



REQUEST FOR CEO APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Earth Fund: Conservation Agreement Private Partnership Platform (CAPPP)			
Country(ies):	Global	GEF Project ID: ¹	4259
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	01176
Other Executing Partner(s):	Conservation International	Submission Date:	2014-04-04
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multifocal Area	Project Duration(Months)	60
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Project Agency Fee (\$):	450,000
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
(select) BD-1	Outcomes 1.1 and 1.2	Conservation Agreements PPPs (Output 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3)	(select)	3,500,000	10,000,000
(select) BD-2	Outcome 2.1	Conservation Agreements PPPs (Output 2.1)	(select)	1,500,000	5,000,000
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
Total project costs				5,000,000	15,000,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

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

Project Objective:

The goal of the Conservation Agreement Private Partnership Platform (CAPPP) proposed by Conservation International (CI) under the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) as Implementing Agency is to catalyze private sector support for conservation of biodiversity and maintenance of ecosystem services in globally important sites. The objective of the CAPPP is to demonstrate the potential for achieving biodiversity conservation and ecosystem service maintenance with private sector support through the use of conservation agreements with local land- and resource-users. Conservation agreements will be used to forge mutually beneficial links between the private sector and local communities and landowners who commit to achieve biodiversity conservation, reduce land degradation, support climate regulation efforts, and promote sustainable natural resource management.

Using the Conservation agreement approach, the Platform will engage the private sector in conservation in the following ways:

- a) Streamline product sourcing agreements between companies and communities;
- b) Develop conservation partnerships between private sector actors and communities that produce social and environmental results to meet corporate responsibility commitments; and
- c) Build capacity of small and medium enterprises to ensure increased participation in product/service supply chains that benefit conservation as well as economic development.

The project directly contributes to the overarching goal of the GEF's Earth Fund, which is to establish innovative partnerships with the private sector and to enhance private sector participation in GEF activities. The project will be implemented along the guidelines set out in the "Earth Fund CAPPP Operation Manual 5-11". It will contribute overall to achieving the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Targets 4, 7 and 14.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1.1. Conservation agreements with communities under implementation with private sector support: (Fostering sustainable supply-chains).	Inv	At least 10 conservation agreements signed between private sector partners and local communities in high biodiversity areas At least 300,000 hectares protected by agreements for product sourcing in high biodiversity areas	5 or more private sector companies engaged in supporting biodiversity conservation from areas where products are sourced 10 or more communities or land-owner groups engaged in protecting high biodiversity areas while supporting the sourcing of products for private sector companies. 300,000 hectares of high biodiversity areas protected by local communities with the involvement of private sector	GEF TF	1,100,000	5,000,000
1.2. Conservation agreements with communities under implementation with private sector	Inv	At least 15 agreements signed with local communities protecting high	10 or more private sector companies engaged supporting the conservation of high biodiversity areas with	GEF TF	1,600,000	4,500,000

support: (Readying communities to partner with the private sector to secure conservation outcomes).		biodiversity areas with private sector involvement At least 500,000 hectares protected by conservation agreements with local communities with private sector involvement	local communities. At least 15 communities engaged protecting and managing high biodiversity areas with the involvement of private sector partners 500,000 hectares of high biodiversity areas under management by local communities with the involvement of private sector partners			
1.3. Conservation agreements with communities under implementation with private sector support: (Supporting small and medium local green enterprise development).	Inv	At least 5 conservation agreements signed with communities or land-owners in support of small or medium enterprises At least 200,000 hectares protected by conservation agreements that support private sector capacity building through small and medium enterprise investments	5 or more private sector companies supported through small or medium enterprise investments conserving high biodiversity areas. 200,000 hectares of high biodiversity areas under management by small and medium enterprises	GEF TF	941,508	3,250,000
2. Knowledge management: best practice for conservation agreements as private sector engagement tool documented and shared	TA	4 Annual Learning Network Events held Conservation agreement projects profiled on CSP website (At least) 5 publications/ dissemination products produced	Private sector experience with conservation agreements documented to develop lessons learned and best practices CAPPP results widely disseminated to attract further private sector interest in the conservation agreement approach	GEF TF	587,483	1,000,000
3. Project Management: CAPPP effectively managed through sound implementation	TA	Ongoing project evaluation and review performed as per M&E plan	Project performance documented and used for adaptive management	(select)	271,009	350,000

arrangements and processes						
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
				Subtotal	4,500,000	14,100,000
				Project management Cost (PMC) ³	GEF TF 500,000	900,000
				Total project costs	5,000,000	15,000,000

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

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
(select)	As stated in the original PIF approved by GEF CEO, "... additional co-financing of [\$10,000,000] in the form of Private Sector contributions, Grants from NGOs, Foundations, Governments, Loans and other will be secured through the implementation of the platform." The target of \$10 million has been amended to \$15 million. This Project takes the form of a platform that, over the course of 5 years, will invest in sub-projects (site-based initiatives), which will be selected over time as a function of successful engagement of new private sector partners and other co-financiers. Thus, the details of co-financing sources will be determined over the course of the project implementation period, as per Earth Fund goals.	(select)	15,000,000
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
Total Co-financing			15,000,000

