



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

MONIQUE BARBUT
Chief Executive Officer and Chairperson

1818 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20433 USA
Tel: 202.473.3202
Fax: 202.522.3240/3245
E-mail: mbarbut@TheGEF.org

September 29, 2011

Dear Council Member,

The UNDP as the Implementing Agency for the project entitled: ***Costa Rica: Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme***, has submitted the attached proposed project document for CEO endorsement prior to final Agency approval of the project document in accordance with the UNDP procedures.

The Secretariat has reviewed the project document. It is consistent with the project concept approved by the Council in March 2011 and the proposed project remains consistent with the Instrument and GEF policies and procedures. The attached explanation prepared by the UNDP satisfactorily details how Council's comments and those of the STAP have been addressed.

We have today posted the proposed project document on the GEF website at www.TheGEF.org for your information. We would welcome any comments you may wish to provide by October 28, 2011 before I endorse the project. You may send your comments to gcoordination@TheGEF.org.

If you do not have access to the Web, you may request the local field office of UNDP or the World Bank to download the document for you. Alternatively, you may request a copy of the document from the Secretariat. If you make such a request, please confirm for us your current mailing address.

Sincerely,

Attachment: Project Document
cc: Country Operational Focal Point, GEF Agencies, STAP, Trustee



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT¹

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme			
Country(ies):	Costa Rica	GEF Project ID: ²	4382
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	4560
Other Executing Partner(s):	UNOPS	Submission Date:	2011-09-02
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multifocal Area	Project Duration(Months)	48 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/>	GEF Small Grants Programme	Agency Fee (\$):	351,852

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK³

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
(select) BD-2	Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation	Output 2.2: National and sub-national land use plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation	GEF TF	2,367,879	2,450,000
CCM-3 (select)	Outcome 1.1: Investment in renewable energy technologies increased	Output 3.2: Renewable energy capacity installed Output 3.3: Electricity and heat produced from renewable sources	GEF TF	394,646	430,000
CCM-5 (select)	Outcome 5.3: GHG emissions avoided and carbon sequestered	Output 5.2: Forests and non-forest lands under good management practices	GEF TF	394,647	430,000
(select) LD-1	Outcome 1.2: Improved agricultural management	Output 1.2: Diverse sources of investment for SLM interventions at multiple scales (e.g., PES)	GEF TF	350,000	366,000
(select) LD-1	Outcome 1.3: Functionality and cover of agro-ecosystems maintained	Output 1.3: Hectares of tree cover in agro-ecosystems	GEF TF	222,794	234,000
CD-2 (select)	Outcome 2.2: Increased capacity of stakeholders to diagnose, understand and transform complex dynamic nature of global environmental problems and develop local solutions	Output 2.2.2: Stakeholders are better informed via workshops and trainings about global challenges and local actions required.	GEF TF	113,159	162,490
CD-2 (select)	Outcome 2.3: Public awareness raised and information management improved	Output 2.3.1: Public awareness raised through workshops and other activities	GEF TF	50,000	73,010

¹ It is important to consult the GEF Preparation Guidelines when completing this template

² Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

³ Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when filling up the table in item A.

CD-5 (select)	Outcome 5.2: Evaluation of programs and projects strengthened and improved against expected results	Output 5.2.1: Capacities for monitoring of projects and programs developed Output 5.2.2: Learning system established to provide feedback to policy, strategies and management decisions from evaluation reports	GEF TF	154,386	178,500
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)	Others		(select)		
Subtotal				4,047,511	4,324,000
Project management cost ⁴			GEF TF	350,637	301,000
Total project costs				4,398,148	4,625,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: Global environmental benefits secured through community-based initiatives and actions that address habitat fragmentation and enhance ecological connectivity in twelve biological corridors linking eight Protected Areas and their buffer zones

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Community-based actions mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes in biological corridors and PA buffer zones	TA	1.1 Enhanced protection and conservation of BD in 12 priority biological corridors and buffer zones of 8 Protected Areas >180,000 hectares	1.1.1 Local Councils for biological corridors promote and manage community initiatives focused on environmentally friendly products and land management for a sustainable use of biodiversity (>10 initiatives) 1.1.2 Management plans for buffer zones or important areas within biological corridors formulated and implemented (10 plans) 1.1.3 New community Protected Areas within biological corridors established and managed (>5 areas) 1.1.4 Community-based reforestation, natural regeneration of forests, and payment for environmental	GEFTF	2,210,379	2,300,000

⁴ This is the cost associated with the unit executing the project on the ground and could be financed out of trust fund or cofinancing sources.

			<p>services schemes implemented (>10 initiatives)</p> <p>1.1.5 Biodiversity conserved by families living in corridors and PA buffer zones through sustainable livelihood opportunities (i.e., community rural tourism, organic agriculture, organic honey, medicinal plants, handcraft activities and other sustainable production practices) (>1,000 families)</p>			
2. Green-house gas emissions reduced and carbon stocks increased through community-based actions	TA	2.1 Uptake of energy efficient and renewable energy technologies by rural households and for production processes >15,000 tons of CO2e/ in 4 years	<p>2.1.1 Energy efficient technologies in rural productive activities in PA buffer zones such as ecotourism facilities, water pumping and crop drying implemented (>15 interventions reduce >5,000 tons of GHG emissions in 4 years)</p> <p>2.1.2 Small-scale renewable energy systems at community level including biogas for cooking and heating, solar energy for cooking, and photovoltaic energy for off-grid areas implemented (10 initiatives reduce >10,000 tons of GHG emissions in 4 years)</p> <p>2.1.3 Technical assistance and capacity building delivered so that partners can offer micro-credit lines for rural small scale energy efficiency and renewable energy investments (>3 local</p>	GEFTF	736,793	800,000

		<p>2.2 Climate Change mitigated through community forest fire prevention and management >50,000 tons of CO₂ e avoided during lifetime of project</p> <p>2.3 Carbon stocks increased through community-based actions on forest protection, reforestation, and natural regeneration. >83,237 tCO₂ e sequestered in 3 years through reforestation of 2,300 ha (12.06 tCO₂ e ha/year) and through the protection of >60,000 ha of native forests</p>	<p>financial institutions) 2.2.1 Local community crews trained, equipped and organized for forest fire prevention and management in the buffer zones of Palo Verde, Chirripó, Guanacaste and La Amistad National Parks, and Diria Biological Corridor (>10 initiatives training and equipping 30 crews) 2.3.1 Reforestation and natural regeneration, and forest protection in buffer zones of Palo Verde, Chirripó Guanacaste and La Amistad National Parks, and Diria Biological Corridor (>5 initiatives protect forests from fire and increase vegetation cover)</p>			
3.Conservation of productive lands and restoration of degraded lands contribute to sustainability and improved local livelihoods	TA	<p>3.1 Community-owned degraded lands restored through reducing land use pressure and increasing biomass cover >500 hectares</p>	<p>3.1.1 Integrated farm management and sustainable production implemented under criteria of environmental protection, social responsibility and economic efficiency (>10 productive initiatives restore >200 hectares) 3.1.2 Community-based reforestation, agro-forestry and silviculture systems implemented to restore degraded land (>10 initiatives restore 300</p>	GEFTF	532,794	560,000

		<p>3.2 Improved water resources management and protection > 29,000 hectares</p> <p>3.3 National Action Plan to Combat Land Degradation adopted within the Jesus Maria Watershed and increased community capacity to fulfill obligations under the NAP (>8 communities implementing the NAP)</p>	<p>hectares)</p> <p>3.2.1 Water resources protection actions and integrated watershed management practices for improved community water supply and ecosystem resilience implemented (>5 initiatives)</p> <p>3.3.1 Local Watershed Commission in the Jesus Maria watershed established and training and awareness program on the NAP delivered (>2,000 people trained)</p> <p>3.3.2 Capacity development program on watershed management delivered to communities vulnerable to land degradation through strategic alliances with key institutions, participatory research, training & exchange of experiences (>40 local leaders in each of 8 communities)</p>			
4. Knowledge management and capacity development of community groups and members for replication and upscaling	TA	<p>4.1 Strengthened capacities of SGP stakeholders to contribute to policy and legislation development related to Project thematic priorities.</p> <p>4.2 Enhanced capacities of community groups to generate, access and use information and</p>	<p>4.1.1 Stakeholder networks established and awareness and understanding of existing policies and national legislation in relation to biological corridors, fire management and sustainable production increased through consultations with community members and indigenous peoples leaders (>5 networks and consultations)</p> <p>4.2.1 Community proposals related to policy and regulatory regime change for environmental</p>	GEFTF	317,545	414,000

		<p>knowledge on global environmental issues</p> <p>4.3 SGP operates an efficient knowledge management system to capture and disseminate good practices and lessons learned >5 interventions replicated in >6 communities each within Biological Corridors and PA buffer zones</p> <p>4.4 Improved monitoring capacities of SGP grantees and adaptive management applied leading to successful project implementation.</p>	<p>conservation and sustainable livelihoods prepared and delivered to policy makers (>2 documents)</p> <p>4.2.2 Information & knowledge related to their projects managed and shared by communities through publications, fairs, presentations and other means (>20 community groups)</p> <p>4.3.1 Exchange of experiences and capacity building between stakeholders organized (peer-to-peer knowledge and learning)</p> <p>4.3.2 SGP website strengthened and knowledge management products such as publications, media events and presentations, generated and available with respect of SGP-funded community based initiatives that have been successful in generating global environmental benefits (>15 Knowledge products)</p> <p>4.4.1 CBO training program delivered on integrated monitoring instruments to assess project progress and results (>20 communities in 12 biological corridors)</p>			
5. Monitoring and evaluation	TA	5.1 Accountability and adaptive management of SGP at the project and country programme	<p>5.1.1 Field visits and project evaluations conducted and systematized</p> <p>5.1.2 Mid-term review</p>	GEFTF	250,000	250,000

		levels	and independent terminal evaluation 5.2.3 Audit			
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
Subtotal					4,047,511	4,324,000
Project management Cost ⁵				(select)	350,637	301,000
Total project costs					4398148	4625000

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

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	Ministry of Environment/SINAC/Ministry of Agriculture/FONAFIFO	In-kind	100,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	In-Kind	100,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	1,000,000
Bilateral Aid Agency (ies)	Not specified at this stage	Grant	125,000
Other Multilateral Agency (ies)	Not specified at this stage	In-Kind	100,000
CSO	Not specified at this stage	Grant	1,000,000
CSO	Not specified at this stage	In-Kind	1,600,000
Private Sector	Not specified at this stage	In-Kind	100,000
Others	Not specified at this stage	In-Kind	500,000
(select)		(select)	
Total Co-financing			4,625,000

D. GEF/LDCF/SCCF 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
UNDP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Costa Rica	2,777,778	222,222	3,000,000
UNDP	GEF TF	Climate Change	Costa Rica	925,926	74,074	1,000,000
UNDP	GEF TF	Land Degradation	Costa Rica	694,444	55,556	750,000
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
Total Grant Resources				4,398,148	351,852	4,750,000

E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

⁵ Same as footnote #3.

Component	Estimated Person Weeks	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
Local consultants*	301.00	264,754	537,200	801,954
International consultants*	44.00	139,000	30,000	169,000
Total		403,754	567,200	970,954

* Details to be provided in Annex C.

F. PROJECT MANAGEMENT COST

Cost Items	Total Estimated Person Weeks/Months	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
Local consultants*	371.00	175,104	0	175,104
International consultants*	0.00	0	0	0
Office facilities, equipment, vehicles and communications*		113,469	138,000	251,469
Travel*		31,500	0	31,500
Others**	Sundries and outreach	30,564	30,000	60,564
	UNDP staff in NSC and MAG-funded staff for coordination in Jesus Maria	0	133,000	133,000
Total		350,637	301,000	651,637

* Details to be provided in Annex C.

** For others, to be clearly specified by overwriting fields *(1) and *(2).

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

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

H. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

Project monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures. The Logical Framework Matrix in Annex A provides performance and results indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The project will be monitored through the following M&E activities. The M&E budget is provided in ANNEX G.

Portfolio of upgraded Country Programmes: The UNDP Communities Cluster at HQ will monitor the implementation of the portfolio of upgraded SGP Country Programmes and will promote and support cross-fertilization and learning among Country Programmes and with the global SGP. The SGP CPMT will monitor SGP Country Programmes for compliance with the SGP Global Operational Guidelines.

Country Programme Level:

Project start: A Project Inception Workshop will be held within two months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure: the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor, the UNDP Country Office SGP Focal Point, National Steering Committee members, the SGP Country Program Manager (formerly National Coordinator) and, where feasible, a UNOPS headquarters representative. The Inception Workshop is crucial to brief all

participants on the new SGP requirements as a GEF Full-Size Project and to build ownership for project results. The Inception Workshop should carry out a number of key activities including:

- Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of the UNDP Communities Senior Technical Advisor (STA), Regional Technical Advisor (RTA), and Country Office (CO), and of UNOPS vis-à-vis the project team and the National Steering Committee (NSC). Discuss the roles, functions and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms.
- Based on the project results framework, finalize the first annual work plan and agree on a schedule for grant approvals for the entire project life.
- Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.
- Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements and roles. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled.
- Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and audit arrangements.

An Inception Workshop report is a key reference document and must be prepared by the National Coordinator with RTA review and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

Quarterly:

- Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform.
- Based on information recorded in ATLAS by UNOPS, UNDP will have access to updated financial information in an ongoing manner.
- Information on the grant portfolio shall be updated in the SGP Global Database using the indicators provided in ANNEX H.
- Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high.
- Based on the information recorded in Atlas by the CO and the SGP Country Program Manager, Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.
- Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

Annually:

Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (1 July to 30 June). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements. The Country Program Manager will prepare the PIR with inputs and supervision from the UNDP CO SGP Focal Point and the RTA. The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative).
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
- Lesson learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports.
- Risk and adaptive management.
- ATLAS QPR.
- Portfolio level indicators, in this case the global SGP Indicators as outlined in ANNEX H will be used on an annual basis.

The RTA may conduct joint visits with the Country Program Manager to selected project sites as an input to PIR preparation. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be circulated to the project team and other relevant project stakeholders, as appropriate, no less than one month after the visit.

Mid-term of project cycle:

The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation (approximately July 2013). The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course corrections, as needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of

project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the second half of the project's term. Ideally, the Mid-term Evaluation should be conducted with similar terms of reference for all GEF-5 SGP upgraded Country Programmes and concurrently, if possible. The objective is to facilitate the comparison of experiences between all upgraded countries and distill common lessons to inform similar upgrading processes for other Country Programmes. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided in consultation with the SGP Central Programme Management Team, the UNDP-GEF Results Management Advisor, the Communities STA, the RTA, the CO and the Country Program Managers. The Terms of Reference for the Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by CPMT based on guidance from the GEF Evaluation Office and UNDP-GEF, and will be validated by the UNDP Evaluation Office. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC).

End of Project:

An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the expected project end date (approximately on April 2015). The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The UNDP STA, in consultation with SGP CPMT, will prepare the Terms of Reference for this evaluation. The TOR shall be validated by the UNDP Evaluation Office. Given the pilot nature of the first group of upgrading SGP Country Programmes, the final evaluation should also undertake an assessment of costs and benefits of the upgrading process, summarize lessons learned, and provide recommendations to the GEF Secretariat and the Global SGP concerning the upgrading of other Country Programmes. The final evaluation requires a management response, which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC).

During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and help replication of project results.

Learning and knowledge sharing:

Particular attention will be paid to the GEF Focal Area "learning objectives" to ensure that experiences emerging from local level implementation of technologies, approaches and policies are fed back to the wider portfolio. Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation through lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects, in particular to other SGP upgrading countries. The project team will participate in at least one workshop with other SGP upgraded countries to share experiences. Ideally, this workshop should take place as part of the mid term evaluation. The detailed objective(s), venue, agenda, and timing of the workshop will be determined by the STA in consultation with the SGP country teams, the respective RTAs and the evaluation team.

Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project, other SGP upgraded countries and the global GEF SGP programme. Such flow of information should cover substantive and operational information, experiences and lessons.

Individual grant M&E

The following minimum standards shall be applied for individual grant M&E:

Ex-ante Visits: The project team should undertake ex-ante visits on a risk basis to grant-requesting organizations upon grant-approval by the NSC and prior to the signature of the MOA between UNDP and the grantee.

Field monitoring visits: Every project should be visited at least twice in its lifetime, upon receipt of the first progress

report from beneficiary organizations and during the following year. NSC members with relevant expertise in project-related technical areas may join the Country Program Manager during these visits as appropriate.

Progress reports: Beneficiary organizations should submit half-yearly progress reports to the Country Program Manager along with a financial report. A forecast of resources needed in the following period should be submitted by the grantee to the Country Program Manager as a requirement for disbursement of next instalment.

Final report: Beneficiary organizations should submit a final report summarizing global benefits and other results achieved, outputs produced, and lessons learned. The final report should also include a final financial statement.

Final Evaluation: A final evaluation will be done for each project. The Country Program Manager should validate the terms of reference for these evaluations and vet the evaluation consultant. The cost of this evaluation will be part of the grant budget.

Audit: The SGP Country Program Manager will organize audits to selected grantee organizations on a risk basis. The cost of these audits will be charged to the grant project budget.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:

A.1.1. The [GEF focal area/LDCF/SCCF strategies](#):

1. The objectives and expected outcomes of the SGP in Costa Rica for the 5th Operational Phase build directly on the agreed strategic priorities for GEF-5. Funding for the SGP will be drawn from the biodiversity, climate change and land degradation focal area STAR allocations, and thus SGP will focus on objectives and outcomes consistent with GEF-5 objectives for these focal areas.
2. In the biodiversity focal area, the SGP in Costa Rica will support the second GEF biodiversity objective to *mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors* (BD-2). The project aims at addressing habitat fragmentation in 12 biological corridors that connect 8 protected areas and their buffer zones through community sustainable livelihood initiatives that enhance biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. The project will also have indirect effect in the first GEF biodiversity objective to *improve sustainability of protected area systems* (BD-1) through the establishment of community-conservation areas within the selected corridors, and as a result of civil society and community-based organizations increased capacity to implement conservation actions in line with the conservation objectives of the PAs, thus contributing to their long-term sustainability.
3. In the climate change focal area SGP will be consistent with CCM-3 and CCM-5, which are the most relevant in the context of SGP's civil society and community-based focus of the six GEF climate change objectives. Component 2 of the project will promote investments that demonstrate and accelerate uptake of low carbon solutions that meet community energy needs at the household level and for rural production processes. This includes micro-solar power, biogas digesters, and fuel-efficient kilns, ovens and stoves. In CCM-5, the project will support community-based initiatives that prevent forest fires and land use change in critical biological corridor areas and PA buffer zones, as well as initiatives for the restoration of degraded areas. The project will develop a system to monitor carbon stocks in the areas of intervention that will be consistent with national carbon monitoring. SGP may use the carbon monitoring tools being developed by another GEF project (the Carbon Benefits Project) if these become available at the inception of the project.
4. For the land degradation focal area, SGP Costa Rica will support LD-1 to maintain or improve the flow of agro-ecosystem and forest ecosystem services to sustain community livelihoods. SGP will work with community partners to increase their capacity to contribute to the implementation of the National Action Plan on Land Degradation with emphasis on the Jesus Maria Watershed, which is the most degraded watershed in the country.
5. A cross-cutting objective of the project will continue to be capacity development of community-based and civil society organizations in the corridors and buffer zones targeted, in particular CD-2 and CD-5 objectives, outcomes and outputs. SGP will provide support to communities for engagement through consultative processes; generation, access and use of information and knowledge to address global environmental issues;

implementation of convention guidelines at municipal level; and monitoring and evaluation of environmental impacts and trends. Capacity development, knowledge management and communications are essential for up-scaling and replication of best practices. This is also consistent with GEF's longstanding programmatic support for capacity development, as outlined in GEF-5 programming document.

6. In accordance with the decisions of the GEF-SGP Steering Committee meeting that took place in Washington DC on 3 March 2010⁶, a maximum of 20% of the STAR allocations may be used to support demand-driven community-based International Waters and POPs project proposals where synergies with the STAR focal areas can be found. Given the latitude inherent in this proviso, it is not possible to select a priori the GEF-5 strategic objectives, outcomes and outputs for the IW and Chemicals focal areas; these will, however, be identified as and when grant proposals in these focal areas are approved by the National Steering Committee. SGP-funded IW and Chemicals proposals will be aligned with the objectives agreed in the above-mentioned Steering Committee, as follows:

- IW Objective: Support transboundary water body management with community-based initiatives.
- Chemicals Objective: Promote and support phase out of POPs and chemicals of global concern at community level.

- a.1.2. For projects funded from LDCF/SCCF: the ldcf/sccf eligibility criteria and priorities:

N/A

A.2. National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, etc.:

7. The SGP is directly relevant to, supportive of, and consistent with Costa Rica's national priorities and policies related to global environmental issues and development priorities. The SGP supports Costa Rica's obligations as a Party to multiple international conventions, including the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the Convention to Combat Desertification.
8. In the biodiversity focal area, the SGP responds to Costa Rica's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) in several key aspects: consolidation of Protected Areas; consolidation of biological corridors; enhancement of ecological connectivity through new Protected Areas within existing corridors; and sustainable use of wild resources.
9. In climate change, the SGP supports the National Climate Change Strategy. SGP grants will contribute to implementing key aspects of this Strategy, particularly, aspects related to reduction of rural emissions of GHG. It is also important to highlight that in June 2007, Costa Rica made a public commitment to become a carbon-neutral country by 2021, the year marking the bicentennial of its Independence. Since then, several government organizations have prepared and launched activities to meet this ambitious goal, pulling together efforts to reduce carbon emissions, increase energy generation sources not based in fossil fuels (hydro-power, solar, biogas, biofuels, wind and other). The Government expects all investments of country funds (including the GEF STAR allocation to SGP) to contribute to the carbon neutrality goal.
10. Regarding land degradation, Costa Rica has a National Action Plan to combat Land Degradation and a National Land Degradation Commission (CADETI) to implement the Action Plan. SGP activities in this focal area are aligned with the Action Plan concerning soil conservation and restoration, as well as water resources management and conservation. During the preparation of the Strategy a thorough analysis of Costa Rica's degraded areas was performed and these areas were prioritized accordingly. In consultation with CADETI, it was agreed that SGP's land degradation interventions will concentrate in the Jesus Maria watershed, which is not only a highly degraded area but also part of the Montes de Aguacate biological corridor, and therefore, important for biodiversity conservation.

B. PROJECT OVERVIEW:

- B.1. Describe the baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

⁶ The minutes of the GEF SGP Steering Committee of 3 March 2010 read as follows: "For those countries that are fully dependent on STAR funds, the SGP country programmes can look at links and synergies between the IW and the Chemicals focal areas with those of Biodiversity, Climate Change, and Land Degradation focal areas so that funds can be shared but not to go beyond 20% of their original STAR allocation".

11. With just 51,100 km² of land area (0.03% of the world) and 589,000 km² of territorial sea, Costa Rica is considered one of the 20 most biodiverse countries in the world. Its geographical position in the tropics, its two coasts and its mountain systems generate numerous and varied microclimates that explain this natural wealth in both species and ecosystems. The more than 500,000 species found in this small country represent nearly 4% of the estimated total number of species worldwide.
12. To protect this wealth of global importance, the country has allocated over 25% of its territory to be protected under different categories of Protected Areas. This effort is extended with the support of private initiatives that establish private reserves dedicated mainly to ecotourism and research. This is a conservation effort that few countries in the world have achieved and in which Costa Rica has invested substantial resources for the wellbeing of present and future generations. Through the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor Project, the GEF was instrumental in helping establish the basis for the biological corridor system in Costa Rica.
13. For the last 10 years, Government and non-governmental organizations active in biodiversity conservation in Costa Rica, have been engaged in an ambitious two-phase program known as GRUAS I & II, to identify and define a national network of biological corridors to improve the ecological connectivity among national protected areas and between these and PA of neighboring countries. These studies were completed in 2009, at a very detailed geographical scale, with participation of national and local actors including government institutions, CBO, NGO, and academic institutions. GRUAS I & II was the basis for selecting the biological corridors and protected areas' buffer zones where SGP will focus its work in the next four years. The project will concentrate its activities around eight PA out of 169 existing in the country. The project will also target 12 biological corridors linking these areas among themselves and with others (Costa Rica has officially registered 37 biological corridors).
14. The areas selected for the project's interventions include the five largest undisturbed blocks of forest in Costa Rica, composed of rain forests, dry forests, páramo, mangrove and wetlands, where the most important Protected Areas of Costa Rica are found. These areas harbor species of endangered fauna, which in turn are very good indicators of ecosystem health: the Ocelot (*Leopardus tigrinus* and *Leopardus pardalis*), Cauce (*Leopardus wiedii*), Puma yaguarondi (*Panthera onca*), Puma concolor, Danta (*Tapirus bairdii*), Chanco de Monte (*Tayassu tajacu*) and the Manatee (*Trichechus manatus*). The three Biosphere Reserves and the World Heritage Sites of the country are found among the 8 selected PA. The table below shows the protected areas and biological corridors involved, and Annex E provides an overview of the biodiversity in each PA.

