



REQUEST FOR CEO APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Improving mangrove conservation across the Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape (ETPS) through coordinated regional and national strategy development and implementation.			
Country(ies):	Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape (ETPS) including Costa Rica, Panamá, Colombia and Ecuador.	GEF Project ID: ¹	5771
GEF Agency(ies):	World Wildlife Fund, Inc.	GEF Agency Project ID:	G0011
Other Executing Partner(s):	Conservation International Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS); UNESCO-Quito.	Submission Date:	04-12-2016 05-23-2016 07-01-2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters	Project Duration(Months)	24
Name of Parent Program:		Project Agency Fee (\$):	171,073

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
IW-2	<p>Outcome 2.1: Implementation of agreed Strategic Action Programmes (SAPs) incorporates ecosystem based approaches to management of LMEs, ICM principles, and policy/legal/ institutional reforms into national/local plans.</p> <p>Outcome 2.3: Innovative solutions implemented for reduced pollution, rebuilding or protecting fish stocks with rights based management, ICM, habitat (blue forest) restoration/conservation, and port management and produce measureable results.</p> <p>Outcome 2.4:</p>	<p>Output 2.1: Agreed commitments to sustainable ICM and LME cooperation frameworks</p> <p>Output 2.2: National and local policy/ legal/ institutional reforms adopted/ implemented.</p> <p>Output 2.3: Types of technologies and measures implemented in local demonstrations and Investments.</p> <p>Output 2.4:</p>	GEF TF	950,405	2,258,429

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

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

	Climatic variability and change at coasts and in LMEs incorporated into updated SAP to reflect adaptive management and ICM principles (including protection of “blue forests”).	Enhanced capacity for issues of climatic variability and change.			
IW-3	<p>Outcome 3.1: Political commitment, shared vision, and institutional capacity demonstrated for joint, ecosystem-based management of waterbodies and local ICM principles.</p> <p>Outcome 3.2: On-the ground modest actions implemented in water quality, quantity (including basins draining areas of melting ice), fisheries, and coastal habitat demonstrations for “blue forests” to protect carbon.</p> <p>Outcome 3.3: IW portfolio capacity and performance enhanced from active learning/ KM/ experience sharing.</p> <p>Outcome 3.4: Targeted research networks fill gaps.</p>	<p>Output 3.1: National inter-ministry Committees established; Transboundary Diagnostic Analyses & Strategic Action Programmes; local ICM plans.</p> <p>Output 3.2: Demo-scale local action implemented, including in basins with melting ice and to restore/protect coastal “blue forests”.</p> <p>Output 3.3: Active experience/sharing/ learning practiced in the IW project portfolio.</p> <p>Output 3.4: Arctic LMEs addressed with partners.</p>	GEF TF	950,405	2,258,429
Total project costs				1,900,810	4,516,858

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To implement a comprehensive, multi-government ratified and regionally articulated mangrove conservation strategy in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape (ETPS) countries of Costa Rica, Panama, Colombia and Ecuador through on-the-ground management activities and the strengthening of national and local policies that inform ridge-to-reef development planning and practices relevant to mangrove conservation.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
Component #1: Regional mangrove strategy	TA	Outcome 1.1: The four ETPS countries adopt and advance the regional	Output 1.1.1.: A Mangrove Technical Working group/network	GEF TF	470,767	850,000

<p>development and implementation</p>		<p>strategy for the conservation of mangroves elaborated by the Comisión Permanente del Pacífico Sur (Permanent Commission for the South Pacific or CPPS) to implement key mangrove conservation and restoration measures identified in this project by Y2Q4.</p> <p>Outcome 1.2.: Costa Rica via the Ministry of Environment, attends the official invitation from CPPS to participate in the development of the regional strategy for the conservation of the mangroves by Y1Q3.</p> <p>Outcome 1.3.: Policy makers and national mangrove managers from at least three countries have the tools and capacity to strengthen the implementation of the regional mangrove strategy.</p>	<p>comprised of leading mangrove experts is created within CPPS to advise on the completion of the regional strategy for the conservation of mangrove.</p> <p>Output 1.1.2.: At least two meetings of a Mangrove Technical Working Group are held to contribute to regional strategy for the conservation of mangrove.</p> <p>Output 1.1.3.: The updated regional strategy for the conservation of mangroves is ratified by Ministerial level authorities and published.</p> <p>Output 1.2.1.: Official letter of confirmation from Costa Rica’s Ministry of Environment ratifying Costa Rica’s participation in the development of a regional strategy for the conservation of mangroves by Y1Q3.</p> <p>Output 1.3.1.: At least two ETPS trans-boundary learning and cooperation exchanges between project countries and at least one international exchange with other countries with similar mangrove conservation challenges completed by Y2Q4.</p>			
---------------------------------------	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>Output 1.3.2.: Communication products on mangrove conservation (policy, regulations, field implementation and other related issues) will be completed and made available to policy makers and stakeholders by Y1Q3.</p>			
<p>Component #2: National mangrove action plans and policy strengthening.</p>	TA	<p>Outcome 2.1.: At least two ETPS countries have updated national mangrove action plans in line with the regional strategy that addresses pressure on mangroves from sources across the ridge-to-reef (watershed) scale by Y2Q4.</p>	<p>Output 2.2.1: A national mangrove policy and threat assessment for each ETPS country to orient economic valuation work, inform policy gaps, and identify outreach needs and priorities in each ETPS country completed by Y1Q4.</p> <p>Output 2.2.2.: Legislation passed to strengthen the protection of mangroves in at least two ETPS countries completed by Y2Q4.</p>	GEF TF	674,490	1,986,372
<p>Component #3: Local conservation actions.</p>	TA	<p>Outcome 3.1.: At least two key mangrove ecosystems have updated management plans and/or new local development plans consistent with updated national and regional strategies, taking into account the results of economic valuation studies from this and related projects and building on increased national capacity and support to protect mangroves in a comprehensive ridge-to-reef context by Y2Q4.</p>	<p>Output 3.1.1.: At least two local management plans and/or local development plans for priority mangrove sites are formally ratified by local authorities by Y2Q4.</p> <p>Output 3.2.1.: Final report on the economic valuation of ecosystem goods and services provided by mangroves in at least two project sites, including a) fisheries, b) nature-based tourism, c) coastal</p>	GEF TF	579,399	1,463,461

