



# REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Enhancing The Conservation Effectiveness of Seagrass Ecosystems Supporting Globally Significant Populations of Dugongs Across the Indian and Pacific Ocean Basins (Short Title: The Dugong and Seagrass Conservation Project)			
Countries:	Global multi-country: Indonesia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mozambique, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Timor-Leste, Vanuatu	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	4930
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	00857
Other Executing Partners:	Mohammed bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund (MbZSCF) <b>Technical Partners:</b> the CMS Dugong MoU Secretariat and its Dugong Technical Group (DTG), UNEP-DEPI, Blue Ventures (BV), Marine Research Foundation (MRF). The full list of additional 40 National Partners in the 8 project countries is provided in <b>Annex E</b> to this document.	Submission Date: Resubmission Date:	03/12/2013 22/04/2014
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	48
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	Project Agency Fee (\$):	\$558,982

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>2</sup>

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-1	Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas.	Output 1.1: New protected areas (number) and coverage (hectares) of unprotected ecosystems.  Based on the available information, the minimum project area is estimated at 1,406,718 Ha (minimum project area of 713,452 Ha and additional indirect impact area of minimum 693,266 Ha) for all eight countries.	GEFTF	2,563,268	43,548,230

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

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

		This figure is inclusive of existing protected areas within project sites (11), proposed new protected areas (15) and unprotected ecosystems.			
BD-1	Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas.	Output 1.2: New protected areas (number) and coverage (hectares) of unprotected threatened species (number).  Over 14 different threatened species were identified in seven of the eight countries to date. The number of threatened species within the project areas targeted by the project will be better defined during the Inception Phase.	GEFTF	1,752,967	29,188,772
BD-2	Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks	Output 2.2: Policies and regulations governing sectoral activities that integrate biodiversity conservation in the project target areas (in 8 countries) as recorded by the GEF tracking tool as a score.	GEFTF	810,300	14,359,458
BD-1	Set-aside to support regional-global projects		GEFTF	757,483	12,202,583
<b>Total project costs</b>				5,884,018	99,299,043

## B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

<b>Project Objective:</b> To enhance the effectiveness of conservation of dugongs and their seagrass ecosystems across the Indian and Pacific Ocean basins						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
Component 1: Improved site-level management at globally important sites for dugongs and seagrasses	TA	Outcome 1. Community-based stewardship of dugongs and their seagrass ecosystems at selected globally important Indo-Pacific sites enhanced	Output 1.1 Governance structures for improved community involvement in conservation and monitoring of dugong and seagrass ecosystems established or	GEFTF	1,375,083	8,960,559

			<p>strengthened in target areas</p> <p>Output 1.2 Capacity for community-based stewardship developed through increased awareness and active participation of local communities and relevant government structures in conservation and monitoring of dugongs and their seagrass habitats in target areas</p> <p>Output 1.3 Integrated community management plans for conservation management and monitoring of dugong and seagrass ecosystems developed and piloted in target areas</p>			
Component 2: Development of incentive mechanisms and tools to promote conservation and sustainable use of dugongs and seagrass ecosystems	TA	Outcome 2. Sustainable fisheries practices that reduce damage to dugongs and their seagrass ecosystems widely adopted through uptake of innovative incentive mechanisms and management tools	<p>Output 2.1 A range of management and incentive mechanisms and tools for sustainable fisheries developed, tested and piloted in target areas and capacity built within local community and government for effective implementation</p> <p>Output 2.2 Awareness raising and social marketing programmes developed, implemented and contributing to the adoption of more</p>	GEFT F	701,181	7,670,722

			sustainable practices among subsistence and small-scale artisanal net fishers in target areas			
Component 3: Removal of knowledge barriers	TA	Outcome 3. Increased availability and access to critical knowledge needed for decision-making for effective conservation of dugongs and their seagrass ecosystems in Indian and Pacific Ocean basins	Output 3.1 Critical gaps in knowledge of dugong and seagrass status, distribution, threat and conservation identified and survey programmes initiated or supported in priority areas  Output 3.2 Good practice guidelines developed for dugong and seagrass ecosystem conservation (including incentive-based approaches), based on assessment of project results and experiences  Output 3.3 Conservation-relevant information and guidance on dugong and seagrass ecosystems collated, shared across partner network and disseminated through dedicated web-based platforms and other channels	GEFT F	1,491,581	49,548,342
Component 4: Mainstreaming of dugong and seagrass conservation priorities into national and regional policies and plans	TA	Outcome 4. Conservation priorities and measures for dugongs and their seagrass ecosystems incorporated into relevant policy, planning and regulatory frameworks across the Indian and Pacific Ocean basins	Output 4.1 Policy, planning and regulatory gaps in conservation of dugongs and their seagrass ecosystems identified, and recommendations to address these developed, in all Project Countries  Output 4.2	GEFT F	1,682,510	32,250,751

			<p>Advocacy programmes developed and implemented and capacity built within advocacy groups in target areas to advocate for improved conservation policy, planning, regulation and management of dugongs and their seagrass ecosystems</p> <p>Output 4.3 Capacity for national and regional networking and contribution to global policy processes for effective dugong and seagrass conservation in the Indian and Pacific Ocean basins</p>			
Monitoring and Evaluation	TA	Project M&E plan timely implemented	Project management established and implementation and monitoring proceed effectively towards achievement of Outcomes	GEF TF	214,596	248,190
Subtotal				GEFT F	\$5,464,951	\$98,678,564
Project management Cost (PMC) <sup>3 i</sup>				GEFT F	\$419,067	\$620,479
<b>Total project costs<sup>ii</sup></b>					\$5,884,018	\$99,299,043

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

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$) <sup>– see ‘end notes’</sup>
Charity	Mohamed bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund (MbZSCF)	Cash	613,948
Government	Directorate of Marine and Aquatic Resources Conservation, Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Indonesia	Cash	1,534,198 <sup>iii</sup>

<sup>3</sup> PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.  
GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

