can be applied to all ecological systems present on both islands. Furthermore, the broad geographic distribution of the 6 pilot PAs provides for the engagement of CBOS and NGOs from both islands, and across a large number of communities in the country, potentially broadening the impact of potential benefits to the national community (with limited project costs).

At the PIF stage, only five PAs covering 35,000 ha were proposed, but during the inception workshop, the stakeholders in Tobago demanded inclusion of two more PAs, Buccoo Reef and the North-East Tobago MPA (the largest PA among the 6 proposed project sites). Further discussions with stakeholders and the Steering Committee especially considering

the limited budget and the investments required to intervene, North-East Tobago was chosen as a project site (MPA where interventions with minimal cost can have a great impact on the management within the project period - some stakeholders opined that more resources will be needed to recover the habitats in Buccoo Reef due to its degree of disturbance and the challenges of stakeholder conflict at the site). During midterm workshop in Trinidad, stakeholders demanded to add more areas to the MPA. This was considered in the project design considering little increment in adding more areas bringing greater incremental benefits to conservation/management effectiveness. Accordingly, the maps of all PAs were prepared using GIS, so that indicative areas to be demarcated during project implementation could be identified.

During terminal workshop, more areas were added to terrestrial PAs as satellite areas to be considered during project implementation. These areas included additions to the Trinity Hills PA, to reduce the edge effect of this PA and increase its area to allow for an increase in its potential populations of wildlife. At both the Matura and Nariva sites, stakeholders recommended the inclusion of the nearby beach areas as satellite areas to the proposed PAs, because of their existing and/or potential value for conservation of critically endangered marine turtle populations, and due to their value as locations for ecotourism centred on turtle protection. Again, the high incremental benefit of adding little additional investments was the rationale for adding these to the project design (as these additional areas increase the size of the six PAs by 3,434 ha). The area of six project sites increased to 98,452 ha (182% more than what was indicated in PIF) as the outcome of the stakeholder discussions during the PPG phase. These PA cost-effectiveness considerations will result in highly replicable models that adopt landscape-ecological approaches to PA management, and which provides the benefits of economies of scale.

Site selection for developing user fee system (Caroni swamp and Main Ridge reserve) was based on where this system can quite easily be implemented with minimal investments and where the benefits of conservation can be demonstrated most easily to the public (Caroni is very close to the capital city and Main Ridge is the centre of attraction in Tobago). Focusing on such "quick wins", will be catalytic in generating public and political support for conservation in the country and provide lessons learned for replication elsewhere.

4. Cost-effective approach in rejection of project sites: A Northern Range PA which includes some of the most inaccessible and undisturbed forest on the northern facing slopes of Trinidad's Northern Range, was another terrestrial PA proposed by stakeholders during midterm consultations. However, within the project resources it was found difficult to include this additional area, especially considering the complexities regarding the boundaries, management arrangements etc which may need considerable resources to intervene. In this regard this proposed PA, this was kept as "plan B" should some of the project areas chosen are dropped at a later stage, due to unforeseen reasons.

5. Cost-effective considerations in selection of activities: Careful selection of activities to be implemented and choice of implementation arrangements was also guided by cost-effectiveness. The approach in the project is to move from the current situation where the Forestry Division attempts to undertake all management actions by itself, to a model in which other stakeholders with an interest in the resource, share responsibilities for its protection and management. Training provided to project partners (including stakeholders) in strategic planning and budget management will address some of the current inefficiencies in resource utilization, and create the sense of shared responsibility for the resource. Wherever possible, training of trainers was adopted as the cost-effective approach for capacity development. Likewise, developing the public education materials and programs centrally would be more cost-effective and to focus on thematic areas of global/national importance.

6. In-kind inputs through better stakeholder engagement: Technical assistance for several outputs are expected from some NGOs (e.g. biodiversity monitoring). Their travel costs will be covered by the project budget and co-financing will cover their remuneration as agreed through MOUs between different stakeholders during project inception. This will ensure the retention of local capacity in annually occurring monitoring programmes and reducing recurring costs in future.

