



# 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](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Conserving biodiversity through sustainable management in production landscapes in Costa Rica			
Country(ies):	Costa Rica	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	9416
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5842
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Environment and Energy (MINAE)	Submission Date:	12/21/2017
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi-focal Areas	Project Duration (Months)	60
Integrated Approach Pilot	IAP-Cities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input type="checkbox"/>	Corporate Program: SGP <input type="checkbox"/>	
Name of Parent Program	[if applicable]	Agency Fee (\$)	636,435

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES<sup>2</sup>

Focal Area Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
BD-4 Program 9	Outcome 9.1 Increased area of production landscapes and seascapes that integrate conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into management	GEFTF	3,602,968	14,035,971
LD-2 Program 3	Outcome 2.2: Improved forest management and/or restoration <sup>SEP</sup>	GEFTF	431,621	1,681,453
LD-3 Program 4	Outcome 3.1. Support mechanisms for SLM in wider landscapes established	GEFTF	431,621	1,681,453
SFM-1	Outcome 1. Cross-sector policy and planning approaches at appropriate governance scales, avoid the loss of high conservation value forests; Outcome 2: Innovative mechanisms avoid the loss of high conservation value forest. <sup>SEP</sup>	GEFTF	2,233,105	8,699,437
Total project costs			6,699,315	26,098,314

### B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

<b>Project Objective:</b> To mainstream biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management and carbon sequestration objectives into production landscapes and urban biological corridors of Costa Rica						
Project Components/Programs	Financing Type <sup>3</sup>	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co-financing
1. Favorable enabling conditions (policies, technologies, markets and finance) for delivering multiple global	TA	Enabling policy, institutional arrangements, community participation and market conditions for delivering multiple global environmental	1. Interinstitutional agreement/Ministry Decree formalizes the establishment, management arrangements, and financial sustainability of the MOCUPP as part of the Monitoring System for Land and Ecosystem Cover and Use	GEFTF	1,635,735 BD: 879,717 LD: 210,773 SFM: 545,245	6,372,282

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number remains the same as the assigned PIF number.

<sup>2</sup> When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on [GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF](#) and [CBIT programming directions](#).

<sup>3</sup> Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

environmental benefits in managed production landscapes and interurban biological corridors		<p>benefits (GEBs) in production landscapes, resulting in:</p> <p>1.1. The ability of the State to enforce the Forestry Law and generate economic incentives for maintaining ecosystem services is strengthened through:</p> <p>i) Interinstitutional agreement formalizes the National Monitoring System for Land Use Change in Production Landscapes (MOCUPP)</p> <p>ii) Eleven (11) interinstitutional agreements signed annually with the National Geo-Environmental Information System (SNIT), linking georeferenced information with land ownership data and the most recent and available satellite imagery, and available through the SNIT/MOCUPP viewer.</p> <p>1.2. Ten (10) agreements established with international buyers for the acquisition of products verified as free of loss of forest cover.</p>	<p>(SIMOCUTE), including annual monitoring of forest cover change and land degradation within agricultural production landscapes and interurban biological corridors in Costa Rica, as well as the review of current national forest policy and regulations.</p> <p>2. Agreements with 15 institutions to provide updated georeferenced information to MOCUPP through the SNIT's Geoportal and associated services on a yearly basis so imagery may be tied to land tenancy.</p> <p>3. An agreed-upon long-term inter-institutional financial sustainability strategy to fund:</p> <p>i) forest cover monitoring services provided by the Council of State Universities - Airborne Research and Remote Sensing Program (CeNAT-PRIAS) for the MOCUPP; ii) continuous updating of the national cadaster by the National Registry (DRI) so that land tenancy records are visible through the SNIT, including gender-disaggregated data; and iii) the continuous updating of the SNIT web-tool by the National Geographic Institute (IGN).</p> <p>4. 2000-2015 baseline study of total forest cover gains and losses within production landscapes.</p> <p>5. 2015 baseline study of total land cover of pastureland for cattle grazing and pineapple and palm oil crops.</p> <p>6. CeNAT-PRIAS staff trained in advanced classification techniques of satellite images and remote-sensing processing equipment and software for monitoring trends in forest cover and land use.</p>			
---	--	---	---	--	--	--

			<p>7. SNIT online map viewer is updated and enhanced with new applications for users.</p> <p>8. National repository of information for participatory ecological monitoring implemented collaboratively between public, private, and civil society stakeholders, including women, and linked to the National Ecological Monitoring Programme (PRONAMEC).</p> <p>9. 25% of the agricultural, pineapple, and pasture production units verified as free of loss of forest cover by MINAE.</p> <p>10. At least 1,000 international companies buying commodities from Costa Rica aware of the free of loss of forest cover verification.</p>			
<p>2. Multiple global environmental benefits (biodiversity conservation, reduced carbon emissions and increased carbon storage) are delivered in production landscapes in the Amistad Pacific Conservation Area (ACLA-P) buffer zone forest zone (Region 1) and in the Interurban Biological Corridor of Maria Aguilar (MAIBC) (Region 2)</p>	TA	<p><b>Region 1: ACLAP</b></p> <p>2.1. Connectivity and biodiversity conservation between production landscapes and ACLA-P's protected areas are increased over 700 ha of micro corridors and 2,000 ha of silvopastoral systems through the implementation of Landscape management tools (LMTs).</p> <p>2.2. Increase of forest cover and carbon storage within in the ACLA-P buffer zone's farms leading to:</p> <p>i) 103,100 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq biomass stocks derived from LMTs by project end</p> <p>ii) Reduction in 142,434 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq emissions in prioritized farms by project end.</p> <p>iii) Presence of key bird species in the ACLA-P</p>	<p><b>Region 1: ACLA-P</b></p> <p>1. Twenty (20) nurseries for endemic and native plant species established to support LMTs (through cofinancing).</p> <p>2. Financing of socio-productive community initiatives in the ACLA-P support the implementation of LMTs.</p> <p>3. Measurement, report, and verification (MRV) system assesses the impact of LMT on biodiversity conservation derived from the financing of the socio-productive community initiatives in the ACLA-P.</p> <p>4. Risk mapping system for the prevention of forest fires includes the classification of vegetation to determine its combustion rate.</p> <p>5. Pilot project for the implementation of the PRONAMEC in ACLA-P includes an interactive online platform for the exchange of information.</p>	GEFTF	<p>4,243,565 BD: 2,282,238 LD: 546,805 SFM: 1,414,522</p>	16,531,525

		<p>remains stable: Quetzal (<i>Pharomachrus mocinno</i>), Three-wattled Bellbird (<i>Procnias tricarunculata</i>), and Great tinamu (<i>Tinamus major</i>)</p> <p>2.3. 820 ha of avoided loss in forest cover by project end (reduction of forest cover loss from 699.9 ha/yr. to 535.9 ha/yr.)</p> <p>2.5. 50 farms verified as free of loss of forest cover</p> <p>2.6. Change in annual income per initiative and disaggregated by gender with verified increase in forest cover (baseline and targets will be determined during project implementation)</p> <p><b>Region 2: MAIBC</b></p> <p>2.7. Increase of biological diversity, forest cover and carbon storage within the MAIBC leading to:</p> <p>i) 2,050 hectares of landscape management tools (micro corridors, protection zones<sup>4</sup>, and urban green areas<sup>5</sup>) increase connectivity and conserve biodiversity within MAIBC.</p> <p>ii) 94,201 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq of biomass stocks derived from LMTs by project end.</p> <p>iii) Presence of migratory bird species in the MAIBC remains stable: Summer tanager (<i>Piranga rubra</i>) and</p>	<p>6. Land tenancy registries, disaggregated by sex, for a 50-km<sup>2</sup> area of production lands within the buffer zones of protected areas of the ACLA-P finalized and updated in the SNIT.</p> <p>7. Land suitability for forestry study for public lands or without registration ownership contributes to strengthening connectivity in landscapes of the ACLA-P.</p> <p>8. MINAE staff, municipal authorities, female and male judges, and female and male private producers informed about and trained in the MOCUPP and how to use it to enforce the Forestry Law.</p> <p>9. Environmental education program led by ACLA-P in coordination with stakeholders associated with biodiversity and forest conservation in production landscapes.</p> <p>10. Verification system for production units free of loss of forest cover designed and discussed in multi-stakeholder workshops and piloted within the ACLA-P.</p> <p>11. Local and institutional capacities for citizen participation and governance in production landscapes of the ACLA-P strengthened.</p> <p><b>Region 2: MAIBC</b></p> <p>12. Five municipalities in the MAIBC and other public entities sign joint action agreements for controlling solid waste and discharge into rivers and promoting the connectivity of urban green areas, conservation, and rehabilitation of riparian forests of the María Aguilar River and tributaries.</p> <p>13. Delimitation of protection zones in compliance with</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<sup>4</sup> River and stream banks, spring buffers, groundwater recharge areas, and catchment areas or outlets for drinking water.