University	Research Centre for Fisheries Resources Management and Fishery Resources, Indonesia	Cash	40,000
University	Research Centre for Fisheries Resources Management and Fishery Resources, Indonesia	In-kind	20,000
University	Research Centre for Oceanography, Indonesian Institute of Sciences (P2O-LIPI), Indonesia	Cash	505,887
University	Research Centre for Oceanography, Indonesian Institute of Sciences (P2O-LIPI), Indonesia	In-kind	41,915
Government	Bintan District Government - Bintan Regional Planning Board, Indonesia	Cash	10,000
Government	Bintan District Government - Bintan Marine Affairs and Fishery Office, Indonesia	Cash	460,500
Government	Bintan District Government - Land Division of Bintan Secretariat, Indonesia	In-kind	150,000
Government	Bintan District Government - Bintan Tourism Office, Indonesia	Cash	387,500
Government	Bintan District Government - Bintan Public Works Office, Indonesia	In-kind	350,000
Government	Bintan District Government - Bintan Environment Board, Indonesia	Cash	199,500
NGO	World Wide Fund For Nature, Indonesia	Cash	100,000
University	Bogor Agriculture University, Indonesia	Cash	20,000
University	Bogor Agriculture University, Indonesia	In-kind	5,500
University	LAMINA Foundation, Indonesia	In-kind	75,000
Private Company	Sea World, Indonesia	In-kind	100,000
NGO	Blue Ventures (BV)	In-kind	1,142,472
NGO	Community Centred Conservation (C-3), Madagascar	Cash	160,000 <sup>iv</sup>
NGO	Community Centred Conservation (C-3), Madagascar	In-kind	160,000 <sup>iv</sup>
NGO	Madagascar National Parks Sahamalaza (COSAP), Madagascar	Cash	11,050 <sup>v</sup>
NGO	Madagascar National Parks Sahamalaza (COSAP), Madagascar	In-kind	85,500 <sup>v</sup>
Government	Ministry of Environment and Forests (MEF), Madagascar	In-kind	1,326,727
NGO	Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), Madagascar	In-kind	940,000 <sup>vi</sup>
Government	Department of Marine Park, Malaysia	In-kind	413,920
Government	Department of Fisheries Malaysia (DoFM) Turtle and Marine Ecosystem Research Centre (TUMEC), Fisheries Research Institute (FRI), Malaysia	In-kind	510,600
University	Universiti Sains Malaysia, Center for Marine and Coastal Studies, Malaysia	In-kind	197,200
NGO	The MareCet Research Organization, Malaysia	In-kind	96,774 <sup>vi,vii</sup>

University	Universiti Malaya, Malaysia	In-kind	92,484 <sup>vi,vii</sup>
Government	Sarawak Forestry, Protected Area and Biodiversity Conservation Division (PABC), Malaysia	In-kind	520,320
University	University of Eduardo Mondlane, Mozambique	In-kind	13,500
University	University of Pretoria, Mammal Research Institute Whale Unit, Mozambique	In-kind	10,000
University	Centre for Dolphin Studies, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Mozambique	In-kind	12,000 <sup>vi</sup>
NGO	Endangered Wildlife Trust (EWT), Mozambique	Cash	70,000 <sup>iv</sup>
NGO	Endangered Wildlife Trust (EWT), Mozambique	In-kind	70,000 <sup>iv</sup>
NGO	IUCN Save Our Species (SOS), Mozambique	In-kind	43,247 <sup>vi</sup>
NGO	La Guntza Foundation, Mozambique	Cash	9,500
Government	Ministry for the Coordination of Environmental Affairs - National Directorate for Environmental Management (MICOA – DNGA), Mozambique	In-kind	32,938
Government	Biodiversity Education And Research (BEAR), Sri Lanka	In-kind	120,829
Government	Department of Wildlife Conservation, Sri Lanka	In-kind	293,096
NGO	IUCN Sri Lanka	In-kind	224,100
Government	National Aquatic Resources Research and Development Agency, Sri Lanka	In-kind	89,750
NGO	Ocean Resources Conservation Association (ORCA), Sri Lanka	In-kind	111,800
NGO	Turtle Conservation Project, Sri Lanka	In-kind	63,820
NGO	Marine Research Foundation (MRF), Timor Leste	In-kind	20,000
Government	Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation (DEPC), Vanuatu	In-kind	40,000
Government	Fisheries Department, Vanuatu	In-kind	40,000 <sup>viii</sup>
NGO	Wan Smolbag Theatre, Vanuatu	In-kind	10,000
NGO	Vanuatu Cultural Centre	In-kind	10,000
NGO	Marine Research Foundation (MRF), Malaysia (Technical Support)	In-kind	220,000 <sup>vi</sup>
IGO	UNEP/Convention on Migratory Species Office - Abu Dhabi (UNEP/CMS Office – Abu Dhabi)	Cash	634,000
IGO	UNEP/CMS Office - Abu Dhabi	In-kind	1,166,000
NGO	Sea Sense, Tanzania	In-kind	394,650
Government	Australian Government	In-kind	85,000,000
IGO	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)	Cash	18,000
IGO	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)	In-kind	40,000

IGO	UNEP Regional Office of West Asia (UNEP/ROWA)	In-kind	112,000
University	Universiti Malaysia Terengganu, Institute of Oceanography and Environment (INOS)	In-kind	158,818 <sup>vii</sup>
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			99,299,043

#### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
UNEP	GEF Trust Fund	Biodiversity	Indonesia	\$887,009	\$84,266	\$971,275
UNEP	GEF Trust Fund	Biodiversity	Madagascar	\$892,257	\$84,764	\$977,021
UNEP	GEF Trust Fund	Biodiversity	Malaysia	\$443,504	\$42,133	\$485,637
UNEP	GEF Trust Fund	Biodiversity	Mozambique	\$443,504	\$42,133	\$485,637
UNEP	GEF Trust Fund	Biodiversity	Sri Lanka	\$665,257	\$63,199	\$728,456
UNEP	GEF Trust Fund	Biodiversity	Timor Leste	\$887,009	\$84,266	\$971,275
UNEP	GEF Trust Fund	Biodiversity	Vanuatu	\$177,401	\$16,854	\$194,255
UNEP	GEF Trust Fund	Biodiversity	Solomon Islands (country added during PPG)	\$730,594	\$69,406	\$800,000
UNEP		Biodiversity	Additional FA set-aside (RSA)	\$757,483	\$71,961	\$829,444
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				<b>\$5,884,018</b>	<b>\$558,982</b>	<b>\$6,443,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> Indicate fees related to this project.