Two key indicators for quantifying cost-effectiveness are below.

a. Cost per hectare of GEF funding for PA management: The costs applicable to various outputs are shown in the Table below. The project will directly result in strengthened PA management across 98,452 ha of PAs and the unit cost of this is USD 10.7/ha (considering items 2, 4 and 5 in the Table below), but comparable to the levels of investment by GEF on similar projects in other Small Island States. The outputs applicable to the comprehensive PA of 214,000 ha incur a unit cost of USD 6.8/ha (considering items 1, 3 and 6 in the Table below). There is a large fixed cost associated with PA management in the country. Current annual PA management expenditure of about USD 10.7/ha in the country is very low and the ideal amount needed is USD 88/ha per year. For the basic management of PAs USD 33/ha is needed. The proposed unit cost of investment from GEF is comparable to this. Because the project involves management of mangroves and the population density in the country is considerably high in certain areas, the cost is reasonable.

| No | Project output | GEF costs- USD | Applies to |
|----|-----------------|----------------|------------|
| 1 | 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 | 165,778 | 214,000 |
| 2 | 1.1.3 | 79,250 | 98,452 |
| 3 | 1.2.1 to 1.2.4 | 688,820 | 214,000 |
| 4 | 1.3.1 to 1.3.3 | 709,105 | 98,452 |
| 5 | 2.1.1 to 2.1.3 | 270,000 | 98,452 |
| 6 | 3.1.1 to 3.2.5 | 594,282 | 214,000 |

b. Return on investments: USD 594,282 GEF investment in sustainable financing should result in a USD 100,000/year reduction in the funding gap for PA management with 17 % return on that investment in addition to the GEBs. This is realistic considering the carrying capacity of the PAs, uncertainties related to the tourism sector and negative externalities of such activities. The potential is much more as explained in Otuokon (2013). The comprehensive finance plan covering the entire 214,000 ha will build on these results. Kick starting the process of capturing the recreational value of the PAs within the social and ecological carrying capacity will bring down the funding gaps in long term. Also, the co-finance (e.g. The Green Fund) is likely to continue to address the funding gap because biodiversity will be mainstreamed through this project by involving CBOs/NGOs (whose capacities will be enhanced during the project for accessing the Green Fund).

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN

Based on the targets and indicators established in the Project Results Framework, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of progress in achieving project results will be done. M&E activities will follow FAO and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and guidelines. The project M&E Plan has been budgeted at USD 138,072 (see the table below) and the M&E programme will be put in place within the first 3 months of project implementation. The M&E system will also facilitate in learning and mainstreaming of project outcomes and lessons learned in relation to PA establishment, co-management models, ecotourism development, development of financial plans etc. Reporting on project activities, outputs and outcomes will be disaggregated by gender (where applicable).

The current M&E plan will be reviewed and updated during the project inception phase. This exercise will be led by the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA). It will involve: (i) review of the project's results framework; (ii) refining of outcome indicators; (iii) identification of missing baseline information and action 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 put in place within the first 6 months of project implementation.

Based on the revised plan and Results Matrix agreed by stakeholders during the inception workshop, an M&E Manual will be prepared. This will outline the provisions for participatory mechanisms, M&E tasks by different stakeholders and methodologies for systematic data collection and recording.

In addition to the project specific M&E system, the project will support the establishment of monitoring of biodiversity under Component 1. The biodiversity monitoring system will be managed by FPAMA/THA, with sufficient funding from their resources (to ensure sustainability).

The day-to-day monitoring of project implementation will be the responsibility of the Project Coordination Unit (PCU), led by the CTA. It will be driven by the preparation and implementation of an annual work plan and budget (AWP/B) followed up through six-monthly project progress reports (PPRs). This will represent a unified planning process between main project partners. As tools for results-based-management, the AWP/B will detail the activities proposed for the coming year and output targets to be achieved. The PPRs will report the progress of implementation of activities and achievement of output targets. AWP/B will be submitted to the PSC and to FAO for approval. PPRs will be submitted to both for review and clearance. The AWP/B will be developed in a manner consistent with the project's Results Framework.

