



# REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Medium-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: Conservation, management and rehabilitation of fragile lomas ecosystems in Lima			
Country(ies):	Peru	GEF Project ID:	5458
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5845
Other Executing Partner(s):	SERNANP (National Service of Natural Protected Areas)	Submission Date:	20 June 2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	BD and LD	Project Duration(Months)	60
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Project Agency Fee (\$):	188,461
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul>			

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-1	Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness new protected areas.	Output 1. New protected areas (2) and coverage (21,000 hectares) of unprotected lomas ecosystems.	GEFTF	465,000	7,019,516
BD-2	Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation.	Output 2. Sub-national land-use plans (9) that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation.	GEFTF	415,000	689,700
LD-2	Outcome 2.3: Sustained flow of services in forest ecosystems in drylands	Output 2.3 Suitable SFM interventions to increase/maintain natural forest cover in dryland production landscape	GEFTF	550,000	4,228,434
LD-3	Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities	Output 3.2 INRM tools and methodologies developed and tested	GEFTF	553,799	1,585,965
<b>Total project costs</b>				<b>1,983,799</b>	<b>13,523,615</b>

### B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: Contribute to an integrated management and protection of fragile lomas ecosystems in the Province of Lima.						
Project Components	Grant Type <sup>1</sup>	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
I. Conservation of lomas ecosystems	Inv	1. Creation of Regional Lomas Conservation Area (RLCA) with revenue stream from selected loma sites  2. Reduced pressure on	1.1 Management plan for Regional Lomas Conservation Area (RLCA) developed 1.2 Base line data for lomas ecosystems collected.	GEFTF	Total: 469,000 BD:469,000	7,019,516

<sup>1</sup> Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

		<p>lomas ecosystems through buffer zone management</p> <p>3. Improved information on lomas biodiversity</p>	<p>1.3 Demarcation of 14 loma sites</p> <p>1.4 Financing plan developed for the RLCA</p> <p>1.5 Control and security plan developed with local communities</p> <p>1.6 Control posts built for securing access to priority loma sites in the Province of Lima.</p> <p>2. Investment in infrastructure for recreation areas in selected buffer zones of protected lomas ecosystems.</p> <p>3. Biodiversity inventory of lomas ecosystems in the Province of Lima completed.</p>			
II. Land use management tools	TA	<p>1. Metropolitan Lima Municipality (MLM) approves lomas ecosystem Conservation Strategy.</p> <p>2. At least 9 local governments approve integrated biodiversity inclusive lomas ecosystem management policies, including land use zoning</p> <p>3. At least 6 public-private partnerships for lomas management strengthened and 2 new partnerships created and implemented</p>	<p>1. Lomas Conservation Strategy and management policy for lomas ecosystems developed with strong focus on biodiversity conservation and management.</p> <p>2.1 Land use management regulations established by municipalities (including integrated natural resource management (INRM) and zoning)</p> <p>2.2. 9 lomas-friendly integrated natural resource management (INRM) tools prepared and implemented through participatory process for the selected lomas</p> <p>3.1. Current public-private lomas management partnerships evaluated and options for improvement and expansion partnerships proposed.</p> <p>3.2. Personnel from municipalities, civil society organizations and private sector trained in biodiversity management, land use planning, etc.</p>	GEFTF	<p>Total: 292,234</p> <p>BD:155,298 LD:136,936</p>	689,700

III. Economic diversification and low impact land use	Inv	<p>1. Reforestation of degraded lomas (1,000 ha)</p> <p>2. Reduced impact on lomas ecosystems from ranching and mining activities.</p> <p>3. Increased visitation to selected loma sites.</p>	<p>1.1 Plan for improvement of degraded areas prepared</p> <p>1.2 At least one municipality nursery completed for local lomas tree species</p> <p>1.3 Water fog-catchers and small reservoirs built to facilitate reforestation</p> <p>1.4 Degraded area (1,000 ha) reforested with native tree species</p> <p>2.1 Rangeland and animal husbandry impact reducing management practices identified.</p> <p>2.2 Local farmers trained in management practices.</p> <p>2.3 Mining concessionaires trained</p> <p>3.1 Evaluation of tourism potential conducted</p> <p>3.2 Training local organizations</p> <p>3.3 Basic tourism facilities implemented in selected loma sites.</p>	GEFTF	<p>Total: 654,500</p> <p>LD:654,500</p>	4,228,434	
IV. Monitoring and evaluation	TA	<p>1. Permanent monitoring systems established with partnerships with local authorities, NGOs, and universities.</p>	<p>1.1 Participatory monitoring and evaluation plan developed.</p> <p>1.2 Monitoring sites established and monitored during course of project.</p> <p>1.3 Training of monitoring participants</p>	GEFTF	<p>Total: 387,720</p> <p>BD:194,620</p> <p>LD:193,100</p>	199,584	
Subtotal						1,803,454	12,137,234
Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>2</sup> – BD: 61,082 LD: 119,263					GEFTF	180,345	1,386,381
<b>Total Project Cost</b>						<b>1,983,799</b>	<b>13,523,615</b>

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

Letters confirming co-financing for the project are included with this form.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Co-financing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
Local Government	Muni. Carabayllo	Grant	\$1,128,136
Local Government	Muni. Rímac	Grant	\$321,401

<sup>2</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.

Local Government	Muni. Rímac	In-kind	\$ 6,060
Local Government	Muni. Independencia	Grant	\$1,436,718
Local Government	Muni. Independencia	In-kind	\$ 25,598
Local Government	Muni. San Juan de Lurigancho	Grant	\$ 677,768
Local Government	Muni. Villa María del Triunfo	In-kind	\$ 103,661
Local Government	Muni. Pachacamac	Grant	\$ 8,912,346
NGO	Centro de Estudios y Prevención de Desastres (PREDES)	In-kind	\$350,000
NGO	Cooperazione Internazionale (COOPI)	In-kind	\$ 25,000
CBO	Asociación Ecológica Lomas de Primavera	In-kind	\$36,621
CBO	Asociación Protectores de las Lomas y de la Flor de Amancaes	In-kind	\$28,833
CBO	Comité de Gestión para la Promoción de las Lomas de Amancaes y la Bella Durmiente	In-kind	\$38,114
CBO	Comité Ecoturístico de las Lomas de Mangamarca	In-kind	\$ 55,685
CBO	Asociación Circuito Ecoturístico Lomas de Paraíso	In-kind	\$29,091
CBO	Asociación Circuito Ecoturístico Lomas de Lúcumo (ACELL)	In-kind	\$ 35,409
National Government	National Service of Natural Protected Areas SERNANP	In-kind	\$178,174
GEF Agency	UNDP	Cash	\$135,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			\$13,523,615

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

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>b)</sup>	Total (c)=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Peru	880,000	83,600	963,600
UNDP	GEF TF	Land Degradation	Peru	1,103,799	104,861	1,208,660
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				1,983,799	188,461	2,172,260

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

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	40,000	TBD	TBD
National/Local Consultants	163,000	TBD	TBD

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

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

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### **A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>3</sup>**

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

1. The Convention on Biological Diversity was ratified by Peru in 1993. Over the next several years a series of legislation was enacted related to the protection, management and sustainable use of biodiversity: Law for Conservation and Use of Biodiversity (1997), Law of Protected Areas (1997), National Biological Diversity Strategy (2001), Environmental Law (2005), National Environmental Policy (2009) and its 2011 – 2021 Action Plan.
2. Under Chapter 2 (Conservation of Biological Diversity) of Peru’s Environmental Law (2005), Article 99 defines lomas as fragile ecosystems, further indicating that special protection measures need to be adopted for these types of ecosystems. In Peru’s fourth national communication on the application of the Convention on Biological Diversity (2010), lomas are highlighted for their species richness and endemism. Since neither provides specific examples of measures to employ in order to protect lomas, the project will be instrumental in defining and implementing practical strategies to complement these.
3. The project is aligned with the following strategic objectives of the National Biological Diversity Strategy (NBDS) Action Plan, approved in 2014<sup>4</sup>: The project is aligned with the following strategic objectives of the NBDS Action Plan: (i) SO1: Improve the state of biodiversity and maintain the integrity of the ecosystems services it provides, (ii) SO3: Reduce direct and indirect pressures on biological diversity and its ecosystem processes, (iii) SO4: Strengthen the sustainable management of biodiversity capacities at the three levels of government, and (vi) SO6: Strengthen cooperation and participation of all sectors of society in the governance of biological diversity.