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



<b>Component</b>	<b>Grant Amount (\$)</b>	<b>Cofinancing (\$)</b>	<b>Project Total (\$)</b>
International Consultants	265,950.00	660,576.60	926,526.60
National/Local Consultants	325,050.00	807,371.40	1,132,421.40

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

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### **A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>4</sup>**

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

The only changes from the original PIF under A.1 relate to the inclusion of an additional country (Solomon Islands) at PPG Phase. Solomon Islands is a signatory to the CBD (ratified 3/10/1995), to the CMS Dugong MoU (signed 09/09/2010) and to CITES (entry into force 24/06/2007). A revised Table 4 in Section 2.4 of the ProDoc lists ratification of relevant MEAs by all countries. Solomon Islands has a National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan (2009), National Environmental Development Action Plan (aligned with CBD, UNFCCC and UNDP), a Dugong Action Plan in preparation and is a participating country in relevant regional initiatives (Pacific Islands Regional Marine Species Programme, Coral Triangle Initiative). The project is aligned with conservation priorities identified in these Plans. Table 6 in the ProDoc (Section 2.4) provides information for all eight countries on relevant national and regional policies, legislation and action plans, and information on existing networks of MPAs and management mandates for MPAs, LMMAs and other designated marine sites. Table 12 in the ProDoc (Section 3.6) gives more detail for all eight countries of the alignment between NBSAP and other national and regional plans and the four Project Outcomes.

**A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities: no change**

**A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:** no change

**A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:** Changes made from the PIF include revision and refinement of the Project Results Framework and the addition of Solomon Islands, taking the total number of participating countries to eight. The revised Project Results Framework is included here (Appendix 4 to the UNEP project document) and the STAP Review and Responses in Appendix 26 to the UNEP project document. Further detail of the rationale for specific changes (in response to STAP and GEF review comments) is summarised below:

#### ***A.4.1 Results Framework (Log Frame), Global context (dugong conservation) and strategic approaches (STAP review points 1 and 2)***

Revisions to the Project Results Framework (Log Frame) were made in line with the development of M&E indicators and also respond to the STAP review points 1 (the global context and threat to dugongs and seagrass ecosystems) and 2 (project strategies to address the objective).

The project objective is: *“to enhance the effectiveness of conservation of dugongs and their seagrass ecosystems across the Indian and Pacific Ocean basins”*. The four project Components and associated Outcomes are effectively the same as at PIF stage, with slight revisions to wording and grouping. This is for clarity and to emphasize the contribution of project strategies under each of the four Components to the Project Objective. Capacity building was removed as a separate Outcome (it is incorporated as an activity and process in all other Outcomes). The finalised Log Frame is included in the ProDoc in Appendices 4 (Results Framework) and 6 (Key Deliverables and Benchmarks); and an analysis of changes to wording and budget percentages is described in Appendix 25 (Budget Comparisons with PIF). The final Components, Outcomes and Outputs are listed in Table 8, Section 3.3 in the ProDoc, which also shows their

---

<sup>4</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.

alignment with the broader Dugong MoU Conservation and Management Plan (CMP) objectives. (The CMP covers all range states of the dugong which are signatories to the Dugong MoU). The revised wording of Project Components and Outcomes is:

Project Component	Project Outcome
COMPONENT 1. Improved site-level management at globally important sites for dugongs and seagrasses	<b>Outcome 1: Community-based stewardship</b> of dugongs and their seagrass ecosystems at selected globally important Indo-Pacific sites enhanced
COMPONENT 2. Development of incentive mechanisms and tools to promote conservation and sustainable use of dugongs and seagrass ecosystems	<b>Outcome 2: Sustainable fisheries practices</b> that reduce damage to dugongs and their seagrass ecosystems widely adopted through uptake of innovative incentive mechanisms and management tools
COMPONENT 3. Removal of knowledge barriers	<b>Outcome 3: Increased availability and access to critical knowledge needed for decision-making</b> for effective conservation of dugongs and their seagrass ecosystems in Indian and Pacific Ocean basins
COMPONENT 4. Mainstreaming of dugong and seagrass conservation priorities into national and regional policies and plans	<b>Outcome 4: Conservation priorities and measures</b> for dugongs and their seagrass ecosystems incorporated into relevant policy, planning and regulatory frameworks across the Indian and Pacific Ocean basins

The development of indicators builds on the information gathered from PPG workshops, national reports and the suite of national sub-projects submitted. With the addition of Solomon Islands late in the PPG process, there is a total of 40 national sub-projects from eight countries (see ProDoc Appendix 20). Table 9 in the ProDoc (Section 3.3) shows how national sub-projects contribute to Project Outcomes; this Table is included under A.7 below. Overall Project indicators were developed (through consultation with the scientific advisors of the Dugong Technical Group) to encompass the outcomes and impacts targeted across all countries (and sub-projects) and the proposed regional impacts. These will be developed further, with additional quantified baselines and targets, during Inception Phase and in tandem with the development of more detailed national project plans. These will include specific targets and SMART indicators for individual projects and national programmes, and project-specific M&E plans.

In response to the *STAP review comment 1* (Appendix 26 of UNEP Project Document), the ProDoc clarifies and emphasizes the global importance and threat to dugongs and seagrass beds across their entire ranges in the Indian and West Pacific Ocean Basins and the innovative nature of the Project as the first coordinated approach to their conservation across a wide range of countries and sites. A regionally coordinated approach is essential because of the migratory nature of dugongs and the critical threats to coastal ecosystems which may extend across many national jurisdictions. The Project will enhance conservation effectiveness, develop approaches and tools at key priority sites and contribute global environmental benefits in the eight participating countries. It will contribute much wider regional impacts through replication, enhanced knowledge and information exchange, awareness raising and mainstreaming. This will be facilitated by the very close linkages and synergies between the Project and the wider Dugong MoU and its Conservation and Management Plan (covering more than 40 range states of the dugong). Project results will be disseminated and experience exchanged throughout the network of range states via a Clearing House Mechanism established under the Project. Additional detail is provided in the ProDoc Section 2.1 and Appendices 17 (Global Overview of Dugong Conservation<sup>ix</sup>) and 18 (The CMS Dugong MoU).