Table 1

Protected Areas	PA area (ha)	Biological Corridors	BC area (ha)
Parque Internacional La Amistad	193,929	Talamanca Caribe	47,000
NP Chirripo	50,150	Cordillera Volcanica Central-Talamanca	114,617
NP Tapanti-Macizo de la Muerte	58,323	Montes del Aguacate (including Jesus Maria Watershed)	70,600
NP Palo Verde	16,804	Amistosa	115,809
NP Braulio Carrillo	47,580	Paso de la Danta	80,000
NP Corcovado	55,000	Paso de las Lapas	
Guanacaste Conservation Area	110,000	Diria	180,000
Barra del Colorado Wildlife Refuge	92,000	San Juan-La Selva	246,208
		Pájaro Campana	66,416
		Colorado Tortuguero	130,000
		Ruta Los Malekus	144,726
		Miravalles-Santa Rosa	42,053
Total Area	623,786		1,237,429

15. All twenty-four indigenous peoples' territories existing in the country overlap with the selected biological corridors, encompassing 338,000 hectares, the equivalent of more than 25% of the 1,237,000 hectares covered by these biological corridors. For example, four indigenous territories on the Atlantic side and 3 indigenous territories on the Pacific side surround "La Amistad" International Park. The Talamanca-Caribe corridor includes the Talamanca Bribri, Talamanca Cabecar, Talamanca Keköldi, and Taini indigenous territories. The GEF "Ecomarket Project" allowed extending payment for ecosystem services (PES) to indigenous territories

and communities in biological corridors. Other previous GEF initiatives in the areas targeted by this project are Conservation International's Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund activities in Costa Rica, and ACICAFOC, which supported integrated ecosystem management actions in Tortuguero, La Amistad, Osa, Corcovado and Chirripó National Parks. Prior GEF investment in Costa Rica's protected areas has been concentrated in La Amistad, Chirripó and Corcovado NP, specifically in infrastructure and equipment, and in the establishment of trust funds in Chirripó and Corcovado to finance conservation activities in buffer zones.

16. The contribution of Costa Rica to the total global GHG emissions is very low (less than 0.1%), however, the country made a commitment to become Carbon-neutral" by 2021. The country's decision to avoid net carbon emissions has led to the preparation of an integrated National Climate Change Strategy (NCCS) for achieving a C-neutral economy by 2021, which will include actions on mitigation and adaptation to climate change. The mitigation strategy will have a three-pronged approach: 1) GHG emissions reduction by sources; 2) capture and storage of CO₂; and 3) carbon market development. The new Government (2010) of Costa Rica will deploy domestic and international financial resources for the implementation of the NCCS, however, specific activities and amounts are yet to be determined. The SGP country team is regularly monitoring NCCS design progress to create co-financing opportunities for SGP CC interventions. It is also monitoring progress of activities related to Costa Rica's participation in UN-REDD and in the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility with a view to ensure complementarity with SGP CC initiatives and to leverage these investments if they take place in the same geographic areas of project intervention. SGP will participate in the Government-led initiative for developing a method for measuring carbon stocks, which has been considered part of the baseline for this project. It will also build on the capacity building, technology transfer, public awareness, behavioral change, and education initiatives being designed. Prior GEF CC investments in Costa Rica⁷, in particular the "National Off-grid Electrification Program Based on Renewable Energy Sources, Phase I" project implemented between 2002 and 2009, have helped create an enabling environment for investments in renewable energy for off-grid areas. SGP RE interventions will help expedite the uptake of RE technologies in the focus geographical areas, taking advantage of the favorable policy and regulatory conditions established by this GEF FSP.

Threats and barriers to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use:

17. GRUAS I & II contain an in-depth analysis of current status of biodiversity and threats to each of the PA and biological corridors in Costa Rica. The main common threat is the existing fragmentation of ecosystems due to historic forest clearing to expand the agricultural frontier, changes in agricultural systems that maintain forest cover to monoculture crops, commercial timber extraction, and other agricultural and land use practices that do not take into account biodiversity. Although Costa Rica has been successful in halting deforestation nationally there are still areas where land use change and forest ecosystem degradation are happening. For example, pineapple monoculture has increased by 20,000 hectares between 2008 and 2010. There is also concern for expanding mining operations in the northern part of the country. Forest fires are also an important cause of concern for several protected areas. Land degradation is a further driver of biodiversity loss in most biological corridors. Indeed, land degradation is affecting Diria, Paso de la Danta, Paso de las Lapas, San Juan-La Selva, Pajaro Campana and Colorado-Tortuguero biological corridors in various degrees. The Jesus Maria watershed located in the biological corridor of "Montes de Aguacate" is the most affected watershed in the country. Climate change will exacerbate ecosystem degradation in areas where soil erosion and other land degradation processes are already present. While Costa Rica has made notable progress in most aspects measured by the Human Development Index⁸, poverty in the rural areas is still a major factor of environmental degradation. Rural poverty was estimated to be 19.2% and extreme poverty 5.3% in 2009.
18. Despite Costa Rica's strong commitment towards the protection and sustainable use of its natural base and its previous investments on biodiversity conservation, a number of barriers still need to be addressed to enable communities contribute more effectively to overcome these threats:

⁷ Other GEF funded CC projects in Costa Rica include: Building National Capacity to Develop Policy Options for Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reductions and Sink Enhancements (1996); Tejona Wind Power (2002); and Second National Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (2004). Costa Rica also participated in a number of early regional and global CC GEF-funded projects.

⁸ Between 1980 and 2007 Costa Rica's HDI rose by 0.42% annually from 0.763 to 0.854 today.

- Lack of legislation regulating land use and activities in buffer zones. In the absence of these laws, local communities living around protected areas manage their farms and conduct other economic activities without due consideration to the effects these may have on ecosystems and species.
- Insufficient capacity at community level for land use planning in buffer zones and corridors. Even if communities are willing to mainstream biodiversity in their land use decisions, they do not have the information, tools and resources to undertake adequate land use planning. This is often compounded by weak institutional presence in these areas, and therefore technical assistance from government entities is not available to many communities.
- Weak governance mechanisms for the implementation of biological corridor management plans. While community participation is an important consideration in the BC management plans and communities are part of Local Councils for biological corridors, their enhanced participation in and contribution to the Councils is an essential ingredient for the successful implementation of the plans. Local leaders that represent communities in the Councils lack financial support and technical resources to reach out to the rest of the population within the corridors.
- Lack of information, skills and knowledge on agricultural production technologies that help maintain ecological connectivity, such as agro-forestry and organic agriculture.
- Absence of economic incentives for changing unsustainable community practices and /or lack of knowledge about incentive mechanisms such as payments for environmental services that exist in Costa Rica. Indeed, Costa Rica is a pioneering country concerning mechanisms to help maintain environmental services but, in spite of the positive track record, there are still many communities that have not been able to benefit from these financial incentives. While SGP's previous efforts to enable indigenous peoples receive PES have been successful, coverage to a significant number of indigenous communities has yet to be achieved.
- Low public awareness of the need to conserve critical areas to maintain ecosystem services.

Barriers to achieve national Carbon neutral targets in rural areas:

19. Of the total annual GHG emissions of the country (8,779 million tons per year) the agriculture and livestock sector accounts for half of the total emissions, that is, 4,603 million tons. In particular, slash-and-burn agriculture is still widespread in some regions of Costa Rica, including those targeted by this project. The use of fuelwood for meeting household energy needs as well as those of rural agro-processing enterprises, represents another source of GHG emissions at community level. There are about 50,000 households located in buffer zones and biological corridors without access to the public electricity grid. Forest fires in the country are a significant contributor to GHG emissions and a threat to ecosystems. Such forest fires occur because of lack of fire management in slash-and-burn agriculture and as a result of other anthropogenic causes. Although in accordance with the Costa Rican National Commission Against Wildfires (CONIFOR) fire occurrence has been down to 13,900 hectares per year in the last three years from 32,500 hectares it still represents an average emission per year of 1.9 million tons of CO₂ equivalent. Land use change from forest use to agricultural use, and from integrated agricultural systems to monoculture crops is affecting at least 25,000 hectares per year.
20. This implies that the country must overcome the following barriers:
 - Weak access to information at community level on government policies and regulations on climate change;
 - Absence of viable alternatives to unsustainable land use change for poor rural communities;
 - Lack of access to clean and efficient rural energy technologies;
 - Deficient access to credit for clean technology investment in rural areas. There are not enough lines of credit for it and / or the communities are unaware of the existence of the few ones available.
 - Lack of skills and know-how to phase-out slash-and-burn practices in agriculture.
 - Lack of equipment and financial and technical resources by many communities adjacent to PA to prevent and combat in a timely manner forest fires.

Community barriers to adopt sustainable land management approaches:

21. Unsustainable production practices in the Jesus Maria Basin (with an extension of 37,000 ha) have made it one of the most degraded watersheds in the country according to the CADETI Advisory Commission on Land Degradation. Livestock and agricultural activities in areas with steep slopes and poor vegetation cover have lead

to its deterioration. The watershed area requires immediate changes in production systems and improved management of small-scale livestock activities to arrest soil erosion and further degradation, and to start recovering its soil productivity. To achieve this, it is required to overcome the following barriers at the community level:

- Limited capacity of local communities to participate in watershed management bodies and for policy advocacy at the local level.
- Lack of knowledge and skills to apply sustainable land management methods to their farms;
- Insufficient information on and difficulty to access technologies for soil and water conservation and to benefit from financial resources available for SLM in various government and non-government programs.

Long-term solution/ project approach

22. Addressing habitat fragmentation that is threatening the sustainability of the National Protected Areas System of Costa Rica requires full participation of farmer and indigenous communities inhabiting PA buffer zones and biological corridors to mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use throughout the production landscape of the country. A mosaic of land uses and community practices that provide sustainable livelihoods compatible with ecosystem conservation needs to be established at scale to trigger larger positive impacts and help restore ecological connectivity. Meeting the C-Neutrality target in Costa Rica and arresting land degradation in priority areas, also require the full engagement of communities in the rural areas. This SGP project will therefore address biodiversity conservation and sustainable use at the landscape level, including land use, land use change and forestry, by continuing to apply an ecosystem focus when programming community interventions for sustainable land and resource use leading to global environmental benefits. All project-funded initiatives will take place in the selected 12 biological corridors and 8 PA buffer zones to achieve synergies between the three focal areas.
23. Over the last 17 years, SGP Costa Rica has developed significant experience in working with local communities to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity in fragile ecosystems in PA buffer zones and biological corridors, including by supporting the establishment of new community-managed protected areas. Over 80% of the more than 500 previous initiatives financed by SGP in the country, are located in biological corridors and PA buffer zones in various regions of Costa Rica. While these efforts have been successful, there is a need to consolidate previous work by targeting a limited number of areas and by strengthening the enabling environment and governance mechanisms that enhance community participation in sustainable ecosystem management and stewardship of biological resources. This project will also emphasize replication and up-scaling within the selected geographical areas.
24. As demonstrated by country program evaluations and by the catalogue of biodiversity products from Latin America and the Caribbean recently launched by SGP at the CBD COP in Nagoya, SGP Costa Rica has considerable experience in supporting communities to develop and implement successful sustainable production initiatives. Organic production of bananas, coffee, cocoa, and medicinal plants, organic apiculture, and sustainable production and harvesting of plant and animal species for the food and handicraft industries are important tools for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in rural landscapes within biological corridor areas. With SGP support, Costa Rica has transformed sustainable rural community tourism into a fast-growing and successful economic activity that enables communities to earn a living while conserving biodiversity. In addition to helping individual farmers and communities to produce and sell biodiversity-friendly goods and services, SGP Costa Rica has helped establish several umbrella organizations such as the Organic Coffee Producers and the Community Tourism Associations to further strengthen the capacities of its members and represent small-holders interests nationally. All the above products have markets in expansion nationally and internationally, and experience demonstrates that indeed, sustainable livelihood activities generate both socio economic benefits and biodiversity benefits. For example, during OP4, 23 communities received funding for sustainable production ventures, generating 171 permanent jobs and incomes ranging from \$1,500 to \$11,000 annually, while also meeting the conservation objectives of the projects. On the other hand, SGP has also learnt about the causes for failure of community and NGO initiatives and these lessons will be taken into consideration for grant selection and in the monitoring of grants during implementation to maintain or increase the rate of success of SGP-funded interventions which is about 90%.
25. The project will support community-based interventions that help establish a mosaic of land uses that integrate

biodiversity conservation and sustainable use within the biological corridors. It will also support enabling activities such as strengthening community participation in local governance mechanisms for biological corridors, training and land use planning, and also investments in biodiversity friendly practices within the production landscape. Among others, the project will fund:

- Training of community leaders for managing sustainably the territory of biological corridors and for their effective participation in Local Councils.
- Community-based local management plans for sustainable land use that takes into account biodiversity.
- Enhanced connectivity in the existing biological corridors through reforestation, agro-forestry, natural regeneration, and new community-owned and managed conservation areas.
- Community enhanced access to existing financial incentives for the conservation and protection of forests, water, and biodiversity (PES and other schemes).
- Sustainable production initiatives that provide alternatives to unsustainable practices. These include, among others, community rural tourism, responsible fisheries, sustainable harvest of medicinal plants, organic agriculture and beekeeping.
- Community networks to facilitate access to markets and to contribute to the development of policies and norms that further enable sustainable livelihood options.
- Environmental education initiatives at local level.

26. In the climate change focal area the project will be focused on:

- Disseminating the C-Neutral national strategy among rural communities.
- Promoting the use of appropriate technologies in agricultural production processes that contribute to the C-Neutral Strategy of the country.
- Demonstration projects using renewable energy and fuel-efficient technologies (biogas digesters, solar cookers, improved stoves and ovens, solar panels, among others). Annex F provides further information on RE and EE technologies that will be promoted by SGP and the estimated carbon reduction benefits.
- Promotion of investments in low energy technologies for coffee production processes (solar coffee drying, waste management, production of organic fertilizer, etc.).
- Promotion of energy efficient technologies for rural productive activities taking place in buffer zones of PA (organic agriculture, Rural Community Tourism, and other sustainable production activities).
- Promotion of lines of micro-credit for clean technology investments, particularly for community-based renewable energy and energy efficient systems in off-grid areas. For this purpose, SGP will partner with cooperatives and other financial organizations and projects that have demonstrated interest in lending for small-scale renewable energy and energy efficiency projects and that will manage the credit lines (among others, Agri-Cooperative, Alianza Cooperative, Fundecooperación, CAMBIO, ARECA). Financial resources for the credit will be contributed by SGP partners, while SGP will allocate GEF resources to support technical assistance and capacity building for communities and local NGOs.
- Training and strengthening of voluntary forest brigades at community level, in buffer zones of PA vulnerable to forest fires, for the prevention and timely control of forest fires. The target is to avoid wildfires in at least 350 hectares in biological corridors and PA buffer zones during the life of the project (approximately 87.5 hectares annually as indicated in Annex F).
- Reforestation and forest enrichment of degraded forests with native species to increase carbon stocks in biological corridors and PA buffer zones. It is estimated that SGP interventions will maintain existing native forests within an area of 60,000 hectares and increase carbon stocks by reforesting 2,300 hectares within the same area. During the early stages of project implementation SGP will utilize the IPCC Good Practice Guidance for LULUCF to establish precise baseline values to measure the CO₂ benefits to be generated by the project. Figures provided are tentative given that the 60,000 ha have different land uses (agricultural, natural forest, grassland) and rates of land use change and the extension of each land use will only be known when grant proposals are approved by the NSC.

27. In the land degradation focal area SGP will be working in the cantons of Esparza, San Mateo and Orotina, where the main communities within the Jesus Maria river basin are located in an extension of 29,000 ha. The following activities will be supported:

- Applied participatory research on SLM with support from national, regional and local relevant government and non-government organizations
 - Community-based activities on natural regeneration, reforestation, and erosion control in degraded areas. As a policy SGP Costa Rica uses native species for all agroforestry and reforestation activities (see ANNEX K for the list of species that will be used)
 - Community-based actions establishing agroforestry systems, rain harvesting, organic agriculture, agro-ecological farms and similar practices.
 - Dissemination of the National Action Plan on Land Degradation in the watershed area.
 - Capacities development for local communities in watershed management.
 - Strategic partnerships between communities and government institutions, academia and others for the constitution of a Local Committee for watershed management.
 - Strengthening of ASADAS (Community-based Associations for Water Administration) for enhanced community governance of water resources and for policy advocacy and participation in decision-making processes at the local and regional levels.
28. An important component of the project is community capacity development and knowledge management. This includes activities to support stakeholder networks (among community groups producing similar products and services) to participate in the development of relevant policies and legislation and facilitate access to markets; to up-scale results in fire management, agro-tourism and eco-tourism, and organic farm production, and to link-up stakeholder networks that currently operate in a completely autonomous and isolated manner. Systematization of experiences and lessons learned through SGP initiatives and dissemination of knowledge are also a main component of the project to achieve replication of successful interventions and up-scaling of eco-friendly practices and businesses.
29. Cost-effectiveness is an important criteria for the approval of SGP grants by the NSC. The budgets of project proposals are compared with those of prior similar interventions and assessed against expected environmental and social benefits. In all cases, communities are expected to contribute substantial in-kind co-financing (i.e., labor, infrastructure, equipment, tools, land) and help mobilize other in-kind or cash resources from development partners and local government. The NSC also assesses whether there may be more cost effective alternatives to achieve the same global environmental benefits before approving SGP grants. This ensures that GEF funds are applied in the most cost-effective manner.
30. The M&E component is focused on meeting the project requirements at project and Program level, and also in the development of skills at local level to enable grantees to monitor their own activities and achievements. A priority task in the first stage of project implementation is the development of a system to monitor carbon stocks in areas targeted by project interventions. SGP-Costa Rica will apply the Global SGP indicators to monitor individual projects and the national portfolio, and to report to UNDP and GEF through the SGP global Database and other project reports (see ANNEX H for the selected global SGP indicators for GEF-5).
31. The SGP policy in Costa Rica is to finance CBOs as a matter of priority. NGOs receive grants only when the outcome of their projects is CBO strengthening. In Costa Rica, approximately 85% of SGP grants go to CBOs and 15% to NGOs supporting community groups. SGP's financial contribution to one organization never exceeds \$50,000 during a given Operational Phase, and the average grant size is approximately \$20,000. Community organizations may benefit from SGP support once or twice during an Operational Phase, which means smaller individual disbursements and a longer timeframe to achieve sustainability of interventions. The reason for this is that CBOs need time to develop alliances, obtain co-financing, group together in networks, and develop the capacity to generate good project proposals and income-generation activities that support their environmental work. Working with community-based organizations not only guarantees the sustainability of the processes but also that SGP-funded activities are based on real local priorities and needs.
32. The majority of SGP-financed CBOs have not managed a prior grant directly from an international organization or a bilateral donor. CBOs in Costa Rica are mostly self-help groups composed of community members working pro bono for the CBO. The quality of project proposals is generally very poor at the start, even though the community may have interesting ideas. Also, the community's understanding of global environmental issues is lacking, and usually it has no experience of RBM and participatory M&E. At the end of project implementation several members of the CBOs are able to develop adequate project proposals and explain in an

articulate manner what their project is about and what GEBs will be achieved. Most SGP supported CBOs improve their governance and financial management systems, which is demonstrated by their capacity to continue operating and sustaining or upscaling project results, getting grouped in networks such as Rural Community Tourism associations, Organic Agriculture, Biological Corridors and others.

33. Capacities built in CBOs and their constituent members through SGP grant activities are largely retained through the following mechanisms: encouraging CBOs to develop new project proposals for other donors using the acquired project development skills; providing technical support beyond project completion to ensure sustainability of project outcomes; encouraging peer-to-peer support beyond project completion among CBOs; involving former grantees – CBO leaders and members – in new training activities; encouraging NGOs operating in the area to involve former CBO SGP grantees in their activities; and using qualified CBO members to train or support other community organizations so that they practice their skills and gain self-confidence. Also, SGP works with the local and national government to mainstream communities' initiatives in local development plans, budgets, and extension work. For example, the National System of Protected Areas has assigned staff responsible for the implementation of the biological corridors and fire management programs in each conservation area to support and monitor community-based groups during and beyond SGP project implementation. Furthermore, SGP has established partnerships with leading institutions such as the National Training Institute (INA), the Distance Education State University (UNED), CATIE; and BUN-CA to further enhance and update the technical skills of actual and former grantees. This is particularly important for climate change mitigation initiatives. BUN-CA, a specialized regional energy entity will help ensure that local technicians trained through SGP projects are able to provide good quality maintenance services to communities adopting RE and EE systems.

B. 2. [incremental /Additional cost reasoning](#): describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF financing and the associated [global environmental benefits](#) (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

34. The main baseline projects and activities in Costa Rica relevant to this project are those linked with the National Program for Biological Corridors, NAP implementation, and the National Strategy for Carbon Neutrality (Costa Rica planned activities for REDD+, including Carbon monitoring). SGP's initiatives supporting local communities will add value and build on these government led projects. The current baseline scenario would remain the status quo without GEF SGP support as the above-mentioned initiatives do not have the capability to reach out and work with the remote and poor communities in the geographic areas where SGP is focusing on to address global environmental issues in an integrated and sustainable manner.
35. SGP strengthens the capacity of communities and civil society organizations to address environmental issues, increasing knowledge and awareness about environmental threats, and providing financial leverage to overcome short-term decision-making that negatively affects environmental resources. Short-term decision-making is often necessitated in poor regions where individuals have to secure the basic elements for survival on a day-to-day basis, and therefore do not have the possibility to plan for long-term sustainable livelihoods ensuring environmental protection.
36. The baseline scenario without GEF support would therefore see the same level of habitat fragmentation in the 8 PA buffer zones and the 12 biological corridors, the consequence of existing production practices by communities living in these ecosystems. It would also see increasing levels of GHG emissions, mostly the result of forest fires and rural production practices, and further degradation and desertification of productive and non-productive land-use systems. Habitat fragmentation, if not addressed, will continue contributing to loss of ecosystem function and the gradual erosion of the capacity of the entire national system for biodiversity conservation. Many climate change scenarios show increases in average temperatures as well as reduction in rainfall, including larger variations in temperatures and changes in the rainfall distribution along the year. The initial analysis of potential implications for biodiversity (see Costa Rica Second National Communication to the UNFCCC) show that a national biodiversity conservation system heavily fragmented will not be resilient to those changes and that many wild species of plant and animals will be lost, particularly the endemic ones who are more vulnerable to habitat modification. Therefore, the prospects of the baseline scenario are significantly high losses of the investment made for several decades to protect biodiversity in Costa Rica.
37. In Costa Rica, efforts to address global environmental challenges in an innovative and community-driven

manner are underfunded by orders of magnitude in relation to the potential need. As discussed in paragraph 15, previous GEF biodiversity investments in Costa Rica have been deployed in a limited number of PA and have been mostly directed towards PA infrastructure. SGP has built on pioneer PES work funded by previous GEF projects (by enabling indigenous people to access PES mechanisms) and is ensuring that lessons learnt through CEPF initiatives in Costa Rica are applied in SGP projects. However, there is a major gap in supporting communities across production landscapes in biological corridors that this project intends to fill. On the other hand, without SGP there will be limited monitoring and reporting on environmental conservation efforts and environmental trends in targeted areas and communities. Monitoring and evaluation is critical for data collection on environmental and socio-economic trends and documenting and disseminating good practices.

38. This SGP FSP is expected to catalyze a significant change in relation to the business-as-usual scenario in a focused number of Protected Areas buffer zones and biological corridors highly significant in terms of global environmental benefits. The consolidation of conservation in these territories based on the active involvement of local communities committed to these goals will not only strengthen the situation in the specific areas but will also have a significant demonstration value for all PAs and biological corridors of the National System.
39. Last, it is important to highlight that this integrated strategy focused on key biological corridors will enhance a biodiversity-friendly mosaic of land uses by combining different interventions coherently. Bringing together biodiversity conservation actions with reduction of GHG emissions through renewable energy and energy efficiency, and improvements in local livelihoods, will reduce the pressure on the resource base more efficiently than addressing each of them separately or spreading them over larger and multiple territories.

