昆明生物多样性基金
Kunming Biodiversity Fund

# Kunming Biodiversity Fund Direct Allocation Project Proposal

| I.Basic Information | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Project Title | *Scaling up connectivity in the Trifinio-Fraternidad Transboundary Biosphere Reserve* | | | |
| **Funding Priority** | *Insert the funding request priority of this proposal* | | | |
| **Implementing Entity and Focal Point** | *United Nations Education, Science, and Culture Organization*<br>[redacted] | | *António de Sousa Abreu*<br>*Maria Rosa Cardenas*<br>*Martin Delaroche*<br>*Juan Criado*<br>*UNESCO*<br>*Sciences sector (SC)*<br>*Earth and Ecological Sciences (EES) division*<br>*Man and the Biosphere Programme (MAB)*<br>*a.abreu@unesco.org*<br>*m.cardenas@unesco.org*<br>*m.deluroche@unesco.org*<br>*j.criado@unesco.org*<br>*+33145680887* | |
| Geographical scope | *El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras* | | | |
| **Beneficiary Country and Focal Point** | *El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras*<br>**Sr. Lucky Halach Medina**<br>CBD Focal Point for Honduras<br><br>**Igor De la Roca Cuellar**<br>CBD Focal Point for Guatemala<br><br>**José Enrique Barraza Sandoval**<br>CBD Forcal point for El Salvador | | | |
| Total Budget (USD) | KBF funding requested : | US$...300,000 | Co-funding Sources (if appliable): | *UNESCO*<br><br>*Spanish National Parks Autonomous Agency (OAPN)* |
| | Co-funding provided (if appliable): | US$...30,000 | | |
| | Total | US$...330,000 | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Delivery timeframe | *April - November 2025 (8 months)* |
| **Date of Executive Council Approval** | |

*KBF Executive Council Co-Chairs Signature (signature confirms Steering Committee approval of the funding request)*

[redacted]

27.03.2025

## II. Introduction

*This section should provide a summary of the problem or main challenges which the proposed project is aiming to address. Based on the problem analysis, please describe how the proposed project could support strategic actions to trigger the accelerated and upscaled implementation of the GBF at the international, regional, national, or subnational level.*

***Limit: no more than 200 words.***

**Protected and connected areas represented only 9,3% of the world's surface as of 2017.[1] Central America and South America experiences high forest habitat fragmentation despite attempts to address its anthropogenic drivers** (deforestation, agriculture and cattle-ranching expansion, urban, road or rail expansion, etc.)**, with 11.2% forest fragments smaller than 10,000 hectares.[2] Central America, in particular, typically experiences rapid loss of protected fragments,[3]** increasing the risks of species extinction, loss of livelihoods and hinder the resilience of ecosystems to face the twin biodiversity and climate crises.

In this context**, restoring connectivity and ensuring integrity of social-ecological landscapes to maintain ecosystem functions** and Nature's Contribution to People (NCP) is instrumental to the successful implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) 2050 objectives.

In the recent past, however, **large-scale landscape connectivity projects at continent scale** (e.g. Mesoamerican Biological Corridor) **have had mixed results due to a number of challenges**: top-down political and administrative coordination, lack of

[1] https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.12.047

[2] https://doi.org/10.1038/nature25508

[3] https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aax8574

attention to socio-economic factors and conflicts, inability to secure long-term funding, low community engagement levels, and data gaps.

The proposed project aims to build upon an existing landscape connectivity experience in the **Trifinio-Fraternidad Transboundary Biosphere reserve (TFTBR)** between **El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras**. The objective is twofold:

(1) **Mapping of landscape connectivity knowledge and policy gaps, opportunities, informing NBSAPs[4] and NRs[5]**

(2) **Development of a long-term, multi-level and transboundary funding plan to support landscape connectivity efforts**

The project will contribute to the connectivity-related GBF targets (2 and 3) and strategic priorities of the TFTBR 2024-2034 management plan by providing capacity-building and bridging knowledge and funding gaps to the implementation of landscape connectivity goals. It will address the Kunming Biodiversity Fund Project Application (2024 Direct Allocation Project) by contributing to national resource mobilization strategies (Focus Area 2) and capacity-building to implement the CBD (Focus Area 3).