In response to the STAP review comment 2, the rationale and logic for the Project (the 'theory of change') is more clearly defined in the Log Frame and the overall Project strategies (including scientific and technical aspects) are explained in more detail in the ProDoc. Relevant sections are ProDoc Section 3.3, Appendix 4 Results Framework (Outcomes and Indicators) and Appendix 6 (Key Deliverables and Benchmarks). The response to STAP (Appendix 26 to UNEP ProDoc) also gives details of the composition and expertise of the DTG (Dugong Technical Group - marine conservation scientists and programme experts) who have contributed throughout the PPG and will continue to advise the Project at a strategic and programme level throughout implementation. The broad Project strategies correspond to the 4 Components: enhanced community engagement in marine and seagrass-dependent biodiversity; provision of economic incentives and strategies to promote behavioural change (“dugong and seagrass-friendly” fisheries) and conservation buy-in; removal of critical knowledge barriers for the protection of marine and seagrass-dependent biodiversity; and mainstreaming of marine and seagrass-dependent biodiversity priorities into local, national, regional and coastal/sectoral policy, planning and regulation. During the PPG Phase national sub-projects were developed to target conservation priorities under the four Project Components. The Results Framework was refined and streamlined (now four outcomes and 11 outputs) and broad Project level indicators developed (see above). Table 9 in the ProDoc (Section 3.3) shows how national sub-projects contribute to overall Project Outcomes and Appendix 20 gives more detail of all 40 national sub-projects, their individual strategies and how they will contribute to the 11 Project Outputs and achievement of the four Project Outcomes.

The PPG Phase was highly collaborative, with regional and national workshops and consultancies providing country-level background information and proposals for sub-projects aligned with national frameworks. This was a very participatory and country-driven process but also very complex due to the large number of participants (32 Project Partners across eight countries) and the late inclusion of Solomon Islands (after most other regional PPG activities had been completed). As a result, it is acknowledged that levels of data for some elements of the Project plan (e.g. baselines for Results Framework indicators) are insufficient and more work is needed. Some PPG dugong and seagrass survey results and analyses will only be available by the end of 2013. An extended Inception Phase is therefore envisaged for the start of Project implementation to allow time for additional activities at national level to supplement critical baseline data collected during the PPG Phase (and to allow for data collection in Solomon Islands, which was not involved in the PPG data collection phase). The extended Inception Phase will also allow for the refinement and planning of sub-projects to further define regional, national and Project specific targets, milestones and indicators and to look for possible synergies and harmonization across national programmes. This process will continue to be supported by the DTG and other technical experts. More detail of the proposed extended Inception Phase and strategic planning is given in the second response to STAP review comment 2 (ref. appendix 26 to UNEP ProDoc).

In addition, **project management costs** were raised from 5% (at PIF) to 7.1% to reflect the high execution complexity of management arrangements, given the increased number of countries (now 8 over an extensive area, spanning from Mozambique to Vanuatu), the need to set-up and oversee 40 sub-projects, 8 national committees, and the wide range of partners involved (detail is also provided in Table 11 in Section 3.5 of the UNEP ProDoc). A significant share of co-financing will support management costs.

#### ***A.4.2 Data on dugong and seagrass conservation status; MPAs, LMMAs and community-based approaches; Indicators and GEBs (STAP review points 3, 4 and 7)***

Data on both dugong populations and seagrass ecosystems are very patchy and incomplete – Project Component 3 tackles the barrier to effective conservation action created by this lack of information on dugong population status and location, extent and condition of seagrass habitats. For Mozambique, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Timor Leste and Vanuatu in particular, there is very little information, and for most regions data on trends are only anecdotal or fairly crude estimates. The migratory nature of dugongs also makes analysis of trends and population sizes problematic; for example, it is very likely that individuals and groups move between contiguous range states so ‘national estimates’ are

hard to define. Data given in the ProDoc are based on the best available information from peer-reviewed journals and from national reports at PPG Phase (see Section 2.6 Baseline analysis and gaps by country). A synthesis of this information is included as ProDoc Appendix 17 (Global Overview of Dugong Conservation). Further surveys to supplement this information were also carried out as part of PPG activities in several Project Countries; this new information on dugong ‘baselines’ will be available by the end of 2013 for most Project Countries. This will be used to help finalise the choice of national target sites for action, as well as monitoring indicators and targets at national and overall Project level, during the proposed extended Inception Phase (see above).

Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) can be a powerful tool for the conservation of dugongs and their seagrass habitats but there are many other conservation approaches, known as “ancillary marine conservation initiatives” under the CBD, complementary to MPAs (see *STAP Review response 3 and 7*, Appendix 26 to ProDoc). As described in the ProDoc and Appendices, the Project will also employ community-based approaches and incentives for behavioural change (e.g. to achieve widespread adoption of less destructive fishing practices). Many of the Project Partners as well as some Supporting Partners (e.g. CMS Dugong MoU Secretariat, the Dugong Technical Group) have extensive experience in developing and managing community-based approaches to both surveys and conservation management. These Partners include leading experts in the development of innovative and effective programmes of community stewardship, incentive tools and alternative livelihoods (e.g. Blue Ventures in Madagascar, Mozambique and Vanuatu; ‘Seagrass Watch’ in Solomon Islands; the CMS Dugong MoU Secretariat’s ‘Dugong, Seagrass and Coastal Communities Initiative’ Toolbox) and development of community-based surveys and monitoring (e.g. Marine Research Foundation in Malaysia, members of the DTG, listed in *STAP Review responses*). Detailed information is given in the ProDoc on approaches, existing project examples and Partners’ expertise, which will be used to guide the development and implementation of sub-projects at national level. Information on Project Partners and stakeholders is in Section 2.5 Stakeholder mapping and analysis; Appendix 21: Stakeholder Capacity; Section 4 Institutional Framework and implementation arrangements. Details of national sub-projects are in Section 3 Intervention Strategy (Table 9) and Appendix 20: National projects summaries. Details of conservation and community approaches and tools are in Section 3.3; Appendix 17: Global Overview of Dugong Conservation; Appendix 24: Management Toolboxes). Additional information is also provided under the response to *STAP Review comment 7* (Appendix 26) and under B.1 and B.2, below.

The suite of national sub-projects (ProDoc Section 3, Table 9 -copied into B.1 below- and Appendix 20) involve a mix of approaches both within existing MPAs and/ or LMMAs or other marine area designations and in areas not designated. Details of the ‘baseline’ situation in relation to MPAs and LMMAs at national level and the relationship between the provisional list of sites targeted under the Project and their designated status (MPA, LMMA or other category) are given in Table 6, Section 2.4 Institutional, sectoral and policy context and Appendix 23. Tracking Tools (METT) for an initial sub-set of proposed target sites are included in Appendix 15.