<sup>5</sup> Urban parks, urban open space, tree-lined streets and avenues.

		<p>Baltimore oriole (<i>Icterus galbula</i>).</p> <p>2.2. 100% of forest cover (i.e., 147.1 ha) in the MAIBC remains by project end</p>	<p>Article 33 of the Forestry Law and Regulation includes contour maps.</p> <p>14. Protocols for interinstitutional coordination to address issues related to discharges, elimination of solid wastes and illegal constructions on the banks of the María Aguilar River formalized.</p> <p>15. Environmental assessment of the MAIBC completed.</p> <p>16. Gains and losses of forest cover within the MAIBC for years 2017, 2018, and 2019.</p> <p>17. Baseline study of urban land and forest cover (2015) as part of the MOCUPP annual monitoring of urban encroachment on natural habitat.</p> <p>18. Formalization and open audience of cadastral records by the DRI within the MAIBC.</p> <p>19. Government staff (MINAE, Ministry of Health, National Center for Geo-environmental Information [CENIGA], and National Institute of Housing and Urban Development [INVU]), authorities from five municipalities, male and female judges, women and men from the private sector, community members and other interested parties informed about and trained in the SNIT/MOCUPP and how to use it to enforce the Forestry Law and decision making in an urban environment.</p> <p>20. Eight (8) nurseries established to support the LMTs.</p> <p>21. 16,000 individuals of endemic and native species of trees and shrubs planted in MAIBC.</p>			
--	--	---	---	--	--	--

			22. Environmental education program led by SINAC for economic and social stakeholders associated with the conservation of biodiversity in the MAIBC. 23. Communications strategy for the MAIBC.			
3. Knowledge Management and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)	TA	3.1. Ten (10) documents on successful experiences about the incorporation of conservation biodiversity objectives, land management, and carbon sequestration in sustainable production landscapes and interurban biological corridors in Costa Rica. 3.2. Change in the indices about Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices (KAP; indices will be defined at the beginning of the project) as a result of awareness and environmental education at the subnational and local levels	1. The experiences and lessons learned from monitoring changes in land cover, biodiversity, carbon emissions and stocks, and gender equality and women's empowerment on production landscapes in ACLA-P systematized. 2. The experiences and lessons learned from monitoring changes in land cover, biodiversity, carbon emissions and stocks, and gender equality and women's empowerment in the MAIBC systematized in guideline documents and toolboxes to inform future urban policy. 3. Thematic studies and other knowledge documented, and communication and public awareness materials with a gender perspective produced and available for dissemination.	GEFTF	501,000 BD: 269,443 LD: 64,557 SFM: 167,000	1,951,730
Subtotal					6,380,300	24,855,537
Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>6</sup> ; BD: 171,570, LD: 41,107, SFM: 106,338				GEFTF	319,015	1,242,777
<b>Total project costs</b>					<b>6,699,315</b>	<b>26,098,314</b>

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

Please include evidence for co-financing for the project with this form.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
Recipient Government	National High Technology Center (CeNAT)	Grants	227,022
Recipient Government	National High Technology Center (CeNAT)	In-kind	559,572
Recipient Government	National Center for Geo-environmental Information Ministry of Environment and Energy (CENIGA-MINAE)	Grants	122,000

<sup>6</sup> For GEF Project Financing up to \$2 million, PMC could be up to 10% of the subtotal; above \$2 million, PMC could be up to 5% of the subtotal. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project financing amount in Table D below.

Recipient Government	National Center for Geo-environmental Information - Ministry of Environment and Energy (CENIGA-MINAE)	In-kind	5,000
Private Sector	Livestock Corporation (CORFOGA)	In-kind	31,590
Recipient Government	National Geographic Institute (IGN)	Grants	7,635,629
Recipient Government	National Geographic Institute (IGN)	In-kind	1,019,093
Recipient Government	Institute of Aqueducts and Sewers of Costa Rica (AyA)	Grants	236,885
Recipient Government	Institute of Aqueducts and Sewers of Costa Rica (AyA)	In-kind	790
Recipient Government	National Forestry Financing Fund (FONAFIFO)/ Ministry of Environment and Energy (MINAE)	Grants	10,693,000
Recipient Government	National System of Conservation Areas (SINAC)	Grants	1,219,443
Recipient Government	National System of Conservation Areas (SINAC)	In-kind	4,348,290
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>26,098,314</b>

**D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES), 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 <sup>a)</sup> (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total (c)=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Costa Rica	Biodiversity	N/A	3,602,968	342,282	3,945,250
UNDP	GEF TF	Costa Rica	Land Degradation	N/A	863,242	82,008	945,250
UNDP	GEF TF	Costa Rica	Sustainable Forest Management	SFM	2,233,105	212,145	2,445,250
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>					<b>6,699,315</b>	<b>636,435</b>	<b>7,335,750</b>

a ) Refer to the Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies

## E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS<sup>7</sup>

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	2,050 hectares <sup>8</sup>
2. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes)	120 million hectares under sustainable land management	2,700 <sup>9</sup> hectares
4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path	750 million tons of CO <sub>2e</sub> mitigated (include both direct and indirect)	339,735 metric tons <sup>10</sup>

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

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

## PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

### A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>11</sup>

A.1. *Project Description*. Elaborate on:

- 1) The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed. NA
- 2) The baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects.

1. Information regarding investments of the baseline scenario was updated during the final project design phase; this information is included in Section IV: Strategy of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.

3) The proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area<sup>12</sup> strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project.

2. A description of the project's outputs and activities is included in Section V: Results and Partnerships of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.

4) [Incremental/additional cost reasoning](#) and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF and [co-financing](#).

3. The project design is closely aligned to the original PIF. The structure of the project components closely resembles the PIF that was approved by the GEF. However, as per UNDP guidelines regarding Knowledge Management and M&E, a stand-alone Component 3 was included in the project results framework and also in the total budget and work plan. This component outlines the knowledge management strategy of the project focusing on the production of knowledge products, and the wider communication and dissemination of project lessons and experiences to support the replication and scaling-up of project results. In addition, changes were made to the project's outputs, which do not represent a departure from the

<sup>7</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> Area (ha) of improved connectivity in an urban biological corridor (i.e., MAIBC) by project end.

<sup>9</sup> Area (ha) of improved connectivity between production landscapes and protected areas in ACLA-P by project end.

<sup>10</sup> Refer to Annex P of the GEF-UNDP Project Document for calculations on the carbon benefits of the project.

<sup>11</sup> 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.