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

4. The project is seeking to incorporate into protection status critical lomas ecosystems from which important global environmental benefits are derived. These actions, together with the design and implementation of management plans, financing plans, and mainstreaming loma biodiversity considerations into sub-national land use plans are consistent with the core outputs of outputs of GEF 5 focal areas BD-1 and BD-2.
5. The project is consistent with BD Objective 1’s focus to improve sustainability of protected area systems with an emphasis on expanding the area under protection, improving financial sustainability and effective management of the national ecological infrastructure. In particular, GEF support will focus on strengthening the legal framework and corresponding institutional capacity to establish a Regional Conservation Area as well as a Private Conservation Area and the corresponding Management Plan, Financial Sustainability Plan and Surveillance Strategy. As such, the project will provide the legal, financial and institutional foundations to expand the cohort of protected areas in Peru and thereby ensure that globally-significant biodiversity and ecosystems in 21,000 hectares of the lomas of Lima will be conserved and sustainably used.
6. With regards to BD-2, Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors, the project will support the elaboration of sub-national land-use plans (9) that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation through the following suite of activities:
  - a) Developing policy and regulatory frameworks that provide incentives for biodiversity-friendly land and resource use in the fragile lomas ecosystems of Lima that remains productive but that does not degrade biodiversity;
  - b) Spatial and land-use planning to ensure that land and resource use is appropriately situated to maximize production without undermining or degrading biodiversity in Lima’s lomas;
  - c) Improving and changing production practices to be more biodiversity friendly with a focus on sectors that have significant biodiversity impacts (animal husbandry, tourism, and mining).

---

<sup>3</sup> For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

<sup>4</sup> DS N° 009-2014-MINAM

7. The results of the project's BD focus will ultimately contribute to Peru's achievement of Aichi Targets 5, 11, 12 and 14. Specifically, Peru has committed in its NBSAP to reducing the degradation of its fragile ecosystems, including lomas, as a means to contribute to Aichi Target 5. This project will also contribute to Aichi Target 11 by increasing area of the lomas ecosystem under formal protection. Through initially supporting the conservation of pre-identified endemic species, as well as supporting biological inventories and monitoring, the project will contribute to conserving threatened species (Aichi Target 12). Particularly through the project's Component 3, local communities will benefit from the enhancement of ecosystem services, including water resources, fodder for livestock and ecotourism (contribution to Aichi Target 14).
8. In relation to GEF 5's land degradation focal area, the project is aligned with **LD-2 and LD-3** core outputs by seeking to generate sustainable flows of lomas ecosystem services and reduce pressures on lomas from competing land uses, particularly through interventions aimed at increasing forest and vegetation cover, development of integrated land management plans, dissemination of good practices and management technologies, and improved livestock management.
9. For LD-2, GEF support will focus specifically on land management options that increase and maintain agricultural productivity and deliver multiple environment benefits at the landscape scale in the lomas (Component 3), particularly in the context of addressing livelihood needs of affected communities with an emphasis on the different gender roles between women and men and the important role of women.
10. With regards to LD-3, GEF support will focus on the mainstreaming of integrated natural resources management criteria in the land use tools adopted by 9 local governments (Component 2) in coordination with efforts to scale-up policies, practices, and incentives for improving production landscapes with environmental benefits, and will encourage wider application of innovative tools and practices for natural resource management at scale (Component 3). This includes innovations for improving soil health, water resource management, and vegetation cover in production landscapes systems in Lima's lomas to benefit land users most vulnerable to land degradation. Women are often the most vulnerable to such degradation, but are also the most active in some lomas and can therefore offer local innovations for sustainability. Therefore the specific roles of men and women in these systems will be considered.
11. Finally, this project will contribute to multiple SDGs, including those related to environmental well-being, sustainable cities and communities, poverty reduction and job creation, and gender equality. For example, the project's indicators related to increased areas of lomas under protection and the reduction of pressures and threats to their well-being, are aligned with SDG 15's focus on halting and reducing land degradation as well as biodiversity loss. The project will also support the concept of Sustainable Cities and Communities by promoting strategies to incorporate the lomas ecosystem and the services it provides into local integrated, sustainable development plans. In addition, the project's local beneficiaries will be engaged in sustainable economic activities through which historically marginalised communities can perceive social and economic benefits from the sustainable management of lomas (SDG 8: Sustainable economic growth and employment).

### **A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:**

12. The Government of the Republic of Peru requested UNDP's assistance for the design and implementation of this project owing to UNDP's wide experience in the conservation of Peru's globally-significant biodiversity and ecosystem services. At present, UNDP supports the formulation and implementation of GEF projects in the field of sustainable land management and conservation. UNDP also has a wide experience in integrated policy making, development of human resources, institutional strengthening, and non-governmental community participation.

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

13. The Project Document contains substantially expanded information and analysis regarding the baseline project and problem issues. This represents a strong and well-reasoned platform for project implementation. This GEF project was originally conceived under the previous Metropolitan Lima Municipality (MLM) administration, whose main contribution was the development of the technical dossier for the creation of a Regional Conservation Area for lomas and actions to develop participatory management of these fragile ecosystems. With the change in administration came a change ownership of the project to National Service of Natural Protected Areas (SERNANP), due to its expertise in establishing and supporting protected areas and the relevant management mechanisms (i.e. Management Plans). Moreover, in the time between PIF approval and ProDoc submission, several municipal districts and CSOs have initiated grassroots-level conservation and ecotourism endeavors. District municipalities

with lomas in their jurisdiction have become very active and surpassed the commitment originally envisioned of the MLM administration in pursuing this initiative, as reflected in the co-financing (Table C, above). As such, the Baseline section of the ProDoc has been extended to include these recent initiatives. However, the core challenges identified during project preparation are not substantially different from those identified in the original PIF.

14. The final project design is aligned with the original PIF; it preserves its main objective, strategy and structure. However, small adjustments were made to the project framework based on analyses and discussions with project partners and key stakeholders during the PPG, aiming to improve precision in outputs and indicators so as to best achieve the outcomes and the overall objective.
15. The **barriers** to achieving the long-term solution to the degradation of the lomas ecosystems include legal, institutional and capacity weaknesses:
  - (a) No formal protection of lomas ecosystems: While *lomas* are categorized as fragile ecosystems in Peru's environmental law, very few areas have formal protection status. In particular, no formal protection status exists for those lomas found in the Province of Lima.
  - (b) Inadequate land use management tools: Current zoning and land-use management tools do not properly recognize and manage the human settlement dynamic in the lomas areas, as they lack adequate zoning regulations and criteria specific to the distinctive features of these areas. Present zoning regulations are limited to traditional residential or productive use modalities without any criteria related to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services provided by fragile lomas ecosystems. This is due, in part, to overlapping institutional mandates and a lack of detailed information regarding the unique characteristics of the lomas biodiversity and ecosystem services.
  - (c) Prevalence of high-impact economic activities: Given the current zoning regulations, the lomas ecosystems are under constant siege by grazing livestock, non-mineral mining activities, and urban encroachment that is gradually advancing changes in land use.
16. To address the barriers mentioned above, the project will support a multi-pronged approach in collaboration with key local, regional and national stakeholders comprised of the strengthening of the institutional framework related to the conservation and sustainable use of fragile lomas ecosystems, the establishment of conservation areas, and economic diversification including low-impact productive activities (e.g. ecotourism, sustainable agriculture/pastoral practices, and low-impact mining).
17. **Project Objective and Components:** The objective of the project is to protect, conserve and sustainably manage the lomas ecosystems in the Province of Lima<sup>5</sup>. With GEF support and cofinancing, the project aims to promote improved conditions for the conservation of these rare and fragile ecosystems which support a number of globally significant species and to decrease the risks of their degradation. In doing this, the project will work with local stakeholders to formalize and strengthen successful local community ecosystem management efforts, as well as promoting the replication of these to other loma sites. To achieve these objectives, the project is structured along a series of strategic initiatives. An urgent first step is to establish protected areas for the core lomas ecosystems in the Province of Lima. The protected areas will be complemented by extensive demarcation of the buffer zones and the provision of low impact recreational facilities between urban fringes of the city and the protected areas, as well as investments in vegetation recovery in key areas of the lomas' area of influence. A series of governance tools will also be developed in parallel to further encourage a participatory approach to an integrated management of the lomas and will be accompanied/ supported by an Interinstitutional Alliance<sup>6</sup> for the Conservation of Lomas with roles and responsibilities articulated and functioning. These activities will be supplemented by a participatory monitoring component.
18. **Outcome 1. Lomas ecosystems conservation and protection system:** The aim of this component is to support the creation and implementation of formalized protected areas and low impact recreational areas in the buffer zones as a means of diminishing the threats to Lima's core priority lomas ecosystems. The component will support the creation

---

<sup>5</sup> Per the 2002 Organic Law of Regional Governments (Ley Orgánica de Gobiernos Regionales) and the 2003 Organic Law of Municipalities (Ley Orgánica de Municipalidades), the Metropolitan Lima Municipality (Municipalidad Metropolitana de Lima-MLM) is the regional and provincial government of Lima Province. As such, to avoid confusion to the reader, this document refers to the Municipality of Lima.