## III.Project Objective

***Describe the transformational change or changes the proposed project intends to bring about. And please provide an overview of the opportunities for reversing the trend of biodiversity loss and achieving the outcomes set out in the 2050 vision, including the four long-term goals by 2050 and the 23 action targets of the GBF by 2030, and thereby contributing to the three objectives of the CBD and its Protocols.***

***Limit: no more than 500 words.***

To address some of the limitations of past projects working on ecological connectivity (under the framework of Aichi target 11) and aligning with ongoing initiatives from other multilateral and development agencies (e.g. GEF, KfW, GIZ), the proposed project intends to support the TFTBR in gathering the building blocks of landscape connectivity planning and comprehensive territorial management to execute their management plan:

- **Landscape connectivity effectiveness assessment (baseline):** mapping and assessment of existing ecological corridors within and outside protected areas, assessing current performance of their key functions (connectedness, ecological processes, species protection and circulation, and resilience) using ecological, social, and economic data **(GBF Target 3);**

[4] National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan

[5] National Report

- **Identification of knowledge gaps and lessons learned:** review of past local experiences and international cooperation of landscape restoration projects and integration of insights into planning. National technical workshops to identify missing data, tools, and capacity-building needs for inclusive and participatory planning of ecological corridors associated with socio-economic opportunities **(GBF Target 20);**

- **Mapping of landscape connectivity opportunities:** geospatial and socio-economic analysis of ecological corridor design options with the development of different landscape connectivity scenarios (i.e. pathways), including feasibility analysis, fit with existing territorial management documents, transparent decision criteria, preliminary monitoring indicators, and gender-sensitive inclusiveness targets to provide a basis for prioritization by local stakeholders **(GBF Target 2);**

- **Development of a strategic, transboundary, and multi-level funding plan:** inclusive and participatory workshops involving the three countries of the TFTBR to (1) identify short- and long-term funding needs, sources, grant applications, and cooperation opportunities at all governance levels (local, national, international) to implement the activities listed under each landscape connectivity scenarios, as well as define responsibilities for each local stakeholders for securing funding; and (2) prioritize scenarios based on a multi-criteria framework that explicitly includes socio-economic factors in addition to ecological variables, and fit with local and regional land-use planning **(GBF Target 2).**

Securing long-term engagement toward building ecological corridors and sustaining landscape connectivity efforts require sound scientific data, participatory design processes, long-term funding planning and international cooperation. The project will provide a basis for the successful and long-term landscape integrity and connectivity planning of the TFTBR, directly addressing **GBF's Goal A "Protect and Restore,"** by strengthening governance and planning for landscape restoration (**Target 2**), expanding conservation of existing landscapes (**Target 3**), and promoting capacity-building and transboundary cooperation for scaling up biodiversity conservation and sustainable use initiatives, and promoting peace through the reduction of land-use conflicts (**Target 20**). Over half a million migrants at the US border in FY 2022 were from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras; improving landscape connectivity in the TFTBR can help alleviate the environmental stressors driving this migration.[6]

This work will also contribute to **GBF's Goal D** by promoting investment in North-South and South-South scientific cooperation through the involvement of the network of UNESCO Chairs and key research institutions which will make targeted

[6] https://worldmigrationreport.iom.int/what-we-do/world-migration-report-2024-chapter-3/latin-america-and-caribbean#:~:text=More%20than%20half%20a%20million,Salvador%2C%20Guatemala%20and%20Honduras

contributions to the project related to their area of expertise. The project will rely whenever possible on cost-effective tools and methods to increase likelihood of replication elsewhere in the region, especially sites that are part of ongoing regional initiatives like the Mesoamerican Forest Integrated Program (IP) by the GEF in the region dedicated to supporting countries (El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama) (GEF ID: 11273), a part of which (GEF ID: 11278) is already actively supported by UNESCO San José Office through a co-funding letter

## IV. Rationale for KBF Investment

***Describe the current context (Economic, Social and Political) in the sector, countries, or region/s in which the project will operate and the impacts this will have on project delivery. Explain how this information has been used to guide the project plan.***

***Please detail how KBF investments are complementary to previous, ongoing, and planned operations in the beneficiary country by the Implementing Entities and other funds. Please state relevant ongoing or planned activities of the Implementing Entities in the beneficiary country. If the proposed KBF project will be integrated within or complemented by a larger project or program of the Implementing Entity / Beneficiary Country, please identify the project or program and summarize alignment and leverage.***

***Limit: no more than 300 words.***

At the continental level, the TFTBR area represents a significant piece of the Mesoamerican biological corridor,[7] popularly known as the "path of the panther," a fundamental land route for many migratory species, connecting diverse biomes from North to South America. The TFTBR already has a 15 year-long experience about landscape connectivity and track-record of demonstrated results regarding the creation of ecological corridors, through a variety of projects undertaken to restore forests and switch from traditional agriculture to agroforestry systems:

- **2006-2011** Integrated Management of the Montecristo Trinational Protected Area project (GEF) which already aimed to consolidate biological corridors within the Trifinio Region[8]
- **2009** Forests and Watersheds Program (GIZ/KfW)

[7] https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2022.104504

[8] https://www.thegef.org/projects-operations/projects/2686

- **2016** Strengthening of the Trinational Structure for the Implementation of the Montecristo Trifinio Trinational Biological Corridor
- **2016 – 2023** Governance of Groundwater Resources in Transboundary Aquifers - GGRETA Phase II (SDC)
- **2020** Protection and Conservation of the Trifinio Fraternity Biosphere Reserve (KfW)

The proposed project will build on the rich work done in the area and extend any other work that has been previously done.

In addition, UNESCO will seek alignment, complementarity, and integration with ongoing initiatives in the region (mainly by KfW and GEF). UNESCO San José office already supports implementation of GEF projects in the area. Synergies will be assessed with the following identified projects:

- **Mesoamerican Forest Integrated Program (IP) by the GEF in the region dedicated to supporting countries (El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama) (GEF ID: 11273) and its two related child projects in El Salvador (GEF ID: 11277) and Guatemala (GEF ID: 11275)**
- **Fostering Water Security in the Trifinio Region: Promoting the formulation of a TDA/SAP for its transboundary Lempa River Basin (GEF ID: 10108, UNEP)**
- **Mesoamerica Critical Forest Biome IP Regional Coordination, Knowledge Sharing and Support Project" (GEF Project ID 11278).**
    - Note: UNESCO San José office is currently a partner to this project and provides co-financing in the order of USD 449,600

Implementation will count with the support of the Trinational Commission for the Trifinio Plan (CTPT) and provide an opportunity to strengthen its governance and address some of the strategic activities outlined in its upcoming 2024-2034 management plan.

The project will also receive additional financial support of USD 30,000 from UNESCO's Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme and Spanish National Parks Autonomous Agency (OAPN), along with technical support from the MAB Programme Secretariat and the World Network of Biosphere Reserves.

## V . Project alignment

*List and describe any past/existing projects, initiatives, policies or other activities in the regions or countries that may complement, overlap, or compete with the proposed project. Position the project in relation to these, explaining how the project*

*will extend any work that has been previously done, implement lessons learned, or develop stronger collaboration between existing projects.*

*Limit: no more than 200 words.*

One of the main objectives of UNESCO's biosphere reserves is to encourage Member States to increase landscape connectivity by incorporating and connecting ecological corridors within and between protected area. The collaborative zoning of biosphere reserves help materialize such corridors across political boundaries and foster collaboration among stakeholders to manage the landscape holistically, balancing conservation with sustainable human development.

Since 1997, the Trinational Trifinio Plan Commission (CTPT) gathers high-level political representatives (it is composed of the Vice-Presidents of El Salvador and Guatemala and a Presidential Appointee from Honduras) into a **permanent coordinating and consultative body. It serves as a high-level forum working on shared governance models for the Trifinio region** that promote **inclusive natural resources governance and sustainable development serving the TFTBR.** Previous projects in the TFTBR and implemented by CTPT and its partners have focused mainly on restoring underground water through landscape interventions targeted in six micro-basins. Such projects (2009-2017 time span) encouraged the adoption of agroforestry systems and forest restoration initiatives, improving local livelihoods and governance (a majority of beneficiaries saw income increase significantly by over 100%, and a third of them were women), and shifting away from bean and corn production to reduce erosion by 15-45% (according to GIZ[9]).

The current project will further these efforts by assessing the feasibility of connecting ecological corridors across micro-basin (as opposed to focusing efforts within each micro-basin separately) while proposing different scenarios to address the direct drivers of agricultural encroachment and land-use conflicts that currently undermine the long-term prospects for ecological corridors. This effort will be complementary and will seek synergies with a current KfW-funded project working on land tenure in the Trifinio area.