Indicators and information sources

Indicators have been established in the Results Framework (Appendix 1 in the project document) for monitoring project outputs and outcomes. These indicators and means of verification will be applied to monitor both project performance and impact. FAO's monitoring procedures and data collected through progress reporting will track specific outputs and outcomes and flag project risks in advance.

Tracking outcomes as changes in behavior and relationships of target stakeholders may be done using the outcome mapping method to identify indicators of change. For monitoring of outcomes related to changes in the physical environment and socioeconomic conditions, specific surveys, field inspections and assessments will be carried out.

Output target indicators will be monitored on a six-monthly basis and outcome target indicators will be monitored on an annual basis. Both will be assessed also during the midterm and final evaluations.

Reports and their schedule

Specific reports that will be prepared in relation to M&E are: (i) Project inception report (ii) Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP/B); (iii) Project Progress Reports (PPRs); (iv) annual Project Implementation Review (PIR); (v) Technical Reports; (vi) co-financing Reports; and (vii) Terminal Report. GEF Biodiversity Tracking Tool completed during project preparation will be completed again at midterm and final project evaluation.

Project Inception Report: An inception workshop will be held after FAO approval of the project and signature of the GCP Agreement. Immediately after the workshop, the CTA will prepare a project inception report in consultation with FAO and other project partners. The report will include a narrative on the institutional roles and responsibilities of project partners, progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities and an update of any changes in external conditions that may affect project implementation. It will also include a detailed first year Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP/B) divided into monthly timeframes detailing the activities, outputs to be produced, progress indicators that would guide implementation, as well as a detailed budget for the first full year of project implementation. The AWP/B should also include proposals for: (i) dates and locations of specific field visits; (ii) dates and locations of PSC and other key meetings; (iii) dates and locations of workshops and training workshops to be organized; (iv) requirements for procurement, short-term contracts and consultancies, materials and operating expenses; and (v) technical support and review missions to be carried out.

The draft report will be circulated to FAO and the PSC for review and comments before its finalization before the end of the first quarter of project implementation. The revised project inception report will be reviewed and cleared by FAO (LTO and BH). The LTU will submit the final draft to the GEF Coordination Unit for final review and approval. Subsequently, the final draft will be circulated by the BH to all project partners. The final project inception report will be uploaded in FPMIS by the LTO/BH.

Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP/B): PCU (CTA) will prepare and submit to the FAO Representation in TT a draft Annual Work Plan and Budget, with the approval of PSC, no later than 10 January from project year 2. This should include detailed activities to be implemented by project outputs and divided into monthly timeframes and targets and milestone dates for output indicators to be achieved during the year. A detailed project budget for the activities to be implemented during the year should also be included together with all monitoring and supervision activities required during the year. The draft AWP/B will be reviewed by the FAO Project Task Force and the final AWP/B will be sent to

the PSC for approval and to the FAO for final no-objection. The final AWB/P will be circulated by the BH to all project partners.

Semi-annual Project Progress Reports: PCU (CTA) will prepare six-monthly PPRs and submit them to the FAO Representation in TT no later than July 31 (covering progress from January- June) and 31 January (covering progress from July to December). The report will contain the following: (i) an account of actual implementation of project activities compared to those scheduled in the AWP/B; (ii) an account of the achievement of outputs and progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (based on the indicators contained in the results framework); (iii) identification of any problems and constraints (technical, human, financial, etc.) encountered in project implementation and the reasons for these constraints; (iv) clear recommendations for corrective actions in addressing key problems resulting in lack of progress in achieving results; (iv) lessons learned; and (v) a revised work plan for the final six months of the project year. The report will also include an estimate of co-financing received from all co-financing partners. The CTA will incorporate the comments from FAO and send the final version to the FAO Lead Technical Officer who will give final approval and submit the final PPR to the GEF coordination Unit for final clearance and upload in FPMIS. The final PPR will be circulated by the BH to all project partners.