<sup>6</sup> Possible members of the Alliance could include: UNDP, SERNANP, Province of Lima, MINAM, MINCU, MINCETUR, MINAGRI, MINEDU, local government officials, private sector, academia, NGOs and civil society.

of Lomas Conservation Areas (Regional Conservation Area-ACR and other modalities, i.e. Private Conservation Area-ACP) covering approximately 21,000 ha by project end, each with their corresponding Management Plan, Financial Sustainability Plan and Surveillance Strategy (as defined with the communities). One of the selected lomas - Lomas de Lachay - is home to *Caesalpinia spinosa*, *Capparis prisca*, *Senna birostris* and *Carica candicans*, together with a dense accumulation of epiphytes. At the same time, the lomas are important components of migratory bird routes (e.g. *Athenecunicularia*, *Nothoprocta pentlandii*, *Sparverius peruvianus*, etc.). Furthermore, their genetic information could prove valuable for understanding resilience to arid conditions.<sup>7</sup> An Alliance for Zero Extinction site is one of the lomas included in the project (Atocongo is situated within the districts of Villa Maria del Triunfo, Lurin and Pachacamac). These lomas are the last remaining habitat of *Melanomys zunigae* (Zuniga's Dark Rice Rat) which is listed as Critically Endangered (possibly extinct). Ultimately, in addition to improving the protection of threatened species, the project also aims to reduce local species extinction.

19. **Outcome 2. Land use management tools:** A number of threats to Lima's fragile lomas ecosystems are related to the lack of adequate zoning regulations, lack of information and management plans related to the lomas, and unclear definition of roles and responsibilities among different stakeholders, among others. The objective of this component is to develop integrated land use management tools and participatory processes for an effective management of Lima's core lomas ecosystems, conservation areas and their adjacent buffer zones, taking into consideration biodiversity aspects, ecosystem services, integrated natural resources management (INRM) and competing land uses.
  20. **Outcome 3. Economic diversification and low-impact land use:** The threats of over-grazing, unregulated mining concessions and other activities have an important impact on the quality of the lomas ecosystems. Through this component, the project will work hand in hand with local stakeholders to reforest 1,000 hectares of degraded loma areas with native lomas species; develop and promote sustainable animal husbandry and grazing practices; as well as develop regulation and enforcement mechanisms for mining concessions, and thereby support the adoption of low-impact practices. (See Annex A for more detailed information regarding specific interventions in each of the selected lomas.) Experiences with reforestation and grazing management in the lomas of Lachay and Atiquipa will be integrated into the design of specific interventions, per the specific characteristics of the selected lomas.
  21. **Outcome 4. Monitoring and evaluation:** Working together with local universities and NGOs, the project will monitor key indicators to gauge the health of the lomas ecosystem and establish a permanent mechanism for participatory monitoring, in conjunction with local municipal district authorities and the Ministry of Environment. The project will build upon the dispersed efforts of individual institutions and organizations, i.e. SERFOR has 9 individual factsheets on lomas flora and fauna. To accomplish this, the project will support the elaboration of a participatory Monitoring Plan for the conservation and sustainable use of lomas ecosystems, as well as vulnerability/impact from CC. This will be followed by the establishment of 14 permanent monitoring sites (one per loma), training of local monitors, and periodic monitoring. This component will also finance the development and implementation of an integral lomas communication strategy (paper and virtual) and citizen mobilization campaign with a gender and youth focus. It will also support the terminal evaluation of the project and ensure the compilation and distribution of lessons learned for future replication in other priority lomas areas.
- 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:
22. The GEF's incremental funding and co-funding resources will be used to overcome the barriers mentioned above and in detail in the Project Document. While lomas are categorized as fragile ecosystems in Peru's environmental law, very few areas have formal protection status. In particular, no formal protection status exists for those lomas found in the Province of Lima. In response to this, several local communities have pursued dispersed and limited conservation and sustainable use activities, but without a cohesive and coherent base to guide them. Without the project, it is expected that these limited actions would continue but would be insufficient to effectively conserve and safeguard the globally-important biodiversity and ecosystem services provided by the Lomas of Lima. The project increment will support the formalized protection through conservation and permitted mixed uses of the areas, with regard to established thresholds and carrying capacity. The current public policy framework is inadequate to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of Lima's lomas. As such, the Project provides the increment necessary to lay

---

<sup>7</sup> Peru. 2010. Cuarto Informe Nacional sobre la Aplicación del Convenio de Diversidad Biológica. Ministerio de Ambiente.



the foundations of the long-term public policy regarding the use and conservation of fragile lomas ecosystems, encouraging activities that restore degraded areas and ensure long-term survival of the lomas and the ecosystem services they provide. Additionally, regulatory and administrative measures arising from this Project, will establish a favorable regulatory environment so that current and future development is done in harmony with the unique characteristics of the lomas ecosystems, thereby ensuring the conservation of globally-important biodiversity, the ecosystem services they provide, and viable low-impact economic activities for local communities.

**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:

23. The following table presents the Risks identified as well as the Mitigation measures to be implemented by the project.

Project risks					
Description	Type	Impact & Probability	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status
Urban encroachment continues to affect lomas ecosystems	Regulatory Environmental	P = 3 I = 4	Creation of 2 lomas conservation areas (Regional Conservation Area in Group 1 and Private Conservation Area in Group 2) in will limit the expansion of urban areas in strategic fragile lomas ecosystems.  The capacity of local (regional, municipal/district) authorities of 9 local governments will be strengthened to implement rigorous land use regulations which limit impact on lomas ecosystems.	PCU	Increasing
An increasing number of non-metallic mining permits are authorized by the Ministry of Mines and Energy and district municipalities leading to further degradation of lomas ecosystems.	Regulatory Strategic Environmental	P = 3 I = 3	Mining concessions are required to develop an EIA and implement mitigation actions in compliance with the permit granted by MINAM. The project will promote coordination between the Ministry of Energy and Mines, Ministry of Environment, Metropolitan Lima Municipality and district municipalities in order to ensure the effective implementation of existing regulations for mining activities in the lomas areas of influence.	PCU	Increasing
Local authorities do not promote a sustainable management of the lomas ecosystems.	Political Regulatory	P = 2 I = 3	A series of activities will be promoted by the project in order to engage local authorities, along with concerned citizen groups, to increase awareness and empowerment with the issues surrounding lomas management. The project will facilitate the development of land use policies, management plans and other tools. For example, Component 2 will support the elaboration of a Lomas Conservation Strategy, as well as local planning and management mechanisms.	PCU	TBD
Carrying capacity of lomas ecosystems surpassed by tourism interest generated.	Environmental	P=1 I=2	As part of Component 3, the project will support the elaboration of an analysis of the tourism potential of the lomas ecosystems and the corresponding carrying capacity to ensure adequate strategies and plans for public use of the areas.	PCU	TBD

Climate related disasters affect livelihoods and fragile ecosystems in Lomas	Environmental	P=2 I=2	The project will promote measures to decrease the negative impact of climate related events through the improved ecosystem services associated with disaster reduction. For example, the reforestation and restoration of 1000 hectares of degraded areas in Component 3 will prevent “huaycos” (landslides) and/or decrease their impact.	PCU	Increasing
------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------	------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	------------

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

24. As an integral part of the National Portfolio, the project has natural links with the other initiatives in the Biodiversity and Land Degradation focal areas, with direct institutional and thematic links with initiatives such as:

- The UNDP/GEF project “Transforming Management of Protected Area/Landscape Complexes to Strengthen Ecosystem Resilience” (5152) will provide support so that climate change effects are adequately addressed through the management of the National Protected Areas System. As a complement to the Lomas Conservation project, capacities will be strengthened at the national level within SERNANP to improve planning and monitoring instruments for protected areas.
- The UNDP/GEF project “NAP Alignment LD Enabling Activity” (5417) aimed to develop a National Action Plan to address desertification through a strengthened policy framework that would guide land use management decisions in the Lomas ecosystem. Therefore, the Lomas Conservation project provides an opportunity for implementing the NAP.
- The UNDP/ BMUB project “Ecosystem Based Adaptation in Amazonia” (5021) is an International Climate Initiative-financed project that generates lessons learned as well as methodologies for how to incorporate ecosystem-based climate adaptation measures into protected areas management. In addition, a co-management model is being developed that can provide inputs into participatory and co-management of other ecosystems in Peru, such as the fragile ecosystems of the Lomas of Lima.
- The UNDP/EU/ Governments of Germany and Switzerland, Biodiversity Finance Initiative – “Building Transformative Policy and Financing Frameworks to Increase Investment in Biodiversity Management (BIOFIN).” BIOFIN has supported the introduction of policy guidelines into the National Public Investment System that facilitates public investment in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, as well as ecosystem restoration. BIOFIN will design pilot public investment projects to apply the new policy guidelines as well as generate lessons learned. One of these pilots will focus on the conservation of the Lomas ecosystem, providing experience that can be built upon in this GEF Lomas Conservation project.
- IDB GEF6 initiative “Sustainable Cities – Lima” envisages establishing environmental corridors through an urban green areas system allowing connectivity of biodiversity and ecosystems between the Costa and Loma border. Both projects are complementary in time, as well as focus in terms of connecting biodiversity/ecosystems and collaborating in the promotion of ecofriendly activities to boost sustainable local development of Lima Province.