Table 2

Current Practice	Alternative to be put in place by the project and global benefits
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited community participation in Local Councils for Biological Corridors (only 3 LCs functioning optimally, only one with an operational plan, many not constituted) - Limited number of indigenous peoples and small farmers benefiting from PES through FONAFIFO in project area; - Forest areas allocated to local communities through the agrarian reform process (area sizes range from 30 to 300 ha each) have not been transferred to the MINAET to enable communities manage them as wildlife conservation areas - Lack of land use regulations in PA buffer zones and biological corridors causes unsustainable resource and land use practices -Poverty in project area, remoteness, and lack of information and know-how hampers communities' ability to switch to more sustainable practices that also improve their livelihoods 	<p>The project will enable local communities to contribute to the management and conservation of biodiversity in 12 biological corridors and buffers zones connecting 8 PAs by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Developing the capacity of local communities through training and technical assistance to establish 3 Local Councils for biological corridors and strengthen the operation of 7 existing Local Councils through developing their operational plans and implementing them in partnership with national and local organizations and other biological corridor stakeholders; - Mentoring and supporting indigenous peoples and small farmers to access FONAFIFO payments for environmental services (PES); - Supporting local communities to transfer at least 5 communal lands to MINAET to be managed as community conservation areas; - Providing training and technical assistance for the development and implementation of management plans in community lands to substitute for the absence of relevant regulations; - Funding sustainable livelihood activities in production landscapes to address habitat fragmentation and improve the lives of local communities; - Making available technical assistance and business support to enable communities meet national or international standards for certification of production landscapes and practices. <p>Delivers the following global benefits: 180,000 hectares with improved protection and conservation in globally significant ecosystems and improving ecosystem resilience through ecological connectivity. This target represents a coverage of about 15% of the total area within the selected biological corridors.</p>

<p>- The energy sector in Costa Rica is a State monopoly vested in the Costa Rican Electricity Institute. This entity is responsible for the production and distribution of electricity throughout the country. Although electricity coverage is significant, some remote areas remain without this service. Many rural businesses could improve their productivity through renewable energy and energy efficiency but EE and RE is not promoted or supported by the Institute;</p> <p>- Communities lack information concerning energy efficiency and small-scale renewable energy technologies;</p> <p>- While credit lines for environmentally friendly practices have been established in Costa Rica in the last few years (among others the CAMBio Project of BCIE, Development Fund of the Costa Rica National Bank, Oiko Credit, Fundecooperacion), most remote rural communities are not aware of their existence or cannot meet requirements for the credit.</p>	<p>The project will demonstrate in rural areas renewable energy and energy efficient practices and will help establish the conditions for their uptake and replication. The project will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support selected rural businesses to implement energy efficiency practices; - Support rural communities install small-scale renewable energy systems for various end uses (e.g, cooking, heating, lighting) in off-grid areas; - Promote micro-credit with local financial intermediaries to finance sustainable energy interventions at the local level in the target zones - Provide technical assistance and capacity building so that financial partners can offer the most appropriate micro-credit lines - Implement an information system with existing knowledge and experiences in financial opportunities - Develop the mechanisms needed to attain financial and institutional sustainability at the community level <p>Delivers the following global benefit: 15,000 tons of CO₂e emissions avoided or reduced during the lifetime of the project through RE and EE adoption by local off-grid communities.</p>
<p>There is a National Programme for wild fire Management in the SINAC as well as a Fire National Strategy. However, SINAS does not have adequate financial and human resources to prevent and manage forest fires in risk areas. Further more, the implementation of biological corridors may increase the risk of forest fires in protected areas as it links up forested areas. Volunteer groups to prevent and combat forest fires are emerging, however, while they contribute human resources they do not have adequate skills for this dangerous activity nor do they have the equipment to do so effectively. Many forest fires are the result of uncontrolled burning for agricultural purposes or accidental fires.</p>	<p>SGP will support local communities prevent, control and combat forest fires, particularly in the dry zone of the Pacific region as well as manage, regenerate and reforest biological corridor and PA buffer zones. The project will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish and train local fire fighting crews, and co-finance the acquisition of equipment; - Support community volunteer crews to prevent fires and manage forests in various biological corridors; - Awareness-raising and education for the prevention of fire; - Restoration of areas affected by forest fires; - Help phasing out slash-and-burn agricultural practices in the most vulnerable areas; - Development of a carbon monitoring system to be implemented by local communities with support from relevant institutions present in the project areas; <p>Delivers the following global benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 50,000 tons of CO₂e avoided through community forest fire prevention and management (see Annex F for details) and enhanced capacities to implement LULUCF strategies and to monitor carbon stocks; - 60,000 hectares of Carbon stocks maintained through community forest protection actions and 83,237 tCO₂e sequestered in 3 years through reforestation and natural regeneration in 2,300 ha (calculated on the basis of IPCC 2006: 12.06 tCO₂e/ha/year, a conservative estimate for monoculture reforestation).

<p>Unsustainable water and land management leading to land degradation and low yields; The River-basin Commission in the Jesus Maria watershed has not been established. Such Commission is expected to bring together all institutions and water users within the watershed for its sustainable management; The National Action Plan to Combat Land Degradation is not known in the Jesus Maria River basin and therefore is not being implemented. The ASADAS are community-based organizations that administer drinking water resources. These organizations often operate without the know-how to manage water resources in an effective manner.</p>	<p>The project will improve land and water resources management in the Jesus Maria watershed, the most degraded river basin in the Costa Rica. The project will help communities in this watershed contribute to the implementation of the NAP. SGP will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promote and support integrated farm management, agro-forestry, silvicultural systems and other land use practices that help restore degraded community lands; - Work with the ASADAS and other CBOs to protect water resources for improved community water supply and ecosystem resilience in the watershed; - Help establish the Watershed Commission and develop its capacities to ensure adequate water resources governance; - Provide training and develop the capacities of communities vulnerable to land degradation through strategic partnerships with key institutions including research, agricultural extension, local governments and NGOs. <p>Delivers the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 29,500 hectares under improved sustainable land management in the most degraded watershed of Costa Rica.
<p>Costa Rica has many innovative and far-reaching environmental policies and regulatory frameworks. These, however, are not known or well understood by local communities. On the other hand, some policies and norms have not been tested on the ground and there is no feedback as to their relevance and effectiveness. Global environmental issues are not understood by local communities in project areas, except by those CBOs that have received SGP support in the past. Most environmental organizations and development partners are working to address local environmental problems and the linkages with the broader environment is not sufficiently understood. NGO project support is often localized and, while individual interventions may be successful, their impact is often limited. Recently, networks bringing together CBOs and NGOs working in similar areas or objectives have emerged.</p>	<p>SGP in Costa Rica will strengthen the capacities of CBOs and local NGOs to contribute to policy and legislation development. It will also enhance the capacity of CBOs to access, generate and use information concerning global environmental issues and potential local solutions. In order to improve the likelihood of upscaling and replication of successful conservation and livelihood practices, SGP will help establish thematic networks of civil society organizations or at the biological corridor levels. It will also strengthen existing networks such as the Talamanca Indigenous Network, the Wildfires Management Network, the National Biological Corridors Network (National Management Assessment on Biological Corridors), BIOVIDA- Community Leaders for Biodiversity Conservation Or the National Rural Community Chamber. It will also provide avenues for consultations with the most vulnerable community groups such as small farmers in remote areas and indigenous peoples, concerning policy and regulatory frameworks. SGP will promote peer learning by supporting experience exchange visits and workshops. Knowledge management products will be generated and widely disseminated in project areas and beyond. Communities will also be trained in project development and participatory monitoring techniques to promote transparency, learning and accountability at all levels.</p>

B.3. 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) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF). As a background information, read [Mainstreaming Gender at the GEF.](#)":

- 40.** In order to bring economic benefits to the greatest possible number of communities and people in the project areas of intervention, SGP Costa Rica has established for this phase a maximum funding of \$20,000 per project when the grantee is a CBO. An important strategy of the program is to focus a

minimum of 20% of resources on the most vulnerable groups including women, indigenous people, and groups from marginalized rural communities. The rest of the portfolio, promotes equitable economic benefits for both men and women, and incorporates them, in the same way, in all decision-making positions of the projects and in the governance bodies established with SGP support. This approach is expected to result in some 120 CBO projects, directly benefiting 1,000 to 1,500 families. During OP5, SGP will support community based initiatives that benefit at least 1,000 families committed with biodiversity conservation and living in biological corridors and buffer zones of PA, to help improve their livelihood opportunities through, community rural tourism, organic agriculture, organic honey, medicinal plants, handcraft activities and other environmentally-friendly activities. Access to clean energy sources will benefit women and children by reducing firewood collection work and indoor pollution, and renewable energy sources will provide communities with electricity for lighting, and other important services in off-grid areas. In addition, SGP will allocate a number of grants (approximately 36 grants with an average of \$30,000 each) to be implemented by national NGOs and thematic networks with local communities to assist them with implementation of initiatives that require a significant level of technical expertise such as renewable energy and energy efficiency projects as well as those related to, for example, access to new markets, PES schemes, and land use planning and management.

41. SGP Costa Rica will be addressing and implementing gender mainstreaming actions, including gender analysis, consultation with both women and men, and identification of gender-disaggregated data and indicators in SGP projects. Individual grants will define baseline values for men and women and specific targets disaggregated by gender (for example, percentage of increased income expected for women in a given intervention). Last but not least, capacity development of CBOs and local leaders, both men and women, will receive special attention and will include mentoring, training and peer-to-peer learning.

B.4 Indicate risks, including climate change risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design:

42. There are few new risks to be faced by SGP in Costa Rica since the program has already been operating for 17 years. However, SGP takes risks seriously and will be monitoring for them on an ongoing basis and updating the UNDP risk log module in ATLAS on a quarterly basis (see M&E section). Below are some perceived risks and their mitigation measures. The project Results Framework also includes risks and assumptions at the objective and outcome levels.

Table 3: Risk rating and management

RISK	RISK RATING	MITIGATION MEASURES
Running a grants programme with civil society organizations that have a low level of technical and management capacity	Low	SGP has a past performance rating of 90% achievement. Risk mitigation systems in place will be strengthened to maintain or improve this rate of achievements. SGP works with all grantees to help build capacities by identifying appropriate rates of disbursement, linking grantee partners to learn from each other (peer-to-peer), and working in a flexible manner that responds to the strengths and comparable advantages of grantees. SGP also reduces risk by supporting replication of good practices that have proven to deliver on GEF strategic priorities at the community level. The National Steering Committee (NSC), with representation from civil society leaders, government institutions, and donors further provides support for effective design and implementation of SGP projects.
Climate variability fueled by the climate change process	Medium	There is already an incidence of climate variability taking place and all beneficiaries are adapting to it. The overall Project strategy and activities (forest conservation, reforestation, agroforestry, land restoration, etc.) can be considered mitigation measures of this risk. Climate variability related risks are taken into consideration in project design and approval by the NSC.

Weak governance systems may delay or impede adequate land use planning and management in the biological corridors	Medium	The SGP National Coordinator will continue to participate actively in the Coordination Committee of the National Network of Biological Corridors and the project will support capacity development for improved governance and community participation in the Local Councils for Biological Corridors.
Difficulty for communities in accessing markets for goods and services produced with SGP support	Medium-low	The NSC will appraise projects with sustainable livelihood components to assess their business feasibility. The NSC will call upon relevant experts from the SGP technical committees. SGP will support communities to access expertise in business development and marketing from the project design stage to reduce the risk of failure of projects which will produce goods and services. SGP will also encourage partnerships between the grantees and the private sector. Based on prior SGP experience, markets for bio-products and eco-tourism are growing in Costa Rica and elsewhere. The Ministry of Tourism is providing support to SGP grantees for the promotion of their tourism facilities.
Other exogenous risks (economic crisis, political instability, etc.)	Low	These, and other similar risks, can be considered as contingencies. As such, the mitigation measures are implemented in an ongoing ad-hoc manner as necessary and appropriate.

B.5. Identify key stakeholders involved in the project including the private sector, civil society organizations, local and indigenous communities, and their respective roles, as applicable:

43. GEF/SGP-CR has formed mutually beneficial long-standing relationships with national and community level initiatives and partners (public and private sector), and will continue to seek synergies in the coming operational phase. Local communities located in the buffer zones of selected PA and biological corridors are the most important partners for SGP. Of these, the population in 24 indigenous territories, some 63,876 people, accounts for approximately 1.7% of the total population. SGP-CR coordinates with the associations that serve as the local government within indigenous territories, recognized by indigenous law as the organizations responsible for internal and external affairs of the community. SGP also coordinates at national level with CONAI- the National Commission of Indigenous Affairs and the Mesa Nacional Indígena. It should be noted that SGP-CR has worked in 22 of the 24 indigenous territories in previous program phases. Main stakeholders and partners and their roles are presented in the table below.

Table 4: SGP Stakeholders and Partners

Institution/stakeholder	Role/type of coordination
Ministry of the Environment (MINAET) - National System of Conservation Areas (SINAC), Biological Corridors National Program	This is the office, within SINAC, responsible for implementation of the Biological Corridors System, where SGP funded activities will be located. SGP grant activities will be coordinated with them. The Biological Corridors National Program will also provide co-financing and technical assistance to SGP grantees.
MINAET - CADETI-Advisory Commission on Land Degradation	This organization is the national focal point for Land Degradation, and is the organization with which SGP will coordinating actions on sustainable land management.
National Biodiversity Institute (INBio-)	INBio is a key national biodiversity research and policy institution and it also implements projects. It is an SGP partner, providing co-financing, technical assistance and applied research support to grantees. INBio also works on climate change issues, in particular on ecosystems-based adaptation.
State Universities: University of Costa Rica, National University, and Distance Learning University	These organizations are key SGP partners as they carry out research on SGP-related subjects and locations throughout the country. They are also active in providing training at the local level on subjects relevant to SGP and its grantees.
Costa Rica Organic Production Movement (MAOCO)	SGP and MAOCO have a very well established partnership jointly funding many community-based initiatives related to organic production, pesticides use reduction, land conservation, etc.
National Network of Biological Corridors	This is a network of organizations (Governmental, NGOs, CBO, etc.) active on different aspects of conservation and sustainable use of resources in the officially

	designated biological corridors of the country. It is basically a coordination structure, but different joint initiatives, co-financing, technical assistance and training actions are implemented by SGP with this Network partners.
“Marine and coastal biodiversity, capacity development and adaptation to climate change (BIOMARCC)” initiative	BIOMARCC is part of the "Costa Rica Forever" initiative and is co-funded by the German Government. BIOMARCC has interventions in critical coastal zones where SGP has been active supporting local fishing communities, and therefore, collaboration between the two programmes has already taken place. Examples of this collaboration are the implementation of pilot projects aimed at supporting sustainable fishing practices, oyster harvesting, and mangrove conservation. Under this SGP/FSP collaboration with BIOMARCC is particularly relevant to the coastal areas of targeted biological corridors, such as Talamanca-Caribe, Paso de la Danta, and AMISTOSA.
IUCN	IUCN is a member of the SGP NSC. SGP will coordinate actions with three IUCN initiatives: IUCN-DPCL Partnership Promoting Sustainable Environmental Alliances, Environmental Law Fund, and a recent project on watersheds and micro-watersheds, in Sixaola bi-national watershed, with German funds.
National Commission of Indigenous Affairs (CONAI), Mesa Nacional Indígena and National Indigenous Board	CONAI and MNI are members of the SGP NSC, and are responsible for carrying out the technical analysis of project proposals to be implemented in indigenous territories. SGP actions with indigenous development associations are coordinated with CONAI.

B.6. Outline the coordination with other related initiatives:

44. SGP works with relevant stakeholders in the geographic and focal areas selected to ensure coordination of donor funding on relevant initiatives and avoid duplication of efforts. For biological corridors, the main coordinating mechanism is the Commission for the National Network of Biological Corridors⁹, of which SGP is a member. At the local level, SGP grantees are members of the Local Councils established for the management of each biological corridor. SGP's initiatives on PA are coordinated with the Director of the National Protected Area System and with individual PA Directors. SGP has participated in the consultation process related to the preparation of the Reddiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) presented to the Forest Carbon Partnership facility. The R-PP is awaiting final approval. SGP also seeks linkages with other relevant GEF MSPs and FSPs implemented in Costa Rica wherever synergies can be found. The Government representative in the SGP NSC is the GEF Operational Focal Point. This facilitates coordination with other GEF initiatives in the country. The table below summarizes the most relevant initiatives, however, like in the case of BIOMARCC, SGP will further consult with other partners and initiatives in each biological corridor to ensure collaboration takes place and duplication is avoided.

Table 5

Institution	Initiative/Program	Type of coordination
GEF Project – UNDP / Ministry of the Environment – Conservation Areas National System (SINAC)	Removing Barriers to Sustainability of PA	This is a 5-year GEF Full Size project that started in early 2010 focused on removing administrative, financial and organizational barriers constraining Protected Areas sustainability. Most of the components of this Project are aimed to Protected Areas and the institution itself (SINAC) with limited attention to actions outside Protected Areas. SGP will complement this Project through its actions focused in buffer zones and biological corridors
FONAFIFO- National Fund for Forestry Financing	Eco-markets	FONAFIFO is the institution in charge of the implementation of the PES Program in Costa Rica. SGP coordinates with FONAFIFO the involvement of local communities and indigenous peoples to access this type of incentives.
UN-REDD and Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Initiatives	Various	Costa Rica is part of these two initiatives. SGP will therefore seek to cooperate with the national institutions in charge of these initiatives to ensure there is adequate coordination and to explore possibilities to leverage resources to achieve the project objectives both in the biodiversity focal area and for forest carbon. It should be noted that the

⁹ Comisión Coordinadora de la Red Nacional de Corredores Biológicos de Costa Rica

		SGP National Coordinator participated during the consultations to develop the REDD+ support programme to be funded by the World Bank and will continue participating during its implementation.
--	--	---

C. GEF AGENCY INFORMATION:

C.1 Confirm the co-financing amount the GEF agency brings to the project:

45. UNDP will make an in-kind contribution of \$100,000. This contribution will be made effective through UNDP professional staff participating in the SGP National Steering Committee, an important tool for transparency, strategic guidance and direction in selecting and approving projects, and to ensure quality standards in programming. UNDP will also assist SGP in fundraising and in negotiations to establish a pipeline of projects with marginalized communities in the framework of the Millennium Development Goals. The \$100,000 in-kind contribution from UNDP corresponds to (a) the participation of a senior professional staff member in the National Steering Committee, which involves at least two months of time per year for participation in NSC meetings, project field visits, review of work plans, review of project proposals, and monitoring the progress of the program (\$30,000); (b) advocacy, technical support in fund raising, knowledge management communications, and the agency expertise in the areas of Human Development, Democracy and Governance, Poverty Reduction, Environment, Energy and Risk Management, Equality and Gender Equity, with staff time estimated at \$50,000; and (c) the use of equipment, office supplies, meeting infrastructure, furniture, among others, that facilitate SGP operation in the country, estimated at \$20,000.
46. The Costa Rica SGP with UNDP's support has a consistent track record of leveraging significant cash and in-kind co-financing to further enhance cost-effectiveness of delivering Global Environmental Benefits on behalf of the GEF partnership. It is estimated that UNDP will mobilize at least \$1,000,000 of cash contributions for the project during its lifetime.

C.2 How does the project fit into the GEF agency's program (reflected in documents such as UNDAF, CAS, etc.) and staff capacity in the country to follow up project implementation:

47. The Project is in line with the 2008-2012 U.N. Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) agreed between the Government of Costa Rica and the U.N. System Country Team. It is consistent with the following outcomes: capacity building of local actors for a sustainable development, inclusive and equitable; promotion of effective participation of people in the formulation, implementation and evaluation of public policies; development of analytical skills in social organizations for an informed and sustained public participation; changes in economic and socio-cultural practices in priority groups, in favor of environmental sustainability; and creation and strengthening of social networks that work under the principles of solidarity and respect for human rights.
48. UNDAF is the result of an agreement of the UN System in Costa Rica based on the national priorities and needs, including those defined in the National Development Plan (NDP) 2006-2010 and the country's commitments around the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and other international commitments.
49. The Project is fully consistent with three of the main strategic lines of action of UNDP Costa Rica's Country Program Document Framework (CPD): (i) Reducing poverty, inequality and social exclusion, (ii) Environment, energy and risk management, and (iii) Gender equality and equity. Professional staff in the Energy and Environment team of the Country Office will oversee the implementation of the SGP project in Costa Rica. Administrative staff will support financial, procurement and other administrative matters. SGP supports community-based activities that simultaneously help reduce poverty, promote sustainable use of natural resources and, in general, improve environmental management, which includes energy efficiency, the use of renewable energy and reduction of risks caused by poor management of land and natural resources, such as mudslides in deforested areas.
50. UNDP's project implementation capacity in Costa Rica is strong because it has a multi-disciplinary team with cross-cutting expertise on issues that are important to improve the likelihood of SGP project success and outcome sustainability. UNDP's cluster on Human Development, Democracy and Good Governance will make available an expert to support SGP's work on strengthening community-based organizations and will provide advice on national and local environmental governance matters; the Poverty Reduction cluster

will make available two experts, one of whom will provide advice on business development and marketing for SGP grantee products and services; two experts from the Environment and Energy cluster will contribute their protected area and natural resources management expertise, and a risk management expert will provide technical advice to grantees addressing forest fires, or located in risk-prone areas such as degraded river basins; two experts in Equality and Gender Equity will contribute to SGP gender mainstreaming at the program and individual grant levels. The SGP National Steering Committee, which is integrated by seven specialists in the GEF Focal Areas, and the SGP Costa Rica Technical Advisory Committee, composed by six experts in SGP priority thematic areas (i.e., community-based tourism, fire management, biological corridors, sustainable agriculture, and indigenous territories), are key to ensure that SGP grant approval and implementation processes are sound from an environmental, social and economic perspective.

PART III: INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT

A. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT:

51. The project will be implemented solely by UNDP. However, the SGP National Team will seek cooperation with relevant activities and projects of other GEF Agencies in Costa Rica.

B. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT:

52. GEF SGP has, since 1992, continuously refined and modified its implementation approach to ensure the most efficient use of resources possible in generating global environmental benefits through community action. The cost-effectiveness of the GEF SGP and the Costa Rica program have been extensively independently reviewed and analyzed. A 2007 GEF Council technical paper reviewed and analyzed the GEF-SGP cost-effectiveness compared to other programs, and found that with the current structure, “overall the SGP is comparable to other programs in terms of cost efficiency of management”. A later GEF council paper following up on the 2008 joint evaluation of the SGP and the 2007 technical paper reviewed the cost-effectiveness of alternative execution arrangements. Based on the previous reviews and analysis, a November 2009 GEF Council paper recommended maintaining and continuing to improve the current arrangements for GEF-5, which was supported by the GEF Council. As part of the preparation of the PIF, Costa Rica reviewed the options for implementation and execution arrangements and concluded that the present approach will continue to be the most cost-effective. The project will therefore be implemented by UNDP and executed by UNOPS, through a small country programme team.
53. UNDP will provide overall program oversight and take responsibility for standard GEF project cycle management services beyond assistance and oversight of project design and negotiation, including project monitoring, periodic evaluations, troubleshooting, and reporting to the GEF. UNDP will also provide high level technical and managerial support through the recently established Communities Cluster within EEG, and from a UNDP Regional Technical Advisor (RTA) and other members of the regional teams, who will be responsible for project oversight for all upgraded country programme projects. SGP CPMT will monitor for compliance of upgraded country programmes with SGP core policies and procedures.
54. In accordance with the global *SGP Operational Guidelines* (see ANNEX I) that will guide overall project implementation in Costa Rica, and in keeping with past best practice, the UNDP Resident Representative will appoint the National Steering Committee (NSC) members. The NSC, composed of government and non-government organizations with a non-government majority, a UNDP representative, and individuals with expertise in the GEF Focal Areas, is responsible for grant selection and approval and for determining the overall strategy of the SGP in the country. NSC members serve without remuneration and rotate periodically in accordance with its rules of procedure. The Government is usually represented by the GEF Operational Focal Point or by another high level representative of relevant ministries or institutions. The NSC assesses the performance of the Country Program Manager (formerly National Coordinator) with input from the UNDP RR and the RTA. The NSC also contributes to bridging community-level experiences with national policy-making. The SGP Costa Rica Technical Committee, which is unique to Costa Rica and whose members also work pro bono, will continue advising the Country Team on priority thematic issues or areas of intervention, such as organic agriculture or biological corridors.
55. The Country Office is the business unit in UNDP for the SGP project and is responsible to ensure the project meets its objective and delivers on its targets. The Resident Representative signs the grant agreements with beneficiary organizations. The Country Office will make available its expertise in various environment and development fields as shown below. It will also provide other types of support at the local level such as infrastructure and financial management services, as required. UNDP will be represented in the NSC, and will actively participate in grant

monitoring activities.

56. **UNOPS** will provide country programme execution services, including human resources management, budgeting, accounting, grant disbursement, auditing, and procurement. UNOPS is responsible for SGP financial management and provides periodic financial reports to UNDP. The **country team**, composed of a Country Program Manager, Program/Financial Assistant, and a Secretary recruited through competitive processes, is responsible for the day-to-day operations of the program. This includes supporting NSC strategic work and grant selection by developing technical papers, undertaking ex-ante technical reviews of project proposals; taking responsibility for monitoring the grant portfolio and for providing technical assistance to grantees during project design and implementation; mobilizing cash and in-kind resources; preparing reports for UNDP, GEF and other donors; implementing a capacity development program for communities, CBOs and NGOs, as well as a communications and knowledge management strategy to ensure adequate visibility of GEF investments, and disseminating good practices and lessons learnt.
57. Grants will be selected by the NSC from proposals submitted by CBOs and NGOs through calls for proposals in specific thematic and geographic areas relevant to the SGP strategy (see ANNEX J for the Costa Rica SGP Project Template and Guidelines). Although government organizations cannot receive SGP grants, every effort will be made to coordinate grant implementation with relevant line ministries, decentralized institutions, universities and local government authorities to ensure their support, create opportunities for co-financing, and provide feedback on policy implementation on the ground. Contributions from and cooperation with the private sector will also be sought.
58. SGP utilizes consultants for specialized services only, mostly for baseline data collection, capacity development activities, business development support, and to assist grantees when specialized expertise is required, or for tasks that require an external independent view such as the mid-term and terminal evaluations. Civil society organization networks such as the Community Tourism Association play an important backstopping role in areas such as marketing and technical assistance to community rural tourism activities. These networks may also benefit from SGP grants.
59. Visibility of GEF financial support will be ensured by using the global GEF SGP branding in all electronic and printed materials, both by the SGP country program and by SGP grantees. SGP will also apply the following UNDP-GEF policy: *“The GEF logo should appear on all relevant project publications, including amongst others, project hardware and other purchases with GEF funds. Any citation in publications regarding projects funded by GEF should also acknowledge the GEF. Logos of the Implementing Agencies and the Executing Agency will also appear on all publications. Where other agencies and project partners have provided support (through co-financing) their logos may also appear on project publications”*.