Provisional target sites for survey and conservation action under national sub-projects were selected during PPG Phase. They were identified as potentially important seagrass meadows that support dugongs. Specific criteria will be applied during the Project Inception Phase to determine final target sites, with an emphasis on areas of seagrass habitat with the potential to support dugongs rather than only on dugong occurrence *per se*, because of the difficulty in obtaining evidence of dugong occurrence and the emphasis on a wider ecosystem approach to dugong and seagrass conservation. The conservation approach will be site-specific – in some cases involving designation or existing designated sites; in other cases it will fall in the category of “ancillary marine conservation initiatives” (see above). At this stage (during the extended Inception Phase) more specific site-based information will be provided and baseline information obtained, with Project-specific baselines and targets established (e.g. using METT if appropriate for the site; community and socio-economic indicators specific to the site and the planned approach).

Information obtained during this Inception Phase from all 8 countries on final site selection and details of sites for action (including protected area status/ aim to achieve PA status or extend area of seagrass protected; baseline METT score and targets for improvement; socio-economic or behavioural indicators) will also be used to finalize overall Project monitoring targets and indicators in the Project Log Frame and M&E Plan. The proposed “15% increase in protected seagrass ecosystems” target from the PIF was modified after consultation during PPG Phase. Instead, the proposed objectives level indicator is “Total area of seagrass (key areas for dugongs) under improved conservation management”. This covers all approaches (MPAs, LMMAs, “ancillary marine conservation initiatives” etc.); measures of improved conservation management, baselines and targets will be refined during Inception. Overall Project targets will be defined to encompass the expected results across all 8 countries and the associated regional activities.

The *STAP Review comment 4* also asked about Dugong Catch/ Incidental Catch survey data and analyses and quantifiable GEBs. As detailed in the response to this query (ref. Appendix 26 to the UNEP ProDoc) and in the first paragraph above, data on Dugongs are very patchy across the Project Countries and analyses of additional surveys carried out during the PPG Phase (6 of the 8 countries) are expected to be available by the end of 2013 in time for the Project Inception Phase. Obtaining new or additional data for the 8 countries is also a strategic research priority under the Project and 34 of the proposed sub-projects include additional survey work during implementation (Component 3: removal of knowledge barriers) and to provide baseline data for national sub-projects.

However, it is also acknowledged in the Project response to STAP that any trends detected in dugong population and distribution data over the short (four year) Project timeframe may not be indicators of long term trends in dugong population status. Therefore, proxies to indicate impact of the Project and subsequent contributions to achieving global environmental benefits (GEBs) are used in the Project Log Frame. These will include quantifiable measures e.g. of behavioural change in fishing practices that will reduce dugong mortality and destruction of seagrass meadows. Possible examples include percentage of gill net fishers, time of day of gill net use, soak time of gill nets, location of gill net fishing. Broad indicators are defined in the Results Framework (ProDoc Appendix 4); detailed baselines and targets will be defined at Inception, as described above.

The Dugong is the flagship project species but the targeted GEBs are much wider than the conservation impact on a single species and include benefits resulting from effective habitat and ecosystem conservation and sustainable management. By addressing habitat and ecosystem conservation and the socio-economic needs of communities dependent on the wider ecosystems, the Project will help achieve global targets on biodiversity loss and climate change mitigation and support the well-being of millions of local, often impoverished, coastal dwellers. Ecosystem services provided by seagrass ecosystems include fish habitats (nurseries, shelter, and food for many commercially, recreationally, and ecologically important species); filtration and cleaning of estuarine and coastal waters; food security and cultural heritage values; ecotourism and recreation possibilities; carbon sequestration (often in combination with other linked and ecologically vital community types in the tropics such as coral reefs and mangrove forests). More detail of the anticipated GEBs of the Project is provided in ProDoc Section 3.1.2 and in responses to STAP review comments (Appendix 26 to ProDoc). As described above, broad indicators of outcomes, which will lead to the targeted change (or maintenance) of GEBs are included in the Results Framework (Appendix 4). These include effective conservation management of seagrass beds, behavioural change among fishers to adopt more sustainable fishing practices; changes in awareness and improvement availability and access to critical knowledge for conservation management. Baselines and targets will be better defined and quantified during Inception, as described above – building from site and national to overall Project level. For socio-economic indicators (e.g. benefits derived from alternative income-generating activities or incentive mechanisms) quantifiable information will be obtained at sub-project level. Individual sub-projects will establish project and site-specific baselines and monitor and report against these. This will provide evidence of global benefits derived at site and national level – in effect as case studies. Research investigations and quantification of ecosystem benefits will also provide site and project-specific results for the GEBs at site and community level.

#### ***A.4.3 Research and survey methods; data handling; conservation solutions (STAP review points 5, 6 and 7)***

Detailed responses to *the STAP request 5* (for STAP to be consulted about research methodologies) are included in Appendix 26 to the ProDoc. The research and survey methods to be employed in the Project were developed by global and regional experts and the key references which detail the relevant methodologies are listed under the response to STAP comment 5 (Appendix 26 to ProDoc) and in the ProDoc (Appendix 17: Global Overview of Dugong Conservation). These same expert groups and individuals have contributed to the Project development and design through the PPG Phase and are also Project partners and/ or advisors to project implementation (e.g. Seagrass Watch; the CMS Dugong MoU Secretariat and members of the DTG). The specific expertise of the technical advisors is detailed under the Response to STAP comment number 2, and the roles and responsibilities of experts and Project Partners are detailed in the ProDoc (section 4, Institutional Framework and Implementation Arrangements). Further details of the capacity of Project Partners and their input at PPG Phase are included in the ProDoc Section 5: Stakeholder Participation and Appendix 21: Stakeholder Capacity.

As described above (A.4.1), the detailed planning of national sub-projects (including research and survey methodologies) will be carried out during the extended Inception Phase, with guidance from global and regional experts (the Dugong MoU Secretariat and DTG). National experts will be involved as Project Partners and members of National Facilitating Committees. Details of all proposed national sub-projects are included in the ProDoc (Section 3.3 and Appendix 20). Participation of stakeholders in implementation is also addressed under B.1, below and includes the summary table from the ProDoc section 3.3 showing all national Project Partners.

The same processes of input by global, regional and national experts to the planning and implementation of national sub-projects also apply to the development of conservation solutions at national level and therefore also respond to *STAP comment 7* (see also A.4.2, above).