25. The project will also build on the institutional and financial bases established through the following closed GEF projects:

- The IBRD/GEF project “National Trust Fund for Protected Areas” (GEF ID 438), which provided the seed money for the Trust Fund for Conservation of Peru's Parks and Protected Areas (FONANPE)
- The IBRD/GEF project “Strengthening Biodiversity Conservation through the National Protected Areas Program” (GEF ID 2693).

26. All of these initiatives are complementary and should provide opportunities for synergy in the biodiversity portfolio. Notwithstanding the above, it was determined that the coordination mechanisms between the stakeholders participating in the execution of the Project should be generated jointly, taking into account the conditions, interests and needs of such stakeholders. The project will work with current GEF initiatives under implementation to share data and establish coordination mechanisms. Several coordination mechanisms will be utilized to ensure synergies between the projects. As part of the proposed project, a multi-stakeholder advisory committee will be convened, ensuring that all private and public stakeholders involved in the Lima Lomas can be informed of project status as

well as provide input to project strategies and actions. It is expected that the IDB-administered Sustainable Cities initiative will be an active participant in this space. The Lomas Conservation project will participate actively in an EBA working group initiated and led by SERNANP, together with UNDP, WWF and other partners. The purpose of this space is to share best practice and align strategies to strengthen climate change management as part of NPA administration. The Lomas Conservation project will also participate in a coordination group convened by the Ministries of Economy and Finance and Environment, oriented towards identified synergies and aligning international cooperation in support of strengthening public investment in environmental and climate management. Finally, the Lomas Conservation project's Management Unit will coordinate closely with other UNDP- supported projects, ensuring synergies through joint planning exercises and information-sharing.

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

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

27. The project will be implemented following UNDP's National Implementation modality (NIM), according to UNDP the Country Programme agreed upon between UNDP and the government of Peru. The **Implementing Partner** for this project is the National Service of Natural Protected Areas (SERNANP), given its role as the national public entity responsible for protected areas establishment and administration. The Implementing Partner is responsible and accountable for managing this project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of UNDP resources.
28. The Ministry of Environment, **MINAM**, is environment sector head: its purpose is environmental conservation so as to foster and ensure rational, sustainable and ethical use of natural resources thereby ensuring that present and future generations enjoy a balanced environment suitable for the development of life. MINAM includes a number of institutions of key importance for the project, particularly SERNANP. SERNANP coordinates closely with others MINAM institutions such as the General Directorate of Climate Change, Desertification and Water Resources and the General Directorate of Biological Diversity<sup>8</sup>, which are responsible for the national policies on climate change and biodiversity, and are linked to regional and local governments in relation to the promotion of climate change and biodiversity management within the frameworks of regional CC and BD strategies with the aim of supporting the scaling up of measures of resilience, adaptation and risk management, as well as the lessons that will be learnt by the project. The National Meteorological Service (SENAMHI) and the IGP also play important roles in relation to information management and research. As GEF focal point, and responsible party for national environmental and natural resource policy, MINAM will provide guidance on participatory management of lomas ecosystems, as well as technical input on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, all key elements for the design of the project.
29. Attached to MINAM, **SERNANP** is responsible for directing and establishing technical and administrative criteria for PA conservation and for the maintenance of biological diversity. SERNANP is the governing body of the National System of Protected Areas (SINANPE) and works in coordination with regional and local governments and private conservation areas. It has generated significant experience and lessons learnt in relation to PA management and CC adaptation. In its role as Normative Technical Authority, it coordinates with regional and local governments and the owners of private conservation areas. It executes Budget Programme 0057 (Conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of natural resources in Protected Natural Areas). SERNANP is the principal implementation partner of the Project and as such will be responsible for general oversight of project execution.
30. The Ministry of Energy and Mines (MINEM) is responsible for awarding mining licenses throughout the country. The type of mining found in the lomas is of non-metallic material for construction. The materials extracted by formal and informal businesses are coarse sand, fine sand, gravel, crushed stone - all in significant volumes to supply the real estate growth of the city of Lima. The project consulted MINEM during the design of activities related to managing mining permits and reducing its impact on the lomas ecosystems. MINEM, specifically the Directorate of Mining Environmental Affairs, is fully aware of the project's intent to establish an ACR of 10,540 hectares. The Ministry understands the threats and degradation occurring in and around the lomas, and is supportive of the need to conserve the lomas, including the delimitation of the areas selected by the project. Discussions will be ongoing to ensure proper coordination with the project in recognition that it is a key player in

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.minam.gob.pe/cambioclimatico/>, <http://www.minam.gob.pe/diversidadbiologica/>

the consolidation of ownership of the lomas due to the existence of mining concessions in most of the lomas selected by the project.

31. The Metropolitan Lima Municipality (MLM) and is responsible for environmental management in the Province of Lima jurisdiction, and will provide technical inputs to some of the project components, e.g. guidance on land use zoning requirements, and dialogues with other District governments with co-management responsibilities over the lomas ecosystem areas.
32. There are 19 District Municipalities with management responsibilities over lomas ecosystems in their jurisdictions. They will play a key role in bringing together local stakeholders (citizen groups and private sector) to identify key needs and constraints for implementing local participatory mechanisms for lomas ecosystem management and conservation.
33. Several citizen groups and private sector companies (for example, Conservación de Lomas de Villa María del Triunfo, Cementos Lima, Fundación Atocongo, San Fernando, Grupo Comando Ecológico, Conciencia para el Desarrollo Sostenible and Asociación Circuito Turístico de Lomas de Lúcumo) are already involved or have potential to be involved in the co-management of lomas ecosystems. During design these groups and others were invited to participate in discussions related to co-management and sustainable use of lomas ecosystems, identifying opportunities for collaboration and actions needed by municipal authorities, civil society and the private sector to implement co-management arrangements.
34. Two universities in Lima (Universidad Nacional Agraria – La Molina and Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos) have prior research experience in the lomas ecosystem and will be involved in the design of biodiversity studies and monitoring arrangements for the lomas ecosystems. In particular, their involvement will be related to the detailed characterization to be done of the 14 lomas that have been prioritized by the project in Outcome 1. It is envisioned that these interventions will include assessments performed as part of university theses and/or research required to support the creation of areas of conservation.
35. Furthermore, there are a number of NGOs and CBOs that are active in the Lomas:

<b>NGO</b>	<b>Lomas Site</b>	<b>Activities</b>
Center for Studies and Disaster Prevention (PREDES)	Lomas de Amancaes (Sector Independencia)	Focus disaster risk reduction in the buffer zone through reforestation and protection infrastructure. Implementing a project ending in March 2017, granted with 1M USD supported by USAID.
Ecotourism Association of Lomas de Lúcumo (ACELL):	Lomas de Lúcumo, Pachacamác	Successfully implementing a tourism experience based on public - private management of 150 ha since 2003.
Cooperazione Internazionale (COOPI)	Lomas de Amancaes en el Rímac.	Member of CARE Peru and IRD French Research Institute; focus on disaster risk management based on territory, population and governance, in Rimac and in the buffer zone of Lomas Amancaes.
Grupo GEA Desarrollo Sustentable	Lomas de Lurín y Pachacamác	Experience in strengthening the management of Lomas de Lucumo and training of the populations of the buffer zone, building basic infrastructure to provide tourism services, with the support of Italy and Peruvian Funds.
Centro de Investigación, documentación y asesoría poblacional los (CIDAP):	Lomas de Carabayllo	Focus on resolving Water and Sanitation issues linked to environmental matters. Promoted the "green lomas", and elaborated the first Lomas diagnosis in 2008, in collaboration with other stakeholders.
<b>CBO</b>	<b>Lomas sites</b>	<b>Activities</b>
Comité de Gestión Bella Durmiente	Amancaes	Experience in reforestation in buffers zones, and the vision to provide tourism services
Comité Ecoturístico de Lomas de Mangamarca	Mangamarca	Aims at raising awareness of the importance of San Juan de Lurigancho Lomas, joint efforts with municipality to prevent human settlement and invasions