PART IV: EXPLAIN THE ALIGNMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF

This document is fully aligned with the original PIF.


PART V: 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 template. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Patricia Campos Mesen	Director of International Cooperation, GEF Operational Focal Point	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, ENERGY AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS	10/19/2010

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

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

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Yannick Glemarec GEF Executive Coordinator, UNDP		2011-09-02	Nick Remple	212 906-6866	nick.remple@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD:

Strategic line IV: Environment, energy and risk management. **Component 2:** Promote management, conservation and sustainable and equitable use of natural resources, particularly land use planning processes. **Outcome 2.1:** Strengthened technical, strategic and territorial planning capacities of the environmental sector. **Component 3:** Strengthened mechanisms for prevention, adaptation and mitigation of climate change. **Outcome 3.1:** Improved mechanisms for the prevention, adaptation and mitigation of climate change of all relevant national and local institutions. **Component 5:** Strengthen capacities for risk management and promote a culture of disaster prevention. **Outcome 5.1** Created national and local capacities for disaster risk management.

Country Programme Outcome Indicators:

1. Application of the regulatory framework for water resources management; 2. Percentage of regulatory plans that incorporate criteria on conservation and sustainable use of resources. 3-Updating and training programmes on the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources. 4. Percentage of emergency committees with information on climate change trends and countermeasures. **5.** Number of training and awareness sessions held. 6. Number of Cantons and individuals benefiting from training and awareness raising.

Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): **Number 4.** Expanding access to environmental and energy services for the poor.

Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: **BD-2; CCM-3; CCM-5; LD-1; CD-2; and CD-5**

Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: **BD Outcome 2.1; CCM Outcomes 1.1, 1.3, and 5.3; LD Outcomes 1.2 and 1.3; CD Outcomes 2.2, 2.3 and 5.2**

Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: **BD Indicator 2.1:** Landscapes and seascapes certified by internationally or nationally recognized environmental standards that incorporate biodiversity considerations (e.g. FSC, MSC) measured in hectares and recorded by GEF tracking tool; **CC Indicators 3.3:** Tons of CO2 equivalent; **5.2:** Hectares restored; and **5.3:** Tons of CO2 equivalent. **LD Indicators 1.2** Increased land area with sustained productivity and reduced vulnerability of communities to climate variability; and **1.4** Increased resources flowing to SLM from diverse sources; **CD Indicators:** Stakeholders are better informed via workshops and trainings about global challenges and local actions required; Public awareness raised through workshops and other activities (Number); Capacities for monitoring of projects and programs developed (Number); and Learning system established to provide feedback to policy, strategies and management decisions from evaluation reports (Number).

Project Goal: To conserve critical ecosystems of Costa Rica and mitigate climate change by supporting the implementation of national policies on biodiversity conservation and carbon neutrality, while also contributing to communities' sustainable livelihoods.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective: Global environmental benefits secured through community-based initiatives and actions that address habitat fragmentation and enhance ecological connectivity in twelve biological corridors linking 8 Protected Areas and their buffer zones	Increased area of sustainably managed production landscapes that integrate biodiversity conservation in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12 biological corridors Buffer zones of 8 PAs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 32,000 ha under sustainable management by communities in the geographic areas of the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An additional 180,000 ha of community lands under sustainable management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BD2 GEF Tracking Tool completed at inception (after grants are selected), mid-term and end of project. Project monitoring reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deforestation rate in Costa Rica remains close to 0% during the project timeframe and, therefore, habitat fragmentation does not increase within the project geographic areas. Local and national government entities continue to provide conservation financial incentives to local communities and create new incentives for CO2 mitigation and carbon sinks. Civil society networks and government
	Reduced degraded areas in the Jesus Maria watershed and increased vegetation cover	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TBD. Watershed baseline assessment under preparation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2,300 ha with reforestation and forest regeneration 29,500 ha under sustainable management by 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satellite images Project M&E reports 	

			CBOs that administer water in the river basin		<p>organizations support community-based organizations after project completion to help ensure sustainability of community project outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The “El Niño” phenomenon does not cause an increase in wildfire events, or drought does not negatively affect reforestation activities. Communities within biological corridors are able to link global environmental issues with their livelihoods and, therefore, are interested in undertaking the selected types of interventions
	Reduced GHG emissions resulting from rural production activities, use of fuelwood, and from forest fires	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 254,000 tCO₂ e/year due to forest fires (equivalent to approx. 1,778.96 ha/year burnt) Other values for project area will be determined during inception phase 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15,000 tCO₂ e avoided in four years through EE and RE activities (see table in Annex F attached) 12,500 tCO₂ e/year mitigated (approx. 50,000 tCO₂ in 4 years) from avoided forest fires, equivalent to 87.5 ha of forest fires avoided/year (142.78 tCO₂ e/ha) See Annex F 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carbon monitoring tool Project M&E reports Reports from CONIFOR and SINAC 	
	Carbon stocks increased through protection of forests and reforestation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carbon stock values to be determined for project area at inception 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 83,237 tCO₂ e sequestered in 3 years through reforestation of 2,300 ha (12.06 tCO₂ e ha/year) and through the protection of 60,000 ha of native forests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carbon monitoring tool Project M&E reports 	
	Replication of successful initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 among communities in project areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 types of successful interventions (e.g., silviculture, organic agriculture, ecotourism, RE, etc.) replicated by at least 6 communities each within biological 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports from networks working in related fields Mid-term and final evaluation reports 	

			corridors and PA buffer zones		
<p>Outcome 1: Community-based actions mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes in biological corridors and PA buffer zones</p>	Increased number of biological corridor management plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 biological corridor management plan (Pajaro Campana BC) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 10 biological corridor management plans that include PA buffer zones developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publications with the management plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community-based organizations and their members will contribute to the development and implementation of the management plans of biological corridors and have an active participation in their governance structures. The market for nature-based tourism will continue to expand in Costa Rica and communities will be able to achieve the required quality standards to benefit from it. Certification will create opportunities to access new markets for community-produced goods and services and sale prices will offset the costs of obtaining certification. Strengthened networks of communities' associations will enable them to access new markets for their goods and services. The private sector (e.g. tourism operators) and civil society organizations show continued interest in in-situ conservation and sustainable use of
	Increased percentage of community-based initiatives that obtain certification with national or international standards	<p>10% currently achieve certification. The following certifications have been achieved by communities nationally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organic production certification: 14 Tourism sustainability certificate by ICT: 4 "Blue Flag" ecological certification: 3 Fair trade certification: 5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 50% of community sustainable livelihood initiatives supported by SGP obtain environmental certification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Licences and certificates issued by the relevant authority/body 	
	Increased number of community conservation areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no community conservation areas in the project geographic regions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 new community protected areas increase by at least 2,000 ha community conservation areas in Costa Rica 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project reports Registry of the National Network of Private Reserves or MINAE 	
	Increased number of communities benefiting from Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20 communities supported by SGP currently receive PES 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 additional communities in the project area receive PES 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FONAFIFO reports 	
	Increased number of families generating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 200 families supported by 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 800 additional families will 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project reports Portfolio 	

	income from sustainable livelihood activities	SGP obtain income from sustainable livelihood activities	generate income from sustainable production practices (eg., sustainable use of species for handcraft production, ecotourism, agroforestry, organic apiculture, etc.)	monitoring reports	biodiversity. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costa Rica PES mechanisms will continue to expand to new communities and forest areas that require conservation or restoration.
Outcome 2: GHG emissions reduced and carbon stocks increased through community-based actions	Increased renewable energy capacity installed: - By SGP - From replication	Existing capacity at community level in project area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biodigestors: 300 Solar dryers: 5 Micro-hydro: 0 PV panels: 10 	Additional capacity at community level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biodigestors: SGP 300, through replication 600 Solar dryers: SGP 4, through replication 16 Micro-hydro: SGP 6, through replication 20 PV panels: SGP 5, through replication 10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project reports Portfolio monitoring reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A law currently under consideration by Congress on private power producers is passed to enable communities produce and distribute power generated from micro-hydro. Credit schemes will enable rural communities cover the initial cost of small-scale renewable energy systems, which is still very high for the payment capacity of rural communities. The terms of commercial lending for RE of financial institutions are commensurate with the payment capacity of rural customers, and therefore, facilitate replication nationwide. Rural communities take up RE systems upon demonstration by SGP pilot initiatives.
	Increased electricity and heat produced from renewable sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 27,600 kWh 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8,054,600 kWh more produced from renewable sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project reports Portfolio monitoring reports 	
	Improved energy efficiency in rural productive activities - By SGP - From replication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No rural community tourism venture (30 rural hostels) currently applies EE practices Efficient electric engines in project area: 0 CFL: 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40% reduction of energy consumption in 30 rural hostels Energy efficient electric engines: SGP 50, through replication 100 CFL: SGP 500, through 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project reports Portfolio monitoring reports 	

			replication 1,500		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Savings from implementing EE practices in ecotourism facilities and other rural production processes are sufficient to become the main incentive for their continued application. Key partners from civil society and the private sector continue supporting immediate actions during the occurrence of fire emergencies. New partnerships between SINAC and local stakeholders involved in reforestation and fire prevention in buffer zones develop.
	Improved credit availability for RE and/or EE in rural areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Credit availability and conditions to be determined for project geographic area at project inception 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three financial institutions providing credit for RE and EE to communities in project area and a minimum of 5 credits approved during lifetime of project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project reports Portfolio monitoring reports Financial institution reports 	
	Increased number of crews in the rural areas able to prevent and manage forest fires	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 fire fighting crews trained and equipped 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30 additional crews trained, equipped, and active 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project reports Portfolio monitoring reports MINAE reports 	
	Increased number of communities trained and with seedlings to undertake reforestation in degraded areas or to increase biomass in agricultural lands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no communities undertaking reforestation in the project areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 communities reforesting priority areas identified by biological corridors' management plans and planting trees in their agricultural lands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project reports Portfolio monitoring reports 	
Outcome 3: Conservation of productive lands and restoration of degraded lands contribute to sustainability and improved local livelihoods	Increased number of communities contributing to the implementation of the National Plan to Combat Desertification in the Jesus Maria Watershed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The National Plan has been developed but no communities in the project area are implementing actions identified in the Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan adopted and under implementation by 8 communities within the watershed 40 leaders in the 8 communities trained in techniques related to integrated watershed management 12 representatives participating 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project reports Portfolio monitoring reports Minutes of meetings of Watershed Management Commission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key stakeholders effectively increase their capacities and use this knowledge for improved management of the Jesus Maria Watershed Acceptance of and support from local and national authorities for collaborative water resources management. Water governance mechanisms improve their efficiency and

			actively in the Watershed Management Commission		<p>effectiveness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field data and indicators developed by SGP and CADETI are sufficient to measure reduction of watershed degradation. Government institutions get involved and expand watershed management interventions after completion of the SGP project. Other factors in agricultural production (e.g., labour and transport costs) remain stable or improve so that there is no negative impact on communities' income.
	Reduced degraded area in community lands in the Jesus Maria basin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TBD. Watershed status assessment underway 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 29,500 ha in the Jesus Maria watershed managed for environmental sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project reports Portfolio monitoring reports 	
	Increased sources of investment at local level for SLM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no investment in SLM in the project area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8 new communities in the Jesus Maria watershed receive PES At least 50% of SLM community initiatives financed by SGP receive support from national government institutions for their continuity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project evaluations Portfolio monitoring reports 	
	Increased family income resulting from SLM activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The average rural family income is \$300 monthly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15% increased income for families involved in sustainable production activities 50% increased income for women participating in SLM activities 75% increased income for indigenous communities participating in SLM activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey Project reports Portfolio monitoring reports 	
<u>Outcome 4:</u>	Increased	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGP-related 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Official gazette 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Willingness of relevant

Community-based organizations and their members with improved capacities and knowledge management for replication and upscaling of best practices	community contributions to national policy and legislation related to project thematic priorities	groups are actively promoting 2 law proposals (Laws promoting Organic agriculture and Rural Community Tourism) in Congress	additional national policies and legislation related to project thematic priorities passed during FSP execution.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Government reports	<p>government institutions to consider community input for policy and legislation debate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Communication among dispersed community leaders remains strong to ensure adequate representation of communities interests in policy debateAbility of the SGP team to produce timely and high quality knowledge and information products that can be taken up by media and other sustainable development practitioners in spite of the high demands placed on the team by day-to-day work.
	Increased number of eligible projects demonstrating community understanding of global environmental issues and their local solutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Less than 30% of projects received are eligibleMost communities within the Jesus Maria watershed and BC lack understanding of global environmental issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none">70% of projects are eligible after implementation of capacity development activities100 communities participating in SGP-funded projects able to articulate the relevance of their project goals and activities to related global environmental issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Communities' presentations at local, regional and national events and fairsEvaluation reports	
	Rate of successful community projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none">90% of SGP-funded projects achieve project objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The rate of success of SGP-funded projects during GEF-5 remains 90% or higher	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Mid-term and final evaluation reports	
	Increased number of contributions from SGP Costa Rica to local and national publications and media, as well as to knowledge products of the Global SGP and UNDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none">SGP results and activities are published, announced or quoted by the media at local and national levels at least twice a year	<ul style="list-style-type: none">15 knowledge products published or quoted by the media during the lifetime of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Press releases and formal and informal publications and materials	
Outcome 1: Community-based actions mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes in biological corridors and PA buffer					

<p><i>zones</i></p> <p>Output 1.1.1: Local Councils for biological corridors promote and manage community initiatives focused on environmentally friendly products and land management for a sustainable use of biodiversity;</p> <p>Output 1.1.2: Management plans for buffer zones or important areas within biological corridors (10 plans)</p> <p>Output 1.1.3: New protected areas established by communities within biological corridors (>5 areas)</p> <p>Output 1.1.4: Community-based reforestation, natural regeneration of forests, and payment for environmental services schemes (>10 initiatives)</p> <p>Output 1.1.5: Families living in biological corridors and PA buffer zones conserving biodiversity through sustainable livelihood actions (i.e. community rural tourism, organic agriculture, organic honey, medicinal plants, handicrafts, and other sustainable production practices (>1,000 families)</p>
<p><i>Outcome 2: GHG emissions reduced and carbon stocks increased through community-based actions</i></p> <p>Output 2.1.1: Energy efficient technologies in rural productive activities in PA buffer zones, such as ecotourism facilities, water pumping and crop drying (>15 interventions reduce emissions by >5,000 tCO₂ e in 4 years)</p> <p>Output 2.1.2: Small-scale renewable energy systems at community level, including biogas for cooking and heating, solar energy for cooking and photovoltaic energy for off-grid areas (10 initiatives reduce emissions by >10,000 tCO₂ e in 4 years)</p> <p>Output 2.1.3: Technical assistance and capacity building so that financial partners can offer micro-credit lines for rural small-scale energy efficient and renewable energy investments (>3 local financial institutions and >40 communities)</p> <p>Output 2.2.1: Local community crews trained, equipped and organized for forest fire prevention and management in the buffer zones of Palo Verde, Chirripó, Guanacaste, and La Amistad National Parks, and Diria Biological Corridor (>10 initiatives training and equipping 30 crews)</p> <p>Output 2.3.1: Reforestation and natural regeneration, and forest management in buffer zones of Palo Verde, Chirripó, Guanacaste and La Amistad National Parks, and Diria Biological Corridor (>5 initiatives protect from fire and/or restore vegetation cover in these areas >60,000 hectares covered)</p>
<p><i>Outcome 3: Conservation of productive lands and restoration of degraded lands contribute to sustainability and improved local livelihoods</i></p> <p>Output 3.1.1 Integrated farm management and sustainable production under criteria of environmental protection, social responsibility and economic efficiency (>10 productive initiatives restore >200 hectares)</p> <p>Output 3.1.2: Community-based reforestation, agro-forestry and silviculture systems (>10 initiatives restore 300 hectares)</p> <p>Output 3.2.1: Water resources protection and integrated watershed management for improved community water supply and ecosystem resilience (>5 initiatives)</p> <p>Output 3.3.1: Establishment of a local Watershed Commission in the Jesus Maria watershed and implementation of a training and awareness program (>2,000 people trained)</p> <p>Output 3.3.2: Capacity development program on watershed management delivered to communities vulnerable to land degradation through strategic alliances with key institutions, participatory research, training & exchange of experiences (>40 local actors in each of 8 communities)</p>
<p><i>Outcome 4: Community-based organizations and their members with improved capacities and knowledge management for replication and upscaling of best practices</i></p> <p>Output 4.1.1: Stakeholder networks established and consultations with community members and indigenous peoples leaders to increase awareness on and understanding of existing policies and legislation in relation to fire management, biological corridors, and sustainable production (>5 networks)</p> <p>Output 4.2.1: Compilations of community proposals related to policy and regulatory regime change for environmental conservation and sustainable livelihoods (>2 documents)</p> <p>Output 4.2.2: Information & knowledge related to their projects managed and shared by communities (>20 community groups)</p> <p>Output 4.3.1: Exchange of experiences and capacity building between stakeholders (peer-to-peer knowledge and learning)</p> <p>Output 4.3.2: SGP knowledge management products generated and available on supported community based processes that have been successful in generating global environmental benefits (>15)</p> <p>Output 4.4.1: CBO training program on integrated monitoring instruments to assess project progress and results (>20 communities)</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).

Response to Council Member Comments on SGP Costa Rica PIF

Responses are in *Italic*.

France comments

Comment 1:

The project's objective is to use the Costa Rican STAR allocation to contribute to the GEF/UNDP Small Grants Programme (SGP).

The PIF explains very clearly how this country contribution to the SGP is consistent with the GEF focal area strategies and national strategies/plans, which is a very good mainstreaming exercise.

On the contrary to the PIF number 6 and 8 below, this PIF provides at least some ideas on the project outputs toward the civil society. The § B.3 p14 explains that a maximum grant of 20.000 US\$ will be provided per project and that it is expected that 120 Community Based Organizations should benefit from this GEF Grant.

Then, one question raises: if the GEF grant is 4.398 M US\$ and only (20,000.00 US\$ x 120 CBO =) 2,400,000.00 US\$ is directly awarded to CBOs, where the rest of the grant (1,998,148.00 US\$) is going ?

#1. Response to comment on grant allocation and use of funds:

This SGP/FSP has targeted to support at least 120 community-based initiatives through their CBOs for about US\$20,000 each. It should be noted that a number of grants (approx. 36 grants with an average of \$30,000 each for a total of \$1,079,966) will be allocated to NGOs and thematic networks working with communities on-the-ground to assist them carry out activities that require substantive technical expertise (this has been clarified in paragraph 40 of the CEO endorsement document). This is the case for energy-related activities as well as sustainable production practices that require meeting national or international standards for certification. The remaining resources will be allocated to:

- Capacity building activities and technical assistance, which are essential to ensure the success of CBO activities and the sustainability of project outcomes. The cost of capacity building activities and technical assistance (i.e., training, experience exchange, and on-the-ground technical support) is reflected in Outcome 4 "Knowledge management and capacity development of community groups and members for replication and up-scaling". The allocation to outcome 4 (see Table B of CEO Endorsement document), an estimated \$317,545, also includes knowledge management and the establishment and functioning of networks of community organizations for participation in policy development at local and national levels.*
- Monitoring and Evaluation at the individual grant and country portfolio levels, with an estimated cost of \$250,000. M&E is essential for adaptive management of the grant and to ensure individual community projects and the country programme deliver planned results, and for accountability at all levels. In addition to grantee M&E training and field monitoring visits, this amount covers the cost of the mid-term and final evaluations and the audit of the country programme.*
- Project Management for \$350,637 that includes the cost of administration, financial management, infrastructure and operational costs of the SGP country programme during four years.*

Comment 2:

Moreover, the PIF lacks of an assessment of previous SGP supports, successes and failures and the current status and needs in capacity building of the Costa Rican grant beneficiaries (there is some information on the global SGP program outcomes, but little if no detailed information on the Costa Rican SGP results and national CBOs issues).

#2. Response to comment on results of previous SGP interventions:

The Costa Rica SGP country programme prepared an assessment of results achieved during the fourth operational phase (2007-2010) that can be accessed at http://www.pequenasdonacionescr.org/component/docman/cat_view/31-documentos-publicados. During these 4 years SGP Costa Rica supported technically and financially 95 interventions carried out by community based organizations and NGOs in more than 80 rural communities. Of these interventions, 69% focused on biodiversity protecting about 21,000 hectares of natural forests, conserving, among others, 44 medicinal plant species and a wide range of fauna species such as marine turtles, the great green macaw, and the manati. Even though Climate Change accounted for only 3% of SGP interventions, about 924,000 tons of CO2 were mitigated and/or captured by environmentally friendly agricultural practices such as solar-coffee drying and soil conservation. Sustainable land management accounted for 16% of community-based initiatives, supporting the work of CBOs in 39 micro-watersheds, as well as local production of about 1.6 million kilograms of organic fertilizer leading to a significant reduction of agro-chemical use. Some 11% were multi-focal area interventions. Women's groups implemented 19 projects involving 969 women and 16 projects were in indigenous peoples territories involving 2,468 members of indigenous communities. Overall, SGP benefited 7,800 women and 3,741 men. SGP and its partner organizations created some 171 permanent jobs, and helped generate US\$136,345.59 in additional income for local communities from sustainable products.

During Phase 4, SGP Costa Rica organized 183 workshops, 98 community exchange events and peer learning tours, 255 training courses and other capacity building events, and delivered 183 presentations in educational institutions, 97 activities on environmental education. Some 2,724 people participated in training events and approximately 9,485 people increased their awareness and understanding of global environmental issues.

Concerning failures, some 10% of projects did not fully achieve expected results. The main reasons were poor CBO governance, such as internal conflict, or very high short-term revenue expectations that the project could not meet.

Concerning capacity development needs, the CEO endorsement document contains a summary of capacity development needs of CBOs in the section on Threats and Barriers. These include organizational and individual capacity development needs. Among others, rural communities in Costa Rica have very weak capacities for land use planning, and for participating in a meaningful manner in the governance mechanisms of protected areas and biological corridors. Communities also require enhanced know-how and capacities to implement sustainable livelihood initiatives successfully and meeting the demands of national and international markets for their goods and services. Access to clean energy and improving energy efficiency is another area in which communities require capacity development support. Last but not least, rural communities need to strengthen their ability to access existing sources of finance, for example, indigenous peoples have not been able to benefit substantially from PES schemes due to their inability to access information and meet the necessary requirements.

Opinion: Favorable, if the previous questions on civil society support are clarified.

Germany comments

Suggestions for improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:

Comment 3:

Climate Change: The GAP Analysis is based on the work of GRUAS until 2009. There is no reference to the potential climate variability or the potential effects of climate change. Although we support the assumption that the resilience of ecosystems can be supported through an enhanced connectivity, we suggest to carry out supplementary vulnerability assessments (Biodiversity, Agriculture, and Tourism) to analyze the expected impacts of climate change.

#3. Response to comment on Climate Change:

Costa Rica's Second National Communication to the UNFCCC reviews the potential effects of climate change to biodiversity and the health sector, and assesses the country's water resources vulnerability. It also proposes adaptation measures for various sectors including for the agriculture sector. SGP has considered this information in the design of the present project and will make its best effort to keep abreast of results from recent studies in order to integrate relevant responses into its interventions.

Comment 4:

Risk analysis: The risk analysis is very optimistic. Experiences with small-scale measures cannot be transferred easily into the complex design and management of biological corridors. Governance aspects are only briefly described as barriers, but they are not addressed as part of the solution. Therefore we suggest elaborating the risk analysis.

#4. Response to comment on risk analysis:

SGP agrees that governance aspects need to be addressed if ecological connectivity in biological corridors is to be achieved. Strengthening biological corridor and watershed governance bodies and mechanisms is a project objective. This is reflected in paragraphs 25 and 27 and in the proposed activities related to both biodiversity and land degradation. The Costa Rica SGP Country Program is a member of the National Network of Biological Corridors and of its Coordination Committee. This ensures adequate coordination with all entities working on biological corridors at the national level. Decree 33106 governing the National Program on Biological Corridors established the Local Councils for Biological Corridors that operate in the various conservation areas of the country. SGP's strategy is to strengthen the capacities of local communities to participate actively in these Local Councils. It is also strengthening the capacities of representatives in local water management bodies within the biological corridor areas. Indeed, project outputs 1.1.2, 3.3.1, and 3.3.2 address governance issues from a community perspective. SGP's country team will also help link issues emerging at the Local Councils level with those being addressed in the national Coordination Committee. None-the less, the project has included governance as a potential risk that will be monitored periodically (see Risk Rating and Management table).