<sup>12</sup> 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.



project's strategy as defined originally in the PIF nor will they have an impact on the funds originally budgeted; these changes are described as follows:

PIF Outputs (Component 1)	Project Document Outputs (Component 1)
1. Inter-Institutional agreement / Ministerial Decree formalizes the establishment, management arrangements and financial sustainability of the National System for Monitoring Land Use Change Dynamics (SINAMODICUT) including annual monitoring of gain and loss of forest cover within agricultural production landscapes, and urban biological corridors of Costa Rica.	<p>1. Interinstitutional agreement/Ministry Decree formalizes the establishment, management arrangements, and financial sustainability of the MOCUPP as part of the SIMOCUTE, including annual monitoring of forest cover change and land degradation within agricultural production landscapes and interurban biological corridors in Costa Rica, as well as the review of current national forest policy and regulations</p> <p>The SINAMODICUT was renamed as MOCUPP; in addition, the output was rephrased to indicate that the MOCUPP is part of the national Monitoring System for Land and Ecosystem Cover and Use (SIMOCUTE).</p>
5. 2015 baseline study of total land cover of pasture, bananas, palm oil	<p>5. 2015 baseline study of total land cover of pastureland for cattle grazing and pineapple and palm oil crops.</p> <p>The output was rephrased to clarify that only pasture for cattle grazing purposes will be considered. In addition, bananas were replaced with pineapple and there are no banana plantations in the ACLA-P where the MOCUPP will be used as part of the verification of production units free of loss of forest cover (Component 2). Thus, a baseline is needed for pineapple crops, which are present in the ACLA-P.</p>
6. CONARE-PRIAS staff trained on the use of hiper-spectral cameras and remote sensor processing equipment and software for monitoring of forest and land use trends	<p>6. CeNAT-PRIAS staff trained in advanced classification techniques of satellite images and remote-sensing processing equipment and software for monitoring trends in forest cover and land use.</p> <p>CONARE-PRIAS is part of the National High Technology Center (CeNAT); the output was rephrased to reflect this for clarification purposes. In addition, the assessment of annual changes in land use using the MOCUPP will be done using advanced classification techniques of satellite images rather than images from hiper-spectral cameras.</p>
8. National repository of information for of participatory ecological monitoring implemented collaboratively between public, private and civil society stakeholders and linked to PROMEC, the National Ecological Monitoring programme.	<p>8. National repository of information for participatory ecological monitoring implemented collaboratively between public, private, and civil society stakeholders, including women, and linked to the National Ecological Monitoring Programme (PRONAMEC).</p> <p>This output was rephrased, as the PROMEC is now called the PRONAMEC. In addition, a reference to women's participation was included as part of the project's gender mainstreaming strategy.</p>
9. At least 1000 tourism sustainable tourism operators and affiliated business and community organizations trained on Ecological monitoring and Environmental Planning.	<p>This output was excluded since the focus of the project will be only agricultural and livestock sectors.</p>
10. 25% of agricultural, pineapple and pasture production units certified as deforestation free by MINAE	<p>9. 25% of the agricultural, pineapple, and pasture production units verified as free of loss of forest cover by MINAE.</p> <p>This output was rephrased to indicate that, instead of a certification scheme, the project will make use of a verification scheme as per the Government of Costa Rica's directives (Environmental Recognition</p>

	System of the Ministry of Environment and Energy – MINAE, Decree 37109).
11. At least 1,000 international companies buying commodities from Costa Rica aware of deforestation free certification	10. At least 1,000 international companies buying commodities from Costa Rica aware of the free of loss of forest cover verification.  This output was rephrased to indicate that, instead of a certification scheme, the project will make use of a verification scheme as per the Government of Costa Rica's directives (Environmental Recognition System of the Ministry of Environment and Energy – MINAE, Decree 37109).
– PIF Outputs (Component 2)	Project Document Outputs (Component 2)
<u>Region 1: ACLA-P</u>	
2. 100 farms covering X ha (to be determined at PPG phase) meeting criteria for insertion into sustainable value chains (Livestock NAMA) supported by extension support services implemented by Government, NGOs and/or private sector service providers	2. Financing of socio-productive community initiatives in the ACLA-P support the implementation of LMTs.  The project will not be limited to sustainable value chains for livestock. The new output was rephrased to include other production units (e.g., agriculture and forestry) for which LMTs will be implemented using a community-based approach.
3. Livestock NAMA MRV implemented for 100 farms	3. MRV system assesses the impact of LMT on biodiversity conservation derived from the financing of the socio-productive community initiatives in the ACLA-P.  In line with output 2 above, this output was rephrased in order to monitor and verify the implementation of LMTs using a community-based approach.
4. Forest fire prevention programme extended within ACLA-P indigenous territories	4. Risk mapping system for the prevention of forest fires includes the classification of vegetation to determine its combustion rate.  The project will not be implemented in indigenous territories; instead, a land spatial approach will be used for the prevention of forest fires in areas within the ACLA-P where fires pose a threat to biodiversity, forests, and the local population. This will also allow strengthening and training volunteer forest fire brigades as well as ensuring institutional coordination to prevent and control forest fires.
5. Biological monitoring programme operational in target areas	5. Pilot project for the implementation of the PRONAMEC in ACLA-P includes an interactive online platform for the exchange of information.  This output was rephrased to indicate that instead of a biological monitoring programme, a pilot-monitoring project will be implemented in the ACLA-P, which will be articulated into the PROMANEC. It will include an interactive online platform for the exchange of information. Lessons learned and knowledge from the piloting of this participatory biological monitoring pilot initiative will be identified and documented so that this experience can be replicated in other conservation areas around the country and to consolidate the PRONAMEC.
6. 50 Km2 of land tenancy records within ACLA-P buffer zone's productive landscapes are finalized and updated onto SNIT	6. Land tenancy registries, disaggregated by sex, for a 50-km2 area of production lands within the buffer zones of protected areas of the ACLA-P finalized and updated in the SNIT.  The output was rephrased as part the project's gender mainstreaming strategy.

Not included in PIF	<p>7. Land suitability for forestry study for public lands or without registration ownership contributes to strengthening connectivity in landscapes of the ACLA-P.</p> <p>This new output was included in order to develop a land suitability for forestry study of lands owned by the state or without registration of ownership, so that these lands can become part of the natural heritage of the state, thereby contributing to the conservation of the forests existing on the lands.</p>
Not included in PIF	<p>9. Environmental education program led by ACLA-P in coordination with stakeholders associated with biodiversity and forest conservation in production landscapes.</p> <p>This output was included in order to gain full local support for effective biodiversity and forest conservation in production landscapes, and includes enhanced knowledge, awareness-raising, and training of local stakeholders on the related topics.</p>
8. Certification system for deforestation free productive units designed, discussed through multi-stakeholder workshops and introduced at pilot level within the ACLA-P.	<p>10. Verification system for production units free of loss of forest cover designed and discussed in multi-stakeholder workshops and piloted within the ACLA-P.</p> <p>This output was rephrased to indicate that, instead of a certification scheme, the project will make use of a verification scheme as per the Government of Costa Rica's directives (Environmental Recognition System of the Ministry of Environment and Energy – MINAE, Decree 37109).</p>
9. Commodity buyers make voluntarily pledges to determine their purchasing policies based on information provided by SINAMODICUT maps (made available through SNIT)	This output was combined with Output 10.
10. Agreements/and or contracts between purchasers and farmers regarding the sourcing of products produced in accordance with the generation of GEBs.	This output was combined with Output 10.
Not included in PIF	<p>11. Local and institutional capacities for citizen participation and governance in production landscapes of the ACLA-P strengthened.</p> <p>This output was included to build local governance and promote the participation of local organizations in forest management and conservation actions in the ACLA-P's production landscapes. The output will also allow strengthen SINAC's institutional capacities to coordinate actions with municipalities and other local stakeholders for the prevention, control, and protection of biodiversity in the production landscapes of the ACLA-P.</p>
<i>Region 2: MAIBC</i>	
11. Five municipalities from the Inter Urban Biological Corridor sign agreements for joint action to control of waste and solid waste discharge into rivers, and foster the connectivity, conservation and rehabilitation of riverine forests.	<p>12. Five municipalities in the MAIBC and other public entities sign joint action agreements for controlling solid waste and discharge into rivers and promoting the connectivity of urban green areas, conservation, and rehabilitation of riparian forests of the María Aguilar River and tributaries.</p> <p>This output was rephrased to provide additional information about the nature of the agreements to be established.</p>