Annual Project Implementation Reviews: The FAO Lead Technical Officer (LTO) supported by the FAO Lead Technical Unit (LTU), with inputs from the CTA, will prepare an annual Project Implementation Review (PIR) covering the period July (the previous year) through June (current year). The PIR will be submitted to the GEF Coordination in TCI for review and approval no later than 31 July. The GEF Coordination will submit the final report to the GEF Secretariat and Evaluation Office as part of the Annual Monitoring Review report of the FAO-GEF portfolio. The final PIR will be circulated by the BH to all project partners.

Technical Reports: Technical reports will be prepared to document and share project outcomes and best practices. These will be disseminated to key target groups as guided by the project communication plan (section 4.7).

Co-financing Reports: PCU (CTA) will collect the required information on in-kind and cash co-financing provided by different partners shown in the Project Document. PCU (CTA) will submit a report to the FAO Representation in TT on or before 31 July (covering one year period July through June). The progress with co-finance will be compiled as a section on co-financing in each PPR, too.

GEF-5 Biodiversity Tracking Tool: The Biodiversity Tracking Tool prepared during project preparation will be submitted to GEF at CEO endorsement. This will be updated at the time of the midterm and final project evaluations updated by the PCU (CTA) in consultation with PSC and FAO. The Tracking Tool will be reviewed by FAO and the final version will be submitted to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Evaluation Office.

Project Terminal Report: Soon after the terminal workshops, a draft Terminal Report will be prepared. The report will include:

- a. a list of main outputs and outcomes achieved and summary of activities concluded including any deviations from original project document;
- b. findings of the evaluations;
- c. “lessons learned” and any recommendations to improve the efficiency of similar activities in the future and follow-up of the project.

Monitoring and evaluation plan summary

A summary of the responsibility, timing and budget for M&E is shown below.

| Type of M&E Activity | Responsible Parties | Budgeted costs | Time-frame |
|---|--|---|---|
| Two Inception Workshops | CTA in consultation with FPAMA/MEWR,THA and FAO (LTO, BH), PSC | USD 5,000 | Within two months of project implementation |
| Project Inception Report | CTA with support from FPAMA/MEWR and THA, members of the PSC. Cleared by FAO LTO, LTU, BH, and the GEF Coordination Unit | - | Immediately after two inception workshops |
| Field-based impact monitoring | CTA with support from FPAMA/MEWR and THA, members of the PSC and Project Consultants | USD 32,752 | Continually |
| Supervision site visits and assessing progress in PPRs/PIRs | CTA/FAO (LTO, LTU and GEF coordination unit) | USD 26,320 The visits of the FAO LTU, LTO and the GEF Coordination Unit will be paid by GEF agency fee. The visits of the CTA will be paid from the project travel budget. | Annual or as required |
| Semi-annual Project Progress Report (PPR) | CTA with support from FPAMA/MEWR and THA, members of the PSC and FAO (LTO and BH). | - | Six-monthly |
| Technical reports | CTA and Project Consultants, LTO and LTU | - | As appropriate |
| GEF Project Implementation Review (PIR) | LTO with inputs from CTA and support of LTU. Cleared and submitted by the GEF Coordination Unit to the GEF Secretariat | Paid by the GEF agency fee | Annually with the reporting period July to June |
| Co-financing Reports | CTA with support from co-financiers, FPAMA/MEWR and THA, members of the PSC | - | Annual |
| GEF Biodiversity Tracking Tool | CTA with support from FPAMA/MEWR and THA, members of the PSC and review by FAO (LTO, LTU and BH) | - | At mid-point and end of project |
| PSC Meetings | CTA in consultation with the Chair of PSC, FPAMA/MEWR,THA and FAO (LTO, BH) | - | Once in two months |
| Midterm evaluation | External consultant and FAO independent evaluation unit in consultation with the project team including the GEF Coordination Unit and other partners (participatory) | USD 30,000 (for external consultant). The agency fee will pay for expenditures of FAO staff time and travel | After 24 months of project implementation |
| Two Terminal Workshops | CTA, in consultation with FPAMA/MEWR,THA and FAO (LTO, BH), PSC | USD 5,000 | Three months prior to the end of project |