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

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

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNEP	(select)	Biodiversity	GLOBAL	5,000,000	450,000	5,450,000
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
Total Grant Resources				5,000,000	450,000	5,450,000

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

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	622,039		622,039
National/Local Consultants			0

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

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

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

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

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

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

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:

Initially, GEF linked Conservation International (CI) to the World Bank as Implementing Agency. After nearly four years of unsuccessful effort by CI to satisfy World Bank demands and initiate implementation of the Platform, the World Bank in November of 2012 informed CI that they no longer wished to be the Implementing Agency for this project. GEF then facilitated discussions between CI and UNEP, which have resulted in UNEP accepting the role of Implementing Agency for the CAPPP.

The project is in line with UNEP role in the GEF to catalyse the development of scientific and technological analysis for linking science to policy and advancing environmental management globally and especially in GEF financed

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

activities. In particular, the project further complements UNEP aim to promote scientific methodologies and tools that could be replicated on a larger scale by other partners and its programmatic effort to build capacity of stakeholders to conserve biodiversity and maintain ecosystem services through an ecosystem services approach. It is consistent with Ecosystem Management and Resource Efficiency thematic priorities outlined in UNEP Medium Term Strategy.

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

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: N/A

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: N/A

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives N/A

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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

Under the implementation model developed by CSP, each conservation agreement initiative follows a highly participatory process to define environmental objectives, conservation commitments, socioeconomic needs and priorities, benefit packages, and performance metrics. As a conservation agreement is an arrangement that depends on voluntary participation by community members, the implementers of a conservation agreement initiative necessarily must engage the community and ensure adherence to Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) principles. Without FPIC a conservation agreement can be neither legitimate nor robust over time.

While the stakeholder participation process for any given conservation agreement initiative can vary with respect to the particulars as a function of legal, institutional, cultural and other factors, basic elements are universal. Early in each initiative the implementer must ensure community-wide understanding of the conservation agreement model and its implications, through community meetings, targeted workshops, one-on-one follow up, cultivation of local champions, etc. Once a minimum level of awareness and understanding has been achieved, the community can decide whether or not to proceed to an agreement negotiation and design phase. If it does decide to do so, a widely inclusive process again is essential to ensure that the resulting agreement terms reflect the perspective of all or most members. Finally, once the conservation agreement has been designed, the community decides whether or not to sign and accept the commitments defined therein. After this, participation continues to be critical - in resource governance, in distribution of benefits, and in monitoring of conservation outcomes, socioeconomic impacts, and agreement compliance, as part of ongoing participatory evaluation and refinement of the agreement. In each conservation agreement supported by CSP, including those that will fall under the CAPPP, stakeholder participation will be explicitly documented. This is of interest to private sector partners as well, who want to be assured that their investments benefit communities as a whole rather than a powerful minority or elite. Indeed, an important role of actors serving as brokers between the private sector and the communities is to ensure community stakeholder participation in such a way that levels the playing field between what otherwise might be a deleteriously imbalanced relationship.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF): The socioeconomic benefits to be delivered will vary by site-based intervention, as the benefit package in each conservation agreement is negotiated and tailored to the needs and priorities of each individual community. Experience to date with conservation agreements around

the world indicates that benefit packages resulting from these processes typically include funds for education (scholarships, school supplies, teacher salary stipends), health (stocking medical supplies, arranging mobile health clinic visits), small-scale infrastructure (irrigation channels, water piping, community meeting facilities), and livelihoods (technical support for agriculture, training as wildlife monitors). Each benefit package is different, and each is subject to revision over time as implementers and communities evaluate effectiveness and evolving socioeconomic development needs and priorities. A particular concern for implementers when designing benefit packages is ensuring that 1. the package serves as a meaningful incentive for conservation-oriented behavior change to those members of the community whose resource use patterns are in conflict with biodiversity and ecosystem maintenance, and 2. the community as a whole sees the benefit package as consistent with local norms pertaining to equity and fairness. This means that the negotiation process must include specific consideration of sub-groups who otherwise might be left out, such as landless households or women. Understanding resource use roles of particular groups, such as youth/elders, farmers/hunters, or men/women, therefore is essential to design of effective benefit packages. For example, most conservation agreements include a community monitoring component as an important opportunity for people to earn individual cash benefits; implementers must design participation rosters in monitoring activities in a way that ensures that everyone has equal access to this opportunity, including women. The global environmental benefits of the project depend on 1. appropriate incentives being provided through these benefit packages at the individual, household, and community levels, and 2. these incentive structures being seen as impactful and cost effective by private sector partners such that they embrace the approach and internalize it as a standard complement to their operations.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design: As an incentive-based model, the conservation agreement approach embodies the concept of pay-for-performance. Not only does this resonate with potential private sector partners and thereby encourage them to engage in biodiversity conservation, it also imposes discipline in project design. It does so by reducing benefit packages in the event of non-compliance with conservation agreements, and persistent non-compliance results in termination of an agreement such that funds can be redirected to a different site with better performance. This dynamic guides the overall project to cost-effectiveness. Another factor that contributes to cost-effectiveness in project design is the commitment to work with local partners who are both in a strong position to build positive relationships with communities and also are able to operate with comparatively modest costs. Indeed, by issuing calls for proposals from potential implementers for specific site-based initiatives under the CAPPP, the Platform will be able to evaluate potential implementers for particular conservation agreements on the basis of cost-effectiveness as well as other criteria.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN: The project will follow UNEP standard monitoring, reporting and evaluation processes and procedures. Substantive and financial project reporting requirements are summarized in the accompanying Project Document and its Appendices. Reporting requirements and templates are an integral part of the UNEP legal instrument to be signed by Conservation International and UNEP.