Not included in PIF	<p>13. Delimitation of protection zones in compliance with Article 33 of the Forestry Law and Regulation includes contour maps.</p> <p>This output was included in order to comply with Article 33 of the Forestry Law (Law N°7575, February 13, 1996), which mandates that the country's protection zones (i.e., riparian and spring buffers) should be conserved. The delimitation of protection zones will identify critical areas in the MAIBC that are in need of rehabilitation, thereby improving the forest cover in areas that are critical for improving surface water quality, enhancing connectivity, and improving habitat for resident or migratory species in an urban environment.</p>
Not included in PIF	<p>14. Environmental assessment of the MAIBC completed.</p> <p>This output was included in order to establish baseline information to support decision-making for reducing water pollution, reforestation and rehabilitation of protection zones, and to enhance connectivity in the MAIBC. It will include: a) a soil and phytosanitary analysis for the identification of protection zones, their condition, and potential areas for rehabilitation; b) identification and mapping of potential pollution sources in the watershed through an inventory of point and non-point wastewater discharges to the María Aguilar River and its tributaries; and c) a socioeconomic analysis, including measuring the perceptions and expectations of the inhabitants of the MAIBC regarding biodiversity conservation, reducing carbon emissions, and increasing carbon storage, among other environmental benefits of global and local importance.</p>
17. MINAE, municipal officials, judges and private sector trained on how to use SINAMODICUT to enforce forestry law.	<p>19. Government staff (MINAE, Ministry of Health, CENIGA, and INVU), authorities from five municipalities, male and female judges, women and men from the private sector, community members and other interested parties informed about and trained in the SNIT/MOCUPP and how to use it to enforce the Forestry Law and decision making in an urban environment.</p> <p>This output was rephrased based on the assessment of project beneficiaries in the MAIBC that was conducted during the PPG phase and as part the project's gender mainstreaming strategy.</p>
18. 20 nurseries established support the landscape management tools (target to be determined during the PPG phase).	<p>20. Eight (8) nurseries established to support the LMTs.</p> <p>The number of nurseries to be established to support LMTs in the MAIBC was reduced due to the cost and the available funding.</p>
19. 20,000 endemic and native species of trees and shrubs are planted on the Maria Aguilar Biological Corridor	<p>21. 16,000 individuals of endemic and native species of trees and shrubs planted in MAIBC.</p> <p>The number of individuals of endemic and native species of trees and shrubs to be planted was reduced since the number of nurseries to be established to support the LMTs was also reduced.</p>
Not included in PIF	<p>22. Environmental education program led by SINAC for economic and social stakeholders associated with the conservation of biodiversity in the MAIBC.</p> <p>This output was included to raise awareness among government agencies, municipalities, the private and public banking sectors, and the general public about the environmental significance of the MAIBC. The</p>

	effective conservation of the María Aguilar River watershed depends on the full support and participation of these stakeholders, including building knowledge regarding biodiversity conservation, ecosystem connectivity, and sustainable land and forest management.
Not included in PIF	23. Communications strategy for the MAIBC.  This output was included as part of a communications strategy. The project will raise awareness and promote dialogue regarding the benefits of sustainable management of the María Aguilar River watershed, especially among municipal authorities, community leaders, the Central Government, and the private sector
Changes in cofinancing	
Changes in the cofinancing include a larger contribution from FONAFIFO than originally presented in the PIF. This replaces the expected contribution at the time of the PIF from the National Water Bureau, the CRUSA Foundation, and the National Power and Light Company. Similarly, a larger contribution was obtained from the IGN, which will be used for maintenance of the SNIT web-based tool and support for strengthening the role of the SNIT within National Environmental Information System (SINIA). Also, CONARE-PRIAS is part of the National High Technology Center (CeNAT), which is included in the CEO ER as a cofinancing source rather than CONARE-PRIAS, as was originally presented in the PIF. The final total cofinancing amount is USD \$26,098,314.	

#### *Baseline Scenario*

4. Although important investments will be made under the “business as usual” scenario, these investments alone will not overcome the barriers that currently prevent conserving biodiversity through sustainable management in production landscapes in Costa Rica and the delivery of multiple global environmental benefits. The baseline programs include multiple investments that are planned for the 2018-2023 period.
5. Existing and planned investments for baseline programs and activities for the 2018-2025 time period are estimated at USD \$26,098,314.

#### *GEF Increment to Generate Global Benefits*

6. Component 1: The alternative GEF scenario will facilitate enabling conditions (policies, technologies, markets and finance) for delivering multiple global environmental benefits in managed production landscapes and interurban biological corridors. Incremental financing will be in the amount of USD \$8,008,017; USD \$1,635,735 will be provided by the GEF and USD \$6,372,282 will be provided by co-financing sources. The GEF alternative will include investments from the CeNAT, CENIGA-MINAE, IGN, and FONAFIFO.
7. Component 2: The alternative GEF scenario will deliver multiple global environmental benefits (biodiversity conservation, reduced carbon emissions and increased carbon storage) in production landscapes in the ACLA-P buffer zone forest zone and in the MAIBC. The incremental financing expected for this component is USD \$20,775,090; USD \$4,243,565 will be provided by the GEF and USD \$16,531,525 will be provided by co-financing sources. The GEF alternative will include investments from CeNAT, CENIGA-MINAE, CORFOGA, IGN, AyA, FONAFIFO, and SINAC.
8. Component 3: Knowledge management and M&E. The knowledge management strategy of the project is outlined in this component, which has a total cost of USD \$2,452,730, out of which GEF will provide USD \$501,000 and the cofinancing sources will provide USD \$1,951,730.
9. Project management costs amount to USD \$1,561,792, out of which GEF will provide USD \$319,015 and the co-financing sources will provide USD \$1,242,777. The GEF alternative has a total cost of USD \$32,797,629, 20.4% of which will be provided by GEF (excluding PPG funds).

#### 5) [Global environmental benefits](#) (GEFTF).

10. The project's global environmental benefits include:

- 4,750 ha of increased connectivity between production landscapes and protected areas contribute to the conservation of biological diversity by project end.
- 197,301 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq of biomass reserves derived from landscape management tools in the ACLA-P and the MAIBC.
- Reduction in 142,434 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq emissions in prioritized farms (ACLA-P) by project end.
- 820 ha of avoided loss in forest cover in ACLA-P by project end (reduction of forest cover loss from 699.9 ha/yr. to 535.9 ha/yr.).
- 50 farms in ACLA-P verified as free of loss of forest cover (the farms to be verified as free of loss of forest cover will be identified during project implementation; the forest area size for these farms will be determined by MOCUPP using 2015 baseline data and annual assessments of total gain and loss of forest cover within production landscapes in the ACLA-P).
- Presence of key bird species in the ACLA-P remains stable: quetzal (*Pharomachrus mocinno*), three-wattled bellbird (*Procnias tricarunculata*), and great tinamu (*Tinamus major*).
- Presence of migratory bird species in the MAIBC remains stable: summer tanager (*Piranga rubra*) and Baltimore oriole (*Icterus galbula*).

6) Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

11. An updated description of the project's innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up is included in Section VI: Feasibility, iv. Sustainability and Scaling Up of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.