| Type of M&E Activity | Responsible Parties | Budgeted costs | Time-frame |
|----------------------|---|---|---|
| Final evaluation | External Consultant, FAO independent evaluation unit in consultation with the project team including the GEF Coordination Unit and other partners | USD 39 000 (for external consultant). The agency fee will pay for expenditures of FAO staff time and travel | Two months prior to the end of project implementation |
| Terminal Report | CTA with support from FPAMA/MEWR and THA, members of the PSC and FAO (LTO, BH). Cleared by FAO LTO, LTU, BH, and the GEF Coordination Unit | - | Immediately after two terminal workshops and final evaluation |
| Total Budget | | USD 138,072 | |

Note: Staff time of CTA and others not included in the above table.

Evaluations

A midterm evaluation will be undertaken at project midterm (after 24 months) to review progress and effectiveness of implementation in terms of achieving the project objective, 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 if necessary. FAO will facilitate the evaluation in consultation with the project partners. The review will, inter alia:

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

An Evaluation Specialist will be hired for conducting the midterm evaluation (which will follow a participatory process ensuring appropriate gender representation to ensure effective inputs by key project implementing partners and stakeholders).

An independent Final Evaluation will be carried out three months prior to the terminal review meeting of the project partners. This evaluation arranged by FAO would aim to identify the project impacts and sustainability of project results and the degree of achievement of long-term results. This evaluation would also have the purpose of indicating future actions needed to sustain project results and disseminate products and best-practices.

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

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

| NAME | POSITION | MINISTRY | DATE (MM/dd/yyyy) |
|----------------|--|---|-------------------|
| Dr. Joth Singh | Managing Director/CEO, GEF Operational Focal Point | Environmental Management Authority, 8 Elizabeth Street, St. Clair Port of Spain Trinidad and Tobago | 03/28/2012 |
| | | | |

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 |
| Gustavo Merino Director, Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation Department FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla (00153) Rome, Italy TCI-Director@fao.org |  | March 12, 2014 | Illias Animon, Forestry Officer, FAO | 0039 0657055297 | illias.animon@fao.org |
| Barbara Cooney FAO GEF Coordinator Email: Barbara.Cooney@fao.org Tel: +3906 5705 5478 | | | | | |

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Please see Appendix 1 (pages 85 to 100) in the FAO-GEF 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).