Comite Ecoturistico de Lomas de Paraíso	Villa Maria del Triunfo	Provide ecotourism service and visitor guides during the Spring season since 2013; in 2015 received 2,000 visitors.
Comité Ecoturistico de Lomas de Primavera	Lomas de Carabayllo	Provide guide service in Loma del Paraiso, in 2015 received 750 people
Asociacion Protectoras Ambientales de la Flor y la Loma de Amancaes	Lomas Amancaes-Distrito Rímac	Perform advocacy at the local government level to defend the lomas from invasions; flora restoration and reforestation activities

**B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):**

36. The project will assist community organizations to work with local governments (regional, municipal/district) to develop and implement sustainable land-use plans that incorporate biodiversity and lomas ecosystem conservation criteria to ensure the regularization of uses and management of the natural resources found in the lomas, thereby ensuring the sustainability of livelihoods. For example, the project will support the development of participatory management mechanisms of biodiversity in fragile lomas ecosystems, including the adoption of sustainable agriculture and livestock management practices, ecotourism, and low-impact non-metallic mining. The project will also facilitate the communities' active engagement in lomas governance. The project has a highly participatory approach that will promote participation, inclusion and exchange of lessons/capacities among users and stakeholders. The main tool will be a community of practice in which participants participate equally in a collective learning exercise to address a common problem (i.e. exploitation and degradation of lomas BD and ecosystems, and their management/governance). There are specific actions to support the building of human and social capital, and to promote multi - level dialogue and coordination among key actors (e.g., herders, farmers, tourism operators, mining companies, environment authorities, regional and municipal/district governments). Consequently, it is expected that local stakeholders will benefit from (i) their strengthened participation in decision-making processes, ultimately building partnerships and trust among them; and (ii) recuperation and conservation of important lomas BD and associated ecosystems to ensure the delivery of ecosystem services that provide an important resource for resilience to climate risks and associated disasters:
- a) Ecosystem restoration would benefit approximately 4,200 families involving 21,000 people in the medium term of the project and approximately 42,000 people at the end of the project.
  - b) In relation to sustainable grazing, currently 5 families comprising 25 people are involved in regulated grazing practices. It is expected that at project end there would be 10 families involving 50 people. It is important to note that these are the shepherds who appear during a specific period and install themselves until the end of the season before retiring from the lomas.
  - c) With regard to tourism services, 62 families involving 310 people are expected to be engaged by the mid-term and 122 families at the end of the project, involving a total of 610 people.
37. The project considers direct beneficiaries as those people living in the buffer zone of the lomas actively in project activities, while indirect beneficiaries are human settlements that are located near the lomas, who would benefit from improvements in basic services designed to serve visitors to the lomas (i.e. improved sanitation infrastructure for visitors improves the general environment of nearby settlements).
38. Furthermore, this project strives to be “*gender responsive*”<sup>9</sup> in as much as it has a strong base to implement a highly participatory approach and incorporates actions to promote gender equality and women’s empowerment. In the project’s scope of action, women participate in a variety of functions, including guardians of their local lomas, tourism operators, and agriculture/livestock management, among others. During the dialogue processes and field visits of the PPG, the communities stressed the active participation of women in the conservation of lomas. Furthermore, most civil society groups are led by women and are instrumental in including the issue of lomas conservation in the local agendas. Organized communities of Lomas of Amancaes (District Rimac) and the Lomas of Mangamarca (San Juan de Lurigancho) are headed by women and in the other lomas they serve as part of the

<sup>9</sup> Per the gender results effectiveness scale included in the UNDP evaluation of gender mainstreaming in UNDP: Gender responsive: results addressed differential needs of men or women and equitable distribution of benefits, resources, status and rights but did not address root causes of inequalities in their lives.

board/governance structure (Lomas de Lucumos, Villa Maria del Triunfo and Amancaes-Independencia). **In fact, within current grassroots organizations doing surveillance activities, 60% are women and 40% are men.**

39. In general, the current work strategy to strengthen the active participation of women in the selected lomas places a strong emphasis on initiatives related to tourist services. As such, the project will work to encourage their continued engagement in lomas governance. The integration of women in the communities of practices, as well as their integration into decision-making processes will be promoted in the project. For example, as part of Outcome 2: Land Use management tools, the planning instruments (Policies, Plans and budgeting) for Lomas conservation will incorporate a gender responsive approach by ensuring that vulnerable groups' and women' needs and perspectives are reflected in decision-making processes. As part of Outcome 3, a survey will be conducted to determine the needs of tourism operators and service providers, taking into account particular needs of women and young people to develop their livelihoods, as well as calculate the potential increase of tourism activity in selected lomas and the carrying capacity limits of the ecosystem with regards to increased activity. Women are often the most vulnerable to ecosystem degradation, but are also the most active in some lomas and can therefore offer local innovations for sustainability. Therefore, the specific roles of men and women in these systems will be considered in the development of the Lomas Conservation Strategy and local management plans/planning mechanisms. Furthermore, the project has a gender-sensitive project results framework with specific gender markers included in Indicators #2, #15, and related markers in #8, #9, #13.

#### *Innovation*

40. The project is innovative due to its multi-focal, integrated approach to conserving the fragile lomas ecosystems while promoting economically viable sustainable practices for local communities to maintain their livelihoods. Additionally, while individual lomas communities have pursued separate initiatives to conserve, protect and manage their local lomas, this project is the first of its kind to bring together 14 lomas in a coordinated effort.
41. The project design has been carefully developed to ensure environmental, social, institutional and financial sustainability. Specifically, the project will ensure the proponents and relevant stakeholders have the necessary capacity to continue to implement the interventions without GEF financing once the project is completed, as well as ensure lessons learned are incorporated into broader stakeholder initiatives. A Sustainability Plan will be prepared before the mid-term review so that stakeholders can agree on the plan and focused capacity development activities can be carried out with sustainability of different specific components in mind.

#### *Environmental Sustainability*

42. The project will promote practices that reduce the threats to the fragile lomas ecosystems of the Province of Lima. The project will support a Lomas Conservation Strategy and land use management tools to establish conservation areas covering 21,000 ha. and sustainable practices in the buffer zones of the lomas, with consideration for the lifecycles of endemic flora and fauna, as well as the carrying capacity limits of the ecosystem with regards to productive activities. Furthermore, 1,000 ha. that have already suffered degradation will be restored through reforestation of native lomas species. As such, the unique biodiversity of the lomas and ecosystem services that they provide will be safeguarded.

#### *Institutional Sustainability*

43. Institutional sustainability will be supported by building the capacity of at least 9 local governments to elaborate and implement land use management mechanisms that include criteria for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services provided by fragile lomas ecosystems. SERNANP and MLM will gain experience and capacity in the process of managing the design, approval and implementation of different modalities of conservation areas as well as their monitoring.

#### *Social Sustainability*

44. The project design includes various elements to ensure social sustainability. The project will seek an agreement (i.e. Memorandum of Understanding) with local municipalities to implement specific activities in the priority lomas, as well as with grassroots organizations and NGOs. Their involvement in key project activities ensures greater potential for sustainability. Capacity building at the local level will focus on training tourism service providers, livestock ranchers, local monitors, surveillance groups, and others. A survey will be conducted to determine the needs of tourism operators and service providers, for example, taking into account particular needs of women and

young people to develop their livelihoods. The results of this survey will guide the project's efforts to provide training of local tourism organizations with an emphasis on gender and youth, including training and exchange of experiences of local artisans, tour guides, business administrators, restaurateurs, etc. In this regard, the project has a strong base to implement a highly participatory approach and incorporates actions to promote gender equality and women's empowerment. In addition, the project will fund the production and dissemination of user-friendly material on the environmental regulations and codes of practice in place.

#### *Financial Sustainability*

45. An important focus of the project is creating an enabling environment for alternative economic activities and enhanced monitoring that is financially sustainable and realistic. As such, the project will facilitate the promotion and adoption of low-impact grazing and mining practices, as well as calculate the potential increase of tourism activity in selected lomas with respect to the carrying capacity of the lomas biodiversity and ecosystems. Furthermore, the Conservation Areas will include a Financial Sustainability Plan to accompany their Management Plans.

#### *Potential for Scaling up*

46. The project has the potential to establish a model for community engagement in the conservation of fragile and delicate ecosystems around the world. The Lomas of Lucumos provides an interesting model for community engagement in the conservation of fragile lomas ecosystems. It requires local actors to be empowered by the need to protect these areas and perceive some benefit. The best way to achieve this is to involve them in the management of the lomas' conservation and ensure this mechanism is recognized by the competent authorities, such as MLM, SERNANP or directly by the Ministry of Environment (MINAM).
47. This form of management has a high degree of replicability as seen in CBOs in Lomas de Villa María del Triunfo, Carabayllo, Lomas Amancaes and Lomas de Mangomarca. Indeed, these CBOs have come to understand that, despite their resource limitations, their efforts to defend the lomas from high impact activities (e.g. grazing, squatters), they can transform the lomas into an opportunity for providing ecotourism services, and can thereby generate revenue to continue to fulfill this task.
48. While this has not yet been recognized as an official mechanism for participatory management processes, there is an interest and commitment to developing actions that help strengthen grassroots organizations from local governments and designated authorities.
49. Likewise, to achieve sustainability of lomas conservation actions, it will be important for local governments to consider planning strategies that incorporate specific conservation criteria. The Municipality of Ancon has done this in coordination with the Ministry of Environment through the creation of Raymundi Antonio National Park. There is a lot of potential for these processes to be scaled up within MINAM and SERNANP to encourage their replication in other municipal districts in and around the Lomas.