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

NA

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 ☒)? <sup>13</sup>

12. The successful implementation of the project will largely depend on the effective communication and coordination with the multiple project stakeholders and the implementation of mechanisms to ensure these stakeholders' participation. The key national and subnational stakeholders include the MINAE, MAG, CENIGA, SINAC/ACLA-P, CeNAT-PRIAS, IGN, among others. At the local level, the most relevant stakeholders are the MAIBC Local Committee, municipal authorities, CSOs, private landowners, and small and medium producers. The project's Stakeholder Engagement Plan is included in Annex L of the GEF-UNDP Project Document

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 50%, men 50%)? <sup>14</sup>

13. According to the project objective and the proposed actions, it is categorized as *Gender-responsive: results addressed differential needs of men or women and equitable distribution of benefits, resources, status, and rights, but do not address root causes of inequalities in their lives*. During the PPG a Gender Mainstreaming Plan (included as Annex K) was developed to ensure gender mainstreaming in the project; specific gender-based indicators will be used for monitoring and a gender specialist will be hired to facilitate improvements on gender equality and women's empowerment.

<sup>13</sup> 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.

<sup>14</sup> Same as footnote 8 above.

*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).

14. An updated description of the project's risk is included in Annex H: UNDP Risk Log of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.

*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.

15. Institutional arrangements are described in Section IX: Governance and Management Arrangements of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.

16. In addition to coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives identified at the PIF stage, the project will cooperate with the following GIZ-funded projects in Costa Rica. The REDD+ Landscape CCAD-GIZ Program launched in 2014 supports landscape restoration processes in the Central Pacific Conservation Area (ACOPAC) in Costa Rica ("Landscape Management" [CCAD-GIZ-BMZ]). This area presents soils with significant levels of degradation as well as severe forest fragmentation in water catchment areas as a result of high pressure from agro-industrial crops in the area, along with the expansion of urban areas and poor agricultural practices. This initiative will contribute to: a) the restoration and conservation of natural springs for human consumption through payments for environmental services and municipal regulations; b) the conservation of soil and water resources in extensive livestock production areas through the application of Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) in the livestock sector; and c) the maintenance and expansion of ecosystem goods and services, promoting payment for environmental protection services, natural regeneration, establishment of agroforestry systems, and sustainable management of secondary forests. The project proposed herein will establish synergies with the GIZ in Costa Rica to promote the exchange of lessons learned, best practices, and knowledge in all these areas. To this end, the GIZ will be invited to participate as an observer of the technical committees that will be established to provide general oversight of the project proposed herein.

17. *The Implementation of the National Biocorridor Programme (PNCB) within the Context of Costa Rica's National Biodiversity Strategy* ("Biocorridor Management" [BMUB-GIZ]) aims to develop partners' capacities to maintain the biological diversity and ecosystem services in Costa Rica's biocorridors. To this end, it is supporting the National System of Conservation Areas (SINAC), local governments, and local communities to enable them to cooperatively develop and implement strategy plans for the establishment and management of networks of interlinked biotopes. A small project fund will also promote measures relating to corridor management and processes for converting agricultural production systems. Coordination with this GIZ-funded initiative will also be achieved within the context of the project's technical committees.

18. In addition to the mechanism mentioned above that will be used to promote coordinating and cooperation with the PNCB, UNDP actively participates through its country office in the implementation of Costa Rica's Biodiversity Strategy and works closely with its partners. Additional coordination and cooperation between the project proposed herein, the PNCB, and the GIZ will be achieved within this context.

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)?

19. The project will ensure the direct, free, and equal participation of all national, subnational, and local stakeholders in the planning and implementation of measures to mainstream biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management and carbon sequestration objectives into production landscapes and interurban biological corridors of Costa Rica, contributing to the welfare of local populations and the delivery of multiple global environmental benefits. At the local level, the project will provide monetary and non-monetary benefits equally to the local stakeholders independently of their condition, which will result in the following: a) increase in income of small farmers and producers resulting from the implementation of socio-productive community initiatives in the ACLA-P to support the implementation of LMTs and from 50 farms verified as free of loss of forest cover, half of which will belong to women and groups in situations of vulnerability; b) access to markets through agreements with international buyers for the purchase of products verified as

free of loss of forest cover; c) improved access to plant material for the implementation of agroforestry and silvopastoral systems, the protection waters sources, and soil stabilization through 20 nurseries in ACLA-P (through co-financing) and 8 nurseries in MAIBC to be established with project funds; and d) access to information through the MOCUPP to monitor land use/land cover changes in the production landscapes they inhabit. The number of direct beneficiaries from the implementation of LMTs and members of farms verified as free of loss of forest cover in ACLA-P will be approximately 400 persons (100 farms); and up to 25,000 urban residents that benefit from ecosystem services provided by the MAIBC, including recreation, flood control, and improved water quality, among others.

20. In addition the project will train MINAE and SINAC-ACLA-P staff, municipal authorities, judges, producers, and community members about the MOCUPP and how to use it to enforce the Forestry Law and so that they become the principal facilitators and decision makers for the conservation of biodiversity, SFM, SLM in their region. Local communities will participate in environmental education, awareness-raising, and communication programs for the conservation of biodiversity and SFM in the ACLA-P and MAIBC that will benefit up to 35,000 people.

21. Through the conservation and sustainable use of locally and globally important ecosystems (e.g., cloud forest, tropical rain forest, paramo, and wetlands) and reduced deforestation, the services these ecosystems provide (maintenance of soil quality, control of erosion, food and forest materials production, regulation of water regimes, carbon storage, climate regulation, and habitat for biodiversity) will be improved with a positive impact on the well-being of the communities that reside in the ACLA-P and MAIBC production landscapes. Finally, the project will provide lessons learned, and generate knowledge that will be used for replication and scaling-up of projects results benefiting farmers and producers, PA managers, municipal officer, among others, in other regions of the country.

*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.

22. Project Component 3: Knowledge management and M&E, outlines the knowledge management strategy for the project. This strategy includes specific outputs regarding how best practices will be documented and experiences will be shared with other biodiversity, land degradation, and SFM projects using existing information-exchange platforms. This will include the development of ten (10) documents to disseminate successful experiences for monitoring changes in land cover, biodiversity, carbon emissions and stocks, and gender equality and women's empowerment in the ACLA-P and MAIBC. In addition, the results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention area through a number of existing information-sharing networks and forums. A description of the knowledge management approach for the project is provided in Section V: Results and Partnerships of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.

## **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.:

NA


**C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:** The budgeted M&E plan is included in Section VIII: Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.



### **PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY(IES)**

#### **A. GEF Agency(ies) certification**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies<sup>15</sup> and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.

<b>Agency Coordinator, Agency Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date (MM/dd/yyyy)</b>	<b>Project Contact Person</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
Adriana Dinu, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator.		12/21/2017	Santiago Carrizosa, STA, EBD	+507 302- 4510	santiago.carrizosa@undp.org

<sup>15</sup> GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF and CBIT  
GEF6 CEO Endorsement /Approval Template-August2016

**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 VII. Project Results Framework of the GEF-UNDP 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).

Reviewer's comments	Responses	Reference in CEO Endorsement Document
<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement (FSP)/Approval (MSP): March 16, 2016</b>		
<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p> <p>By the time of CEO endorsement please include any additional biological variables that will be measured to assess the condition of biodiversity beyond the Environmental Service Index based on mammals for ACLAP and birds for MAIBC.</p>	<p>The Environmental Service Index will not be used as a measure to assess the condition of biodiversity; instead, the following indicators will be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Presence of key bird species in the ACLA-P remains stable: quetzal (<i>Pharomachrus mocinno</i>), three-wattled bellbird (<i>Procnias tricarunculata</i>), and great tinamu (<i>Tinamus major</i>).</li> <li>– Presence of migratory bird species in the MAIBC remains stable: summer tanager (<i>Piranga rubra</i>) and Baltimore oriole (<i>Icterus galbula</i>).</li> </ul>	Annex A: Project Results Framework
<b>STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF): May 11, 2016</b>		
<p>1. STAP welcomes the detailed description of the targeted areas. In the project design, STAP recommends describing the social and economic characteristics of the project sites along with the social-ecological relationships. It will be important to focus the analysis of land use change based on the relationship between people and ecosystems.</p>	<p>A description of the social and economic characteristics of the project sites along with the social-ecological relationships (i.e., land use change) is presented in Annex N: Target Landscape Profile of the GEF-UNDP Project Document, which includes current land uses for each target landscape: the ACLA-P and MAIBC.</p>	GEF-UNDP Project Document: Annex N: Target Landscape Profile
<p>2. STAP suggests undertaking an analysis of the supply and demand of ecosystem services. This would generate results that are useful for analyzing synergies and trade-offs between ecosystem services, and for targeting policies, especially for PES schemes. This type of analysis would further strengthen the project's innovativeness on advancing knowledge and learning on meeting the project objective. The project developers may wish</p>	<p>As suggested, an analysis of the supply and demand of ecosystem services was completed using a spatial multi-criteria approach, following the Locatelli, B. et al. paper suggested by STAP, which considered five variables: a) spatial distribution of the prioritized landscapes; b) land cover data (forest, forest plantations, agricultural lands) combined with potential suitability for forestry use; c) protected areas and forest cover; d) threats to ecosystems; and e) potential areas for payment for ecosystem services. This resulted in the identification of areas based on the demand for ecosystems resources for the ACLA-P and MAIBC.</p>	GEF-UNDP Project Document: Annex N: Target Landscape Profile