Detailed responses to *STAP comment 6* on data handling and the legacy of the data repository post-project are included in Appendix 26 to the UNEP ProDoc. The Incremental Cost reasoning (see A.5, below) includes the contribution of the proposed Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) for data and information sharing during and after the Project as a key outcome under the GEF alternative scenario. In the ProDoc, the nature and detail of the CHM are explained in section 4 (Intervention logic and key assumptions) and 3.9 (Replication), which also gives details of the longer-term legacy of the CHM. The relationship between the Project, other initiatives under the CMS Dugong MoU and other policy frameworks are explained in the ProDoc section 2.4 (Institutional, sectoral and policy context) and schematically in Appendix 18 (Fig. 1: CMS Dugong MoU implementation of the Dugong, Seagrass and Coastal Communities Initiative in eight countries across four regions through the GEF Dugong and Seagrass Conservation Project, and synergies with international, regional and national strategic frameworks).

**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:** The Incremental Cost reasoning is presented in Section 3.7, Table 13 in the ProDoc.

**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:** There are few changes from the Risk Assessment at PIF stage. The updated analysis from the ProDoc (Section 3.5 Risk analysis and risk management measures, Table 11: Risks and mitigation measures) is given here. Assumptions and Risks related specifically to the achievement of project Outcomes are also addressed in the Log Frame (see Annex A to this document).

Risk analysis and risk management measures

Multi-country projects are inherently complex and present their own potential risks and challenges with respect to implementation. **Error! Reference source not found.**In the ProDoc Section 3.5, Table 11 highlights specific risks that could affect successful implementation of project activities and the corresponding risk mitigation measures built into the project design. As noted in section A.4.1, management costs were raised from 5% (at PIF) to 7.1% to mitigate the specific risk of the high execution complexity of management and execution arrangements, given the number of countries, sub-projects and partners involved.

The Environmental and Social safeguards, which were observed during the PPG Phase and will be adopted under Project implementation, as required, are detailed in Section 3.11 of the ProDoc, incorporating Table 14 (Checklist for environmental issues) and Table 15 (Checklist for social issues).

STAP Review comment number 9 concerns the need to consider the risk, especially to seagrass beds, of destruction from outside interests, such as land reclamation and coastal construction. Detailed responses to this comment are given in Appendix 26 to the ProDoc. This risk is acknowledged and the Project (and relevant national sub-projects) will address this at local and site level through awareness raising, advocacy and use of appropriate incentives and other tools to encourage and promote conservation-oriented alternatives. Component 4 of the Project also addresses this issue through mainstreaming approaches to promote national and regional policy reform and use of global MEAs and international mechanisms to increase understanding of ecosystem and biodiversity values and longer-term sustainable options for their management (as alternatives to short-term and destructive development). The Project approach to the greatest immediate threat to Dugongs (from direct hunting and incidental capture in fisheries) is to prioritize fishery-related issues and behavioural change among fishers as the most immediate and cost-effective mechanisms for achieving biodiversity conservation and socio-economic outcomes.

**A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives:** The Project will build upon and collaborate with ongoing and planned national, regional and international conservation efforts. Details of Project linkages with both GEF-financed and non-GEF interventions are given in Section 2.7 and Table 7 in the ProDoc. More detail of relevant projects is also available in Appendix 22 (Relevant GEF and non-GEF projects) in the ProDoc. The CMS Dugong MoU Secretariat will play a key role in ensuring that close linkages are established and maintained between the project and all relevant initiatives.

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

**B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation:** The participatory processes involved in the development of the national level initiatives (40 sub-projects) and involvement of global and regional technical experts are described under A.4.1 and A.4.2 above and in previous responses to STAP comments (Appendix 26 to ProDoc). This relates to stakeholder processes under the PPG Phase and the same approaches will continue both during the proposed extended Inception Phase and during implementation. Stakeholders identified at PPG Phase include a broad range of national partners (government institutions and agencies, non-government, civil society, Universities and research institutions and the private sector), as well as the regional and global organizations involved in project guidance and management and described above (the wider Dugong MoU Secretariat, other initiatives, the DTG). These were identified during PPG Phases and details are included in the ProDoc Section 5: Stakeholder Participation, with a full list by country in Appendix 19 (Stakeholders in each Project Country Identified During the PPG Phase) and Appendix 21 (Stakeholder Capacity).

The roles and responsibilities in relation to project implementation (oversight, management and guidance/ technical advice) are detailed in the ProDoc section 4 Institutional Framework and Implementation Arrangements and Appendix 10 (Decision-making Flowchart and Organizational Chart). An innovative partnership will ensure



execution of the Project under supervision from UNEP as the GEF Implementing Agency (through the UNEP-DEPI/GEF BD-LD Team, Nairobi). The execution of the project will be the responsibility of the Mohammed bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund working in partnership with the CMS Dugong MoU Secretariat. Regional support partners and consultants include the Marine Research Foundation in Malaysia (support to four Asian and two Pacific country programmes). The social enterprise Blue Ventures Conservation (a UK based charity with programmes in both Indian and Pacific Ocean basins) will support project implementation in four countries (Madagascar, Mozambique, Timor-Leste and possibly Solomon Islands) and also provide technical support at a strategic and regional level. Executive oversight will be provided by an Executive Project Steering Committee, which includes the CMS Dugong MoU Secretariat and UNEP in an advisory role. Alongside partner countries, a number of other range states and agencies of the CMS Dugong MoU will provide substantial co-financing as supporting partners.

At the national level, the Project will be implemented by Project Partners who make up National Facilitating Committees. Further detail of the capacity of Partners is included in the ProDoc Appendix 21: Stakeholder Capacity. Each sub-project was submitted by a Project Partner which will be responsible for detailed planning, final selection of target sites, and collection and analysis of more detailed baseline information during the extended Inception Phase. Project Partners will also oversee implementation of sub-projects, with support from project management and regional advisers. The mainstreaming of women in fisheries management is a key theme across the Project and in relevant sub-projects. Appropriate involvement of all social groups has been ensured during PPG Phase so that there are no disproportionate impacts to women or other disadvantaged or vulnerable groups, and this will continue throughout implementation. See the full summary table of national sub-projects and Project Partners from the ProDoc (Section 3.3, Table 9). Engagement of stakeholders at the local level (including communities, local government, interest groups including fishers' groups, women's groups and youth) will form part of all sub-projects and will be carried out according to best practice and participatory methods, with guidance from Project management and regional advisers. Community engagement and avoidance of conflict will form an element of the comprehensive Project communication plan (Output 3.3) to be developed during the first year of implementation.