		<p>Outcome 3.2.: Economic evaluation tools and methodologies developed through the GEF-UNEP Blue Forests and other related projects are tested in at least two ETPS countries during their development phases to maximize applicability to policy and management at local to national scales by Y2Q3.</p> <p>Outcome 3.3.: Outreach and capacity building for at least 30 local policymakers and stakeholders finalized by Y2Q4.</p> <p>Outcome 3.4.: At least two demonstration projects that provide incentives and/or that create business opportunities associated with the conservation and sustainable use of mangroves initiated in at least two selected sites by Y2Q4.</p>	<p>protection, d) maintaining water quality and bioremediation, and e) carbon storage completed by Y2Q1.</p> <p>Output 3.2.2: Summary outreach document and associated strategy for making it most relevant to decision-makers on the methodology(ies) and toolkit(s) assessed and used to guide the implementation and policy application of economic valuation of mangrove ecosystem services that include cost-benefit analyses of alternative management options, based on existing initiatives including the GEF-UNEP Blue Forest project and WAVES, completed by Y2Q4.</p> <p>Output 3.2.3.: Mangrove valuation, policy and development planning outcomes and field conservation communicated broadly, including through: distribution of communications materials; an interactive knowledge-sharing platform; presentation in at least three national, regional and global conservation, science, policy and related fora (e.g.: Ramsar, CBD, IMPAC, Blue Carbon</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>Working Group, ITTO); participating in the IW-Learn mechanism (including allocation of 1% of project budget for this purpose), and presentation to policy makers in other mangrove relevant countries by Y2Q4.</p> <p>Output 3.3.1.: At least two training events are conducted per ETPS country with at least 15 participants each to build skills relating to field conservation measures and restoration of mangroves by Y2Q4.</p> <p>Output 3.4.1.: Local associations in at least two sites actively participate and commit to demonstration projects by Y1Q4. Output 3.4.2.: Local stakeholders participating in demonstration projects increased by 20% over the project start-up baseline by Y2Q4.</p>			
			Subtotal		1,724,656	4,299,833
			Project management Cost (PMC) ³	GEF TF	176,154	217,025
			Total project costs		1,900,810	4,516,858

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

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

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

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
CSO	Conservation International	Cash	1,049,639
CSO	Conservation International	In-kind	237,025
Others	Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS)	Cash	20,000
Others	Permanent Commission for the South Pacific (CPPS)	In-kind	480,000
Other Multilateral Agency (ies)	UNESCO-Quito	In-kind	250,000
National Government	Government of Costa Rica	In-kind	210,000
National Government	Government of Panama	In-kind	125,000
National Government	Government of Colombia	In-kind	145,194
National Government	Government of Ecuador	Cash	2,000,000
Total Co-financing			4,516,858

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

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
WWF US	GEF-TF	International Waters	ETPS Regional	1,900,810	171,073	2,071,883
Total Grant Resources				1,900,810	171,073	2,071,883

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

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	30,000	0	30,000
National/Local Consultants	422,720	0	422,720

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

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

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

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

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

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

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

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage: After having described the CI-GEF Agency's comparative advantage in the PIF, the project was later transferred for implementation by the WWF-GEF Agency. The WWF-GEF agency capacity and role is in alignment with expectations for the project (as originally described in the PIF) and a full description of the WWF-GEF Agency comparative advantage is provided in Section 2.11 of the Project Document. The WWF-GEF Agency places over 50 years of conservation expertise directly at the disposition of the GEF, as well as the opportunity to support GEF beneficiary governments in defining national strategies and designing quality projects through the WWF network and its large array of partner organizations.

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address: One requested change was made to Outcome 1.2 (Component #1) to avoid language that could be interpreted as a legally binding arrangement for Costa Rica (non-CPPS member state) while interacting with CPPS in the project. Outcome 1.2 was modified to "Costa Rica via the Ministry of Environment, attends the official invitation from CPPS to participate in the development of the regional strategy for the conservation of the mangroves by Y1Q3" and corresponding Output 1.2.1 to "Official letter of confirmation from Costa Rica's Ministry of Environment ratifying Costa Rica's participation in the development of a regional strategy for the conservation of mangroves by Y1Q3". This was altered after consultation with CI-Costa Rica in contact with MINAE and confirmed by CPPS. This sustains the original PIF stated intention that Costa Rica freely participate as beneficiary and contributor to the Project in the technical fora, development and application of recommendations at their discretion through an open invitation by CPPS, but does not imply a formal relationship with CPPS beyond the project arrangements as a project result.

A.5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project: N/A

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks: N/A

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives: The additional description of links and coordination with four relevant GEF initiatives are provided in Section 1.4 (Table 3) of the Project Document. These projects are; GEF-UNDP "Conservation, sustainable biodiversity use and maintenance of ecosystem services in protected Costa Rica wetlands of international importance"; GEF-UNDP "Designing and implementing a national sub-system of marine protected areas (SMPA) in Colombia"; and the previously (PIF) described GEF-FAO "Integrated management of marine and coastal areas of high value for biodiversity in Continental Ecuador" and GEF-UNEP "Application of Blue Forests methodologies and approaches through small-scale interventions".

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.: The project involves a range of stakeholders at different scales and across the four ETPS countries, the majority of whom are collaborators with the EA (Conservation International), and/or were approached during the PPG phase (taking into account the preferred approach with OFP authorities for access to mangrove user communities in each country and in the development of project activities). A description of the stakeholders and an account of the engagement methods proposed for each component is given in Section 4 of the Project Document and the engagement history (before and during PPG) included in Appendix 19.

At the regional level (Component #1) the main coordination instrument remains the CPPS who as an inter-government commission will be the central element for the implementation of the Regional Open Initiative Mangrove Action Plan with support of CI and UNESCO-Quito between the ETPS member countries. The formation of a technical group to help inform R2R concepts, integrated coastal management, comparable mangrove impact monitoring, coastal climate adaptation, understanding and advances towards improvements in mangrove related policy will draw upon the formal CPPS mechanism and network, CI, UNESCO-Quito project partners and project synergies with the CI-Moore Centre for Science and Oceans and their participation in the Blue Carbon Initiative. CI-ETPS will also facilitate coordination with CI-country offices, national experts, RAMSAR and the country OFP counterparts as described in the Project Document through the CI-ETPS and CI-country offices. CI country programs will further work with the policy makers and thought leaders in the context of the mangrove agenda of each country to support outcomes for national policy (Component #2) drawing upon the umbrella