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

50. In line with the GEF Council's guidance on assessing cost-effectiveness of projects (Cost Effectiveness Analysis in GEF Projects, GEF/C.25/11, April 29, 2005), the project development team has taken a qualitative approach to identifying the alternative of best value and feasibility for achieving the project objective. Cost-effectiveness will be promoted through a range of strategies, including the following:
- Working with existing organizations (especially NGOs) in the project areas, as delivery mechanisms for project support to local stakeholders. This will take advantage of the capacities that these partners have already installed in the target areas, and their established relations with local stakeholders and regional institutions, which will mean that the project will not have to invest from scratch in the establishment of these capacities and relations.
  - Promoting the active and real participation of local stakeholders and their organizations, both in the project itself and in the land management and monitoring strategies that it will seek to establish, with an emphasis on the win-win of the project's interventions in support of ecosystem stability. This will result in these stakeholders collaborating with the project rather than entering into a costly and unproductive adversarial relation in which conservation goals are viewed as externally imposed and contradictory to their needs and priorities.

- Wherever possible, developing the capacities of existing entities (such as SERNANP and MLM) and mainstreaming issues of BD conservation and Lomas ecosystem integrity, as well as GEBs into existing instruments and mechanisms (such as development and spatial plans), rather than developing new entities or instruments specifically aimed at these issues.
  - Promoting inter-institutional collaboration and joint planning in order to realize opportunities for synergies and reduce inefficiencies associated with duplication of effort or contradictions in approaches.
  - Lessons learned from baseline projects will be incorporated so that GEF resources can be targeted in the most efficient manner.
  - Cost effectiveness will be monitored as an integral part of the monitoring and evaluation process. The project budget provides for independent financial auditing on a yearly basis.
51. Finally, cost effectiveness is ensured through a prescribed project management process that will seek the best-value-for-money. UNDP rules employ a transparent process of bidding for goods and for services based on open and fair competition and selection of best value and best price alternatives. Procurement will be managed by UNDP in coordination with SERNANP to ensure the application of all effective regulations. An independent committee is utilized for all procurement of personnel and selection of contractors.



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

52. The project results as outlined in the project results framework will be monitored annually and evaluated periodically during project implementation to ensure the project effectively achieves these results.
53. Project-level monitoring and evaluation will be undertaken in compliance with UNDP requirements as outlined in the [UNDP POPP and UNDP Evaluation Policy](#). The UNDP Country Office will work with the relevant project stakeholders to ensure UNDP M&E requirements are met in a timely fashion and to high quality standards. Additional mandatory GEF-specific M&E requirements (as outlined below) will be undertaken in accordance with the [GEF M&E policy](#) and other relevant GEF policies<sup>10</sup>.
54. In addition to these mandatory UNDP and GEF M&E requirements, other M&E activities deemed necessary to support project-level adaptive management will be agreed during the Project Inception Workshop and will be detailed in the Inception Report. This will include the exact role of project target groups and other stakeholders in project M&E activities including the GEF Operational Focal Point and national/regional institutes assigned to undertake project monitoring. The GEF Operational Focal Point will strive to ensure consistency in the approach taken to the GEF-specific M&E requirements (notably the GEF Tracking Tools) across all GEF-financed projects in the country. This could be achieved for example by using one national institute to complete the GEF Tracking Tools for all GEF-financed projects in the country, including projects supported by other GEF Agencies.<sup>11</sup>

### **M&E Oversight and monitoring responsibilities:**

55. **Project Manager:** The Project Manager is responsible for day-to-day project management and regular monitoring of project results and risks, including social and environmental risks. The Project Manager will ensure that all project staff maintain a high level of transparency, responsibility and accountability in M&E and reporting of project results. The Project Manager will inform the Project Board, the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF RTA of any delays or difficulties as they arise during implementation so that appropriate support and corrective measures can be adopted.
56. The Project Manager will develop annual work plans based on the multi-year work plan included in Annex A, including annual output targets to support the efficient implementation of the project. The Project Manager will ensure that the standard UNDP and GEF M&E requirements are fulfilled to the highest quality. This includes, but is not limited to, ensuring the results framework indicators are monitored annually in time for evidence-based reporting in the GEF PIR, and that the monitoring of risks and the various plans/strategies developed to support project implementation (e.g. gender strategy, KM strategy etc..) occur on a regular basis.
57. **Project Board:** The Project Board will take corrective action as needed to ensure the project achieves the desired results. The Project Board will hold project reviews to assess the performance of the project and appraise the Annual Work Plan for the following year. In the project's final year, the Project Board will hold an end-of-project review to capture lessons learned and discuss opportunities for scaling up and to highlight project results and lessons learned with relevant audiences. This final review meeting will also discuss the findings outlined in the project terminal evaluation report and the management response.
58. **Project Implementing Partner:** The Implementing Partner is responsible for providing any and all required information and data necessary for timely, comprehensive and evidence-based project reporting, including results and financial data, as necessary and appropriate. The Implementing Partner will strive to ensure project-level M&E is undertaken by national institutes, and is aligned with national systems so that the data used by and generated by the project supports national systems.
59. **UNDP Country Office:** The UNDP Country Office will support the Project Manager as needed, including through annual supervision missions. The annual supervision missions will take place according to the schedule outlined in the annual work plan. Supervision mission reports will be circulated to the project team and Project Board within one month of the mission. The UNDP Country Office will initiate and organize key GEF M&E activities including the annual GEF PIR, and the independent terminal evaluation. The UNDP Country Office will also ensure that the standard UNDP and GEF M&E requirements are fulfilled to the highest quality.

---

<sup>10</sup> See [https://www.thegef.org/gef/policies\\_guidelines](https://www.thegef.org/gef/policies_guidelines)

<sup>11</sup> See [https://www.thegef.org/gef/gef\\_agencies](https://www.thegef.org/gef/gef_agencies)

60. The UNDP Country Office is responsible for complying with all UNDP project-level M&E requirements as outlined in the [UNDP POPP](#). This includes ensuring the UNDP Quality Assurance Assessment during implementation is undertaken annually; that annual targets at the output level are developed, and monitored and reported using UNDP corporate systems; the regular updating of the ATLAS risk log; and, the updating of the UNDP gender marker on an annual basis based on gender mainstreaming progress reported in the GEF PIR and the UNDP ROAR. Any quality concerns flagged during these M&E activities (e.g. annual GEF PIR quality assessment ratings) must be addressed by the UNDP Country Office and the Project Manager.
61. The UNDP Country Office will retain all M&E records for this project for up to seven years after project financial closure in order to support ex-post evaluations undertaken by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) and/or the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO).
62. **UNDP-GEF Unit:** Additional M&E and implementation quality assurance and troubleshooting support will be provided by the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor and the UNDP-GEF Directorate as needed.
63. **Audit:** The project will be audited according to UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies on NIM implemented projects.<sup>12</sup>

**Additional GEF monitoring and reporting requirements:**

64. **Inception Workshop and Report:** A project inception workshop will be held within two months after the project document has been signed by all relevant parties to, amongst others:
  - a) Re-orient project stakeholders to the project strategy and discuss any changes in the overall context that influence project strategy and implementation;
  - b) Discuss the roles and responsibilities of the project team, including reporting and communication lines and conflict resolution mechanisms;
  - c) Review the results framework and finalize the indicators, means of verification and monitoring plan;
  - d) Discuss reporting, monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities and finalize the M&E budget; identify national/regional institutes to be involved in project-level M&E; discuss the role of the GEF OFP in M&E;
  - e) Update and review responsibilities for monitoring the various project plans and strategies, including the risk log; Environmental and Social Management Plan and other safeguard requirements; the gender strategy; the knowledge management strategy, and other relevant strategies;
  - f) Review financial reporting procedures and mandatory requirements, and agree on the arrangements for the annual audit; and
  - g) Plan and schedule Project Board meetings and finalize the first year annual work plan.
65. The Project Manager will prepare the inception report no later than one month after the inception workshop. The inception report will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and will be approved by the Project Board.
66. **GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR):** The Project Manager, the UNDP Country Office, and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor will provide objective input to the annual GEF PIR covering the reporting period July (previous year) to June (current year) for each year of project implementation. The Project Manager will ensure that the indicators included in the project results framework are monitored annually in advance of the PIR submission deadline so that progress can be reported in the PIR. Any environmental and social risks and related management plans will be monitored regularly, and progress will be reported in the PIR.
67. The PIR submitted to the GEF will be shared with the Project Board. The UNDP Country Office will coordinate the input of the GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders to the PIR as appropriate. The quality rating of the previous year's PIR will be used to inform the preparation of the subsequent PIR.
68. **Lessons learned and knowledge generation:** Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention area through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to the project. The project will identify, analyse and share lessons learned that might be beneficial to the design and implementation of similar projects and disseminate these lessons widely. There will be continuous

---

<sup>12</sup> See guidance here: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/frm/pages/financial-management-and-execution-modalities.aspx>

information exchange between this project and other projects of similar focus in the same country, region and globally.

69. GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools: The following GEF Tracking Tool(s) will be used to monitor global environmental benefit results: *list the required GEF Tracking Tool(s), as agreed with the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor*. The baseline/CEO Endorsement GEF Focal Area Tracking Tool(s) – submitted as Annex D to this project document – will be updated by the Project Manager/Team and shared with the terminal evaluation consultants before the required evaluation missions take place. The updated GEF Tracking Tool(s) will be submitted to the GEF along with the completed Terminal Evaluation report.
70. Independent Mid-term Review (MTR): An independent mid-term review process will begin after the second PIR has been submitted to the GEF, and the MTR report will be submitted to the GEF in the same year as the 3rd PIR. The MTR findings and responses outlined in the management response will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project’s duration. The terms of reference, the review process and the MTR report will follow the standard templates and guidance prepared by the UNDP IEO for GEF-financed projects available on the UNDP Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). As noted in this guidance, the evaluation will be ‘independent, impartial and rigorous’. The consultants that will be hired to undertake the assignment will be independent from organizations that were involved in designing, executing or advising on the project to be evaluated. Key stakeholders will be involved and consulted during the mid-term review process. Additional quality assurance support is available from the UNDP-GEF Directorate. The final MTR report will be available in English and will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and approved by the Project Board.
71. Terminal Evaluation (TE): An independent terminal evaluation (TE) will take place upon completion of all major project outputs and activities. The terminal evaluation process will begin three months before operational closure of the project allowing the evaluation mission to proceed while the project team is still in place, yet ensuring the project is close enough to completion for the evaluation team to reach conclusions on key aspects such as project sustainability. The Project Manager will remain on contract until the TE report and management response have been finalized. The terms of reference, the evaluation process and the final TE report will follow the standard templates and guidance prepared by the UNDP IEO for GEF-financed projects available on the [UNDP Evaluation Resource Center](#). As noted in this guidance, the evaluation will be ‘independent, impartial and rigorous’. The consultants that will be hired to undertake the assignment will be independent from organizations that were involved in designing, executing or advising on the project to be evaluated. The GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders will be involved and consulted during the terminal evaluation process. Additional quality assurance support is available from the UNDP-GEF Directorate. The final TE report will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and will be approved by the Project Board. The TE report will be publically available in English on the UNDP ERC.
72. The UNDP Country Office will include the planned project terminal evaluation in the UNDP Country Office evaluation plan, and will upload the final terminal evaluation report in English and the corresponding management response to the UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). Once uploaded to the ERC, the UNDP IEO will undertake a quality assessment and validate the findings and ratings in the TE report, and rate the quality of the TE report. The UNDP IEO assessment report will be sent to the GEF IEO along with the project terminal evaluation report.
73. Final Report: The project’s terminal PIR along with the terminal evaluation (TE) report and corresponding management response will serve as the final project report package. The final project report package shall be discussed with the Project Board during an end-of-project review meeting to discuss lesson learned and opportunities for scaling up.

## Mandatory GEF M&E Requirements and M&E Budget:

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget <sup>13</sup> (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
<b>Inception Workshop</b>	UNDP Country Office	USD 4,000	<i>None</i>	Within two months of project document signature
<b>Inception Report</b>	Project Manager	None	None	Within two weeks of inception workshop
<b>Standard UNDP monitoring and reporting requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP</b>	UNDP Country Office	None	None	Quarterly, annually
<b>Monitoring of indicators in project results framework</b>	Project Manager	USD 1,000 Per year: USD 5,000	<i>USD 2,000 Per year: USD 10,000</i>	Annually
<b>GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)</b>	Project Manager and UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF team	None	None	Annually
<b>NIM Audit as per UNDP audit policies</b>	UNDP Country Office	USD 1,500 Per year: \$6,000	<i>add</i>	Annually or other frequency as per UNDP Audit policies
<b>Lessons learned and knowledge generation</b>	Project Manager	<i>None</i>	<i>add</i>	Annually
<b>Monitoring of environmental and social risks, and corresponding management plans as relevant</b>	Project Manager UNDP CO	<i>None</i>	<i>USD 2,000</i>	On-going
<b>Addressing environmental and social grievances</b>	Project Manager UNDP Country Office BPPS as needed	<i>None for time of project manager, and UNDP CO</i>	<i>add</i>	<i>Costs associated with missions, workshops, BPPS expertise etc. can be charged to the project budget.</i>
<b>Project Board meetings</b>	Project Board UNDP Country Office Project Manager	USD 5,000	<i>add</i>	At minimum annually
<b>Supervision missions</b>	UNDP Country Office	None <sup>14</sup>	<i>add</i>	Annually
<b>Oversight missions</b>	UNDP-GEF team	<b>NoneError! Bookmark not defined.</b>	<i>add</i>	Troubleshooting as needed
<b>Knowledge management as outlined in Outcome 4 (1% of GEF grant)</b>	Project Manager	USD15,000	<i>add</i>	<i>On-going</i>
<b>GEF Secretariat learning missions/site visits</b>	UNDP Country Office and Project Manager and UNDP-GEF team	None	None	To be determined.
<b>Mid-term GEF Tracking Tool to be updated</b>	<i>Project Manager</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>USD 3,000</i>	<i>Before mid-term review mission takes place.</i>
<b>Independent Mid-term Review (MTR) and management response</b>	<i>UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team</i>	<i>USD 10,000</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> PIR.</i>

<sup>13</sup> Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff time and travel expenses.


<sup>14</sup> The costs of UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF Unit's participation and time are charged to the GEF Agency Fee.

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget <sup>13</sup> (US\$)		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
<b>Terminal GEF Tracking Tool to be updated</b>	Project Manager	USD 5,000	<i>add</i>	Before terminal evaluation mission takes place
<b>Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) included in UNDP evaluation plan, and management response</b>	UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team	USD 30,000	<i>USD 2,000</i>	At least three months before operational closure
<i>Translation of MTR and TE reports into English</i>	<i>UNDP Country Office</i>	<i>USD 5,000</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>As required. GEF will only accept reports in English.</i>
<b>TOTAL indicative COST</b> Excluding project team staff time, and UNDP staff and travel expenses		<b>\$85,000</b>	<i>\$17,000</i>	

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

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

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

<b>Agency Coordinator, Agency Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date (Month, day, year)</b>	<b>Project Contact Person</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
Adriana Dinu, Executive Coordinator, UNDP-GEF		6/20/2016	Lyes Ferroukhi, Regional Technical Adviser, EBD	+507 302- 4576	lyes.ferroukhi@undp.org

## ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

<b>This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s):</b>					
SDG 15: Life on Land; Sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, halt and reverse land degradation, halt biodiversity loss SDG11: Sustainable Cities and Communities: 11.4 Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage					
<b>This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document:</b>					
Outcome 4. The State, with the participation of civil society, the private sector, scientific and academic institutions, will have designed, implemented and / or strengthened policies, programs and plans, with a focus on environmental sustainability, for the sustainable management of natural resources and the conservation of biodiversity.					
<b>This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan:</b>					
Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste.					
	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Mid-Term Target</b>	<b>End of Project Target</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>
<b>Project Objective:</b> <b>Contribute to an integrated management and protection of fragile lomas ecosystems in the Province<sup>15</sup> of Lima.</b>	IRRF Indicator 1: # of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or sub-national level, disaggregated by partnership type	Key stakeholders in selected lomas identified  There are disperse/ separate conservation and/or restoration efforts	Each actor fulfills their role and responsibilities in the conservation and restoration of lomas	1 Interinstitutional Alliance for the Conservation of Lomas with roles and responsibilities articulated and functioning	Political will, interest and active participation of public and private sector stakeholders, as well as civil society.
	IRRF Indicator 2: # of jobs and livelihoods created through management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste, disaggregated by sex, and rural and urban	TBD in Yr 1	TBD in Yr 1	TBD in Yr 1	Interest and commitment of producers to adopt sustainable practices.  Interest of local stakeholders to engage in tourism activities.  Interest of local and foreign tourists to visit the lomas.
	<u>Mandatory Indicator 3: # direct project beneficiaries<sup>16</sup>:</u> - ecosystem restoration - sustainable ranching/ agriculture - sustainable tourism services	- 0: ecosystem restoration - 0: sustainable ranching/ agriculture - 310:	- 21,000: ecosystem restoration - 25: sustainable ranching/ agriculture	- 42,000: ecosystem restoration - 50: sustainable ranching/ agriculture	Interest and commitment of producers to adopt sustainable practices.  Interest of local stakeholders to engage in tourism activities.  Interest of local and foreign tourists to visit the lomas.