The project M&E plan is consistent with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy. The Project Results Framework includes SMART indicators for each expected outcome as well as mid-term and end-of-project targets. These indicators along with key deliverables and benchmarks will be the main tools for assessing project implementation progress and whether project results are being achieved. The means of verification and associated costs are also summarized in the Project Document. Other M&E related costs are also presented in the Costed M&E Plan and are fully integrated in the overall project budget.

The M&E plan will be reviewed and revised as necessary during the project inception workshop to ensure project stakeholders understand their roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis project monitoring and evaluation. Indicators and their means of verification may also be fine-tuned at the inception workshop. Day-to-day project monitoring is the

responsibility of the project management team but other project partners will have responsibilities to collect specific information to track the indicators.

A mid-term evaluation will take place as indicated in the project milestones. The review will include all parameters recommended by the GEF Evaluation Office for terminal evaluations and will verify information gathered through the GEF tracking tools, as relevant. The project Steering Committee will participate in the mid-term review and develop a management response to the evaluation recommendations along with an implementation plan. An independent terminal evaluation will take place at the end of project implementation. The Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU) of UNEP will manage the terminal evaluation process.

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

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

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
As a global project under the Earth Fund, Focal Point endorsements are not required.			

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
Ms Maryam Niamir-Fuller, Director GEF Coordination Office, UNEP Tel: + 254 20 762 24166		02/14/2014	Mohamed Sessay	+254 20 762 4294	mohamed.sessay@unep.org

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

Strategy Narrative	Indicator	Units	Baseline	Mid-Term Target	End of Project Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Goal: Catalyze private sector support for conservation of biodiversity and maintenance of ecosystem services in globally important sites							
Project Objective: Demonstrate the potential for achieving biodiversity conservation and ecosystem service maintenance with private sector support through the use of conservation agreements with local land- and resource-users							
	Conservation outcomes consolidated in globally important sites using CAs with private sector support	# Hectares	500,000	750,000	1,000,000	CSP Grant Tracking System; Grantee Project Reports	CAs produce demonstrable conservation improvements in the sites they cover
Outcome 1: <i>Conservation agreements with communities under implementation with private sector support</i>							
1.1. Fostering sustainable supply-chains							
1.2. Ready communities to partner with the private sector to secure conservation outcomes							
1.3. Supporting small and medium local green enterprise development							
	Natural product sourcing CAs in place	# CAs	3	6	10	CSP Grant Tracking System; Grantee Project Reports	Private sector partners commit to conservation expenditure using CAs; communities agree to conservation commitments under CAs
	Corporate responsibility CAs in place	# CAs	5	10	15	CSP Grant Tracking System; Grantee Project Reports	
	SME development CAs in place	# CAs	3	4	5	CSP Grant Tracking System; Grantee Project Reports	

Outcome 2: Knowledge management: best practice for conservation agreements as private sector engagement tool documented and shared							
	Annual Learning Network event held	# Events	0	2	4	Post-event summary report	
	Information on each CA available on web	# CAs profiled on CAPPP website	0	20	30	Inventory of website contents	
	Number of publications produced	# Publications (at a minimum: guideline/how to manual; lessons learned document; training tool; dissemination material)	0	2	5	Bibliography of publications produced	
Outcome 3: Project Management: CAPPP effectively managed through sound implementation arrangements and processes							
	Annual PSC sessions convened	# Sessions	0	2	5	PSC Session minutes	
	Operational Manual Approved at first PSC session	Approval document	0	1	1	Approval document	
	Annual reports, mid-term review, and audits performed	# of reports, reviews, audits	0	(see Appendix 8)	(see Appendix 8)	Reports, reviews and audits submitted	

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).

N/A as there was no PIF with UNEP and GEFSEC is apprised of this situation.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁵

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: NO PPG FUNDS WAS USED BY UNEP			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Total	0	0	0

⁵ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

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

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

N/A