**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):**

This section also responds to *STAP Review comment number 8* (the need to engage appropriate methods and experts in gathering baseline socio-economic information during the PPG Phase).

The Project places considerable emphasis on the generation of socio-economic benefits associated with the establishment of incentive schemes and sustainable management and conservation of biodiversity at target areas. The generation of socio-economic benefits (through incentive schemes, direct involvement in conservation management or ecotourism and other tools) will be an objective of all sub-projects with a site-based community stewardship or community monitoring focus (under Project Components 1 and 2). Where applicable, priority in job creation and capacity building will be given to disadvantaged social groups, including women's groups, from local communities. The mainstreaming of women in fisheries management is another key element of the Project and will be a specific objective in relevant national sub-projects. Additional information on what groups targeted and what capacities to be developed and how they will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes is provided in Section 3.8 of the ProDoc.

The contribution of local and national initiatives and the socio-economic benefits derived from individual sub-projects to overall achievement and maintenance of global environmental benefits (GEBs) is detailed under A.4.2 above and in previous responses to STAP comments. These include direct income-generation and sustainable alternative livelihoods derived from dugong and seagrass conservation initiatives and more "dugong and seagrass-friendly" fisheries practices.

Wider ecosystem services benefits which will be maintained or enhanced through sound conservation management and stewardship of seagrass ecosystems include productive fisheries, climate change mitigation, reduced pollution and sedimentation of coastal waters. Further information on socio-economic benefits delivered by the Project and how they will serve a balanced gender and facilitation approach, support the achievement of additional benefits is provided in Section 3.11 of the ProDoc.

Individual sub-projects will establish project and site- or community-specific baselines for socio-economic indicators and monitor and report against these. Research and quantification of ecosystem benefits will also provide site and project-specific results for the GEBs derived at site/ community and national levels. More detail of individual national sub-projects, the proposed approaches and conservation/ stewardship 'solutions' and targeted conservation and socio-economic outcomes are given in the ProDoc Appendices 20 (National Projects Summaries), 23 (National MPAs/ LMMAs and National Projects Activities Based Within MPAs/ LMMAs) and 24 (Management Toolboxes). Detailed targets, baselines, project and monitoring plans for all 40 national sub-projects will be produced at the strategic regional and national planning meetings during the extended Inception Phase.

**B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:** Cost-effectiveness is built in to all elements of the Project design and budgets. It will be achieved particularly through the following approaches:

- Building on existing programmes, expertise and grassroots efforts at the national, regional and international levels in eight countries and across four regions;
- Building on existing global expertise, data and networks for sharing information and best practice and for regional collaboration (though a Clearing House Mechanism to be established under the Project as an on-going legacy of the Project to facilitate regional information exchange and collaboration, feedback and technical advice);
- Harmonisation of activities and synergies between projects and programmes, nationally and regionally;
- A focus on stakeholder engagement and using and developing national capacity to maximise the impact of the project at various governmental and societal levels.

At local level, the approach is to find cost-effective solutions to changing people's behavior and fisheries practices away from destructive methods and towards long-term sustainability of natural resource use coupled with livelihoods benefits among coastal communities in priority sites for dugong and seagrass conservation. Individual initiatives seek to find solutions, which provide sustainable livelihoods and support longer-term conservation management of dugongs and their seagrass ecosystems. The anchoring of the Project under the umbrella of the wider activities and scope of the CMS Dugong MoU (which covers all range states of the dugong) ensures that the best international expertise, methods, tools and advocacy support are available to the Project to achieve its objectives. This also ensures a mechanism for replication of successful approaches, activities and tools developed through Project activities in order to achieve much wider regional and global impacts. This will be achieved through the very significant co-financing to the Project (over USD 99M), through the Clearing House Mechanism to disseminate and share information and expertise within the region and the wider global range of the Dugong. The CHM and other Project outputs and impacts will continue to support enhanced global Dugong and seagrass conservation and GEBs beyond the life of the Project, under the framework of the CMS Dugong MoU, its Conservation Management Plan (CMP) and global Dugong, Seagrass and Coastal Communities Initiative.

**C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:** See costed Monitoring and Evaluation Workplan in the ProDoc (Appendix 7)


**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)
Dana A. Kartakusuma	Assistant Minister, Economy and Sustainable Development	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, INDONESIA	03/15/2012
Christine Edmée Ralalaharisoa	Director General of Environment	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS, MADAGASCAR	05/16/2013 <sup>x</sup>
Christine Edmée Ralalaharisoa	Director General of Environment	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS, MADAGASCAR	11/25/2011
Lian Kok Fei	Undersecretary of Environmental Management & Climate Change Division	MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT, MALAYSIA	03/16/2012
Marília Telma Antónia Manjate	Director for Cooperation	MINISTRY FOR THE COORDINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS, MOZAMBIQUE	04/20/2012
Joe Horokou	Director, Environment and Conservation Division	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, CLIMATE CHANGE, DISASTER MANAGEMENT AND METEOROLOGY, SOLOMON ISLANDS	06/03/2013
B.M.U.D. Basnayake	Secretary	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, SRI LANKA	03/15/2012
Mário Francisco Correia Ximenes		NATIONAL DIRECTORATE FOR INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS, TIMOR LESTE	02/22/2012
Albert Williams	Director	DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND CONSERVATION, VANUATU	03/15/2012

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

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

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Brennan Van Dyke, Director, GEF Coordination		04/22/2013	Max Zieren, GEF Task Manager,	+254 20 762 4380	Max.Zieren@unep.org

Office, UNEP			DEPI, GEF BD/LD Unit, UNEP, Nairobi		
-----------------	--	--	--	--	--

**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).*

The Project Results Framework is provided in Appendix 4 of the UNEP ProDoc.