Comment 5:

Cooperation with other initiatives:

It should be clarified how the proposed project relates to the "Costa Rica Forever" Initiative, an association that manages the public-private conservation initiative developed by the Costa Rican Government together with NGOs and private foundations. Within this initiative, the German Government supports the project "Marine and coastal biodiversity, capacity development and adaptation to climate change (BIOMARCC)". Potential for coordination and cooperation should be explored. The stakeholder analysis should be enhanced in this context.

#5. Response to comment on cooperation with other initiatives:

BIOMARCC has interventions in critical coastal zones where SGP has been active in recent years with local fishing communities, and therefore, collaboration between the two programs has taken place. Examples of this collaboration are the implementation of pilot projects aimed at supporting sustainable fishing practices, oyster harvesting, and mangrove conservation. Under this SGP/FSP there is potential for further collaboration, particularly in the coastal areas of targeted biological corridors, such as Talamanca-Caribe, Paso de la Danta, and AMISTOSA. The stakeholder section has been amended to reflect this potential collaboration.

Comment 6:

Co-financing: Germany notes that only \$200,000 of the anticipated \$4,625,000 co-financing sources have been identified at this stage. Sources of co-financing should be confirmed prior to approval of the Final Project Document.

#6. Response to comment on co-financing:

Please note that the March 2010 [global] SGP Steering Committee Chaired by the GEF Secretariat decided the following concerning co-financing requirements for the up-graded countries:

“Given the grantmaking nature of the upgraded country programmes where grants are later provided in small amounts to many separate local NGO partners for work with poor and vulnerable communities, co-financing will not be upfront and will follow the SGP ratio of 1:1 at the minimum”.

As indicated in the PIF review sheet by GEF Sec. confirmation of co-financing sources is not required at this stage. SGP Costa Rica is committed to mobilizing at least \$4,625,000 to co-finance the GEF investment during the lifetime of the project.

Denmark comments

Comment 7:

Monitoring is only vaguely described. It is not clear if the GEF small grant monitoring scheme is linked to the national monitoring schemes in Costa Rica.

#7. Response to comment on monitoring:

Please, refer to Part I, Section H of the CEO endorsement document for a detailed description of monitoring activities. Annex G includes the M&E work plan and budget. SGP Costa Rica will also coordinate with national monitoring programs, such as the National Biological Corridors Program, the Wildfire Management Program, and the National Action for Land Degradation. It also expects to work with the Carbon monitoring program once it is developed.

Switzerland comments

1.1.1 N°05-10: Fifth operational phase of the GEF's Small Grants Programme, (UNDP)
N°05 – ID 4382; Costa Rica; GEF cost 4.4 million USD, total Project cost 9 million USD
N°06 – ID 4375; Ecuador; GEF cost 4.4 million USD, total Project cost 9.2 million USD
N°07 – ID 4383; India; GEF cost 5 million USD, total Project cost 11 million USD
N°08 – ID 4362; Kenya; GEF cost 5 million USD, total Project cost 10.5 million USD
N°09 – ID 4380; Pakistan; GEF cost 2.78 million USD, total Project cost 6.34 million USD
N°10 – ID 4338; Philippines; GEF cost 4.6 million USD, total Project cost 9.2 million USD

Overall Comments:

This commentary refers to six projects, n°05 to n°10, of the current IWP, which are all subscribed to the fifth operational phase of the GEF's Small Grants Programme. For all of them, UNDP figures as implementing agency.

- All six projects are designed in line with the 5th phase of the SGP.
- Part 1 (project identification) of the six PIFs is done in a rather coherent way. For each project the Focal Area Strategy Frameworks are systematically described and the Project Frameworks are well specified.
- Part 2 (project justification) of the six PIFs is individually done for each project. Particularly the project overview is very well specified.
- We regret, however, that the STAP reviews for all six projects are identical. They do not deal with the individualities of each project.

Questions, Concerns and Challenges for further Project / Programme refinement

We basically feel that the six projects are well designed. The challenges for further Project refinement are in general not project specific but refer more to the overall SGP (programme) level. The latter have been commented on and discussed earlier.

There are only three challenges we would like to emphasise again:

- All six projects look rather like stand-alone projects. We particularly regret that little attention seems to be given to their links with the respective GEF country portfolios.

#8. Response to comment on linking with the respective GEF country portfolios:

This FSP has been designed considering a close link with the GEF country portfolio in Costa Rica. In the Biodiversity Focal Area, it coordinates with the GEF/FSP “Overcoming Barriers to Sustainability of Costa Rica’s Protected Areas System”. This is the only GEF initiative approved so far relevant to this project that will be ongoing during the implementation of this SGP phase. The SGP is monitoring the GEF pipeline of projects under development to promote synergies and collaboration as relevant. For example, in the Climate Change Focal Area, it will collaborate with the capacity building, technology transfer, public awareness, behavioral change, and education initiatives project being designed.

Prior GEF investments in Costa Rica were also considered in developing this SGP project. In particular the “National Off-grid Electrification Program Based on Renewable Energy Sources, Phase I”, a UNDP/GEF Project implemented between 2002 and 2009, helped create an enabling environment for investments in renewable energy for off-grid areas, led by the Costa Rican Institute of Electricity (ICE) and SGP is collaborating with it for possible co-financing in SGP focus geographic areas.

- All six projects seem very ambitious and deal with very different focal areas and geographic territories. The risk of a dispersion of efforts is evident.

#9. Response to comment on the risk of dispersion:

The geographic focus of SGP Costa Rica in 12 out of 32 biological corridors will help mitigate the risk of dispersion. SGP’s approach of working with civil society networks and of linking individual grant organizations to umbrella organizations and networks also helps consolidate efforts thematically or geographically. This project also builds on previous work done by SGP in the same regions and relies on national and local partners with whom it has established working relations over the years.

- The verification in project monitoring and assessments is a major challenge.

#10. Response to comment on project monitoring:

Project monitoring will take place at three levels:

- *Portfolio of upgraded Country Programmes (to ensure lessons from the upgrading process are captured by UNDP and can be applied to future upgraded countries)*
- *Country Programme level (to assess project results at the outcome level)*
- *Individual Grant level (to ensure each individual small grant activity reaches its specific objective and outcomes)*

Verification is indeed challenging but SGP Costa Rica and UNDP already have the systems in place for adaptive management and monitoring for results. At inception, the project will develop a detailed indicator measurement system and will assess if additional expertise and manpower are required.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Overall, all six projects are well designed and the project frameworks are well specified and given very individually.

Switzerland supports the approval by GEF of all 6 SGP projects

Response to the STAP Review

Comment 1:

For all UNDP-SGP projects, STAP has the following general recommendations:

Attention to the GEF Focal Area 'learning objectives' is highly relevant to the selection of individual small grant projects. In particular, this allows for additional opportunities to further evaluate common approaches such as certification, payments for ecosystem services, and community forest management.

Response:

The learning and demonstration value to GEF Focal Areas is a key criterion for grant selection. At the national level, SGP helps link local to national experiences that may be relevant to policy development and law. SGP Costa Rica will support communities to provide input to and participate in relevant policy debates to help ensure communities experience is considered. M&E processes at the individual grant and country portfolio levels will feed into knowledge management processes (see "learning and knowledge sharing" in the M&E section of the CEO endorsement template).

Comment 2:

STAP understands that the SGP tends to be treated very much as a stand-alone project in each UNDP Country Office, often weakly integrated with other national and local-level multi-focal area initiatives. As such, STAP recommends attention as to how the SGP will be integrated institutionally in-country so that the SGP's outputs support multiple objectives, influence other activities, and where possible are sustained over the long term.

Response:

The upgraded SGP Country projects will be the responsibility of the UNDP Country Offices and were developed in close consultation with them. Each project has ascertained its relevance to the UNDAF and to the UNDP CPAP (see Project Result Framework). The wider GEF portfolio and pipeline have been reviewed for potential collaboration and complementarity. The Costa Rica SGP has strong linkages with a large number of government institutions, strategies and bodies (such as the National Coordination Committee for Biological Corridors, the Ministry of Tourism, FONAFIFO, etc) and collaborates with a large number of civil society networks and NGOs. During the previous phase, Costa Rica's SGP forged 60 strategic partnerships and engaged with 49 national institutions to support community based initiatives and improve the likelihood of their sustainability. It will continue to do so in the next phase with UNDP support.

Comment 3:

Finally, STAP would recommend that the contribution of these projects to the development of human and institutional capital and improved knowledge management at national level be further elaborated wherever possible. The contribution to GEF learning objectives, noted above, is one such step. However, these projects are uniquely placed to improve learning and knowledge management at the national level, and contribute directly to sustainable development.

Response:

SGP promotes learning at all levels. At the community level, SGP facilitates peer-to-peer learning through exchange visits and experience exchange workshops. It also encourages and supports community-based organizations to document their experience and share it broadly through different media. M&E activities at the grant level are designed to support the learning process within individual organizations and between CBOs. SGP also supports processes by which those in charge of sector-specific policies have the opportunity to review the policies' effect on the ground. The SGP National Steering Committees are an important instrument for achieving this aim because individual members are able to feed back SGP lessons into their parent organizations and beyond. SGP also develops knowledge products on its experiences and provides inputs to knowledge products developed by others within or outside UNDP. UNDP is also committed to facilitate experience exchange among upgraded countries and to ensure that they continue making available their experiences and knowledge to the Global SGP.

Responses to GEF Secretariat comments at PIF approval

Comments	Response	Ref. in Project Document
<p>Project design 16. CC: Feb 2 2011, Estimates have been made more consistent, but no description of the basis of the assumptions have been given. No CO2 benefits are estimated for the >60,000 hectares for outcome 2.3 General citable estimates are available (for instance, IPCC good practice guidance). Additional information is requested during endorsement stage.</p>	<p>Annex F provides details on the RE and EE activities of the project and related Carbon estimates.</p> <p>The CO2 benefits related to Outcome 2.3 “Carbon stocks increased through community-based actions on forest protection, reforestation and natural regeneration” in 60,000 hectares have been provided.</p> <p>It is expected that the project will result in at least 83,237 tCO2 e sequestered in 3 years through reforestation of 2,300 ha (12.06 tCO2 e ha/year) and 12,500 tCO2 e/year mitigated (50,000 tCO2 in 4 years) from avoided forest fires, equivalent to 87.5 ha of forest fires avoided/year (142.78 tCO2 e/ha)</p>	<p>Table B, Project Results Framework, and Table after paragraph 39</p>
<p>Project desing 17. Costa Rica is a Forest Carbon Partnership Facility country and a UNREDD programme country. Have ways been considered to leverage or to coordinate with activities in those programs to help meet the goals described here? Please provide additional clarification during endorsement.</p> <p>23. Costa Rica is a Forest Carbon Partnership Facility country and a UNREDD country. These will potentially affect both biodiversity and forest carbon. Please describe the relationship of the proposed activities to these programs/partnership during project endorsement phase.</p>	<p>Costa Rica prepared and presented a Readiness Preparation Proposal to the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility in August 2010. The Country is awaiting final approval of this request. The SGP National Coordinator has participated in all meetings related to this proposal with a view to ensure adequate coordination and collaboration between this SGP project and REDD+ initiatives and activities.</p> <p>The process of preparation of the REDD+ strategy for Costa Rica is important to this SGP project because it will determine the next generation of policies and regulations with respect to conservation incentives, forest management and carbon stocks, including national protected areas and private reserves. Given SGP’s focus on local communities, the project will particularly monitor the outcomes that may affect indigenous peoples and other local communities. An important role for SGP is to support local stakeholders access financial incentives related to REDD+ activities once these are established.</p>	<p>The table on coordination with relevant activities (after paragraph 44) includes UN REDD and Forest Carbon Partnership Facility Initiatives</p>
<p>Project design 30. CC: Feb 2 2011. Baseline scenarios are now described. It is still unclear that the budget per objective is adequate because details are lacking. Details must be provided in the project proposal phase.</p>	<p>Baseline values have been included in the Project Results Framework. This information allows to assess whether the targets per outcome and related budgets are adequate.</p>	<p>See Project Results Framework</p>
<p>Monitoring and Evaluation Yes, it does include. However, details on results to be measured and indicators used should be provided in the project document.</p>	<p>The Project Results Framework includes indicators at the objective level and for all project outcomes. Baseline values have been provided for all but two indicators. The missing information will be available during the first quarter of project implementation as an assessment for the Jesus Maria watershed is being conducted.</p> <p>Quantitative targets are also provided for all outputs.</p>	<p>See Project Results Framework</p>

ANNEX C: CONSULTANTS TO BE HIRED FOR THE PROJECT USING GEF/LDCF/SCCF RESOURCES

<i>Position Titles</i>	<i>\$/ Person Week*</i>	<i>Estimated Person Weeks**</i>	<i>Tasks To Be Performed</i>
For Project Management			
Local			
Country Program Manager	1,000	42	Overall project management, administration, finances, reporting, and resources mobilization
Programme Assistant	672	121	Financial and budget control, disbursements to grantees, record keeping, administrative support and procurement
Secretary	249	208	Secretarial support including archiving, inventories, office and equipment maintenance, supplies, minutes taking, workshop preparation and logistics, and database update support
International			
Justification for travel, if any: Travel costs associated with field monitoring of individual grants are also included in Annex G (indicative costs of ex-ante visits \$10,500 and grant monitoring \$21,000)			
For Technical Assistance			
Local			
Country Program Manager	1,000	166	Ex-ante project evaluations, technical assistance to grantees, substantive support to NSC, individual grant monitoring and evaluation, outreach and communications.
Programme Assistant	672	87	Grant progress report review and feedback to grantees, draft country programme reports, coordination of preparation of knowledge products and communications materials, website maintenance
M&E and knowledge management expert	989	10	Adaptation of existing M&E systems to GEF-5 SGP requirements, M&E training to grantees in 12 biological corridors, preparation of training materials, data quality assurance and KM support
BD, CC and LD experts	800	38	Focal area experts to provide technical assistance to grantees, support baseline data gathering, and measurement of indicators
International			
Evaluators	3,500	24	Mid-term and final evaluations (country programme and individual grants)
Carbon monitoring expert	2,500	12	Capacity building on Carbon monitoring to

			country team and individual grantees working on LULUCF, establishing a Carbon monitoring system compliant with IPCC guidelines, and provision of technical backstopping to country team during project lifetime.
International Auditor	3,125	8	Comprehensive SGP country programme audit in accordance with GEF fiduciary standards
Justification for travel, if any: The cost of international evaluation experts and the auditor include their travel costs, estimated at some \$1,500 each.			

* Provide dollar rate per person week. ** Total person weeks needed to carry out the tasks.

ANNEX D: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS

A. EXPLAIN IF THE PPG OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN ACHIEVED THROUGH THE PPG ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN.

N/A

B. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

N/A

C. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Approved</i>	<i>Implementation Status</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>				<i>Cofinancing (\$)</i>
		<i>Amount Approved</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>	<i>Uncommitted Amount*</i>	
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
	(Select)					
Total		0	0	0	0	0

* Any uncommitted amounts should be returned to the GEF Trust Fund. This is not a physical transfer of money, but achieved through reporting and netting out from disbursement request to Trustee. Please indicate expected date of refund transaction to Trustee.

ANNEX E: SGP COSTA RICA – GLOBALLY SIGNIFICANT BIODIVERSITY IN SELECTED PROTECTED AREAS AND BIOLOGICAL CORRIDORS

Protected Area	Extension Hectares	Globally important biodiversity
PILA	193.929	The Park is surrounded by four indigenous territories in the Atlantic and 3 indigenous territories in the Pacific side. It includes rainforests, wet and cloudy, very rich in biodiversity: Mammals: 136 species have been identified, including the jaguar, puma, ocelot, coati, tapir, three-toed sloths, howler monkeys, spider capuchinosy. Birds: there are reported about 450 species representing 51% of the species in Costa Rica, among which the nuthatch alicastaño, hummingbird gorgiblanco, the quetzal, black guan, the peacock, the harpy eagle, macaws and other species. Reptiles: In 2005, INBio recorded 29 species for the PILA-Costa Rica. Amphibians: INBio reported 44 species for the PILA-Costa Rica
Chirripo	50.150	This park contains mainly paramo, cloud forest and rain forest. The park includes the country's highest mountain, Chirripo with 3820 meters over sea level. The park protects the upper basin of the Pacific Chirripo River, a tributary of the Great Basin Térraba River, the same as the upper Atlantic Chirripo River, the main tributary of the Matina. The paramo, close to the 3.4000 m, is dominated by Chusquea Batambo or fescue. The cloud forest, wet and cold, features oak and evergreen trees up to 50 meters high, a high content of tree ferns, mosses, bromeliads, palms and orchids distributed in different strata of the forest. Among the animals recorded are peccaries, squirrels, cougars, jaguars, tapirs, rabbits, coyotes, frogs, toads and a variety of birds, goldfinches, hummingbirds, flycatchers, creepers, warblers, escarcheras and metallic green quetzal, bird feeding on a type of laurel called anger or avocado, worms, insects, small reptiles and amphibians
Tapantí-Macizo de la Muerte	58.323	The altitude of this park varies from 1,220 meters at 2,560 meters above sea level and contains one of the wettest areas of the country with many rivers and waterfalls. It is one of the rainiest areas of the country, with rates from 6,500-8,000 mm of rain per year, an area of great importance for water resources for hydropower and for human consumption. This park contains two major life zones, the lower mountain forest and pre-mountain forest. More than 45 species of mammals are found here, among which tapirs, deer and skunks. It is also "relatively easy" to see squirrel monkeys, raccoons, agoutis, tapirs, ocelots, lions Brenner and thousands of butterflies and other insects. There are also some 260 species of birds, of which the most common sights are hawks, parrots and hummingbirds. Additionally, there are 28 species of reptiles such as frogs, toads, snakes and salamanders.
Palo Verde	16.804	Palo Verde National Park comprises a complex of different habitats, flood plains, rivers bordered by a row of limestone hills. This area is subject to seasonal floods of great magnitude. Due to poor natural drainage, the area is flooded by the combined action of rain, tides and floods along the rivers Tempisque and Bebedero. Sometimes, the whole area becomes a vast lake. Among the largest trees are the espavel, ceiba, kapok tree, rum rum, pot-bellied ceibo the guayabón, the javillo, the cocobolo, the medlar and Panama. The natural hydrologic system of Palo Verde creates the right conditions for the largest concentration of any Central American country of waterfowl and waders, both resident and migratory. From September to March, thousands of egrets, herons, egrets, grebes, ibises, ducks and cockerels of water are concentrated in the lagoons and surrounding areas to feed and reproduce. Aquatic and terrestrial bird species observed total 279. Some of the most abundant mammals are the howler monkeys, whiteface monkeys, the coaties, deer, red squirrels, porcupines and coyotes. In the Tempisque crocodiles have been seen up to five meters long.

Braulio Carrillo	47.580	It contains 6,000 species of plants (half the plant species that exist in Costa Rica), of which at least 50 are endemic. Manu, mahogany, oak, and hawk caobilla are relatively abundant. There is also the botarrama, the ceiba, the yos, the parrot and ojoche; other species, however, are in danger of disappearing, as the Nazarene, gourd, fresh palm hearts and sùrtuba. Concerning birds, 515 species are found (75% of the country and 28 are endemic), thousands of insects, and dozens of reptiles and amphibians. The king of the vultures, the umbrella bird, the goldfinch and the quetzal are found here. Among the mammal species white-faced monkeys, spider and howler, tapir, puma and jaguar, peccary, the bear beekeeper, the hammer, the mountain goat, the agouti and the coyote stand out. Several species are threatened with extinction due to hunting, as in the case of the peacock and the tepezcuintle.
Corcovado	55.000	Corcovado is the largest primary forest of the American Pacific, and one of the few sizeable remnants of tropical rainforest in the world. Biological diversity is outstanding. National Geographic has called it "the most intense in the world, biologically speaking," and it is estimated that anywhere in the world (which has a similar extension) hosts greater biodiversity. It is large enough to support significant populations of tapir (<i>Tapirus bairdii</i>), jaguar (<i>Panthera onca</i>) and peccary (<i>Tayassu peccary</i>). These species are considered threatened with extinction. The park hosts 140 species of mammals (representing 10% of mammal species in the Americas). The abundance of wildlife can be explained in part by the varied vegetation, of which there are 13 types, including montane forest (which covers more than half of the park), mangrove forest, prairie, forest, alluvial plains, woods Marsh and others.
Guanacaste Conservation Area	110.000	Located northwest of the country, its surgace includes terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, with a wide variety of species. (230,000 species estimated, 65% of the species in Costa Rica). GCA has representation ranging from the Caribbean rainforest to dry areas of the Pacific, through cloud forest and dry rainforest, among others. This area has a biological corridor in the Costa Rica-Nicaragua border, which protects the largest tropical rainforest in the region. It also includes scenic beauty and the most important geological discoveries of the country.
Barra del Colorado	92.000	This area is in the List of Wetlands of International Importance of Ramsar. One of the rainiest areas of the country, with between 5000 and 6000 mm of rain per year the fauna and flora are rich and diverse. Among mammals, monkeys are particularly abundant. One of the most interesting species is the fishing bat (Bulldog Bat), which feeds mainly on fish. Among the 309 recorded bird species, the Great Green Macaw (<i>Ara ambigua</i>) is highly threatened as well as the iris toucan (<i>Ramphastos sulfurated</i>). Sixty species of frogs have been recorded, including the transparent frog (<i>Centrolenella valerioi</i>) and the poison dart frog (<i>Dendrobates pumilio</i>). In the sea are important populations of mackerel (<i>Scomberomorus maculatus</i>) and shrimp (<i>Penaeus brasiliensis</i>) and the huge whale shark (<i>Rhincodon typus</i>) has been observed. The natural system of navigable canals and lagoons are of great scenic beauty, crossing the park from southeast to northwest. The park is home to seven species of tortoises. This area is also important for the manatee (<i>Trichechus manatus</i>) and the little crocodile (<i>Crocodylus acutus</i>), both endangered species.
Total area	623.786	

Biological Corridor	Extension Hectares	Globally important biodiversity
Talamanca Caribe	47.000	The TCBC connects the International Park La Amistad (PILA in Spanish) - a biosphere reserve since 1982 and designated World Heritage Site by UNESCO – the Biological Reserve Hitoy Cerere, the Wildlife Refuge of Gandoca Manzanillo (REGAMA) and Cahuita National Park. It also includes the following indigenous territories: Talamanca Bribri, Talamanca Cabecar, Talamanca Keköldi, and Taini, as well as private lands.