<sup>15</sup>Per the 2002 Organic Law of Regional Governments (Ley Orgánica de Gobiernos Regionales) and the 2003 Organic Law of Municipalities (Ley Orgánica de Municipalidades), the Metropolitan Lima Municipality (Municipalidad Metropolitana de Lima-MLM) is the regional and provincial government of Lima Province. As such, to avoid confusion to the reader, this document refers to the Municipality of Lima.

<sup>16</sup> The project considers direct beneficiaries as those people living in the buffer zone of the lomas actively in project activities, while indirect beneficiaries are human settlements that are located near the hills, who would benefit from improvements in basic services designed to serve visitors to the lomas (i.e. improved sanitation infrastructure for visitors improves the general environment of nearby settlements).

		sustainable tourism services	- 310: sustainable tourism services strengthened and providing better quality services	- 610: sustainable tourism services	
	Indicator 4: Level of capacity to sustainably manage lomas ecosystems (as measured by UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard, with emphasis on Indicators #2 “Existence of operational co-management mechanisms” and #9 “Extent of the environmental planning and strategy development process”)	Total: 19.5 I2:1 I9: 1	Total: 22 I2:2 I9: 2	Total: 25.5 I2:3 I9: 3	Political will and commitment of local governments, civil society and SERNANP  Commitment of local stakeholders to the conservation of selected areas.
<b>Component/Outcome 1 Conservation of lomas ecosystems</b>	Indicator 5: # hectares protected through the creation of Regional Lomas Conservation Area (or other figure/ modality/ institutionalized option of effective management) with revenue stream from selected lomas sites (as measured by the GEF Tracking Tool for BD)	0  TT Score: - 16 (ACR) - 9 (ACP)	10,540 (corresponding to the ACR planned for Group 1)	21,000 (corresponding to Group 1 ACR + Group 2 comprised of lomas in the south conserved via Private AC or other modality for private land)  TT Score: - 70 (ACR) - 70 (ACP)	Political will and commitment of local governments and SERNANP Commitment of local stakeholders to the conservation of selected areas.
	Indicator 6: % lomas ecosystems impacted by activities and pressures originating in buffer zones	- 30-45% North Lomas - 10-20% South Lomas	- 20% Reduction of degradation in North Lomas - 10% Reduction in South Lomas	- 50% Reduction of degradation in North Lomas - 50% Reduction of degradation in South Lomas	Local stakeholders adopt sustainable practices promoted in the other components and comply with the legal framework to regulate use of resources in lomas buffer zones.
	Indicator 7: # lomas sites included in BD inventory with studies and detailed characterization of biodiversity in Lomas ecosystems and potential use.	10 sites have general information	14 with detailed characterization (6 from ACR Group 1; 8 from AC Group 2)	14 with detailed characterization (6 from ACR Group 1; 8 from AC Group 2)	Collaboration mechanisms established and interest of academic institutions to collaborate in the detailed characterization of selected



					lomas.
<b>Component/ Outcome 2 Land use management tools</b>	Indicator 8: # of planning instruments for lomas ecosystem established in participative manner	0 Conservation Strategy for Lomas (Metropolitan Environmental Agenda 2015-17 includes Strategic Action 2.2.4 which states the need of MLM to work in lomas)	1 Draft of Lomas Conservation Strategy	1 Lomas Conservation Strategy	Political will of local stakeholders.
	Indicator 9: # of local governments that include biodiversity & lomas ecosystem conservation and integrated natural resources management (INRM) criteria in their management policies, including land use zoning	3 Local Governments (Villa María el Triunfo, Comas and Carabayllo already have local ordinances but without the resources or roadmap to implement them adequately for conservation of BD and ecosystem services) Local governments also have a Concerted Development Plan	9 Local governments have developed ordinances with ecosystem conservation and INRM criteria in a participative and gender-sensitive manner	9 Local governments implementing integrated land management tools (1 provincial and 8 districts)	Political will and commitment of local governments to adopt sustainable integrated land management tools for the lomas and assign resources for their application.
	Indicator 10: # of public-private partnerships for lomas management implemented	6 partnerships: - 5 Ecotourism Services APP in Lomas - 1 Private Protected Area	6 existing partnerships evaluated and strengthened	8 partnerships recognized	Local governments officially recognize the management committees established through public-private partnerships.
<b>Component/ Outcome 3 Economic diversification and low impact land use</b>	Indicator 11: # hectares of degraded lomas reforested with native species	3 hectares reforested	500 ha	1000 ha	Commitment of local stakeholders to get involved in the labor of restoration activities, e.g. establish nurseries of native species, participate in reforestation and

					vigilance of restored areas. Nurseries successfully reproduce and grow native forest species.
	Indicator 12: # of hectares/zones where lomas-friendly production models are implemented: - Sustainable ranching - Low-impact mining	- 1,597 ha regulated ranching - 0 sites low-impact mining	- 5,343 ha sustainable ranching - 2 sites low-impact mining	- 10,686 ha sustainable ranching - 4 sites low-impact mining:	Interest and commitment of producers to adopt sustainable practices.
	Indicator 13: Increase in tourism activity in selected lomas sites, as measured by: - # of public and/or private projects that invest in improving tourism services (including proper waste management strategy) generated during the Project - # of visitors in selected lomas sites - # of direct beneficiaries (tourism service providers, restaurants, guides), disaggregated by gender - \$ generated by tourism activities	- 0 Investment Projects - 21,000 Visitors in 2015 - 310 direct beneficiaries - \$23,000 (78,000 soles) generated (50-100% reinvested in maintaining infrastructure)	- 3 Investment Projects - 10% Annual increase in visitors - 310 direct beneficiaries strengthened - 10% increase in income generated	- 6 Investment Projects - 20% Annual increase in visitors - 610 direct beneficiaries - 20% increase in income generated	Interest of local stakeholders to engage in tourism activities. Interest of local and foreign tourists to visit the lomas.
<b>Component/ Outcome 4 Knowledge Management and M&amp;E</b>	Indicator 14: # of permanent monitoring systems established with partnerships with local authorities, NGOs, and universities, to monitor the presence of endemic flora as well as annual populations of migratory birds	0 systems– there are 9 individual factsheets on lomas flora and fauna (SERFOR). -BD Indicator species Baseline TBD Yr 1	-1 Monitoring System with information from 6 permanent monitoring sites -BD indicator species maintained or increase	-1 Monitoring System with information from 14 permanent monitoring sites -BD indicator species maintained or increase	Interest and active participation of public and private sector stakeholders, as well as civil society. Availability of a standard guide for collecting data on the status of lomas ecosystems.
	Indicator 15: Communication and citizen mobilization strategy with gender and youth focus: - # schools involved in citizen conservation activities (adopt-a-tree, photo monitor of species, etc) - # organized groups that are active - # events (community cleanups, reforestation campaigns, parades)	(2) Schools (5)Groups (1)Events	(30) Schools (7) Groups (3)Events	(60) Schools (14) Groups (6)Events	Interest and active participation of public and private sector stakeholders, as well as civil society.

**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).

THERE ARE NO PENDING COMMENTS.

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>17</sup>**

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
<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>
Component A Technical Review			
I. Baseline Studies	12,250.00	3,802.00	
II. Studies to address risk and opportunities-SESP	8,250.00		3,960.00
III. Intervention location and validation pilot Lomas sites	13,500.00	5,456.97	
IV Policies, plans, programs and projects, and budgets integration	13,500.00	5,480.82	8,714.00
V. GEF Tracking Tools	8,250.00		3,520.00
VI. Stakeholders screening	13,500.00		8,714.00
Component B. Institutional arrangements, monitoring and evaluation			
I. Institutional arrangements	4,000.00		
II. Monitoring and evaluation	6,500.00		2,000.00
Component C: Financial Planning and co-financing	8,250.00		
Component D: Validation Workshop	9,000.00	1,462.70	
Component E: Review and delivery of final documentation	3,000.00		3,000.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>100,000.00</b>	<b>16,202.49</b>	<b>29,908.00</b>

<sup>17</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.