**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).*

See Appendix 26 in Project Document: PPG Response to STAP PIF Review

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>5</sup>**

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

<b>PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$170,000</b>			
<b><i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i></b>	<b><i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i></b>		
	<b><i>Budgeted Amount</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Spent To date</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Committed</i></b>
Local Consultants	63,000.00	63,000.00	0.00
International & Regional Consultants	41,999.94	41,999.94	0.00
Travel	15,000.06	15,000.06	0.00
Meetings and Workshops	47,000.00	47,000.00	0.00
Logistics and Reporting costs	3,000.00	3,000.00	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>170,000.00</b>	<b>170,000.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

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

**ANNEX E: LIST OF NATIONAL PARTNERS**

As indicated in Page 1 under ‘other executing partners’ the full list of the 40 project national execution partners in the 8 project countries is provided below:

Indonesia:

1. Director General of Marine, Coast and Small Islands Affairs (Government Agency) (with various NGO, Government and Academic partners)
2. Ministry of Marine Affairs & Fisheries (Government Agency) (with various NGO, Government and Academic partners)
3. National Institute of Science (LIPI)
4. Ministry of Forestry – DG of Forest Protection and Nature Conservation

Madagascar:

1. Blue Ventures (NGO)
2. Conservation Centrée sur la Communauté Madagascar
3. COSAP: Sahamalaza Community Based Conservation (Stakeholder Platform)
4. Ministry of Environment and Forests (Government agency)
5. Wildlife Conservation Society (NGO)

Malaysia:

1. Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (Federal Government Agency)
2. Turtle and Marine Ecosystem Research Centre (TUMEC)
3. Fisheries Research Institute (FRI) (Government agency)
4. Universiti Sains Malaysia (University)
5. University Malaya (University)
6. MareCet Research Organization (NGO)
7. Protected Area & Biodiversity Conservation Division (PABC)

<sup>5</sup> 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.

8. Sarawak Forestry Corporation Sdn Bhd (SFCSB). Government Link Company (Wholly owned by the Sarawak State Government)

Mozambique:

1. Blue Ventures (NGO)
2. DUGONGOS.ORG (NGO)
3. Endangered Wildlife Trust (NGO)
4. MICOA (Min. for the Coordination Environment Affairs), National Directorate of Environmental Management (Government agency)
- 5.

Solomon Islands:

1. Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (potential)
2. TNC (The Nature Conservancy) (potential)
3. Tetepare Descendants' Association (potential)
4. World Fish Center (WFC) (potential)
5. WWF (World Wildlife Fund) (potential)

Sri Lanka:

1. BEAR (Biodiversity Education And Research) (NGO)
2. Department of Wildlife Conservation (Government agency)
3. Centre for Research on Indian Ocean Marine Mammals (CRIOMM) (Government agency)
4. IUCN Sri Lanka
5. National Aquatic Resources Research and Development Agency (Government agency)
6. ORCA (Ocean Resources Conservation Association) (NGO)
7. Sri Lanka Turtle Conservation Project (NGO)

Timor Leste:

1. Blue Ventures (NGO)
2. Marine Research Foundation (NGO)
3. Ministry of Environment,
4. Move Forward (NGO)
5. Haburas Foundation (NGO)
6. Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries

Vanuatu:

1. Department of Environment Preservation & Conservation (DEPC) (Government agency) (with various NGO, Government and Academic partners)

---

<sup>i</sup> Project management costs were raised from 5% (at PIF) to 7.1% to reflect the high execution complexity of management arrangements, given the increased number of countries (now 8 over an extensive area, spanning from Mozambique to Vanuatu) and the need to set-up and oversee 32 sub-projects, 8 national committees, and over 24 partners involved (detail is also provided in Table 11 in Section 3.5 of the UNEP ProDoc). It is also confirmed that a significant share of co-financing will support management costs.

<sup>ii</sup> The difference of 981,746 USD between the total GEF project costs at PIF (4,902,272 USD) and at CEO endorsement (5,884,018 USD) is due to the following three factors: (a) Madagascar increased its total STAR contribution to the project from 800k to 1M during PPG phase (ref. revised LoE); (b) Solomon Islands joined the project during the PPG Phase (ref. new LoE) providing additional 800k of STAR, and (c) the total amount of STAR resources endorsed by project countries at PIF/PPG stage included a PPG of 295,910 USD + 10% IA fees. However this PPG amount was reduced to 170,000 USD + fees during the GEF review process. The balance of 125,910 USD (i.e. 295,910 USD + fees requested/endorsed in original LoEs, minus the 170,000 USD + fees approved PPG) was therefore added to the project budget at CEO endorsement.

<sup>iii</sup> The co-finance letter from the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries confirms a total co-finance contribution of US \$4M from all partners in Indonesia. The cash co-finance contribution stated on the co-finance table in this letter for the project being undertaken by Directorate of Marine and Aquatic Resources Conservation, Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Indonesia is US \$1,489,198; this is a miscalculation of the figures provided in the first row of the table for the activity, 'coordination related to enforcement of illegal utilization of endangered marine species: coordination, meeting'. The total of all values given in this row is US \$261,000; however the total provided in the table is US \$216,000- which is a typo. The cash co-finance contributions for the individual activities under this project amount to US \$1,534,198; this is the amount stated in Table C.

<sup>iv</sup> The total amount of co-finance has been provided as 'in cash and in-kind' and so it is assumed to be 50% cash co-finance and 50% in-kind co-finance.

<sup>v</sup> The total value in the COSAP letter of co-finance is greater than the sum of values of cash and in-kind contributions specified in the letter, this is a miscalculation from the Project Partner. The values in Table C are the separate values stated as cash and in-kind in the letter rather than the (miscalculated) total in the letter.

<sup>vi</sup> The letter does not specify co-finance as either a cash or in-kind contribution, and therefore has been recorded as "in-kind".

<sup>vii</sup> This figure is rounded to the nearest US dollar.

<sup>viii</sup> The co-finance letter from the Fisheries Department, Vanuatu states that US \$10,000 in co-finance will be provided per annum. The project proposal states that the department will undertake the project over 4 years and therefore it was assumed that US \$40,000 in co-finance would be provided.

<sup>ix</sup> This paper is largely based on a series of edited and updated extracts from Marsh, H, O'Shea, TJ, Reynolds, JE III. 2011. The ecology and conservation of Sirenia: dugongs and manatees. Cambridge University Press. 521pp

<sup>x</sup> The new LoE from Madagascar was sent on 16 May 2013 but there was a typographical error in the date in the letter received (the letter in App. 13 says "2012" instead of "2013"). The first letter from Madagascar stated an amount of US \$800,000; the second letter had an additional US \$200,000 and confirmed endorsement for a total of US \$1,000,000. Both letters from Madagascar are inserted in the table as there was a difference in UNEP IA fees after first letter was received. (See row below in table).