1. Responses to the project review comments from STAP

| Project reviewer | Response |
|--|--|
| STAP | |
| <p>While the biodiversity values of the country are described in a general manner, they are not clearly tied to the proposed outcomes and thus it is not clear how the global environmental benefits will be realized. The benefits of consolidating the national PA system and strengthening management capacity and developing supplementary funding options are more inferred than made clear.</p> | <p>Addressed in the FAO Project Document (see section 2.5 and tables 1, 7 and 8 under Appendix 12 of the FAO Project Document).</p> |
| <p>The better definition of global environmental benefits was asked for previously by GEFSEC and this element could still be improved.</p> <p>Similarly, the increasing threats to biodiversity are presented in a very general manner and are not related enough to specific intended project locations.</p> <p>There is also no provision of a baseline for the level and impact of the threats on global biodiversity values specifically. The baseline on global biodiversity values could also be improved. This certainly should be done in the course of further project development.</p> | <p>a. Global environmental benefits are better defined in section 2.5 of the FAO Project Document.</p> <p>b. Threats to biodiversity are presented in section 1.1 (parts b and c) of the FAO Project Document and the threats in project sites are also described.</p> <p>c. Establishing the baseline for global biodiversity values was attempted during PPG phase. However, due to lack of capacity of the Forestry Division staff, the fieldwork was not carried out (see Appendix 9 of the FAO Project Document). The available information concerning the baseline of globally important species was collected and is indicated in Appendix 1 in the FAO Project Document. The baseline on the global biodiversity values will be established when the capacity of the staff is built and MIS developed (as planned in the project).</p> |
| <p>The barriers are presented in two locations of the PIF, and while there is some overlap in their description, they also show some divergence. In one location, forest degradation is presented as a barrier. It is recommended that forest degradation is not a barrier but rather a result of the lack of an operational and effective policy and legal framework, among other reasons.</p> | <p>Addressed in the FAO Project Document. The barriers are clearly described in sub-section 1.1.1 (part b) of the FAO Project Document. In section 1.1 (part d) of the FAO Project Document current weaknesses are described that the project will address.</p> |
| <p>The proposed indicator for Outcome 3.1 (sustainable financing plan produced) is not an outcome indicator but rather a process indicator. Another indicator should be proposed for measuring a "sustainable financing system".</p> | <p>Addressed in the FAO Project Document. The new outcome indicator (financial sustainability score in BD Tracking Tool) is added in the Results Matrix.</p> |
| <p>Another related concern revolves around the implicit assumption that training will automatically lead to improved performance of PA and related staff. It is recommended that this should be carefully assessed and certain elements be added to actually track changes in performance of personnel vis a vis the objective of the</p> | <p>Lack of capacity is a big limitation in delivering effective PA management in Trinidad and Tobago. A capacity development plan was developed as in Appendix 11 of the FAO Project Document. Considering the comments, activities to measure effectiveness are incorporated in the</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| project and renewed and expanded responsibilities. | Work Plan (e.g. output 1.2.1 in Appendix 2 in FAO Project Document). |
| The establishment of the Forestry and Protected Area Fund will be a central element of this project and it is recommended that effort should be devoted during the PPG to assessing the lessons learned from other similar initiatives to ensure that it will actually be feasible and sustainable. Because the establishment of such a fund is central to the project's success, a "Plan B" outlining alternative options should also be considered in this regard. | The lessons learnt from other initiatives were assessed to ensure that establishing the proposed fund will be feasible and sustainable. EMA Fund and the Green Fund, as described in sub-section 1.1.4 of the FAO Project Document, are functioning now. A one-time endowment for establishment the Forest and Protected Areas Fund from the Green Fund was discussed during project preparation (see activity 1 under output 3.2.5. in Appendix 2). During the project cycle, financing of USD 132 million will be provided by GORTT after merging scattered funds employed in managing forests and PAs currently. This will be redirected to invest in PA management with a more targeted approach. Opportunities also exist to access the Green Fund which may constitute the Plan B. |
| The risk analysis is adequate although the mitigation measures proposed could be more specific, particularly in relation to the impacts of climate change and resistance to change in government agencies. | Specific mitigation measures are proposed in section 3.2 and Appendix 4 of the FAO Project Document as suggested. |

3. Responses to the project review comments from Germany

| Project reviewer | Response |
|--|---|
| Germany | |
| The proposal has undergone several fundamental changes. While it now shows more coherence than in earlier versions, some aspects are still lacking. The overall design of the interventions is rather classical, non-innovative, but might be adequate for the situation | The design suits the context because there is no well-designed PA system or clarity with respect to who does what for effective PA management. The staff are insufficient and most of them do not have required capacity to ensure management effectiveness. So, the basic interventions proposed fit well. Some innovative aspects of the project are, however, mentioned in section 2.7 in the FAO Project Document. |
| It remains unclear, however, whether implementation capacities for a new major project would be sufficient in the PA system and related actors, especially since several new initiatives are being prepared at present. Thus please highlight challenges this setting might pose for the project objective, and show how these could be addressed (i.e. via strategic cooperation with other players/sectors, additional PA staff, etc.) | Addressed in the FAO Project Document (see section 4.1) Implementation capacities for the project would be enhanced by better collaboration and coordination between various agencies and stakeholders. Multi-stakeholder steering committee, site facilitator in every project sites etc will avoid the communication gaps between the agencies while implementing the project. (see section 4.2 in the FAO Project Document) Section 1.1.3 and Table 4 under Appendix 12 in the FAO Project Document explains the participant stakeholders and their roles. Such wide participation demonstrated during the project will minimize communication gaps and ensure better coordination when the PA system will be established. The challenges under the new setting for achieving the project objective and how they could be |