recommendations, opportunities and incentives from the developing Regional Plan and project transboundary learning events, shared and generated knowledge. To explore and demonstrate the potential and relevance of on-the-ground solutions through site level incentives and community based approaches each CI-country team works through prior disclosure and inclusive participation with local communities and representatives. Ensuring representation of the mangrove user groups is achieved through a range of methods most appropriate to the site in question (e.g. public announcement, through community council and coordinating bodies and the support of local experts working with CI etc.). The project also intends to improve awareness with upstream land users and planners with no direct stake in the mangrove resource. This will involve community outreach at the pilot sites, involvement where approachable in the C1 thematic learning events and awareness building with policy makers and planners through technical discussions that incorporate R2R/ S2S concepts, and direct accessory in some cases at the site level (e.g. oil infrastructure in Gulf of Tortugas (Colombia), upstream connectivity reserves in Gulf of Chiriquí (Panama). Attention will be paid to ensure that gender appropriate and inclusive methodologies (such as same sex working groups for example) are applied throughout the convocation of events and undertaking of activities. UNESCO-Quito with support from CPPS and CI will develop on-line knowledge management and communication as a transverse element throughout the project across intervention scales and geographies with the goal of ensuring a wide and open access to project results (and through the IW-Learn mechanism / IWC9), with results and key recommendations distributed (and maintained through the CPPS IOC SPINCAM project) across a wider national and international technical and scientific audience.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF): The project will work with national authorities and local communities to help raise awareness of the many societal benefits of mangrove conservation. By reversing where possible patterns of use that lead to mangrove degradation it should be possible to also reduce the risk associated with local food security, storm, sea level rise and erosion (and to a lesser extent the rare tsunami events posed to those same communities). As described in Section 2.2 of the Project Document the global environmental benefits associated with the project include multi-state cooperation with potential to reduce and reverse environmental threats to mangroves, scaling of benefits from knowledge sharing and transboundary learning, support of policy to reduce upstream pollution (and improve the natural filtering capacity afforded by mangroves in the coastal fringe) as well as ensuring the provision of ecosystem goods and services.

The adoption and multiplying effect of demonstrating successful alternative livelihoods such as micro-tourism enterprises (as in Chira, Costa Rica), fisheries enhancement projects that showcase the role of mangroves as nursery and restocking areas or through conditional access rights through concession programs (as developed in mainland Ecuador) has potential to improve basic services and life-styles in low income areas. The results of improved national policy that encourages responsible upstream watershed management and recovery of mangroves that actively filter contaminants and sediment generates improvements in water quality that can reduce local health risk.

Over global scales the value of intact mangrove systems in terms of their contribution to carbon sequestration is relevant for climate change mitigation scenarios. This follows recent research that demonstrates that mangroves can be 3-10 times as effective as tropical forest in sequestering carbon. The consequences of carbon release through combustion of mangroves as fuel and the release of soil carbon from root systems has implications for human well-being beyond just local communities and the ETPS region.

The loss of protective buffering function to other productive habitats such as coral bays or barrier islands implies that actual impact of mangrove loss upon local livelihoods extends beyond just mangrove habitat. Coastal "green corridors" provide important along-shore ecological connectivity that helps communities and societies adapt to changes in climate and bolsters resilience across connected habitats and societies. For example, maintaining diversity in ecosystem goods across connected yet distinct habitats helps ensure livelihood alternatives and food security.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design: The project strategy adopts a multi-scale approach (regional, national and local) working in parallel between ETPS countries and project partners as being more cost effective than addressing any one country or scale. This works towards improvements in national policies

and financing mechanisms that can generate benefits beyond the original GEF seed investment for mangrove conservation:

- (1) Shared and centralized technical inputs and the concerted implementation of project actions across four countries are more effective than individual isolated and potentially duplicated efforts by country. This is supported under a common regional framework and has continuity through an Open Mangrove Initiative Steering Committee sustained by CPPS with participating countries.
- (2) Complementary roles that play to institutional strengths of the project partners multiply the return on a medium sized GEF-IW investment split across four countries. CPPS brings an established and formalized governance process through the regional Plan, leveraging for international ETPS agreements and existing long-term investments with renewable funding towards linked integrated coastal zone management in the region. It would not be as cost effective to integrate into the necessary government channels without the facility provided by CPPS. UNESCO brings technical expertise, credibility for regional and national processes under its international mandate establishing and evaluating World Heritage and Man and the Biosphere Programme sites. It coordinates and connects with a wide network of institutions relevant for the trans-boundary learning experiences and brings a shared communications platform to the project. Conservation International through the coordinated CI-ETPS CI-Global Marine, CI-Costa Rica, CI in Panama, CI-Colombia CI-Ecuador offices provides an unmatched level of national context, capacity, networking with local partners and relevance for concerted conservation actions in the ETPS region, including a presence in local sites for on-the-ground tangible improvements, feedback into policy. The project partners and national governments (OFPs with supporting institutions) also provide cost-match and in-kind support for activities and have the facility to construct their agendas in support of the ETPS region around the GEF project for increased effect.
- (3) Capacity building and transferable technical tools at the regional and national level have considerable potential to enable and leverage other opportunities. The trans-boundary interchanges between policy makers aim to encourage a diversity of options for a "feed-forward" multiplying effect where the most useful examples and experiences can be extrapolated to other areas and national planning frameworks.
- (4) The project approach aims to encourage adoption of conservation principles by way of small business incentives or concessions where benefits are evident to the community. By improving individual and community returns the incentive for illegal or undesirable practices is reduced encouraging auto-stewardship as an alternative to increased vigilance costs and possible infringement of liberties. This option involves at least 2 of the 4 ETPS countries recognizing that in some countries it would not apply given existing mangrove protection laws.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The Project M&E Plan includes the following components (see M&E Table 11 in Section 7 of the Project Document for indicative budget):

- a. Inception workshop held within the first three months of project start with the project partners and relevant stakeholders. An overarching objective of the inception workshop is to assist the project team in understanding and taking ownership of the project's objectives and outcomes. The inception workshop will be used to detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of the Executing Agency, partners and the WWF-GEF Project Agency.
- b. The Executing Agency should produce an inception report documenting all changes and decisions made during the inception workshop to the project planned activities, budget, results framework, and any other key aspects of the project. The inception report should be produced within one month of the inception workshop, and ratified by the PSC as it will serve as a key input to the timely planning and execution of project start-up and activities.
- c. A drafted Project Results Monitoring Plan has been developed by the EA and Project Agency, which includes objective, outcome and output indicators, metrics to be collected for each indicator, methodology for data collection and analysis, baseline information, location of data gathering, frequency of data collection, responsible parties, and indicative resources needed to complete the plan. Appendix 9 of the ProDoc provides the Project Results Monitoring Plan table that will help complete this M&E component. In addition to the objective, outcome,

and output indicators, the Project Results Monitoring Plan table will also include all indicators identified in any Safeguard Plans prepared for the project, thus they will be consistently and timely monitored. The monitoring of these indicators throughout the life of the project will be necessary to assess if the project has successfully achieved its expected results.