<p>to consult this paper for further guidance on this topic: Locatelli, B. et al. "Synergies and Trade-offs Between Ecosystem Services in Costa Rica". Environmental Conservation, 2013. <a href="https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Bruno_Locatelli/publication/258237686_Synergies_and_trade-offs_between_ecosystem_services_in_Costa_Rica/links/004635277ef0cd09ec000000.pdf">https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Bruno_Locatelli/publication/258237686_Synergies_and_trade-offs_between_ecosystem_services_in_Costa_Rica/links/004635277ef0cd09ec000000.pdf</a></p>		
<p>3. Additionally, the project developers may want to include a map that specifies the provisions and demand of biodiversity and ecosystem services based on their indicators. A spatial distribution of the ecosystem services would be beneficial for monitoring purposes, assessing the value of the ecosystem (e.g. demand of an ecosystem service is dependent on its spatial characteristics, such as number of downstream water users), and developing policies. The paper cited above can provide an example of a map of ecosystem services.</p>	<p>The results of the analysis described in the response to Comment 2 was also summarized in maps where the spatial distribution of the ecosystem services can be observed, and as suggested can be useful for monitoring purposes. These maps are included in Annex N: Target Landscape Profile of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.</p>	<p>GEF-UNDP Project Document: Annex N: Target Landscape Profile</p>
<p>4. A prominent component of the proposal is the intention to develop "deforestation-free" certification of commodities. STAP would like to see more detail on this, in particular how leakage is to be managed (in cases where other land uses are displaced), and chain of custody ensured, in a manner that is both credible and practical. Given the similarities, and UNDP's involvement, with the GEF's Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) "Taking Deforestation Out of Commodity Supply Chains", STAP recommends for UNDP to consider the</p>	<p>The project proposed herein, similar to the GEF's IAP "Taking Deforestation Out of Commodity Supply Chains" initiative, will support production and supply interventions that do not contribute to loss in forest cover, but rather increase the ability of buyers to manage the loss in forest cover in supply chains, increasing purchases from suppliers who do not cause deforestation and facilitating commercial transactions.</p> <p>Leakages will be managed through the MOCUPP, which will monitor forest cover gains and losses on an annual basis within the prioritized agricultural production landscapes of the ACLA-P. A baseline study of the total coverage of pastureland for cattle grazing and pineapple and palm oil crops will be developed and will compare changes in land use and detect leakages. The MOCUPP, in addition to serving as a tool to conduct periodic assessments of changes in the total cover of specific agricultural commodities and forests, is a tool for institutional coordination that brings together multiple partners with complementary roles and jurisdictions, and which will ensure the chain of custody. MINAE's National Geo-Environmental Information Center (CENIGA), which is responsible for the management of the</p>	<p>GEF-UNDP Project Document Section IV. Strategy.</p>

<p>methods used to address leakage, and, if appropriate, replicate them for this project.</p> <p>Additionally, STAP recommends for UNDP and Costa Rica to consider strengthening the evidence base for the effectiveness of certification programs in generating benefits (local and global). For advice on this topic, STAP recommends its advisory document "Environmental Certification and the Global Environment Facility (2010): <a href="http://www.stapgef.org/stap/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Environmental-Certification-and-the-GEF.pdf">http://www.stapgef.org/stap/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Environmental-Certification-and-the-GEF.pdf</a></p>	<p>National Environmental Information System (SINIA), will serve as the MOCUPP's institutional reference and for quality control and adherence to criteria for generating geospatial maps. The preparation of yearly maps depicting forest cover gains and losses will be done by the National High Technology Center's (CENAT's) Laboratory of the Airborne Research Program (PRIAS), which in turn forms part of the National Universities Council (CONARE). The Directorate of Real Property Registration (DRI), which belongs to the National Registry, maintains the land tenure records that can be related to the maps PRIAS generates when they are published through the National Land Information System. Finally, the National Geographic Institute (IGN) manages the National Geo-Environmental Information System (SNIT), which provides viewer services on the web for maps generated by PRIAS so they can be related to land tenure information provided by the DRI. This information will be available to the public and to national and local authorities charged with enforcing the Forest Law (SINAC/ACLA-P and municipalities), which forbids land cover changes in forests within national reserves and regulates the use of forests within private properties.</p> <p>Instead of a certification scheme, the project will make use of a verification scheme, which is more in line with producers' needs and expectations. Verification will include the establishment of a "Production Units Free of Loss of Forest Cover" (PUFL) environmental recognition within the framework of the Environmental Recognition System of the Ministry of Environment and Energy – MINAE (Decree 37109). The project will provide support to MINAE's Office for Environmental Quality Management (DIGECA) to conduct the process of regulating the environmental recognition. An impartial entity will be identified to act as an organizer of the environmental recognition and manage the logistics related to the environmental recognition using scientific-technical criteria in the evaluation (following a procedure established by Decree 37109). The project will identify producers/private owners in the ACLA-P and purchasers of those products interested in benefiting and making use of the recognition. To evaluate the economic and social benefits, studies will be conducted among farmers to analyze the changes in their annual income, disaggregated by gender, from the products of PUFLs. Based in this government directive, STAP recommends its advisory document "Environmental Certification and the Global Environment Facility (2010)" was not considered.</p>	
<p>5. Please provide further detail on the following: the strategy for reducing emissions from livestock systems; the "area-weighted Environmental Service Index"; evidence to support the proposed use of micro-corridors, live fences, silvopastoral systems documenting the benefits for connectivity and biodiversity conservation.</p>	<p>The Environmental Service Index will not be used as a measure to assess the condition of biodiversity; instead, the following indicators will be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Presence of key bird species in the ACLA-P remains stable: quetzal (<i>Pharomachrus mocinno</i>), three-wattled bellbird (<i>Procnias tricarunculata</i>), and great tinamu (<i>Tinamus major</i>).</li> <li>– Presence of migratory bird species in the MAIBC remains stable: summer tanager (<i>Piranga rubra</i>) and Baltimore oriole (<i>Icterus galbula</i>).</li> </ul> <p>Landscape management tools (LMTs; micro-corridors, live fences, silvopastoral systems, etc.) for biodiversity conservation in production landscapes are landscape elements that create or improve habitat, increase functional connectivity, or comply simultaneously with these functions to benefit the native biodiversity [Lozano-Zambrano, F. H. (ed). 2009. Herramientas de manejo para la</p>	<p>Annex A: Project Results Framework.</p> <p>GEF-UNDP Project Document Section IV. Strategy.</p>