Cordillera Volcanica Central-Talamanca	114.617	CVCT BC started as a proposal to restore the connectivity between the Central Volcanic Mountain Range of Talamanca, mainly as an initiative of the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor, and the Cordillera Volcanica Central Conservation Area. CVCT BC strategic position between the protected areas “Biosphere Reserve of the Central Volcanic Mountain Range” and the “La Amistad Biosphere Reserve”, gives a huge value in terms of connectivity in the country between these two important clusters of protected forests. The CVCT BC aims to restore connectivity between ten PA, a wetland (lacustrine Bonilla - Bonillita) and three indigenous territories (Cabecar low Chirripó Cabecar Chirripó-Duchi and Nairi-Awari). Within the PA, there are three national parks (Barbilla, Turrialba Volcano and Tapantí - Macizo Cerro de la Muerte), three forest reserves (Central Volcanic Mountain Range, Rio Pacuare and Rio Macho), two protection zones (Siquirres River Basin and Rio Tuis Watershed), a private wildlife refuge (La Marta) and the only National Monument in the country (Guayabo). Eleven life zones have been identified. CVCT BC was recognized in 2008 as a priority area for the Jaguar Corridor, an initiative proposed by the Wildlife Conservation Society and the Panthera Foundation, due to the location of several key sites within the CVCT BC for the existing populations of jaguar and other felines in the region.
Montes del Aguacate (including Jesus Maria Watershed)	70.600	The corridor connects the following conservation areas: Rio Grande, Cerros Atenas, Rodeo, Cerros de Turrubares, Tivives, Montes de Oro, Carara National Park, Wildlife Refuge Castro Cervantes, Peñas Blancas National Wildlife Refuge, Alberto Manuel Brenes Biological Reserve, and Arenal Monteverde Protected Zone. It is characterized by the existence of a large number of headwaters for several rivers in the country, including the rivers Grande de San Ramón, San Lorenzo, Balsa, Aranjuez, Jesus Maria, Barranca, Barranquilla, La Paz, Jabonal, and Jesus, among others.
Amistosa	115.809	It connects the Osa Peninsula with the Talamanca Mountain Range.
Paso de la Danta	80.000	Paso de la Danta biological corridor is considered, based on studies of distribution of birds species, as the Mesoamerican Center of the Pacific, because it is the center of distribution of species such as <i>Trogon bairdii</i> , <i>Pteroglossus frantzii</i> , <i>Melanerpes chrysauchen</i> , <i>Manacus aurantiacus</i> , <i>Thamnophilus bridgesii</i> , <i>Thryothorus semibadius</i> , <i>Euphonia imitans</i> and <i>Habia atrimaxillaris</i> .
Paso de las Lapas		It includes the area located from the mangroves Guacalillo Pacific to the Rio Grande de Candelaria, that host biodiversity with high rates of flora endemism. It also includes an important network of rivers, which flows into three major watersheds of the Tárcoles, Grande de Candelaria and Tusubres rivers. The corridor has endangered species of trees such as Nazareth, Ron Ron, Cocobolo, Caoba, Ajillo, Pilon and Cristobal. And animal species under protection: white tail deer, tepescuintle, Lapa Roja, Lora verde, Zaino.
Diriá	180.000	It connects the Marine Park of Las Baulas, the National Forest and Wildlife Refuge of Diriá and Barra Honda National Park. There are 306 bird species recorded, of which the most important are <i>Ara macao</i> , <i>Ajaia ajaia</i> y <i>Jabirú mycteria</i> (endangered species).
San Juan-La Selva	246.208	This biological corridor, seeks to protect the territory of the Great Green Macaw (<i>Ara ambigua</i>) and almond (<i>Dipteryx panamensis</i>). Maintaining biological connectivity between Indio-Maiz Biological Reserve in Nicaragua, with the system of protected areas in the Central Volcanic Mountain Range in Costa Rica for conserving biodiversity in the tropical rainforest.
Pájaro Campana	66.416	This biological corridor is the only one nationwide that connects the cloud forest with mangrove forest, allowing the migration of endangered native species such as Pájaro Campana (<i>Procnias tricarunculata</i>) and Quetzal (<i>Pharaochrus mocinno</i>)
Colorado-Tortuguero	130.000	It interconnects the Wildlife Refuge Barra del Colorado and Tortuguero NP in Costa Rica to the Reserve Indio Maiz in the south of Nicaragua. It includes wetlands in the Caribbean, where over 400 species of trees are found and about 2,200 species of other plants. It is common to find a wide variety of fauna, including endangered mammals such as jaguar, ocelot, tapir, manatee, toluco, perezoso and three species of monkeys, among others. In addition, there are more than 405 species of birds, approximately half the species found in Costa Rica.
Ruta Los Malekus	244,726	The name is in memory of the aboriginal culture of Guatusos Malekus. The corridor connects the Wildlife Refuge Border Corridor, Wildlife Refuge Caño Negro-Tenorio Volcano National Park, and the Arenal Volcano National Park. It is a corridor of great importance because of the presence of large-scale wetlands, including: the Laguna de Cote, Caño Negro (RAMSAR site) and Lake Arenal. The backbone of the corridor is the Rio Frio

		that flows towards Lake Nicaragua. It is a very important area for migratory birds, of which 379 species have been identified, including: pork or duck cormorant (<i>Phalacrocorax brasilianus</i>), Anhinga (<i>Anhinga anhinga</i>), Roseate Spoonbill (<i>Ajaia ajaia</i>), and ospreys (<i>Pandion haliaetus</i>), among others. It is also the habitat for the hapless lover (<i>Jabiru mycteria</i>), fish gaspar (<i>Atractosteus tropicus</i>) and the caiman (<i>Caiman crocodilus</i>). It harbours plant associations such as the marillal cedar, dominated by <i>Calophyllum brasiliense</i> and Marill (<i>Symphonia globulifera</i>), and the Yolillal dominated palm (<i>Raphia taedigera</i>). Both are endangered ecosystems.
Miravalles-Santa Rosa	42,053	This corridor is key to the ecological connectivity of the tropical dry forests of Guanacaste. This area includes special plant communities that are important for birds, among which the bell bird (<i>Procnias tricrunculata</i>), which uses this route in altitude flight. Flora includes, Aceituno (<i>Simarouba glauca</i>), Cachimbo (<i>Platimisia polystachyum</i>), Mahogany (<i>Swetenia macrophylla</i>), Charcoal (<i>Albizzia neopoides</i>), Cocobolo (<i>Dalbergia retusa</i>), genizaro (<i>Samanea saman</i>), Guachipelín (<i>Dyphisa robinoides</i>) Guanacaste (<i>Enterolobium cyclocarpum</i>) Guapinol (<i>Hymenea Corubaril</i>), and Ron Ron (<i>Astroneon graveolens</i>). Many animals with a high ecological value are present, among others, Armadillo (<i>Cabassous centralis</i>), Cauce (<i>Felis wiedii</i>), ocelot (<i>Felis pardalis</i>), capuchin monkey (<i>Cebus capucinus</i>), howler monkey (<i>Alouatta palliata</i>) anteater (<i>Myrmecophaga tridactyla</i>), sloth (<i>Bradypus variegatus</i>), paca (<i>Agoati paca</i>), and deer (<i>Odocoileus virginianus</i>).
TOTAL AREA	1,237,429	

ANNEX F: SGP CLIMATE CHANGE INTERVENTIONS

Energy Efficiency (Output 2.1.1)					
Technology	Number of SGP-funded installations in a 4-year period	Number of installations by replication	Total number of installations	Assumptions	Energy consumption reduction KWh/year (x number of lamps)
Lighting	500 lamps	1500 lamps	2000 lamps	Substitution of 60 w incandescent bulbs by compact fluorescent lamps (5 hours/day)	42,888
Electrical engines	50 engines	100 engines	150 engines	Substitution of 50 engines of 5 hp with 86% efficiency for engines of similar power capacity (5hp) but with 93% efficiency to be used for water pumping or ventilation (8 hours/day)	33,480.5
Energy efficient practices	10%	20%	40%	Energy efficiency practices in the tourism industry that reduce electricity consumption by 10% to 30% (some examples are: not using electric dryers for drying bed sheets and towels, control of room temperature, turning off equipment when not in use such as air conditioning, lights, and heaters, control of water-heating systems. These practices require changing behavior rather than making investments.	

Renewable Energy (Outcome 2.1.2)				
Technologies	Number of SGP-funded installations in a 4 year period	Number of installations by replication	Total number of installations	Assumptions
Biodigestors (8 m3)	300	600	900	Each m ³ produces biogas 0,50 m ³ /day (a 4-people family requires 3 to 4 m ³ of biogas per day).
Coffee solar dryer	4	16	20	0.5 kWh of electric consumption per "quintal" unit of dry coffee
Photovoltaic	5	10	15	Solar panels with a capacity of 20 kWh/month per unit
Micro-hydro	6	20	26	Micro-hydros of 20 kW with a generation capacity of 14.400 kW/month

Technology	Year	2011		2012		2013		2014		TOTAL	
		# of new units/year	tCO ₂ Year 1	# of new units/year	tCO ₂ Year 2	# of new units/year	tCO ₂ Year 3	# of new units/year	tCO ₂ Year 4	# of units	tCO ₂ cumulative
Biodigestors	SGP	100	400	100	800	50	1000	50	1200	300	3400
	Replication	200	800	200	1600	100	2000	100	2400	600	6800
	Sub-total	300	1200	300	2400	150	3000	150	36000	900	10200
Solar dryers	SGP	1	0.2	1	0.4	1	0.6	1	0.8	4	2
	Replication	2	0.4	6	1.6	6	2.8	2	3.2	16	8
	Sub-total	3	0.6	7	2.0	7		3		20	10
PV panels	SGP	1	0.01	2	0.03	1	0.04	1	0.05	5	0.13
	Replication	1	0.01	2	0.03	4	0.07	3	0.10	10	0.21
	Sub-total	2	0.02	4	0.06	5	0.11	4	0.15	15	0.34

	Year	2011		2012		2013		2014		TOTAL	
Micro-hydro	SGP	2	140	2	280	1	350	1	420	6	1190
	Replication	2	140	8	700	8	1260	2	1400	20	3500
	Sub-total	4	280	10	980	9	1610	3	1820	26	4690
Compact Fluorescent Lamps	SGP	200	2.4	200	4.8	50	5.4	50	6.0	500	18.6
	Replication	600	7.2	600	14.4	150	16.2	150	18	1500	55.8
	Sub-total	800	9.7	800	19.2	200	21.6	200	24.0	2000	74.4
Electric engines	SGP	15	1.5	15	3	10	4	10	5	50	13.5
	Replication	30	3.0	30	6	20	8	20	10	100	27
	Sub-total	45	4.5	45	9	30	12	30	15	150	40.5
Energy Efficiency practices	SGP	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	10%	8
	Replication	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	30%	22
	Sub-total									40%	30
TOTAL											15045.24

Forest fire avoidance (Outcome 2.2)

SGP 48 month target	350.0
Unit	Hectares
Area burnt (ha/year)	87.5
mass of fuel (tonnes/ha)	160.0
combustion factor	0.5
emission factor CO2	1,580.0
Emission factor CO	104.0
Emission factor CH4	6.8
Emission factor N2O	0.2
Emission factor Nox	1.6
tCO2	11,060.0
tCO	728.0
tCH4	47.6
tN2O	1.4
tNox	11.2
tCO2e for CO2	11,060.0
tCO2e for CH4	999.6
tCO2e for N2O	434.0
Annual tCO2e	12,493.6
48 month tCO2e	49,974.4
annual tCO2e/ha	142.8

Emissions from fire (for each GHG) = area*mass of fuel*combustion factor*emission factor*0.001

Equation 2.27 in IPCC 2006 Guidelines, Vol 4

Other Default Values:

Mass of fuel - Table 2.4, IPCC 2006 Guidelines, Vol 4

Combustion factor - table 2.6, IPCC Guidelines, Vol 4

Emissions factors - Table 2.5, IPCC Guidelines, Vol 4

ANNEX G: MONITORING AND EVALUATION WORKPLAN AND BUDGET

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Country Programme Level			
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGP Country Program Manager NSC UNDP RTA and CO UNOPS 	Indicative cost to project: \$ 3,500 Travel cost of RTA from IA fee	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country Program Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies (i.e., carbon monitoring method, adaptation of GEF tracking tools for community use) 	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop. \$68,000	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on <i>output and implementation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversight by SGP Country Program Manager 	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan preparation. (Other costs included above)	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP RTA SGP Country Program Manager CO 	No cost to project budget Annual visit by RTA – Travel cost from IA fee	Annually
Periodic status/progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGP Country Program Manager and team 	No cost to project budget	Quarterly
SGP Global Database quarterly update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGP Country Program Manager Local consultant (Quality control of information entered for accuracy and completeness: 1 week per quarter @\$375/week) 	Indicative cost to project: \$6,000	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation Country Program Managers Experience exchange workshop with other countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGP Country Program Manager and team UNDP STA GEF SGP CPMT External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost of evaluation: \$40,800 (includes travel costs) Indicative cost of SGP team participation in multi-country evaluation workshop: \$8,200	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGP Country Program Manager and team, UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost: \$ 40,000 (includes travel costs)	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGP Country Program Manager and team UNDP CO Local consultant (Publication editing, proof-reading, and layout) 	Indicative cost: \$5,000 (includes editing, layout and printing)	At least three months before the end of the project
International Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNOPS SGP Country Program Manager and team 	Indicative cost per audit: \$25,000	Once in the lifetime of project
SUB-TOTAL <i>Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses</i>		US \$	\$196,500

Individual grant level			
Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$	Time frame
Ex-ante visit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGP Country Program Manager and team NSC members 	Indicative cost: \$10,500	Risk based (20% of total No. of grants)
Field monitoring visit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGP Country Program Manager and team NSC members 	Indicative cost: \$21,000	At least twice in the lifetime of project Additional visits on a risk basis
Monitoring of and technical support to community application of M&E methods and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGP Country Program Manager National consultant (preparation of training materials and training delivery in 12 corridors) NSC members 	Indicative cost: \$22,000	Half-yearly

tools			
Progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Beneficiary organization ▪ SGP Country Program Manager 	No cost	Half-yearly
Final report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Beneficiary organization ▪ SGP Country Program Manager 	No cost	End of project
Final evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National consultant ▪ SGP Country Program Manager ▪ Beneficiary organization 	Included in project grant budget	End of project
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNOPS ▪ SGP Country Program Manager ▪ Beneficiary organization 	Included in project grant budget	Risk based
SUB-TOTAL COST		US\$	53,500
TOTAL indicative COST of Project M&E <i>M&E of approx 150 projects. Excluding project team staff time and costs included in project grant budget</i>		US\$	250,000

ANNEX H: GLOBAL SGP INDICATORS SELECTED FOR THE COSTA RICA COUNTRY PROGRAM IN GEF-5

Project outcomes will be monitored and reported on using the following indicators:

Biodiversity (BD)

- Hectares of indigenous and community conserved areas (ICCAs) influenced
- Hectares of protected areas influenced
- Hectares of significant ecosystems with improved conservation status
- Hectares of production landscapes/seascapes applying sustainable use practices

Climate Change (CC)

- Tonnes of CO2 avoided by implementing low carbon technologies
 - Renewable energy measures (*please specify*)
 - Low carbon transport practices (*please specify*)
 - Energy efficiency measures (*please specify*)
 - Other (*please specify*)
- Tonnes of CO2 avoided through improved land use and climate proofing practices

Land degradation (LD) & Sustainable Forest Management (SFM)

- Hectares of land applying sustainable forest, agricultural and water management practices
- Hectares of degraded land restored and rehabilitated
- Number of communities demonstrating sustainable land and forest management practices

Policy Influence, Capacity Development & Innovations (all focal areas)

- Number of consultative mechanisms established for Rio convention frameworks

please specify (1 example per entry)

- Number of innovations or new technologies developed/applied

please specify (1 example per entry)

- Number of local or regional policies influenced (*level of influence 0 – 1 – 2 – 3 – 4*)

please specify (1 example per entry)

- Number of national policies influenced (*level of influence 0 – 1 – 2 – 3 – 4*)

please specify (1 example per entry)

Livelihoods & Sustainable Development (all projects)

- Number of participating community members (gender disaggregated) * *mandatory for all projects*

Empowerment (all projects)

- Number of NGOs/CBOs formed or registered
- Number of indigenous peoples directly supported
- Number of women-led projects directly supported

- Number of quality standards/labels achieved or innovative financial mechanisms put in place

ANNEX I: SGP OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR THE GEF SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME

Purpose of this Document

These Operational Guidelines are intended to assist GEF SGP National Coordinators/Sub-Regional Coordinators (NCs/SRCs), National Steering Committees (NSCs), Sub-regional Steering Committees (SRSCs), National Focal Groups (NFGs), UNDP Country Offices and National Host Institution (NHI) staff in programme implementation at the country level. They are based on the experience and knowledge gained both at the country and global levels through years of GEF SGP programme implementation. They provide basic framework for operations about the structure, implementation, and administration of the programme. They also address the project cycle and grant disbursement. Programme and project monitoring, evaluation, and reporting are covered in the GEF SGP Monitoring and Evaluation Framework.

The guidelines and models set forth herein are meant to apply generally to all GEF SGP country programmes. It is recognized, however, that different contexts and situations will require different responses and adaptations. Any questions about the application of particular provisions of the guidelines or need for adaptation should be referred to the GEF SGP Global Manager and Central Programme Management Team (CPMT). On administrative and financial matters, questions may be answered by the UNOPS SGP Standard Operating Procedures and, if necessary, to the respective UNOPS SGP Portfolio Manager.

List of Acronyms

BAC	Budget Account Classification Code
CBO	Community-based Organization
CCF	Country Cooperation Framework
CO	Country Office
COA	Chart of Account (ATLAS)
COB	Country Operating Budget
CPMT	Central Programme Management Team
CPS	Country Programme Strategy
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IOV	Inter-office Voucher
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MOD	Miscellaneous Obligation Document
NC	National Coordinator
NFP	National Focal Person
NFG	National Focal Group
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NHI	National Host Institution
NPFE	GEF National Portfolio Formulation Exercise
NSC	National Steering Committee
OP	Operational Programme
PA	Programme Assistant
PO	Purchase Order (ATLAS)
REQ	Requisition (ATLAS)
SBAA	Standard Basic Assistance Agreement
SGP	GEF Small Grants Programme
SOPs	Standard Operating Procedures
SRC	Sub-Regional Coordinator
SRSC	Sub-Regional Steering Committee
SPS	Sub-Regional Programme Strategy
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNCBD	United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

PART I: GEF SGP PROGRAMME STRUCTURE

1. The structure of the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP), implemented by UNDP, is decentralized and country-driven. Within the parameters established by the GEF Council and reflected in the Project Document for an Operational Phase, the programme seeks to provide for maximum country, and community-level, ownership and initiative. This decentralization is balanced against the need for programme consistency and accountability across the participating countries for the achievement of the GEF global environmental objectives, and the SGP's particular benchmarks as stated in the Project Document for an Operational Phase.
2. The SGP is a global and multi-focal area GEF project, approved for funding by the GEF Council on a rolling replenishment, and implemented on behalf of the GEF partnership by UNDP, and executed by UNOPS. In the case of upgraded country programmes, UNOPS execution is the recommended option although a country-specific execution modality utilizing a national non-governmental organization or a consortium of non-governmental organizations, selected by UNDP through a competitive process, can be utilized¹⁰. Within the UNDP framework, the SGP, as a global programme, is handled differently from UNDP core national or regional programmes.¹¹
3. The GEF Council approves the SGP Project Information Form (PIF), GEF CEO clearance document, and SGP Project Document for an operational phase. The SGP Project Document provides the framework for SGP operations in accordance with the GEF mandate, including specific benchmarks for project achievements. It also sets forth many of the programme and financial reporting requirements for which UNDP has legal responsibility.
4. As a global programme, the SGP brings together country programmes of participating countries across all world regions. The key eligibility criteria for countries to participate in SGP are:
 - ✓ Existence of environmental needs and threats in GEF focal or thematic areas;
 - ✓ Ratification of at least one of the global environmental conventions including the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC); the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants; and United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD);
 - ✓ Government commitment in the participating country and support for the programme's implementation modality according to the operational guidelines;
 - ✓ Potential for strong government-NGO relations and positive support for local Civil Society Organizations;¹²
 - ✓ Commitment for resources mobilization : the UNDP/CO and government share available funding for SGP delivery from both GEF and non-GEF sources, and support efforts to attract other co-funding sources;
 - ✓ Positive enabling environment;

SGP Headquarters Structure

5. A UNDP/GEF Unit at UNDP Headquarters in New York provides fiduciary oversight for all of its GEF activities, including the SGP. Key UNDP Headquarters staff include the UNDP GEF Executive Coordinator, and his/her Deputy, who are legally accountable to UNDP and to the GEF Council for the utilisation of GEF resources.

¹⁰ As per policy approved by the GEF Council Meeting (November 10-12, 2009, Washington DC) based on GEF/C.36/4 Small Grants Programme: Execution Arrangements and Upgrading Policy for GEF-5 (see para 19 and paras 52 - 53)

¹¹ For more information about global programming, please see the UNDP Programming Manual, especially Section 8.3. The Programming Manual is available in UNDP Country Offices and at the following website:
<http://www.undp.org/osg/pm/index.htm>

¹² For the purpose of the SGP and its grantmaking, CSOs refer to national and local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) with priority for community-based organizations (CBOs), indigenous peoples, farmer's, scientific community, women's groups, and the youth and children organizations.

6. Overall SGP programme management, operational guidance and support to the country programmes, as well as the identification and establishment of the SGP in new countries, are conducted by the SGP Central Programme Management Team (CPMT). The CPMT is composed of a Global Manager and Deputy Global Manager; Programme Specialists responsible for matrixed country support and focal area guidance, knowledge management, and monitoring & evaluation; Programme Associates; as well as external consultants as needed.
7. The United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) provides programme execution services including administrative, financial, legal, operational, procurement and project management for the SGP as described in detail in the UNOPS SGP Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs).¹³ The UNOPS SGP Cluster Coordinator and his/her team work closely with the SGP Deputy Global Manager and CPMT staff.
8. The SGP Global Manager and his/her alternate, the SGP Deputy Global Manager, are ultimately responsible for the overall management, strategic direction, policy development and resource mobilization efforts of the SGP. The Programme Specialists are primarily responsible for guidance on GEF focal areas and thematic directions, country programme support, assigned regional coordination responsibilities, knowledge sharing, partnership development and networking. As necessary, the Global Manager and Deputy Global Manager may delegate certain functions to the Programme Specialists.
9. SGP regional teams, composed of at least one staff member from CPMT and from UNOPS, as well as the regional senior National Coordinator as needed, provide a range of technical advice, operational, management and administrative support to country programmes in each of the six SGP world regions,¹⁴ divided as follows:
 - ✓ Africa
 - ✓ Arab States
 - ✓ Asia
 - ✓ Europe & CIS
 - ✓ Pacific
 - ✓ Latin America & the Caribbean
10. While the CPMT regional focal point focuses primarily on GEF technical and programmatic matters, and the UNOPS regional focal point is responsible for administrative and financial issues, the SGP regional team works collaboratively in advising country programmes with regard to all substantive and operational matters. The regional teams also review the annual SGP country staff performance and recommend ratings for review by the Deputy Global Manager, and his/her counterpart in UNOPS, prior to endorsement and finalisation by the Global Manager.
11. SGP Programme Associates are responsible for daily administration, filing and archive management; financial record-keeping and reporting to donors; human resources support; external communications; organisation of meetings; and responses to routine requests for information. The Programme Associates monitor completion of SGP work-plans, and assists in CPMT activities, correspondence, and other assigned tasks.

SGP Country Programme Structure

12. The SGP operates in a decentralized and country-driven manner through a National Coordinator or Sub-regional Coordinator (both hereafter to be referred as NC) and National Steering Committee or National Focal Group for those in sub-regional programme modality (both hereafter abbreviated to NSC) in each participating country, with some modification in the case of countries in a sub-regional programme modality¹⁵, with financial and administrative support provided by the UNDP Country Office (CO). In some

¹³ https://intrafed.unops.org/ORGANIGRAMME/NAO/SGP/SGP_MANUAL/Pages/default.aspx

¹⁴ For a full list of participating SGP countries see:

http://www.sgp.undp.org/index.cfm?module=ActiveWeb&page=WebPage&s=contry_profile

¹⁵ In the case of SGP Sub-regional Programmes, the Sub-Regional Coordinator (SRC) may manage the programme, while projects are reviewed and approved by a voluntary National Focal Group (NFG) with part-time facilitation by a National Focal Person (NFP). Some countries, with substantial grantmaking, may decide to shift to a country programme modality still linked to

countries, a National Host Institution (NHI) or host NGO¹⁶ is responsible for programme implementation in conjunction with the NC and NSC. While the SGP is a global programme, at the country level it operates under the overall UNDP SBAA agreement. As a global programme, the SGP is not considered a part of the CCF or UNDP core functions.

13. The NSC is composed of voluntary members from NGOs, academic and scientific institutions, other civil society organizations, the UNDP CO, and government, with a majority of members coming from the non-governmental sector. The NSC provides overall guidance and direction to the country programme, and contributes to developing and implementing strategies for country programme sustainability.
14. The technical capacity of the individual NSC members is an important criterion in determining its composition, and to the maximum extent possible the NSC membership should include experts in the relevant GEF focal areas of biodiversity; climate change mitigation; international waters; sustainable land management; sustainable forest management and REDD; persistent organic pollutants/ chemicals; as well as capacity development. The inclusion of the government GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP) or relevant Convention Focal Point in the NSC is also recommended.
15. The NSC is responsible for the review, selection and approval of projects, and for ensuring their technical and substantive quality as regards the strategic objectives of the SGP. In collaboration with the NC, the NSC contributes to the development of the Country Programme Strategy (CPS) in accordance with the relevant Operational Phase project document and national environmental priorities, and oversees its implementation. NSC members are expected to support the country programme in resource mobilization and in mainstreaming SGP lessons learned and successes in national development planning and policy-making. NSC members are encouraged to participate in pre-selection project site visits and in project monitoring and evaluation.
16. The NSC may also constitute Technical Advisory Groups (TAGs) with a pool of voluntary experts on call to serve as a technical sub-committee, for review of proposals and in relation to specific areas of programming and partnership development. The TAG can also be tasked by the NSC to provide specific technical guidance in specialised areas of work, such as carbon measurement, payments for ecosystem services, marketing and certification of products, transboundary diagnostic analysis, and other relevant fields. In addition, TAGs may also be formed in response to donor and co-financing requirements mobilised for the SGP country programme.
17. The SGP NC has lead responsibility for managing the country or sub-regional programme implementation, and ensuring that grants and projects meet GEF and SGP criteria. The NC major functions *inter alia* include: (i) assisting CSOs in the formulation of project proposals; (ii) serving as the *ex officio* secretariat for the NSC; (iii) ensuring sound programme monitoring and evaluation, including periodic project site visits; (iv) resource mobilization; (v) communication and dissemination of SGP information; and (v) global reporting to CPMT, UNOPS, responding to audits, and other tasks as stipulated in their ToR.¹⁷
18. The UNDP CO provides management support to the SGP country programme as outlined in this document. The UNDP Resident Representative/Resident Coordinator (*hereafter abbreviated to UNDP RR*) in each UNDP CO assigns a senior staff person (typically the Sustainable Development Advisor or environment focal point) to serve as the SGP focal point. The UNDP RR participates in the NSC or may designate the focal point as his/her delegate in the NSC. Each UNDP CO also contributes to monitoring programme activities – usually through broad oversight by the designated focal point as part of NSC responsibilities; facilitates interaction with the host government; and develops links with other in-country financial and technical resources.
19. The UNDP CO is also responsible for providing operational support – the RR signature of grant project MOAs (on behalf of UNOPS); appointment letters to NSC members (on behalf of SGP); local grant disbursements; HR administration; as well as assisting in audit exercises for the programme. The detailed

the subregional group with a full-time NC or a Community Program Officer and the SRC providing subregional coordination and technical support.