| | |
|--|---|
| | addressed are explained in section 3.2 of the FAO Project Document. |
| The threats to individual PAs, the PA system, and the objective of forest carbon storage are not clearly described – governance of forest areas is vital, yet in the proposal it is identified only as a capacity issue, not as a political/societal challenge. How governance issues link to PAs and forest carbon is not evident, so please explain what the key risks and drivers in T&T are, and how project strategies plan to address these, and provide for efficient and socially inclusive management of the forests and PAs. | The threats are described in the FAO Project Document (section 1.1. part b). How the project will address the key risks and bring in efficient and socially inclusive management of PAs are explained in the FAO Project Document (section 3.2.1 and Appendix 4). |
| While apparently improvements in funding needs and financial transparency were made, many aspects remain unclear. Please describe FAO investments and strategic project-interventions in more detail (including their start and end dates, funding amounts); and specify the exact funding requirements (gap). Explain how the additional funding will lead to concrete improvement of PA management, overall efficiency of the PA system, governance aspects, and forest carbon storage. | FAO investments and interventions are explained in the FAO Project Document (see sub-section 1.1.1 and 4.3.4). The exact funding gaps are described in the FAO Project Document (see section 1.1 part d). How additional funding will lead to improvement in PA and biodiversity management is described in the FAO Project Document (see sub-section 1.1.1 part c). One notable incremental benefit of the project is sustaining and enhancing global environmental benefits achieved by consolidating the PAs (never done before and unlikely to happen in the near future, if the project is not implemented). Most of the existing areas are managed without priority for biodiversity conservation and this is likely to continue if the project is not in place. |

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

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

| PPG GRANT APPROVED AT PIF: 119,000 | | | |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i> | <i>GEF Amount (\$)</i> | | |
| | <i>Budgeted Amount</i> | <i>Amount Spent To date</i> | <i>Amount Committed</i> |
| Activity 1. Stakeholder consultations | 20,000 | 20,000 | |
| Activity 2. Review of legislation and institutional arrangements | 15,000 | 15,000 | |
| Activity 3. Collect baseline information and define options for PA management and development | 24,000 | 14,138 | 9,862 |
| Activity 4. Assess improvement needs for infrastructure, equipment and forest restoration | 10,000 | 10,000 | |
| Activity 5. Collect information required to develop a sustainable financing plan | 15,000 | 7,851 | |
| Activity 6. Assess capacity development (CD) needs, and develop a CD development plan and strategies | 5,000 | 5,000 | |
| Activity 7. Prioritizing and Planning for awareness raising and information dissemination | 5,000 | 5,000 | |
| Activity 8. Risk analyses | 9,000 | 9,000 | |
| Activity 9. Analysis of execution options, fiduciary standards assessment ¹ | 6,000 | 6,000 | |
| Activity 10. Design of project components | 10,000 | 10,000 | |
| Total | 119,000 | 101,989 2 | 9,862 |

² The cash balance of USD 7,149 will be used in PY 1 as cited in the footnote

Note: The objectives of the PPG were achieved. The consultancy reports produced during project preparation are listed in page 84 of the FAO Project Document. Six stakeholder workshops were held (three in Trinidad and three in Tobago during project preparation). The project team visited all the proposed project sites and discussed with local PA staff and stakeholders. A wide range of other stakeholders (including NGOs, hoteliers/tour operators, energy companies, Tourism Development Corporation, Environmental Policy and Planning Division, Forestry Division, Green Fund, Tobago House of Assembly, Delegation of the European Union to the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, Environment Management Authority, Water and Sewerage Authority, Central Statistical Office, University of West Indies etc.) were consulted separately to gather inputs for designing the project.

⁶ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent funds, 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 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)