	<p>conservación de biodiversidad en paisajes rurales. Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt y Corporación Autónoma Regional de Cundinamarca (CAR). Bogotá, D. C., Colombia. 238 p.]). The use of LMTs in GEF projects can be traced back to the <i>Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Andes Region</i> project (ID 774), which was implemented between 2002 and 2007 in Colombia, and included a landscape approach to conservation and the implementation of LMTs in Los Nevados and Iguaque National Parks and their surrounding landscapes. The contribution of this project to increasing connectivity among ecosystems previously managed separately was highlighted in a recent GEF paper: Impact Evaluation of GEF Support to Protected Areas and Protected Area Systems (GEF/ME/C.49/Inf.02 October 06, 2015). Since then, LMTs have been included in other GEF projects in Colombia, Guatemala, and Honduras, as well as proposed herein for Costa Rica.</p>	
<p>6. Please explain the often-repeated statement "Reduction in area converted annually from forest to other land use, from 21,707ha/yr to 354ha/yr, resulting in a net avoided deforestation and land degradation over the project area of 11,033ha". The arithmetic is hard to follow, the precision seems in appropriate, and the objective of reducing deforestation by over 98% - even if this is the target to be achieved after 5 years - seems unrealistic. The methodology used to calculate these estimates needs to be detailed in the project document.</p>	<p>This statement was revised and changed to the following: 820 ha of avoided loss in forest cover by project's end (reduction of forest cover loss from 699.9 ha/yr. to 535.9 ha/yr.). This corresponds to the avoided deforestation in the ACLA-P as a result of the project. The baseline was estimated based on an analysis of forest cover loss for the period 2001-2013 conducted by PRIAS-CENAT using data from the REDD+ baseline level; a reduction in loss in forest cover by 20% per year is estimated as a result of the project.</p>	Annex A: Project Results Framework
<p>7. It would be useful to provide further details on SINAMODICUT as it is intended to strengthen the effectiveness (and enforcement) of forestry regulations, and monitor land degradation. For example, further information on these issues would be useful: 1) is it a new program being established under the project?; 2) is SINAMODICUT based on satellite remote sensing?; 3) who will manage the program - there is reference in one place to a university consortium but it is unclear if this is the case; 3) on page 20, the PIF states that the project will use Landsat</p>	<p>The MOCUPP (previously the SINAMODICUT) is a tool for sustainably managing landscapes in which agricultural commodities are grown throughout the Costa Rican territory. The MOCUPP generates total land cover maps of agricultural commodities (e.g., pineapple, pasture, sugar cane, palm oil) annually using remote sensors; it also generates maps of the deforestation detected within production landscapes. These maps are published through the SNIT, which allows users to link these maps with land tenure information so they may serve to generate economic incentives for those who avoid deforestation or to process those who violate the Forestry Law. A complete description of the MOCUPP is available at the following link: <a href="http://www.mocupp.org">http://www.mocupp.org</a>. Reference is made to this website in the GEF-UNDP Project Document; a copy of a document published in 2016 describing the MOCUPP is available at the link.</p> <p>The MOCUPP was officially launched in 2016 as part of the MINAE's National Environmental Information System and the National System for Monitoring Land Use Dynamics (SINAMOCUTE). The project proposed herein will use the MOCUPP to monitor changes in forest cover in the ACLA-P and MAIBC production landscapes. The MOCUPP uses satellite remote sensing to develop maps of land cover of agricultural commodities</p>	GEF-UNDP Project Document Section IV. Strategy.

is that for SINAMODICUT?; and, 4) will Landsat imagery be adequate for the purposes of monitoring forest cover and land degradation (temporal frequency and spatial resolution)?	and forest cover loss and gain within production landscapes. For the project, LANDSAT, Rapideye, and SENTINEL images will be used to ensure the temporal frequency and spatial resolution required for monitoring forest cover and land degradation; the use of unmanned aerial vehicle (i.e., drones) will also be considered.	
8. The project developers may wish to consult the Forestry Geographic Information System (FGIS) database for component 2, and for indicator data. The FGIS database can be useful for indicators of carbon stocks, and to assess the type of tree species at a spatial scale. Further information about the FGIS database can be found in the paper: Svob, S. et al. "The development of a forestry geodatabase for natural forest management plans in Costa Rica". Forest Ecology and Management 327 (2014) 240-250. <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2014.05.024">http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2014.05.024</a>	<p>Thank you for your suggestion regarding the FGIS for indicators of carbon stocks. The carbon stocks indicators for the project were defined using Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 2006 guidelines and are based on the total area of LMTs to be implemented in each prioritized landscape:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 103,100 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq of biomass reserves derived from LMTs in the ACLA-P by project end</li> <li>– 94,201 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq of biomass reserves derived from LMTs in the MAIBC by project end</li> </ul>	Annex A: Project Results Framework
9. STAP suggests its advisory document "Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Practice (2014) may be useful in project design: <a href="http://www.stapgef.org/stap/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Mainstreaming-Biodiversity-LowRes.pdf">http://www.stapgef.org/stap/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Mainstreaming-Biodiversity-LowRes.pdf</a>	In line with the STAP advisory document, the project strategy incorporates guidance regarding: a) spatial and land use planning to ensure that land and resource use is appropriately situated to maximize production without undermining or degrading biodiversity; b) improving and changing production practices to be more biodiversity friendly, with a focus on sectors that have significant biodiversity impacts (i.e., agriculture and forestry); and c) implementing a verification/financial mechanism in one of the prioritized landscapes (ACLA-P) to incentivize farmers and producers to change current practices that may be degrading the condition of biodiversity.	Project Document, Section IV. Strategy.
10. STAP notes the following minor details that should be corrected in the project document: 1) inaccurate use of the terms "trigger" (LUC is not a trigger of biodiversity loss; rather it is the pressures leading to LUC that are the triggers) and "opportunity cost"; and, 2) reference to oil palm as a domestically-consumed crop, rather than an export crop.	As suggested, the incorrect use of the term "Trigger" was revised; in the context of the project proposed herein the main cause of biodiversity loss results from rapid and uncontrolled land use change. In addition, the inaccurate use of the term "Opportunity cost" was revised. Finally, reference to oil palm as a domestically consumed crop rather than an export crop was corrected in the GEF-UNDP Project Document.	GEF-UNDP Project Document
<b>Comments submitted by council members on the GEF June 2016 Work Program: Germany</b>		
The PIF so far does not refer to thematic synergies with two projects funded by the	The REDD+ Landscape CCAD-GIZ Program launched in 2014 supports landscape restoration processes in the Central Pacific Conservation Area (ACOPAC) in Costa Rica ("Landscape	PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION:

<p>German Government (BMZ, BMUB) dealing with “Landscape Management” (CCAD-GIZ-BMZ) and “Biocorridor Management” (BMUB-GIZ). Germany suggests analysing the cooperation potential and including it in the full proposal where appropriate.</p>	<p>Management” [CCAD-GIZ-BMZ]). This area presents soils with significant levels of degradation as well as severe forest fragmentation in water catchment areas as a result of high pressure from agro-industrial crops in the area, along with the expansion of urban areas and poor agricultural practices. This initiative will contribute to: a) the restoration and conservation of natural springs for human consumption through payments for environmental services and municipal regulations; b) the conservation of soil and water resources in extensive livestock production areas through the application of Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) in the livestock sector; and c) the maintenance and expansion of ecosystem goods and services, promoting payment for environmental protection services, natural regeneration, establishment of agroforestry systems, and sustainable management of secondary forests. The project proposed herein will establish synergies with the GIZ in Costa Rica to promote the exchange of lessons learned, best practices, and knowledge in all these areas. To this end, the GIZ will be invited to participate as an observer of the technical committees that will be established to provide general oversight of the project proposed herein.</p> <p><i>The Implementation of the National Biocorridor Programme (PNCB) within the Context of Costa Rica's National Biodiversity Strategy</i> (“Biocorridor Management” [BMUB-GIZ]) aims to develop partners' capacities to maintain the biological diversity and ecosystem services in Costa Rica's biocorridors. To this end, it is supporting the National System of Conservation Areas (SINAC), local governments, and local communities to enable them to cooperatively develop and implement strategy plans for the establishment and management of networks of interlinked biotopes. A small project fund will also promote measures relating to corridor management and processes for converting agricultural production systems. Coordination with this GIZ-funded initiative will also be achieved within the context of the project’s technical committees.</p>	<p>A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination.</p>
<p>The full final proposal should clearly incorporate a coordinating and cooperation structure with the “Programa Nacional de Corredores Biológicos (PNCB) de Costa Rica”, carried out by the National Conservation Authority (SINAC) and GIZ-Project “Apoyo a la Implementación del PNCB en el Marco de la Estrategia de la Biodiversidad de Costa Rica (2014 - 2020)”.</p>	<p>In addition to the mechanism mentioned in response to Comment 1 from the German Government that will be used to promote coordinating and cooperation with the PNCB, UNDP actively participates through its country office in the implementation of Costa Rica’s Biodiversity Strategy and works closely with its partners. Additional coordination and cooperation between the project proposed herein, the PNCB, and the GIZ will be achieved within this context.</p>	<p>PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION: A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination.</p>