¹⁶ National Host Institution or NHI and host NGO are used interchangeably in this document because SGP country programmes commonly employ both terms.

¹⁷ See full-length version of SGP NC ToRs.

steps for each operational aspect are described in the UNOPS SGP SOPs. The UNDP CO also plays a fundamental role in launching a new SGP programme in terms of endorsement of the government application to be a participating SGP country and in helping CPMT organize the start up mission. The UNDP CO also plays a critical role in the proper closing of an SGP country programme.

PART II IMPLEMENTATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF SGP COUNTRY PROGRAMMES

In-country institutional arrangements

20. While the SGP is a global programme, at the country level it operates under the overall UNDP SBAA agreement, but remains accountable to the CPMT/UNOPS SGP Cluster at Headquarters and, ultimately, to the GEF Council. There are two basic modalities for SGP hosting arrangements that CPMT, in consultation with country stakeholders, will decide for the country programme. In most countries, the programme is hosted by the UNDP CO, although this may also mean that the SGP office is physically located outside of the CO premises. Where there are issues of accessibility and based on consultations with stakeholders, the programme could be hosted in a National Host Institution (NHI), which may be an NGO or an academic institution.
21. In case of NHI hosting, UNOPS issues and administers a sub-contract with the NHI that outlines the technical support and administrative services to be provided, as well as the applicable operating budget. In all cases, the UNDP CO provides needed support for SGP in-country operations in coordination with the CPMT and UNOPS. Whatever the hosting arrangements, all country programmes respond equally to the relevant Operational Phase project document and global SGP Operational Guidelines.
22. As noted above, NCs are guided by CPMT regional focal points for the majority of operational and technical matters, whilst reporting ultimately to the SGP Global Manager. NCs are also accountable to the UNDP RR for country-level programme expenditures and on matters regarding meeting the ethical and professional standards of the UNDP. The UNDP RR with members of the NSC is responsible for preparing the annual evaluation of the NC performance and recommendation concerning contractual status for review by CPMT and UNOPS.
21. In keeping with the spirit and mandate of the SGP to develop and foster the capacities of CSOs in participating countries, it is expected that as individual country programmes mature it will be possible to transfer the hosting arrangements from the UNDP CO to NHIs. Any decision for transfer should be based on a full consultative process and analysis of key factors, and must be approved by the CPMT in consultation with the UNDP RR. In certain cases, where the selected NHI does not fully meet performance expectations, and upon consultation with country stakeholders, the contract may be terminated by the CPMT and UNOPS, and hosting will be transferred either to the UNDP CO or to another NHI.
22. The relationship with an NHI may range from the provision of physical office space, with the NC and NSC carrying full responsibility for programme management; one in which the NHI is responsible for providing specifically agreed services, such as technical advice and support; through to one where the NHI carries full responsibility for managing the SGP programme. The extent of responsibility will be clearly identified in the contract for services signed by UNOPS and the NHI and may evolve over time.
23. The identification of a pool of suitable NHIs may be carried out through a process of competitive bidding, or by gradually accumulating a list of available and interested organizations in consultation with key stakeholders. Local representation of international NGOs would not normally be eligible. The legitimacy and neutrality of potential NHIs within the national NGO community are essential qualifications to carry out SGP grant-making activities. Once a pool of organizations has been established, the following factors will be considered by the CPMT and UNDP CO in order to select the best candidate:
 - ✓ National stature and credibility;
 - ✓ Good working relationships with other CSOs, including participation in environment/ development networks;

- ✓ Demonstrated compatibility with the procedures, objectives, and grant-making functions of the SGP, GEF, and UNDP;
- ✓ Significant experience in community-based, participatory environment and development;
- ✓ Substantial involvement and technical expertise in environmental issues related to the GEF focal areas and the Rio conventions;
- ✓ Proven programme management and administrative capacity with systems in place.

24. The NC is normally an employee of UNOPS whereas the contract is administered locally by the UNDP CO on behalf of UNOPS. In some cases, the NC contract administration can be covered under the terms of the contract with the NHI. The selection of the NC is done through a publicly advertised and competitive selection process. As a general rule, the recruitment process for the NC is managed on behalf of UNOPS by the UNDP CO under the overall supervision of the UNDP RR. This is ordinarily the case even if the NC will be placed in an NHI; however, the NHI, as appropriate and upon approval of CPMT, may manage the NC recruitment. The selection panel submits three of the top applicants to the Global Manager for final selection and decision. The recruitment process and related guidelines are highlighted in more detail in the UNOPS SGP SOPs.

25. Typically, NHIs do not normally administer grant funds. As country programmes evolve, however, it may become desirable to include direct grants administration as part of NHI responsibilities under UNOPS-issued contracts or other mechanisms, thereby increasing the level of country ownership of, and civil society participation in, the programme. Administrative procedures will need to be devised to ensure that the administration of grant allocations and their transferral to grant recipients remain transparent, accountable and fluid. NHIs cannot be awarded nor use SGP grant funds.

SGP country staff roles and responsibilities

26. The NC is responsible for the overall functioning of the SGP in each participating country, and for the achievement of the benchmarks established for country programme implementation in the CPS and SGP Project Document for the relevant Operational Phase. The NC is expected to have full-time dedication to the SGP.¹⁸ The NC is responsible for ensuring sound programme and project monitoring and evaluation, and laying the foundation for programme sustainability. In project development, the NC may work directly to assist proponent CSOs access needed support including the recommendation of support through planning grants. The NC, jointly with the UNDP CO, bear direct responsibility for all local programme expenditures. A critical aspect of the NC job performance is to carefully monitor and supervise these expenditures under the overall supervision of UNOPS and to ensure accountability and transparency

27. The NC usually represents the SGP in local and national meetings, workshops, and other events, and may be accompanied by members of the NSC. However, for legal and financial purposes, only the UNDP RR or his/her Officer in Charge (OIC) may represent the SGP in-country (on behalf of UNOPS). Only the UNDP RR or his/her Officer in Charge (OIC) can sign SGP grant Memoranda of Agreement (MOAs) and for signing any co-financing arrangements on behalf of SGP. While the NC may initiate and undertake co-financing and other negotiations for the programme, s/he should never officially sign such agreements. The NC, however, may sign non-binding collaborative agreements between SGP and other projects and programs. The NC should consult the CPMT and the UNOPS SGP Cluster should there be doubt on signing rules and procedures.

28. The performance of NCs is evaluated annually. The evaluation is undertaken through an online Performance and Results Assessment (PRA) in two parts: a self-assessment by the NC, and a performance evaluation with NSC inputs under the charge of the UNDP RR. These two parts of the evaluation should be completed shortly after the completion of the reporting period. The completed and signed evaluations are submitted to the CPMT. The PRA evaluations are reviewed by the CPMT and UNOPS regional teams, and final decisions are then taken by the SGP Global Manager and Deputy Global Manager on contract renewal, and other actions that might need to be taken.

¹⁸ The NC should not accept any other functions unless a cost-sharing arrangement can be negotiated with the UNDP CO or host NGO and validated by CPMT/UNOPS.

29. In most countries, the NC works with a Programme Assistant/Associate (PA). On behalf of UNOPS, the UNDP CO may hire a PA with technical and/or administrative skills and functions depending on local needs. The NC shall be involved in the selection process and the panel recommendation will be forwarded to CPMT and UNOPS for final approval. The NC will be in-charge of the supervision and PRA for the PA. In certain cases, consultants with a technical background, especially in the GEF focal areas, may be recruited to contribute to project design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation, and can be delegated by the NC to provide these services to CSOs and SGP projects as necessary. The recruitment process and related guidelines are highlighted in detail in the UNOPS SGP SOPs.

National Steering Committee procedures

30. The NSC is a central element of the SGP and provides the major substantive contribution and oversight to the programme, in coordination with the NC. While staffing and operational management of the SGP is undertaken through UNDP/UNOPS structures, no SGP project may be undertaken at the country level without the approval of the NSC. As such, the NSC must do its best to ensure the technical and substantive content of SGP grants, and the administrative and financial capacity, either actual or potential, of the CSO grant recipients. The UNDP RR, or his/her delegate, as well as other members of the NSC, are encouraged to provide any relevant information about these concerns, especially the financial and organizational integrity of CSOs. Operationally, the decisions of the NSC are considered final provided they are consistent with these operational guidelines, the SGP Project Document for the operational phase and the Country Programme Strategy. However, neither the NSC nor its individual members as programme volunteers, hold any legal or fiduciary responsibility for the SGP or its activities.
31. The selection of NSC members is normally done by the NC in consultation with the UNDP RR. For new country programmes, the NSC is often established as a result of a preparatory mission or in the initial stages of launching the programme. NSC members should have an abiding interest and commitment to working with communities and share a vision of what sustainable development and "*thinking globally, acting locally*" might mean in terms of linking the GEF focal areas with community needs and concerns. NSC non-governmental members must have high credibility and wide experience working with local communities and CSOs in the country and thus can represent their needs and interests in committee discussions. Strong, experienced, and technically competent civil society representation on the NSC is crucial as a means of keeping the SGP responsive to its mandate to work with CSOs, CBOs and indigenous peoples. These members must also have the requisite knowledge about GEF Focal Areas and/or specific themes such as gender, sustainable livelihoods, and knowledge management. Governmental and donor agency members should hold positions relevant to the work of the SGP and at a level where they could make decisions on behalf of their agencies. NSC members on the whole must be able and willing to discuss constructively and develop consensus decisions. The NSC, with the NC, are responsible for ensuring that participatory, democratic, impartial, and transparent procedures for project review and approval, as well as all other aspects of programme implementation at the country level in accordance with the SGP Project Document for the relevant Operational Phase.
32. The composition of a newly established NSC is subject to ratification by the SGP Global Manager while subsequent appointments can be ratified by the responsible CPMT Regional Focal Point. In general, only one government representative on the NSC is required. However, depending on the circumstances, country programmes can have additional government representatives such as Convention focal points, although in any case majority of members must be non-governmental. The UNDP RR provides the appointment letters on behalf of the SGP.
33. NSC members usually serve for a period of three years. Each country or sub-regional programme must decide whether this term is renewable, and how eligibility for renewal is determined. In general, periodically inviting new members is a sound and healthy policy that brings new ideas and expertise to programme implementation, and roughly one quarter of NSC members may rotate in any given year. Changing the entire membership at one time should be avoided.
34. Participation in the NSC is without monetary compensation. Travel expenses for project site visits or to NSC meetings can be covered by the SGP country operational budget.

35. NSCs adopt decisions under the principle of consensus, and rarely resort to voting to determine whether a project is approved or a particular course of action is taken. To facilitate meetings, the NSC may decide to select its Chairperson(s) in the following way: (i) one of the most committed expert member to Chair for a particular period of time; (ii) members to chair meetings on a rotating basis to enhance each member's participation; and (iii) on a co-chair approach with government and non-government representation to promote civil society leadership and CSO-government collaboration which are institutional objectives of the programme.
36. The NC serves ex officio on the NSC, participating in deliberations, but not in decisions in the project selection process. The NC usually convenes the NSC and functions as its secretariat, including preparing minutes of meetings and maintaining a historical record of programme decisions and implementation. A copy of NSC minutes, signed by the members, and other pertinent material should be filed at the UNDP CO.
37. In as wide a consultation as possible with country stakeholders, the NC shall prepare a long list of possible volunteers to the NSC. From this, the NC in consultation with the UNDP RR prepares the list of NSC members to be nominated for approval by the SGP Global Manager by considering both the expertise and qualifications of the individual candidates, and the overall composition and balance of the committee. While certain institutions (the UNDP, and appropriate governmental ministry or agencies, the NHI) must be represented in the NSC, members should also be chosen who as individuals, including from the private sector and donor community, would contribute significantly to the committee and the programme's various expertise needs (e.g. on GEF focal areas, sustainable livelihoods, gender considerations, communications, resource mobilization, capacity development). The NC, after due consultation with other NSC members of good standing and the UNDP RR, may recommend changes in the composition of the committee to CPMT if it becomes clear that a particular member's participation is not contributing to the programme.
38. The objectivity, transparency and credibility of the NSC is of paramount importance to the success of the country programme, and to maintaining good relations among stakeholders. As a general rule, country programmes cannot consider proposals associated with organizations of sitting NSC members. A CSO may nonetheless submit proposals when its representative has finished the term of service and is no longer on the Committee. On an exceptional basis, and under specified conditions pre-approved by CPMT, CSOs with members in the NSC can submit proposals.

Country Programme Strategy

39. Before any grant-making or other programme activities may take place, each SGP participating country must have an approved Country Programme Strategy or Sub-regional Programme Strategy (abbreviated here to **CPS**). The development/revision of the CPS is designed to ensure congruence with the SGP Project Document for the relevant Operational Phase; the strategic planning frameworks associated with the relevant Rio Conventions;¹⁹ as well as with the GEF National Portfolio Formulation Exercise (NPFE) where relevant.
40. For new SGP country programmes, the development of a CPS is one of the first tasks to be undertaken by the NC and newly-formed NSC. In both new and continuing SGP country programmes, it is important to involve key stakeholders in the CPS revision/elaboration process, and to fully engage and involve the NSC. In this regard, the CPS may be considered a living document, and shall be revised or updated in every operational phase of SGP, or as deemed necessary by the NSC, to align country programme priorities with GEF policies and priorities, and those included in the relevant SGP Project Document.
41. As described in the CPS Guidance framework, the development or revision of the CPS serves several broad purposes to:
 - ✓ Identify the national circumstances and priorities of the country vis-à-vis the Project Document for the relevant Operational Phase;

¹⁹ These include the GEF National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) process; the CBD National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs); the UNFCCC National Communications; the UNCCD National Actions Programmes (NAPs); and the Stockholm Convention National Implementation Plans (NIPs).

- ✓ Provide stakeholders with a framework document to understand the priorities for SGP funding for strengthened country relevance and ownership;
 - ✓ Provide a strategic framework for allocating resources, especially selection of SGP projects, through a bio-geographic and/or thematic focus;
 - ✓ Serve as the framework for country programme operations and guiding programme implementation;
 - ✓ Constitute the basis for the assessment of country programme achievements and impact.
42. The development/revision of the CPS should be undertaken as a participatory process that engages the full range of non-governmental and government stakeholders in the country. The CPS preparation should be seen not only as a document to satisfy global programmatic requirements, but as a country-led process which has value in its own right. The key players in the process are the NC (who facilitates the process, and is responsible for the majority of the drafting), and the NSC (which provides input and guidance throughout the process, and endorses the end product).
43. The CPS should contain: (a) background situation of the country which the SGP country programme has to consider; (b) key objectives vis-a-vis the country situation and the objectives of the global SGP Prodoc for the operational phase; (c) geographic (with maps) and/or thematic focal areas; (d) priority activities to be supported by grantmaking; and (e) expected outcomes, indicators, and M&E plan.
44. Recommended steps to developing the CPS are as follows:
- ✓ NC prepares an initial CPS draft for consultation with the NSC based on the current SGP Project Document;
 - ✓ Wide stakeholder consultations held with key CSO, government, academic and other concerned parties to discuss relevant issues (where possible, these consultations to be linked to the National Portfolio Formulation Exercise (NPFE) of the GEF in the country);
 - ✓ Incorporation of stakeholder inputs into the draft CPS by the NC, and initial approval of the document by the NSC;
 - ✓ Submission of the draft CPS to the CPMT Regional Focal Point for comment and review;
 - ✓ Further CPS revision as necessary based on comments and recommendations by the CPMT;
 - ✓ Submission of the revised CPS by the NC for formal endorsement by the NSC;
 - ✓ Final approval of the endorsed CPS by the SGP Global Manager, or delegated CPMT Regional Focal Point;
 - ✓ Posting and circulation of the final version of the CPS as a public document.

Country Operating Budget

45. The Country Operating Budget or Sub-regional Operating Budget (abbreviated here to COB) is the financial provision for country, or sub-regional, programme implementation. The COB is prepared by the NC, and reviewed and approved by the CPMT and UNOPS. The COB should allow the effective operation of the country or sub-regional programme in implementing activities in support of the objectives of the Project Document, as well as to be responsive to specific country circumstances and needs, as reflected in the CPS. In countries where a NHI hosts the SGP, the COB is generally covered by the terms of the contract for services between the organization and UNOPS. The COB process and related guidelines are highlighted in detail in the UNOPS SGP SOPs.

PART III IMPLEMENTATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF SGP GRANTS

SGP grants and project cycle

46. Each SGP country programme should, after adopting or revising its CPS, prepare and issue an SGP programme announcement. Information in the call for proposals should clearly state that the SGP makes grants to eligible CSOs, with priority for supporting poor and vulnerable communities in the GEF focal areas, with a maximum grant amount for a project of US\$50,000. The subsequent process of developing an SGP project should then take place in a transparent manner covering the: (i) project preparation guidelines setting forth the eligibility criteria; (ii) application/proposal review process and calendar; (iii) formats for project concept and proposal development, and; (iv) co-financing requirements in cash and/or in-kind.

47. Project concepts from eligible CSOs²⁰ and CBOs may be screened by the NC or jointly with the NSC. Each country programme should determine which screening modality it will follow, and periodically review this decision to make sure that the modality chosen is working well. In both cases, project concept selection should be done on the basis of established eligibility and selection criteria in accordance with the CPS. At the very least, project concepts should be relevant to one or several of the GEF focal areas and that they reflect the needs of the community or communities and/or stakeholders that would be involved. Once the concepts have been selected, the proponent organizations will be notified of this decision and asked to develop complete project proposals.
48. It is critical for all project proposals to meet the GEF and SGP criteria. While it is an important part of the NC responsibilities to work with CSOs in proposal development, sometimes additional assistance is nonetheless required. In such cases, two options may be considered: (i) a local consultant may be hired to help the CSO/CBO/communities according to terms of reference that the NC elaborates in coordination with the organization; and (ii) the SGP planning grant modality may be used.

Planning Grants

49. The NC or NSC may authorize planning grants²¹ once project concepts have been selected. CSOs such as CBOs, indigenous peoples' organisations and communities with little experience in project design and management receive priority to benefit from this assistance. Hence, the planning grant has an important capacity-building function which in itself is an important SGP objective. The NC makes recommendations to the NSC about which proponent organizations would require a planning grant.
50. A planning grant can be used by an eligible CSO to organize stakeholder workshops or meetings to design the project in a participatory manner. The planning grant can be used to contract an experienced NGO or local consultant to work with the project proponents to elaborate the project, to undertake baseline assessments, develop a business plan (for projects with strong sustainable livelihood elements), and through learning-by-doing, build capacity in proposal design including the development of indicators and a monitoring and evaluation plan.
51. Administratively, a planning grant is a grant like any other SGP grant, and therefore can only be made to eligible CSOs. The project document for the planning grant specifies the activities to be undertaken, and the responsibilities of the parties concerned. The NSC generally approves the planning grant, although the NSC can in certain instances also delegate approval to the NC for certain exceptional cases (e.g. time-sensitive activities, smaller amounts). The process follows the modus operandi of an SGP facilitative grant-making and is explained in detail in the UNOPS SGP SOPs.

Project proposals

52. SGP provides grants to support activities that help achieve the programme objectives outlined in the CPS and the SGP project document for the Operational Phase. In terms of helping achieve global environmental benefits, the SGP's starting point is to ensure that each project proposal fits the GEF criteria, and that each proposal clearly articulates how project objectives and activities would have a positive effect in the relevant GEF focal areas. To create sustainability and impact beyond the project, SGP projects can combine demonstration, capacity-building, network building, awareness raising, and dissemination of lessons learned as integral components. Given this comprehensive approach, while a logical framework is not formally required, it would be advisable to include a Monitoring and Evaluation work-plan in each proposal (see SGP M&E Framework).
53. As a demand-driven programme, SGP projects endeavour to address both the GEF criteria, as well as community needs and initiatives. The SGP usually works with communities and localities that confront a multitude of social and economic development problems that impact on concerns related to global

²⁰ Whilst a category of CSO for the GEF, international NGOs and private sector companies are not directly eligible for SGP support, but may co-finance the relevant national NGO, CBO, indigenous peoples' or community projects.

²¹ Planning grants are usually in the range of \$2,000 to \$5,000 depending on the capacity of the proponent and additional work that have to be done. The NSC should decide on how to make the provision of planning grants in the most facilitative way such as allowing the NC to make planning grant decisions and reporting on these in NSC meetings.

environmental conventions. For SGP interventions to have relevance and utility at the community level, these non-GEF circumstances are taken into account in project design. A key guiding philosophy of the programme has been to reach the marginalized poor and vulnerable communities, especially when there are no other donors present, and where development baseline conditions have not been met. Typically, the SGP will therefore need to mobilize additional resources to help provide the co-financing, technical assistance, capacity-building, gender training, income-generation component, or whatever non-GEF element may be necessary for a project's success. These project components are vital to achieving local acceptance, ownership, and sustainability of SGP interventions.

Funds disbursement

54. The maximum amount for an SGP grant is \$50,000 per project.²² In special cases, grants for “strategic projects” that consolidate efforts of several communities and CSOs could be provided at a maximum of \$150,000. SGP grants generally only cover a portion of project costs, with other components provided for by the CSO partner, the community itself, or by other donors. Since SGP grants fund activities that are directly relevant to the GEF criteria, co-financing must be sought for community baseline or sustainable development needs. However, since it would be unrealistic to require a baseline/incremental cost exercise for each individual project, each country should instead endeavour to mobilize enough funding in cash or in kind to “match” the GEF country grant allocation²³.
55. Once the NSC has approved a project for SGP funding support, a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) is signed on behalf of UNOPS between the grantee and the UNDP CO. SGP projects normally have a duration of between one and three years. The amounts and schedules may differ, contingent upon the nature and length of project activities, but in no case should the first disbursement be more than 50% of the total project grant amount (except when justified and prior approval from UNOPS has been received). The MOA and grant disbursement process, the applicable templates, and all related guidelines are found in detail in the UNOPS SGP SOPs.
56. A grantee may submit another proposal upon successful completion of an initial project but no grantee can receive funds exceeding US\$50,000 in a given operational phase. Any grantee which has received the maximum \$50,000 in one Operational Phase, may however submit another funding request in the following Operational Phase if the evaluation of project outcomes are positive. .

PART IV REPORTING AND COMMUNICATIONS

57. The NC has lead responsibility for communications between the country programme and the CPMT. In general, the NC reports on substantive and technical matters to the CPMT, and on administrative and financial issues to the UNOPS portfolio manager. The NC should keep the UNDP CO informed of progress in programme implementation, usually through the RR and SGP focal point in the UNDP CO. In particular, the NC and PA are expected to maintain a close working relationship with the UNDP CO regarding the COB and grants disbursements which serves to keep the UNDP abreast of SGP developments.²⁴ The NC should also endeavour to share relevant SGP reports with the GEF Operational and Political Focal Points as well as global environmental convention focal points.
58. Communications among country programmes are facilitated through the global, regional, and sub-regional list servers, the SGP global database and workspace, and the SGP website. Recurring global reporting requirements, such as annual reports, are complemented by periodic requests by the CPMT and UNOPS for information on specific subjects, such as reports under preparation for the GEF Council, or for the relevant global environmental conventions. Full guidance on all project and programme reporting is provided in the SGP Monitoring & Evaluation Framework

²² In many cases, it may however be advisable to provide smaller initial amounts when the grantee-partners have lower implementation capacity.

²³ The matching of GEF funds with co-financing is finally reckoned at the global programme level so as not to disadvantage new country programmes or those in difficult situations.

²⁴ SGP Country Programmes are required to monitor the funds (grants and COB amounts) and expenditures allocated to them. Reporting tools and relevant guidelines are provided by the UNOPS SGP SOPs.