- d. GEF IW-5 Focal Area Tracking Tool will be completed i) prior to project start-up, ii) prior to mid-term review, and iii) at the time of the terminal evaluation. The tracking tool measures progress in achieving the impacts and outcomes established at the portfolio level under the IW focal area and represents an assessment of the project contribution to GEBs
- e. Project Steering Committee Meetings will be held annually, semi-annually, or quarterly, as appropriate. Meetings shall be held to review and approve project annual budget and work plans, discuss implementation issues and identify solutions, and to increase coordination and communication between key project partners. The meetings held by the PSC will be monitored and results adequately reported.
- f. WWF-GEF Project Agency Field Supervision Missions through annual visits to the project countries and potentially to project field sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan. This assesses first hand project progress and monitoring of WWF Safeguards Policies. Oversight visits will most likely be conducted to coincide with the timing of PSC meetings. Other members of the PSC may also join field visits. A Field Visit Report will be prepared by the WWF-GEF PA staff participating in the oversight mission, and will be circulated to the project team and PSC members within one month of the visit.
- g. Quarterly Field and Financial Reports submitted by the Executing Agency (CI) to the WWF-GEF Project Agency every 3 months, will consist of a field progress report and a budget follow-up with requests for disbursement to cover expected quarterly expenditures.
- h. Bi-annual Project Progress Report (PPR) to WWF-GEF to monitor progress made since project start. This will entail: Self-rating of project Development Objective (DO) and Implementation Progress (IP), Safeguards and Risk; Cumulative progress of project results based on project monitoring and evaluation plan; Yearly progress of approved project annual work plan; Exchange of lessons learned between the project regions; Reporting to the PSC and GEF on the project progress.
- i. Final Project Report drafted by the Executing Agency CI within 3 months after the end of the project. This will supplement the final (Year 2 Q4) biannual Progress Report submitted at project completion.
- k. An independent Terminal Evaluation will take place within six months after project completion providing an external evaluation of the overall project effectiveness and efficiency. It will provide recommendations for GEF and its agencies on future IW conservation projects and recommendations to the project team on achievement of the project impacts after completion of the project. The Executing Agency in collaboration with the PSC will provide a formal management answer to the findings and recommendations of the terminal evaluation.
- l. 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 including the IW-Learn program. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. There will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

- m. Annual Financial reports submitted by the Executing Agency will be audited annually by external auditors appointed by the Executing Agency.


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

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

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Srta. Diana Martucci Larrea	Coordinadora General de Planificacion Ambiental	MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT (MAE), GOVT OF ECUADOR	06/30/2016
Abraham Herrera	Head of Environmental Policy and Planning Office	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT (ANAM), GOVT OF PANAMA	04/17/2014
Alejandra Torres Dromgold	Head of International Affairs Office	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (MADS), GOVT OF COLOMBIA.	04/14/2014
Ruben Muñoz Robles	Director of International Cooperation	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT (MINAE), GOVT OF COSTA RICA.	04/28/2014

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Herve Lefeuvre, WWF GEF Agency		05-23-2016	Andrew Hume	202-495-4161	Andrew.hume@wwfus.org Herve.lefeuvre@wwfus.org

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

Objective:	To implement a comprehensive, multi-government ratified and regionally articulated mangrove conservation strategy in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape (ETPS) countries of Costa Rica, Panama, Colombia and Ecuador through on-the-ground management activities and the strengthening of national and local policies that inform ridge-to-reef development planning and practices relevant to mangrove conservation.
Indicator(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Official endorsement of a regionally articulated multi-government mangrove conservation and sustainable development plan by the four ETPS countries (Costa Rica, Panama, Colombia, Ecuador) with a coordinated action plan to restore and protect mangrove systems beyond the funded scope of the two year project. b. At least 2 ETPS countries with have improved legislation governing national ridge-to-reef spatial planning (e.g. upstream watershed management) such that the mangroves in the ETPS region (estimated collectively at 736,000 ha (after Giri et al. 2011)) and are subject to an improved policy conducive to mangrove c. At least 2 examples of supported local private and/or community based mangrove initiatives that strengthen local planning, improve awareness of key issues, build local capacity, reduce mangrove degradation, instigate reforestation, and improve the retention of ecosystem goods, services with economic and cultural dividends for sustainable societies.

Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Project Baseline	End of Project Target	Expected Outputs and Indicators
Component 1: Regional mangrove strategy development and implementation			
<p>Outcome 1.1.:</p> <p>The four ETPS countries adopt and advance the regional strategy for the conservation of mangroves elaborated by the Comisión Permanente del Pacífico Sur (Permanent Commission for the South Pacific or CPPS) to implement key mangrove conservation and restoration measures identified in this project by Y2Q4.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 1.1.:</p> <p>A regional strategy approved by and published for the appropriate authorities of the four ETPS countries by Y2Q1.</p>	<p>Base-Line 1.1.:</p> <p>The four ETPS countries do not share a common strategy for mangrove conservation.</p> <p>Efforts are underway to evaluate the status and value of mangrove ecosystems in each ETPS country, and frame national mangrove conservation in the context of international conventions and commitments such as UNFCCC and CBD. These efforts still remain relatively isolated endeavors often missing the science to action technical justification or scale of effect to consider upstream ridge-to-reef processes such as watershed management that influence sites.</p> <p>Despite increasing global and national awareness of the importance of mangrove forested areas in the ETPS region (e.g. significant carbon sequestration, multiple ecological goods and services provided to local and national communities), deforestation remains at an estimated 1-2%/ year across the region.</p>	<p>Target 1.1.:</p> <p>CPPS within its' regional planning for the South Pacific Nations develops a Regional Open Mangrove Initiative Plan. The Plan is supported and validated by an international technical working group convened by CPPS, and is approved, published and implemented through member country Action Plans as part of their national mangrove strategy.</p> <p>In the mid-term the region-wide implementation of the Plan promotes coordinated actions, cross-learning, an increase in awareness for mangrove sustainable development and advances policy development. Concepts within the regional plan such as EBM ridge-to-reef planning and trans-learning for the conservation and restoration of mangrove ecosystem services and supported sustainable societies are considered where relevant in the development of new national policy.</p>	<p>Output 1.1.1.:</p> <p>A Mangrove Technical Working Group/network comprised of leading mangrove experts is created within CPPS to advise on the completion of the regional strategy for the conservation of mangrove.</p> <p>Output Indicator 1.1.1.:</p> <p>A Mangrove Technical Working Group is convened by Y1Q3 as part of the CPPS Operating Plan with a 2015-2017+ commitment.</p> <p>Output 1.1.2.:</p> <p>At least two meetings of a Mangrove Technical Working Group are held to contribute to regional strategy for the conservation of mangrove.</p> <p>Output Indicator 1.1.2.:</p> <p># Technical Working Group Meetings generating recommendations towards improved regional mangrove conservation strategy by Y2Q2.</p> <p>Output 1.1.3.:</p>

Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Project Baseline	End of Project Target	Expected Outputs and Indicators
		<p>In the long-term policy changes reinforce the benefits of private and/or community led conservation programs and spatial planning measures that reduce mangrove degradation and reduce or reverse deforestation trends. As a result risk to threatened mangrove biodiversity is reduced, climate change mitigation afforded through carbon sequestration improves and natural coastal defenses are strengthened.</p>	<p>The updated regional strategy for the conservation of mangroves is ratified by Ministerial level authorities and published.</p> <p>Output Indicator 1.1.3.: # ETPS country governments that officially endorse a regional strategy compatible with their National Planning Instruments and policies by Y2Q1.</p>
<p>Outcome 1.2.: Costa Rica via the Ministry of Environment, attends the official invitation from CPPS to participate in the development of the regional strategy for the conservation of the mangroves by Y1Q3.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 1.2.: Costa Rica is an active participating member of the CPPS Open Initiative for Mangrove Conservation and Sustainable Development.</p>	<p>Base-Line 1.2.: Costa Rica is not a participating member of the CPPS commission under which the project regional framework is being developed. Costa Rica has national mangrove initiatives underway of relevance to the regional project (e.g. MINAE and SINAC 2014-19 #4966 GEF-PNUD grant for wetland conservation).</p>	<p>Target 1.2.: Costa Rica becomes a full participating member of the Regional Mangrove Action Plan technical forum and GEF ETPS Project Steering Committee, actively contributing to and benefiting from, knowledge sharing/ transfer and conservation incentives afforded by the Ramsar Mangrove and Coral Strategy and CPPS Open Mangrove Initiative for Conservation and sustainable development. The resulting regional strategy is more robust, while being coherent between ETPS countries, strategies for designated Ramsar sites and effective in meeting international biodiversity commitments. The ETPS countries mutually benefit from counterpart financing, complementary actions and new opportunities leveraged during regional interchanges.</p>	<p>Output 1.2.1.: Official letter of confirmation from Costa Rica's Ministry of Environment ratifying Costa Rica's participation in the development of a regional strategy for the conservation of mangroves by Y1Q3.</p> <p>Output Indicator 1.2.1.: CPPS - Costa Rica agreement signed with CPPS before Y1Q3.</p>
<p>Outcome 1.3.: Policy makers and national mangrove managers from at least three countries have the tools and capacity to strengthen the implementation of the regional mangrove strategy.</p>	<p>Base-Line 1.3.: Decision makers responsible for mangrove conservation and sustainable development are very receptive to sound technical and scientific support that helps consolidate coordinated actions in the region.</p>	<p>Target 1.3.: Policy makers and mangrove resource managers benefit from capacity building via the project in at least 3 countries. They benefit from access to the technical advice and tools necessary to rationalize and</p>	<p>Output 1.3.1.: At least two ETPS trans-boundary learning and cooperation exchanges between project countries and at least one international exchange with other countries with similar mangrove</p>

Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Project Baseline	End of Project Target	Expected Outputs and Indicators
<p>Outcome Indicator 1.3.: # of countries that have tools generated by the project that assist and inform integrated regional and national planning (by Y2Q4).</p>	<p>The ETPS mangrove coastal areas are managed under different national regimes that reflect their development history. The existing resources available to policy makers across the region address base-line understanding, public awareness, prioritization methods, inter-sector organization, finance mechanisms and ordination of resource use. Materials and tools produced directly in support of policy improvements are mostly specific to each country and are limited in the thematic areas of climate change and blue forest technologies, policy for mangrove restoration, territorial ridge-to-reef planning and environmental education.</p>	<p>implement improvements in national mangrove related policy and address policy gaps. This encourages a progressive regional agenda that improves overall mangrove health in the ETPS region. A practical shared reference base is available to decision makers beyond the lifetime of the project. Outreach, cross-learning opportunities and knowledge sharing during the project consolidates mangrove conservation "know-how" across the ETPS region.</p>	<p>conservation challenges completed by Y2Q4.</p> <p>Output Indicator 1.3.1.: # of thought leaders trained per country actively working in aspects of mangrove policy and resource planning by Y2Q4.</p> <p>Output 1.3.2.: Communication products on mangrove conservation (policy, regulations, field implementation and other related issues) will be completed and made available to policy makers and stakeholders by Y1Q3.</p> <p>Output Indicator 1.3.2.: % completion of communication products (as described in Section 2.13 of ProDoc) by Y2Q4.</p>
Component 2: National mangrove action plans and policy strengthening.			
<p>Outcome 2.1.: At least two ETPS countries have updated national mangrove action plans in line with the regional strategy that addresses pressure on mangroves from sources across the ridge-to-reef (watershed) scale by Y2Q4.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 2.1.: # of ETPS country updated national plans supported by the regional mangrove strategy.</p>	<p>Base-Line 2.1.: In general ecosystem based management that integrates upstream processes such as watershed management and other ridge-to-reef teleconnections are not traditionally represented in national planning for mangroves. Instead, spatial planning is often undertaken by different agencies and tailored to the needs of the different local populated centers/ divisions. Each ETPS country is working to develop their mangrove and wetland strategies. Costa Rica: Developing a wetland national strategy into 2017 which includes an updated inventory of national mangrove areas. Panama: Developing a national mangrove strategy which has yet to be implemented and adjusted in the context of a new Environment Ministry in 2015. Colombia: Already prohibits the deforestation of mangrove resources and has granted certain concessionary rights to communities but has not yet developed a specific national mangrove action plan.</p>	<p>Target 2.1.: National regulations and national mangrove action plans are improved and made consistent with the regional mangrove strategy, such that priority Pacific mangroves are put under an improved policy conducive to more effective on-the-ground conservation by Y2Q4. Costa Rica incorporates ridge-to-reef processes as relevant upstream watershed processes into their wetland conservation strategy. Panama ANAM and ARAP authorities combine into a new ministry where new competencies are established that improve effective wetland policy development. Colombia: Project inputs support National law 1450 to be established into 2015 towards improved mangrove conservation strategies. Ecuador: The regional action plan contributes to the application of the</p>	<p>Output 2.1.1.: Updated national mangrove action plans are formally ratified in at least two ETPS countries.</p> <p>Output Indicator 2.1.1.: # of updated and ratified national mangrove action plans (and in development) by Y2Q4.</p>

Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Project Baseline	End of Project Target	Expected Outputs and Indicators
	<p>Ecuador: Currently drafting a first national mangrove action plan. MAE has implemented a successful concession program known as "sociomanglares" which would benefit from a viable long term financing mechanism.</p>	<p>Ecuador National Plan for Well-Being (Buen vivir).</p>	
<p>Outcome 2.2.: At least two ETPS countries have passed stronger regulations and incentives conducive to mangrove conservation.</p> <p><i>Outcome Indicator 2.2.:</i> # of countries with stronger regulations or incentives that improve mangrove conservation underway and established at the national level by Y2Q4.</p>	<p>Base-Line 2.2.: Existing regulations and their effective implementation vary between ETPS country:</p> <p>Costa Rica: Forest Law 7575 (1996) outlawed all mangrove extraction and suspended all licensing for additional shrimp aquaculture, but does not yet consider land-use practice affecting upstream watershed processes. Uses are restricted to tourism, education and investigation complicating management in historically fished areas.</p> <p>Panamá: General Environmental Law No. 41 (1998) and recent resolutions (2008) require special permits with fines for any use that could affect mangroves. Unfortunately urban development approved in 2011 resulted in the destruction of extensive mangrove areas, including in Ramsar listed wetlands.</p> <p>Colombia: Amended Resolution 1602 (1996) specifically outlaws mangrove destruction in all national provinces and require licenses for any activities that could negatively affect mangroves. Practical application though is limited across high poverty communities along the Pacific coast where deforestation rates are highest. Law 1450 (2011) under the National Development Plan later prohibited mining and aquaculture industries in mangrove systems. A further mangrove specific resolution is planned by MADS for 2015.</p> <p>Ecuador: Resolution 56 establishes a fine of \$89,273 USD per hectare for mangrove destruction. Concessions agreements across</p>	<p>Target 2.2.: National threat assessment exercises and trans-boundary knowledge exchanges lead to more effective regulations governing ridge-to-reef processes impacting mangrove areas in at least two of the ETPS countries. Changes in policy and national sustainable development programs act to reduce the likelihood of continued mangrove degradation, encouraging instead reforestation. Positive effects of integrated ridge-to-reef planning propagate to local scales. This provides more effective nursery habitat, food security, water quality and coastal defenses are bolstered. Communities within and around the resource shift towards sustainable mangrove based livelihoods with social and economic benefits that improve community well-being.</p> <p>Targets for national planning discussed with local authorities during the PPG will be confirmed during project start-up. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarified tenure and use rights for local communities; • Improved upstream watershed management; • Stricter pollution controls; • Mandatory Environmental Impact Assessments; • Mangrove climate adaptation criteria in national plans; 	<p>Output 2.2.1: A national mangrove policy and threat assessment for each ETPS country to orient economic valuation work, informs policy gaps, and identifies outreach needs and priorities in each ETPS country, completed by Y1Q4.</p> <p><i>Output Indicator 2.2.1.:</i> # of ETPS countries with an updated (post PPG) mangrove base-line, national policy and threat assessment by Y1Q4.</p> <p>Output 2.2.2.: Legislation passed to strengthen the protection of mangroves in at least two ETPS countries completed by Y2Q4.</p> <p><i>Output Indicator 2.2.2.:</i> # of new or updated policies containing elements attributable to the project national assessment exercises.</p>

Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Project Baseline	End of Project Target	Expected Outputs and Indicators
	~50K ha of mangrove have been granted to local communities over the last 5 years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National incentive schemes for effective management; • A financial sustainability mechanism for concession programs; • Strengthening of marine protected networks and biological corridors; • More stringent fines for illegal mangrove destruction. 	
Component 3: Local conservation action.			
<p>Outcome 3.1.: At least two key mangrove ecosystems have updated management plans and/or new local development plans consistent with updated national and regional strategies, taking into account the results of economic valuation studies from this and related projects and building on increased national capacity and support to protect mangroves in a comprehensive ridge-to-reef context by Y2Q4.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 3.1.: # of site level management or local development plans generated with stakeholders directly and indirectly as a result of project developments.</p>	<p>Base-Line 3.1.: The demonstration sites in this project are adjacent to communities for which management plans are being developed or improved: <u>Chira, Gulf of Nicoya (Costa Rica)</u> Management actions are largely organized by private enterprises (women's collectives within the community). A Responsible Fishing Marine Area was designated and adopted by the Palito community Asopecupachi Cooperative in 2012. <u>David, Gulf of Chiriquí (Panamá);</u> CI-Panama has been working in consultation with local authorities and stakeholders since 2007 towards an eventual management plan in David, and more recently (2013+) in Montijo. <u>Bazan-Bocana (Colombia);</u> A local management plan was developed in 2012 with the community council of Bazán Bocana by MADS and the CVC with support from Marviva for a Special Nature Reserve covering 800 ha of bay mangroves. <u>El Morro, Gulf of Guayaquil (Ecuador);</u> A management plan has been in development since 2008 in revision by MAE with financing and technical oversight from CI-Ecuador.</p>	<p>Target 3.1.: Local policy and management plans are strengthened in each site and made consistent with national plans and the regional mangrove strategy in at least two of the local sites of Chira (Costa Rica), David (Panama), Bahia Malaga (Colombia) and/or El Morro (Ecuador) that have field conservation measures underway to reduce degradation and increase mangrove coverage through restoration efforts. Targets for local planning discussed with authorities during the PPG will be confirmed during project start-up. Examples included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mangrove climate adaptation criteria in local plans (David, Panama); • Inter-institutional arrangements that regularize no-take nursery areas zoned by community councils. • Consolidate new concession agreements within management plans (El Morro, Ecuador). 	<p>Output 3.1.1.: At least two local management plans and/or local development plans for priority mangrove sites are formally ratified by local authorities by Y2Q4.</p> <p>Output Indicator 3.1.1.: # of improved site level management plans or local development plans in effect by Y2Q4 and/or % completion.</p>

Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Project Baseline	End of Project Target	Expected Outputs and Indicators
<p>Outcome 3.2.: Economic evaluation tools and methodologies developed through the GEF-UNEP Blue Forests and other related projects are tested in at least two ETPS countries during their development phases to maximize applicability to policy and management at local to national scales by Y2Q3.</p> <p><i>Outcome Indicator 3.2.:</i> # of GEF-UNEP Blue Forests method and/or analogous economic evaluations and tools developed and presented to project stakeholders</p>	<p>Base-Line 3.2.: The GEF-UNEP Blue Forests initiative is currently underway to develop marine carbon accounting methodologies and ecosystem services evaluations that help quantify carbon credit as a potential management as well as financing tool. The initiative that ran from 2010-2014 envisaged small scale interventions at pilot sites to help resource managers better represent the often underestimated value of mangrove systems (e.g. for carbon and emissions scenarios, fisheries enhancement zones etc.) in national policies. This would better reflect their latent resource potential in emerging economies such as climate change, conservation, biodiversity and sustainable development for tourism etc. Both Costa Rica (Cifuentes et al, 2014), and Ecuador (Hamilton & Lovette, 2015) have undertaken recent carbon assessments/ valuation estimating and correcting mangrove loss estimations from the 1960s onwards. STRI working with the Carnegie Institute of science have developed LIDAR based methods for a first high fidelity carbon map for Panama (2013). Colombia has some information for the Caribbean coast, but requires more support in carbon technologies, GIS skills (with CVC) and valuation of ecosystem goods and services.</p>	<p>Target 3.2.: The GEF-UNEP Blue Forest Project and WAVES methodology is successfully applied and evaluated in the ETPS country demonstration sites of Ecuador (Gulf of Guayaquil) and Costa Rica (Gulf of Nicoya). This will provide important economic evaluation tools and base-line reference data of direct relevance for both local resource managers and national planning agencies, helping to value the resource and justify steps in national policy revisions and improved site level management (e.g. creation of new mangrove concessions etc.). A knowledge sharing platform is created drawing upon experiences and examples across the project, and integrated between the outreach platforms of each project partner. The results of the project are widely communicated in national, regional and global conservation, science, policy and related fora.</p>	<p>Output 3.2.1.: Final report on the economic valuation of ecosystem goods and services provided by mangroves in at least two project sites, including a) fisheries, b) nature-based tourism, c) coastal protection, d) maintaining water quality and bioremediation, and e) carbon storage completed by Y2Q1.</p> <p><i>Output Indicator 3.2.1.:</i> # of completed site studies presented to stakeholders by Y2Q1.</p> <p>Output 3.2.2.: Summary outreach document and associated strategy for making it most relevant to decision-makers on the methodology(ies) and toolkit(s) assessed and used to guide the implementation and policy application of economic valuation of mangrove ecosystem services that include cost-benefit analyses of alternative management options, based on existing initiatives including the GEF-UNEP Blue Forest project and WAVES, completed by Y2Q4.</p> <p><i>Output Indicator 3.2.2.:</i> % completion and presentation of outreach document with decision support strategy presented to ETPS decision makers by Y2Q4.</p> <p>Output 3.2.3.: Mangrove valuation, policy and development planning outcomes and field conservation communicated broadly, including through: distribution of communications materials; an interactive knowledge-sharing platform; presentation in at least three national, regional and global conservation, science, policy and</p>

Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Project Baseline	End of Project Target	Expected Outputs and Indicators
			<p>related fora (e.g.: Ramsar, CBD, IMPAC, Blue Carbon Working Group, ITTO); participating in the IWLearn mechanism (including allocation of 1% of project budget for this purpose), and presentation to policy makers in other mangrove relevant countries by Y2Q4.</p> <p>Output Indicator 3.2.3.: # of outreach and communication media/ platforms/ packages generated, aimed at national, regional and global mangrove conservation, science and policy fora by Y2Q4.</p>
<p>Outcome 3.3.: Outreach and capacity building for at least 30 local policymakers and stakeholders finalized by Y2Q4.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 3.3.: # Policymakers and stakeholders trained per ETPS country.</p>	<p>Base-Line 3.3.: The project partners do not have existing outreach and training underway for mangrove conservation at the selected project sites.</p>	<p>Target 3.3.: Local policy makers and stakeholders receive directed training in field conservation skills and mangrove restoration scenarios. Stakeholders are as a result better equipped to develop local policy and action plans, run in-house threat assessments and evaluate their resource use scenarios. This encourages informed decisions when developing alternatives that favor the sustainable use and recovery of their mangrove resources.</p>	<p>Output 3.3.1.: At least two training events are conducted per ETPS country with at least 15 participants each to build skills relating to field conservation measures and restoration of mangroves by Y2Q4.</p> <p>Output Indicator 3.3.1.: # of events and training hours received per stakeholder in each ETPS country by Y2Q4.</p>
<p>Outcome 3.4.: At least two demonstration projects that provide incentives and/or that create business opportunities associated with the conservation and sustainable use of mangroves initiated in at least two selected sites by Y2Q4.</p> <p>Outcome Indicator 3.4.: # of demonstration projects providing incentives and/or business opportunities successfully initiated and/or supported by the project in high priority mangrove conservation areas.</p>	<p>Base-Line 3.4.: The project partners do not have existing demonstration projects for mangrove sustainable use and conservation at the selected project sites.</p>	<p>Target 3.4.: The country level exchange of experiences and technical fora developed in the project (e.g. the ecosystem services evaluations, Blue Forests methodologies etc.) stimulate at least 2 demonstration projects designed to promote the conservation and sustainable use of mangrove resources. At least two sites are selected for these projects on the basis of feasibility for implementation and their potential return for conservation and associated societies.</p>	<p>Output 3.4.1.: Local associations in at least two sites actively participate and commit to demonstration projects by Y1Q4.</p> <p>Output Indicator 3.4.1.: MOUs with local associations that outline commitments to participate in mangrove conservation and restoration activities signed by Y1Q3.</p> <p>Output 3.4.2.: Local stakeholders participating in demonstration projects increased by 20% over the project start-up baseline by Y2Q4.</p>

Expected Outcomes and Indicators	Project Baseline	End of Project Target	Expected Outputs and Indicators
		<p>Successful examples improve the grass-roots advocacy for sustainable livelihoods locally and potentially amplify the benefits of similar practices when adapted to adjacent areas and regions. A list of potential demonstration projects considered for each of the four local sites is given in Section 4B.</p>	<p>Output Indicator 3.4.2.: % of initiatives where stakeholders lead activities and actively participate at each local project site between Y1Q4 and Y2Q4.</p>

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).