## Response to GEF Secretariat Comments at CEO Endorsement

<b>Project:</b>	Conserving Biodiversity through Sustainable Management in Production Landscapes in Costa Rica	<b>GEF ID:</b>	9416
<b>Country:</b>	Costa Rica	<b>GEF Agency ID:</b>	5842

Questions	Secretariat Comment	Response	Location of changes made									
2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>December 11, 2017</p> <p>Please clarify the following issues related to the global environmental benefits presented in the logframe of the project document and the results framework of the CEO endorsement document.</p> <p>1. Table E presents the same amount of hectares for 2 different kind of corporate results. Please specify which area of land is being attributed to which corporate result to avoid double counting.</p>	<p>1. Table E was corrected to show specific corporate results. For the corporate result “Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares,” only MAIBC data will be taken into account. For the corporate result of “120 million hectares under sustainable land management,” only the ACLA-P data will be taken into account:</p> <table><tr><th>Corporate Results</th><th>Replenishment Targets</th><th>Project Targets</th></tr><tr><td>4. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society</td><td>Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares</td><td>2,050 hectares<sup>16</sup></td></tr><tr><td>5. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture,</td><td>120 million hectares under sustainable land management</td><td>2,700<sup>17</sup> hectares</td></tr></table>	Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets	4. 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	2,050 hectares <sup>16</sup>	5. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture,	120 million hectares under sustainable land management	2,700 <sup>17</sup> hectares	<p>CEO Endorsement Request: Part I, Table E</p> <p>CEO Endorsement Request: Part I, Table B (Component 2)</p> <p>GEF-UNDP Project Document: Annex P: Calculation of the Climate Benefits of the Project</p>
Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets										
4. 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	2,050 hectares <sup>16</sup>										
5. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture,	120 million hectares under sustainable land management	2,700 <sup>17</sup> hectares										

<sup>16</sup> Area (ha) of improved connectivity in an urban biological corridor (i.e., MAIBC) by project end.

<sup>17</sup> Area (ha) of improved connectivity between production landscapes and protected areas in the ACLA-P by project end.

Questions	Secretariat Comment	Response			Location of changes made
	<p>2. In table B/component 2/ Region 2: MAIBC. Currently, the outcome is stated "X ha of avoided loss in forest cover by project end".</p> <p>After a lengthy design phase at CEO endorsement we expect that the project proponent will be able to estimate all targets. While it understandable for targets to be further confirmed during year one, we need an estimated target at project start up for all outcomes that are related to the global environmental benefits.</p> <p>3. The estimate of the climate benefits needs to be more clearly explained and presented. For instance, it is not clear in the footnote 10 page 8 why the avoid emissions used to calculate the total carbon benefits (14,232.5 tCO<sub>2</sub>e/year) are the half of the result we find using the numbers provided in the explanation (28,465.0 tCO<sub>2</sub>e/year). Instead of the proposed long footnote, we suggest to add an annex presenting clearly the calculation of the climate mitigation benefits. In addition, <b>please be consistent in table B where some expected outcomes are presented on a</b></p>	<p>rangelands, and forest landscapes)</p>			
		<p>2. The outcome was revised and the following was included: 100% of forest cover (i.e., 147.1 ha) in the María Aguilar Interurban Biological Corridor (MAIBC) remains by project end.</p> <p>3. Thank your for your comment. Please see Annex P (GEF-UNDP Project Document), which presents the calculation of the climate mitigation benefits. Also, outcomes in Table B are presented for the total duration of the project.</p> <p>4. Table E was updated as follows:</p>			

Questions	Secretariat Comment	Response			Location of changes made					
	<p>yearly basis while others are for the total duration of the project.</p> <p>4. In table E, it is not necessary to provide climate benefits estimate with 2-digit precision. Please round the result to the least unit of tCO<sub>2</sub>e.</p>	<table><tr><th>Corporate Results</th><th>Replenishment Targets</th><th>Project Targets</th></tr><tr><td>4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path</td><td>750 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e mitigated (include both direct and indirect)</td><td>339,735 metric tons<sup>18</sup></td></tr></table>	Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets	4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path	750 million tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e mitigated (include both direct and indirect)	339,735 metric tons <sup>18</sup>		
Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets								
4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path	750 million tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e mitigated (include both direct and indirect)	339,735 metric tons <sup>18</sup>								
5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>December 11, 2017</p> <p>Presentation of the cofinancing in the letter from FONAFIFO/MINAE is not clear and we are not sure what is being added up to come up with the total amount in Table C of \$10,693,000. Please clarify.</p>	<p>The National Forestry Financing Fund (FONAFIFO)/Ministry of Environment and Energy (MINAE)/REDD Program Costa Rica Co-finance Letter is for a total amount of <b>\$10,693,000</b> cash co-finance, distributed as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. \$150,000 cash co-finance for land use change imagery processing for the Land Use Change Monitoring System within Production Landscapes (MOCUPP).</li><li>2. \$633,436 cash co-finance supporting the National Center for Geo-environmental Information’s (CENIGA) coordination role of MOCUPP.</li><li>3. \$909,564 cash co-finance for National System of Conservation Areas (SINAC)’s forestry monitoring.</li><li>4. \$9 million cash co-finance, which is the expected amount of PES payments to be provided to producers within the target areas of the project throughout the project’s lifespan.</li></ol>			FONAFIFO/MINAE cofinancing letter (English version)					
6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>December 11, 2017</p> <p>In SFM Tracking Tool, please include also the climate mitigation benefits from the carbon sequestration and indicate the</p>	<p>The SFM Tracking Tool was updated as suggested; the total carbon benefits (emission reductions and carbon sequestration) of the project are 339,735 tCO<sub>2</sub>-eq.</p>			Tracking Tool for GEF 6 SFM Projects					

<sup>18</sup> Refer to Annex P of the GEF-UNDP Project Document for calculations on the carbon benefits of the project.  
GEF6 CEO Endorsement /Approval Template-August2016

Questions	Secretariat Comment	Response	Location of changes made
	source (Increase of forest cover and avoided emissions).		



**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>19</sup>**

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: <b>150,000</b>			
<i><b>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</b></i>	<i><b>GETF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Amount (\$)</b></i>		
	<i><b>Budgeted Amount</b></i>	<i><b>Amount Spent To date</b></i>	<i><b>Amount Committed</b></i>
Component A: Technical review	81,000	77,000	4,000
Component B: Institutional arrangements, monitoring and evaluation	30,000	18,000	12,000
Component C: Financial planning and co-financing investments	36,000	28,000	8,000
Component D: Inception and Validation workshop	3,000	3,000	--
Component E: Completion of project documentation	--	--	--
<b>Total</b>	<b>150,000</b>	<b>126,000</b>	<b>24,000</b>

<sup>19</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities. Agencies should also report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.

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

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

NA