59. SGP country teams are responsible for entering detailed information for all prior and current Operational Phases into the SGP database, including the upload of grant project MOAs. Since the database is the foundation for all reporting and communications at the global level, it is imperative that NCs and PAs input the database as soon as projects are approved by the NSC, and keep it regularly updated on the progress of projects. The SGP database and website also includes visual documentation of SGP projects and country programmes, accounts of lessons learned, and case studies. Project briefs should be stored in the files of every project for easy use and sharing.
60. The NC is required to report on technical and substantive project and programme progress through the annual country programme report. The annual report complements the information that is entered in the SGP database and should cover progress in meeting the year's deliverables as well as other important information including: (i) assessment of the overall progress for the country programme portfolio; (ii) results of project monitoring and evaluation; (iii) key outcomes of SGP-sponsored events; (iv) progress in strengthening working relationships with CSOs, as well as with government agencies and donors; (v) results of resource mobilization efforts; (vi) development of SGP visibility as a GEF programme and activities to share lessons learned and influence policy; and (vii) any special challenges and difficulties faced.
61. The NC shall take all necessary measures to ensure the visibility of the GEF financing. Such measures shall be in accordance with the need to give adequate publicity to the action being implemented as well as to the support from the GEF. A communication and visibility plan shall be outlined in each project document. This should include, *inter alia*, the compulsory use of the GEF logo on all material, publications, leaflets, brochures and newsletters, websites, business cards, signage, vehicles, supplies and equipment, display panels, commemorative plaques, banners, promotional items, photographs, audiovisual productions, public events and visits and information campaigns. The plan should also include press releases, press conferences and press visits to project sites.
62. The Programme Review is an overall assessment of the country programme performance to be undertaken by the NC and the NSC, in consultation with SGP grantees and other stakeholders, at the completion of an SGP Operational Phase. The purpose of the Programme Review is to assess the cumulative progress of the country programme in a particular Operational Phase and provide strategic recommendations on the direction for the programme in the next Operational Phase. Once finalized, the Programme Review should be shared by the SGP country team with the country GEF Operational and Political Focal Points and also the relevant Rio Convention focal points.
63. Audits of SGP country programmes will be conducted in accordance with the internationally accepted auditing standards, and applicable financial rules and regulations. The SGP audit exercises are designed to improve the transparency, accountability and quality of SGP country and global operations. The audits will cover management, financial, and administrative issues as they relate to the country programme as a whole, and will not normally include provisions for project-level inspection. The principles and processes governing SGP audit operations can be found in the UNOPS SGP SOPs.



**GEF SGP PROJECT PROPOSAL
TEMPLATE AND GUIDELINES**

COSTA RICA

2011



GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

The Project Proposal should include the standard cover sheet, a one-page table of contents and not more than fifteen pages of text (including any charts or diagrams). A Project Budget Information Sheet should be fully completed and the Proposal in typed form.

You may also submit additional attachments (not more than ten pages), which may include documents certifying the status of the organization, endorsements of the proposed project, funding commitments or other indicators of participation and support from other institutions, and evidence of community support and participation.

Please ensure that a project proposal and all attachments are legible. All supporting documents (attachments) should also have the name of the project on them. Submit one original copy of the Proposal (soft and hard copy) to *National Coordinator, GEF Small Grants Programme, P.O. Box 4540-1000 San Jose, Costa Rica*. Keep a copy of your proposal for your own records as the one you submit will not be returned.

In preparing a Project Proposal, you should follow the major (numbered) points of the outline set forth below. These are the major issues that the National Steering Committee (NSC) will consider in reviewing the Proposal. Ensure that the entire bullet points included in the outline are addressed. The number of pages allocated to each section is a guide. The information required can be less but not more than the pages stipulated.

Eligible Initiatives:

- Must be submitted by an NGO or community-based organization duly registered and legal status of the day, of which a copy should be provided.
- Initiatives should be located in any of the following priority areas identified for Phase V of the program (Biological Corridors and Buffer Zones of Protected Areas):

Protected Areas	Biological Corridors
Reserva de la Biosfera La Amistad	Talamanca Caribe
Parque Nacional Chirripó	Cordillera Volcánica Central-Talamanca
Parque Nacional Tapanti-Macizo de la Muerte	Montes del Aguacate (Incluye Cuenca del Jesús María)
Palo Verde	Amistosa
Braulio Carrillo	Paso de la Danta
Corcovado	Paso de las Lapas
Área Conservación Guanacaste	Chorotega/Diria
Barra del Colorado	San Juan-La Selva
	Pájaro Campana
	Colorado Tortuguero
	Ruta Los Malekus
	Paso del Mono Aullador

PROJECT PROPOSAL COVER SHEET

Project No. _____ (For Official Use. Do not write anything here)

Project Title: _____ (Use the GEF format, title must capture the essence of project and aligned to GEF focal areas)

Applicant

Name of Organization: _____

Mailing Address: _____

Physical Address: _____

Telephone: _____

Fax: _____ E-Mail: _____

Principal Officer: _____

(Name and Position)

Project Contact: _____

(Name and Position)

Project

GEF SGP Classification

Focal Area (Tick one)			Thematic Area (Tick one)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conservation of Biodiversity		<input type="checkbox"/>	Biological Corridors
<input type="checkbox"/>	Climate Change		<input type="checkbox"/>	Community rural tourism
<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Degradation and Sustainable Forest Management		<input type="checkbox"/>	Sustainable production
<input type="checkbox"/>	Multi-focal*		<input type="checkbox"/>	Fire Management
<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>	Renewable Energy
<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>	Energy Efficiency
<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>	LULUCF

* Proposal addresses more than one focal area

Proposed Starting Date: _____

(Ideally this should be at least six months after submission)

Proposed Project Duration: _____

Finances

Total GEF SGP Request: [local currency] _____ (US\$ _____)

Total from Other Sources: [Local currency] _____ (US\$ _____)

Total project cost : Local currency] _____ (US\$ _____)

Exchange Rate : _____

Section A.

1.0 PROJECT PROPOSAL OUTLINE AND CONTENT

1.1 *Project Summary (1 page)*

The Project Summary should be a brief write up of the key points contained in the Proposal. This should include a brief description of the proposing organization, project objectives, activities, indicators of achievement and the context (or rationale/justification) upon which the project is based. This shall also include the relationship of the project to the GEF/SGP Project Document and a statement of the total cost of the project, the amount of funding requested from the GEF Small Grants Programme, how those funds will be used, the amount, nature, and status of community contributions, and the status and sources of additional funding required.

1.2 *Organizational Background and Capacity to implement the project (1 page)*

This section should clearly demonstrate that the proposing organization has the experience, capacity, and commitment to implement successfully the proposed project. Among the issues to be covered in this section include:

- Nature of the proposing organization – Is it a community-based organization, national or sub-national NGO, research or training institution?
- Purpose and core activities of the organization,
- Organizational approach (philosophy) for project implementation, i.e. how does the organization deliver its projects?
- Length of existence and project management experience
- Organizational structure, governance and administrative framework: number of paid staff members, if any.
- Membership and affiliation to associations or umbrella organizations
- Legal status - registration with government approved authority
- Target population group (women, indigenous peoples, youth, etc)
- Previous experience relevant to the proposed project including: projects addressing problems of Biodiversity loss, Climate Change Mitigation and/or Adaptation, land degradation/Sustainable Forest Management and Pollution of International Waters. OR experience with projects that focus on environment and natural resources management and sustainable development at community level.

1.3 *Project Objectives and Expected Results (1 page)*

This section should contain a clear and specific statement of what the proposed project will accomplish. Among the issues to address include:

- The **problem statement** or challenge the project is intended to address
- The **primary objective** and **specific objectives** of the proposed project
- The **rationale** (justification) for the project. The rationale should indicate the importance of the proposed project to the GEF Small Grants Programme in terms of contributing to its overall and or specific focal area objective (s). It should also reflect the relationship of the project to other relevant programmes such as local, district or national government programmes, other GEF and UNDP projects, multilateral and bilateral aid agency projects, and other community-based, NGO, and/or private sector activities in the same geographic area. This ensures that the intervention is not a standalone activity.
- The **specific results** that the project will produce. The expected results are the measurable changes which will have occurred by the end of the project as a result of the planned intervention e.g. land area under forest cover increasing because of tree planting and promotion of natural regeneration of vegetation; etc.

Project Work plan and Monitoring Schedule

1.4 Description of Project Activities (2.5 pages)

This section should describe what will actually be done to produce the expected results and accomplish the project's objectives. There should be a clear and direct linkage between the activities and the outcomes. (The proponent must ensure that the activities are a means to getting to intended outcomes). ***Note that weakness in this area may be a major reason for failure to receive funding as this is the actual component to be implemented as a project.***

Activity descriptions should be as specific as possible, identifying **what** will be done, **who** will do it, **when** it will be done (beginning, duration, completion), and **where** it will be done. In describing the activities, an indication should be made regarding the organizations and individuals involved in or benefiting from the activity. An example is below for reference only.

1.5 Implementation Plan and Time Frame (2 pages)

This section may be presented in graphical (table) form and can be attached as an annex. It should indicate the **sequence of all major activities and implementation milestones**, including targeted beginning and ending dates for each step. Provide as much detail as possible. The Implementation Plan should show a logical flow of steps, indicating that all the things that must happen have been carefully thought through from the current to the end of project situation. Include in the Implementation Plan all required reports, project reviews and evaluation activities.

1.6 Plan to Ensure Community Participation (1 page)²⁵

Describe how the stakeholder communities were (and are being) involved in

- Project planning and design
- Project implementation
- Project monitoring and evaluation to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in delivery. This is the basis for generating and understanding project impact.

Section B

(See next page)

²⁵ Note that community participation means much more than how the community will benefit from the project. It refers to active involvement and ownership by an appropriate spectrum of people. Describe the specific steps that have been taken/planned to maximize this involvement.

Project Work plan and Monitoring Schedule

Project No:			Project Name:											
Name of Grant Recipient														
Brief description of General Objective of Project:														
GEF Focal Area:			GEF Operational Phase:					Project Start and End Dates:						
Brief Description of Specific Objective No 1:														
List the activities necessary to fulfil this objective. Indicate who is responsible for each activity and an indicator of activity accomplishment.									Duration of Activity in Months (or Quarters)					
Activity	Responsible Party	Indicator	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1.1														
1.2														
1.3														
1.4														
Brief Description of Specific Objective No 2:														
List the activities necessary to fulfil this objective. Indicate who is responsible for each activity and an indicator of activity accomplishment.									Duration of Activity in Months (or Quarters)					
Activity	Responsible Party	Indicator	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
2.1														
2.2														
2.3														
2.4														
Indicate Person responsible for Monitoring and progress reports:									Monitoring Frequency / Reporting					
Monitoring and Record keeping														
Progress Reports														

1.7 Risks to Successful Implementation (0.5 pages)

Identify and list the major risk factors that could result in the project not producing the expected results. These should include both internal factors (for example, the technology involved fails to work as projected) and external factors (for example, significant currency fluctuations resulting into changes in the economics of the project).

Include in this section also the key **assumptions** on which the project plan is based. In this case, the assumptions are mostly related to external factors (for example, government environmental policy remaining stable) which are anticipated in project planning, and on which the feasibility of the project depends.

1.8 Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Indicators (1 page)

This section should contain an explanation of the plan for monitoring and evaluating the project, both during its implementation (formative) and at completion (Summative). Among the key issues to be addressed are:

- How the performance of the project will be tracked in terms of achievement of the steps and milestones set forth in the Implementation Plan;
- How the impact of the project will be assessed in terms of achieving the project's objective(s);
- How the mid-course correction and adjustment of the project design and plans will be facilitated on the basis of feedback received;
- How the participation of community members in the project monitoring and evaluation processes will be achieved.

Propose specific and measurable **indicators** relating to project performance and impact which can form the basis for monitoring and evaluation. These indicators must also speak to the SGP-5 indicators in Costa Rica (seen Annex...). These indicators will be refined in consultation with the SGP Country Program Manager, and will form an important part of the contract between the proposing organization and the GEF SGP. In addition, identify at least **1 Global Environmental Benefit and 1 indicator** from each of the 3 categories of biophysical, livelihood and empowerment indicators provided (*see pages 9 – 10*).

1.9 Sustainability (1 page)

Sustainability is a critical aspect in all the GEF SGP funded projects. The proposal should outline the steps to be taken before, during and at the completion of project implementation to ensure that once all the SGP funds have been disbursed, the benefits of the project and the organization will continue for many years thereafter.

The funds provided by SGP are primarily seed funds, designed to give the project a significant boost. However, project proponents should envision the project three or even five years after SGP has given out the agreed upon funds, and consider the factors that could contribute to the success and failure of sustainability of their project, and address them accordingly.

2.0 PROJECT BUDGET INFORMATION SHEET

The Project Budget Information Sheet is an important part of every GEF SGP project proposal and must be completed prior to consideration of a proposed project for funding. Once a project has been approved for funding, the budget information becomes part of the binding contract between the GEF SGP and the proposing organization.

The development and management of a realistic budget is an important part of developing and implementing a successful GEF project. Careful attention to issues of financial management and integrity will enhance the effectiveness and impact of the project. In keeping with the role of the GEF SGP as a support mechanism for community-level initiatives, every effort has been made to keep financial management requirements as straightforward and non-burdensome as possible. The following important principles should be kept in mind in preparing a project budget:

- Include only costs which directly relate to efficiently carrying out the activities and producing the objectives which are set forth in the proposal. Other associated costs should be funded from other sources.
- The budget should be realistic. Find out what planned activities will actually cost, and do not assume that you will be able to make do for less.

- The budget should include all costs associated with managing and administering the project. In particular, include the cost of monitoring and evaluation.
- "Indirect costs" or administrative overhead costs such as staff salaries and office rent are not funded by the GEF SGP. These therefore should not be part of the funding request.
- GEF SGP funds should be spent according to the agreed budget.
- All relevant, financial records should be made available. These may be independently audited, and may become public information.
- The budget line items are general categories intended to assist in thinking through where money will be spent. If a planned expenditure does not appear to fit in any of the standard line item categories, list the item under other costs, and state what the money is to be used for.
- The figures contained in the Budget Information Sheet should agree with those on the Proposal Cover Sheet and in the text of the proposal.
- GEF SGP grant requests should not exceed fifty thousand United States Dollars (US\$50,000) per project.

Section C

2.1 Project Funding Summary

Funding Source	Funding Plan, [local currency]		Total (local currency)	Total US\$
	Year 1	Year 2		
a. GEF SGP				
b. Community				
c. Proposing Organization				
d. Other co-financiers				
Total Project Cost				

a. Community Contribution

All cost -sharing contributions (cash and in-kind) should be itemized as below. This should include sources and nature of the contribution (e.g. Youth Organization contributing labour, land, cash, etc). Please indicate whether the contribution is already committed or just a projection.

Sources of Community Contribution	Type	Committed or Projected?*	Value, in local currency
1.			
2.			
Total			

** Write 'C' for committed and 'P' for projected funds*

b. Proposing Organization Contribution

The GEF SGP believes in cost sharing. It is therefore important that proposing organizations make some contribution towards the cost of the project. Contributions can be outlined as follows:

Sources of Contribution	Type	Committed or Projected?*	Value, local currency
1.			
2.			
Total			

* Write 'C' for committed and 'P' for projected funds

c. Other Contributions

Sources of Contribution	Type	Committed or Projected?*	Value, local currency
1.			
2.			
Total			

* Write 'C' for committed and 'P' for projected funds

2.2 Projected Expenditures

Expenditure Category	Year 1, [local currency]	Year 2, [local currency]	Total, [local currency]	US\$	% Total
1. Personnel / Labour					
2. Equipment / Materials					
3. Training / Seminars / Travel Workshops					
4. Contracts					
5. Other costs**					
6. Incidentals					
7. Other support requested ²⁶					
7. Contingency (5%)					
Total Project Cost					

**Specify here (category and cost): _____

Exchange Rate ([local currency] /US \$): _____

Notes and Remarks:

²⁶ Outline other forms of support requested from SGP which is not included in the budget. This support may be for both technical and administrative matters (and not for additional funding). This may cover areas which you need to specify such as: Consultants; Procurement; and Other_(specify

2.4 Bank Details

Provide information on any of the Organization's bank account. Upon being successful, a separate bank account would have to be opened for handling of grant funds - No combining of funds is allowed in the GEF SGP.

Account Name : _____
Title (current, savings, etc): _____
Account Number : _____
Branch/Service Centre: _____
Bank Name & Address: _____

6.0 MAKING A GRANT APPLICATION

National and local NGOs and CBOs may propose projects for grant support under the GEF Small Grants Programme. Procedures for project proposal screening and approval are generally as follows:

1. The project proponent contacts the SGP Country Program Manager to receive project application guidelines.
2. The project proponent prepares a project concept paper and submits it to GEF SGP Country Program Manager (CPM). CPM reviews concept paper and recommends it to National Steering Committee (NSC) for further review and approval.
3. Approved concept paper is developed into a full proposal by project proponent, who later submits it to the GEF SGP CPM
4. Completed and appraised project proposal is submitted by the CPM to the NSC for further review and approval.
5. The NSC reviews the proposal and agrees to accept, reject or return it to the proponent with a request that further work be done to refine the project proposal.

An approved proposal enters the national GEF SGP work programme for that particular year. Grants are usually paid in three or four installments.

For proposal submission and more information, contact:

*Eduardo Mata, Country Program Manager, GEF Small Grants Programme,
Oficentro La Virgen # 2, de la Embajada Americana, 300 mts. sur y 200 mts. sureste, Pavas, San Jose, Costa Rica. PO.Box 4540/SAN JOSE, COSTA RICA • Fax: 2296-1545 • Telefono 2296-1544 • 296-1736, E-mail:pequenas.donaciones.cr@undp.org*

Completed proposals (in both soft and hard copies) should be received by the SGP National Coordinator no later than [indicate deadline date]

Annex 1 to Project Template: PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS

The review of project proposals is the responsibility of the National Steering Committee (NSC) with assistance from the GEF SGP Country Program Manager. Upon receiving project proposals,

the CPM acknowledges receipt of the same to the proposing organization(s) and prepares a list of project proposals for consideration of the NSC. This preparation may include discussions with the proposing Organization in refining the proposal if necessary. CPM then presents the project proposal to the NSC. The CPM may also present, for consideration by the NSC additional information about the proposed project, including the results of consultations or site visits. The NSC is structured to provide a full and substantive (independent) discussion, including the sharing of all relevant concerns and points of view.

The NSC shall make its decisions based on a consensus-building process, rather than by formal voting. Final deliberations regarding a project shall take place in the absence of the project proposing organization. NSC members shall disclose any conflict of interest with respect to individual project proposals and excuse themselves from participating in the decision-making process about the said proposal.

The decision of the NSC may be to recommend that the project:

- Be awarded a grant for immediate funding and implementation;
- Be rejected and cannot receive GEF SGP support;
- Be further developed for reconsideration at a later date.

In all cases, the rationale for the decision shall be documented and communicated to the project proposing organization by the CPM on behalf of the NSC. Please see a copy of a typical review sheet annexed to this proposal (annex 3).

Annex 2 to Project Template: GEF SGP OP 5 GUIDE TO PROJECT LEVEL INDICATORS

Biodiversity (BD)

1. Hectares of indigenous and community conserved areas (ICCAs) influenced
2. Hectares of protected areas influenced
3. Hectares of significant ecosystems with improved conservation status
4. Hectares of production landscapes/seascapes applying sustainable use practices

Climate Change (CC)

5. Tonnes of CO₂ avoided by implementing low carbon technologies
 - Renewable energy measures (*please specify*)
 - Low carbon transport practices (*please specify*)
 - Energy efficiency measures (*please specify*)
 - Other (*please specify*)
6. Tonnes of CO₂ avoided through improved land use and climate proofing practices

Land degradation (LD) & Sustainable Forest Management (SFM)

7. Hectares of land applying sustainable forest, agricultural and water management practices
8. Hectares of degraded land restored and rehabilitated
9. Number of communities demonstrating sustainable land and forest management practices

Policy Influence, Capacity Development & Innovations (all focal areas)

10. Number of consultative mechanisms established for Rio convention frameworks

please specify (1 example per entry)

11. Number of innovations or new technologies developed/applied

please specify (1 example per entry)

12. Number of local or regional policies influenced (level of influence 0 – 1 – 2 – 3 – 4)

please specify (1 example per entry)

13. Number of national policies influenced (level of influence 0 – 1 – 2 – 3 – 4)

please specify (1 example per entry)

Livelihoods & Sustainable Development (all projects)

14. Number of participating community members (gender disaggregated) * *mandatory for all projects*

Empowerment (all projects)

15. Number of NGOs/CBOs formed or registered

16. Number of indigenous peoples directly supported

17. Number of women-led projects directly supported

18. Number of quality standards/labels achieved or innovative financial mechanisms put in place

Annex 3 to Project Template: Project Proposal Review Sheet

The following issues represent major points of inquiry for the NSC in considering each project proposal (provided as a guide to the talking points for the discussion, NSC may include other points not presented here).

Evaluation Area	Score: 3=Highly, 2=Moderately, 1=Partially and 0=Not At All	General Remarks
a. Applicant (.....Points)		
1. Does the organization meet the basic eligibility requirement for GEF SGP OP5 support?		
2. Has the organization demonstrated adequate capacity and experience to successfully implement the project?		
b. Project Objectives (.....Points)		
3. Does the proposed project meet the basic eligibility criteria as set forth in the GEF SGP OP 5 Country Programme Strategy (CPS)?		
4. Does the proposed project address one of the priority concerns identified in either the GEF SGP Global Strategy or the CPS?		
5. Does the proposed project have a particular focus on the empowerment of women, Indigenous peoples and or vulnerable grass-roots communities?		
6. Are the objectives of the project clear and compelling? Do they represent a well-conceived integration of GEF-related environmental protection and sustainable livelihoods strategies?		
7. Are the project's expected results appropriate and relevant to the stated objectives? If accomplished, do they represent a substantial beneficial impact in addressing environmental and sustainable livelihood challenges? (Are they sufficiently ambitious but doable? Are they unrealistically ambitious?)		
c. Project Plan and Approach (.....Points)		
8. Does the project presents a sound strategy or approach to achieving the stated objectives and expected results? Are proposed activities properly sequenced?		
9. Does the project plan incorporate realistic approaches and activities which will ensure the sustainability of the project's impacts, activities, or both?		
10. Are the time estimates for project implementation sound and realistic?		
11. Are the assumptions underlying the project's design accurate and complete? Have all substantial risk factors, based on internal and external conditions, been taken into account?		
d. Participation (.....Points)		
12. Has the organization involved and consulted all appropriate stakeholders, including particular members of affected communities, in the design and development of the project?		
13. Have representative groupings in stakeholder communities endorsed or expressed support for the project?		
14. Does the project design incorporate effective and appropriate means of assuring the participation and support of community members and other stakeholders throughout the period of project implementation?		
15. Has the organization made appropriate plans to include affected communities in the monitoring, assessment, and evaluation of the project, both during and after implementation?		
e. Other Considerations (.....Points)		
16. Would the proposed project complement, reinforce, or balance other projects in the GEF SGP portfolio?		
17. Is the geographic location of the proposed strategy supportive of the overall GEF SGP Country Strategy, either by concentrating inputs for maximum impact and synergy, or by providing GEF SGP outreach to new or under- represented areas?		
18. Would the proposed project generate constructive linkages with larger GEF projects in the country or region?		

19. Would the proposed project generate new and innovative models which could be replicated locally, nationally or internationally?		
20. Would the proposed project help develop the capacity of communities and organizations (including the proposer) to address environmental and sustainable livelihood concerns in an effective and integrated manner? And how will this capacity developed be retained?		
21. Are there exceptional circumstances which" would make it important to fund this project in spite of other contrary reasons?		
22. Does the project bring significant co-financing from other partners? What is the ratio of GEF support to co-financing?		
23. Does the project demonstrate strategic partnerships?		
Total points Scored		

ANNEX K: LIST OF PLANT SPECIES TO BE USED IN REFORESTATION AND AGROFORESTRY ACTIVITIES

Common Name	Scientific Name
Balsa o Balso	<i>Ochroma pyramidale</i>
Cacha o espino blanco	<i>Abarema idiopoda</i>
Cachimbo o Cristobal de Guanacaste	<i>Platymiscium parviflorum</i>
Ceibo	<i>Pseudobombax septenatum</i>
Cedro Amargo	<i>Cedrela odorata</i>
Cenízaro	<i>Samanea saman</i>
Cortez Amarillo	<i>Tabebuia ochracea</i>
Cortez Negro	<i>Tabebuia impetiginosa</i>
Cocobolo	<i>Dalbergia retusa</i>
El Dama	<i>Citharexylum donnell-smithii</i>
Espavel	<i>Anacardium excelsum</i>
Gallinazo	<i>Schizolobium parahyba</i>
Gavilan	<i>Pentaclethra macroloba</i>
Guachipelin	<i>Diphyssa americana</i>
Guanacaste	<i>Enterolobium cyclocarpum</i>
Guayabon o Surá	<i>Terminalia oblonga</i>
Indio desnudo/jiñote/jiñocuabe	<i>Bursera simaruba</i>
Jobo	<i>Spondias mombin</i>
Laurel	<i>Cordia alliodora</i>
Madero Negro	<i>Gliricidia sepium</i>
Mayo	<i>Vochysia guatemalensis</i>
Ojoche	<i>Brosimum alicastrum</i>
Pochote	<i>Bombacopsis quinatum</i>
Poro	<i>Erythrina berteroana</i>
Ron-ron	<i>Astronium graveolens</i>
Sotacaballo	<i>Zygia longifolia</i>
Saino	<i>Caesalpinia eriostachys</i>
Tempisque	<i>Sideroxylon capiri</i>