Comments from GEFSEC at CEO approval	Response from Agency at CEO endorsement
<p>Question 6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p> <p>During PPG, consideration needs to be given to collaborating with projects that are not "mangrove" projects but relate to the threats, including urban expansion, aquaculture, charcoal production and agricultural expansion.</p>	<p>This comment has been addressed and is referenced to in several sections of the reformatted WWF-GEF ProDoc:</p> <p>Section 2.5; Component 1 Description (Pg 46): Under this component at least two of the four ETPS countries will either complete or update their national mangrove action plans to make them consistent with the regional strategy (Output 2.2.1). Importantly, updates to national action plans will ensure that “ridge-to-reef” (watershed) considerations are taken into account given the strong connectivity between upstream, coastal (including mangroves) and inshore marine ecosystems. CI country offices with existing peer networks in the region will also identify and collaborate with those projects that are not necessarily focused on mangroves, but relate to the threats posed by upstream and downstream processes such as urban expansion, aquaculture, charcoal production and agriculture expansion.</p> <p>Section 2.6 Lessons Learned from the PPG Phase (Pg. 54): Given access and logistics limitations the trans-boundary mangrove complex spanning the Colombia-Ecuador was removed from the project during the PPG phase as a candidate local demonstration site. It was decided that this instead be included as an element for discussion during the C2 national policy planning between Ecuador and Colombian foreign affair ministries.</p> <p>Section 2.10 Incremental Cost Reasoning (Pg.60): The national project activities (Component #2) supporting policy reform implies collaboration through CI-national offices with other projects not necessarily linked to mangroves, but of direct relevance to threats posed by upstream and downstream processes (in addition to the support to site level management plans contemplated in Component #3) such as urban expansion, aquaculture, charcoal production, climate change impacts and agriculture expansion.</p>
<p>Question 7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p> <p>1) More detail on the communication products (Component 1, Outcome 3.2); 2) addition of regional workshops (Component 2, Output 3.2); 3) the actual economic valuation needs to include a cost-benefit analysis (Component 3, Outcome 2)</p>	<p>Answer (1,2): These comments were addressed in the updated Results Framework and project document text:</p> <p>Component 1. Output 1.3.1.: At least two ETPS trans-boundary learning and cooperation exchanges between project countries and at least one international exchange with other countries with similar mangrove conservation challenges completed by Y2Q4.</p> <p><i>Output Indicator 1.3.1.:</i> # of thought leaders trained per country actively working in aspects of mangrove policy and resource planning by Y2Q4.</p> <p>Output 1.3.2.: Communication products on mangrove conservation (policy, regulations, field implementation and</p>

	<p>other related issues) will be completed and made available to policy makers and stakeholders by Y1Q3.</p> <p><i>Output Indicator 1.3.2.:</i> % completion of communication products (as described in Section 4B) by Y1Q3.</p> <p><u>Component 2.</u> Outcome 2.2.: At least two ETPS countries have passed stronger regulations and incentives conducive to mangrove conservation.</p> <p><i>Outcome Indicator 2.2.:</i> # of countries with stronger regulations or incentives that improve mangrove conservation underway and established at the national level by Y2Q4.</p> <p><u>Answer (3) RBF text:</u></p> <p><u>Component 3.</u> Output 3.2.2: Summary outreach document and associated strategy for making it most relevant to decision-makers on the methodology(ies) and toolkit(s) assessed and used to guide the implementation and policy application of economic valuation of mangrove ecosystem services that include cost-benefit analyses of alternative management options, based on existing initiatives including the GEF-UNEP Blue Forest project and WAVES, completed by Y2Q4.</p> <p><i>Output Indicator 3.2.2.:</i> % completion and presentation of outreach document with decision support strategy presented to ETPS decision makers by Y2Q4.</p> <p>Further explanation on communication products is given in the ProDoc descriptive text (ref (1) Section 2.5 (Pg’s 45,50), Section 2.13 (Pg 67)):</p> <p>“Output 3.2.2 involves creating tool kits specifically tailored for the needs of resource managers (e.g. environmental agencies, self-organized communities etc.). Examples proposed include (i) a manual on carbon assessment in mangroves and carbon based project development as well as thematic packages (e.g. explaining the role that mangroves play as fisheries enhancement areas) and (ii) a summary of applications for economic valuation of mangrove ecosystem services that include cost-benefit analyses of alternative management options (fisheries, tourism, aquaculture) based on existing initiatives including the GEF-UNEP Blue Forest project and WAVES.”</p>
Comments on Prodoc	

<p>The project identifies urbanization as a major global and regional threat and even one of the criteria for site selection. However, there is a heavy emphasis on the conservation aspects with limited inclusion of city planning and development aspects. To address urbanization requires working with city planners and developers, the relevant ministries and integrating mangrove management strategies into their plans. This bias is evident in the table of national priorities, plans and policies (para 84), the description of Component 2 indicative activities (para 111) particularly for Costa Rica and Panama, the table of relevant projects and initiatives (para 136 and 81), the table of stakeholders (para 14) and the institutional context particularly for Costa Rica and Ecuador (para 44, 47). Similarly for addressing other threats, but since urbanization is noted as the focus for the project, it at least needs to be incorporated.</p>	<p>This aspect of component 2 (national policy strengthening which also will respond to policy gap analysis) is now better emphasized in the ProDoc. Please see Section 2.5 (Pg.46) of the ProDoc.</p> <p>The method to best engage the urban planners that influence EIAs and R2R spatial planning is determined for each country under guidance of the OFP leads appointed- these being the authorities (environmental) strategizing national outputs for the project and identified also as key stakeholders given their roles. It is planned that inputs from the regional strategy as well as project C2 support to national planning stimulate and generate policy related to urbanization/EIAs etc. that extends and involves other government branches such as land use planning and forestry where needed.</p>
<p>In the Project Strategy section there are plans for short-term knowledge sharing (e.g. have exchanges, produce tools), but not more long-term institutionalized sharing. There needs to be a commitment and plan to long-term knowledge sharing (e.g. annual sharing of experiences, website, listserve) with an institutional lead. Developing plan may be part of the UNESCO communications specialist work (para 158) and one of the roles for CPPS, which the Sustainability section notes as coordinating long-term (para 147).</p>	<p>We confirm that part of the role envisaged for the UNESCO communications specialist is to draw together the project outputs and learning experiences between in-country activities, CI and CPPS forums and help develop a structured mid-long term strategy to promote and share the relevant ridge to reef and mangrove knowledge so that it be available and used beyond the end of the project. This work also seeks to promote the sharing and hosting of resources and links through other mangrove support networks in the region. CPPS will be a key institution ensuring project legacy, housing the web presence and provide longevity through its long-term support arrangement for member governments and integration of project results into the UNESCO-IOC/ CPPS SPINCAM project. This has been emphasized in the ProDoc text, please see Section 2.12; Sustainability (Pg. 65)</p>
<p>There needs to be a clear description of the 4 sites based on the selection criteria (urbanization impacts, natural value, project links). There are a number of places where the sites are described, including the Socioeconomic and Cultural Context section and the Current Baseline section; however, these do not consistently cover these criteria. Otherwise, it is difficult to discern how they were selected and the current text does not clearly indicate in particular the urbanization concerns for all 4 sites. It would also be useful to include other threats and the socioeconomic values of mangroves at each site.</p>	<p>In the revised WWF-GEF format ProDoc the socio-economic & cultural context for the 4 sites is first described in Section 1.1 (Pg. 15) and a new Table (7) in Section 2.5 (Pgs. 52-53) added which compares sites using the criteria considered when selecting local demonstration sites in each country.</p>

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

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
<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>
Personnel	28,000	28,000	28,000
Consultancy	18,480	18,480	18,480
Travel	10,020	10,020	10,020
Grants and Agreements	19,500	19,500	19,500
Workshop and Training	14,500	14,500	14,500
Other Direct Costs	500	500	500
Total	91,000	91,000	91,000

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

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

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

N/A