## VI . Specific activities

*List and describe the main activity/ies that will be carried out to produce those expected outcomes and outputs.*

***Outcome 1: An updated baseline assessment of ecological corridors and landscape connectivity is made available for the TFTBR***

[9] https://www.giz.de/en/worldwide/13474.html

**Output 1.1.** ***Landscape connectivity effectiveness assessment (baseline)***

*Activity 1.1.1: Geospatial mapping of existing conservation corridors within the TFTBR*

*Activity 1.1.2: Assessment of ecological corridor's current performance of key functions (connectedness, ecological processes, species protection and circulation, and resilience)*

**Output 1.2. Integration of knowledge gaps and lessons learned into planning**

*Activity 1.2.1. Review of past ecological landscape restoration projects experiences and integration of insights into planning*

*Activity 1.2.2. Three (3) national technical workshops to identify missing data, tools, and capacity-building needs for inclusive and participatory planning of ecological corridors associated with socio-economic opportunities*

**Outcome 2. The TFTBR develops a comprehensive strategy and funding plan to implement landscape connectivity-related GBF Target 2 and 3**

***Output 2.1 : Mapping of landscape connectivity opportunities and scenarios***

*Activity 2.1.1: Geospatial and socio-economic analysis of ecological corridor design options*

*Activity 2.1.2: Development of landscape connectivity scenarios (feasibility, fit, transparency, and monitoring indicators)*

***Output 2.2:*** **Development of a strategic, transboundary, and multi-level funding plan**

*Activity 2.2.1: One (1) trinational, inclusive and participatory workshop to identify short- and long-term funding strategies and cooperation opportunities at all governance levels*

*Activity 2.2.2: One (1) trinational, inclusive and participatory workshop to prioritize scenarios based on multi-criteria framework and alignment with local and regional land-use planning*

**Outcome 3 Local stakeholders are informed and are included in landscape connectivity decisions (Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA))**

***Output 3.1. Community engagement and education***

*Activity 3.1.1: Workshops in local communities to encourage participation and provide training on landscape connectivity.*

*Activity 3.1.2: Youth Forum to engage younger generations in conservation efforts, including biodiversity monitoring and volunteering.*

*Activity 3.1.3: Multimedia campaigns using social media, radio, and videos to highlight the benefits of landscape connectivity and raise awareness.*

*Activity 3.1.4: production of educational material/brochure meetings with decision-makers, NGOs, and donors*

***Output 3.2 Stakeholder collaboration and policy integration***

*Activity 3.2.1: Meetings with government representatives, decision-makers, NGOs, and donors*

*Activity 3.2.2: production of briefings*

## VII. Sustainablility, replication and scale up

***Explain the actions that will be taken to ensure the project results and/or benefits are sustained beyond the project lifetime. List the results that can be replicated or scaled up.***

***Limit: no more than 200 words.***

First, the proposed project is fully aligned with the national and international objectives and strategies of the beneficiaries to implement the GBF. Congruent with a long-standing trinational cooperation, the project also directly addresses the key purposes of a transboundary biosphere reserve, which is to provide zoning that ensures well-connected landscapes across national borders and promotes international peace.

Second, project activities fully align with the upcoming TFTBR 2024-2033 international management plan, specifically the item on the **Conservation of Natural Heritage, Biodiversity and Landscape**: "f) *Promote and implement successful experiences, such as land purchase, watershed restoration, the application of compensation mechanisms for water-related ecosystem services (or others), water*

*governance (restoration of water flows, pollution control), and landscape connectivity through the exchange of territorial knowledge*" (Translation of draft management plan- p.80). The development of a strategic, transboundary, and multi-level funding plan that is inclusive, participatory and oriented toward long-term activities will support the TFTBR's resource mobilization strategy for the upcoming ten (10) years.

The methodologies used for the elaboration of geospatial mapping and performance assessment of ecological corridors (baseline definition) as well as ecological corridor design and landscape connectivity scenarios may be replicated with the experience and technical support of the Iberoamerican and Caribbean Network of Biosphere Reserves (IberoMAB). This approach is especially applicable in other UNESCO designated sites and national protected areas that were inside the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor scope that include Mexico, Belize, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama in addition to beneficiary countries.

## VIII. Gender

***Explain what measures the proposed project will take to ensure the full, equitable, inclusive, effective and gender-responsive representation and participation.***

***Limit: no more than 200 words.***

Active participation of women and younger generations is instrumental to the success of this project, just as past projects in the area managed to obtain over 30%[10] of women participation into agroforestry and reforestation initiatives.

Women participation will be secured at several levels. First, the knowledge and experiences of women from local communities of the TFTBR will be valued through the baseline definition and review of past projects to which they actively participated, also through the identification of gender-specific gaps in landscape connectivity project implementation. Second, their participation will be further sought in the definition of landscape connectivity scenarios to ensure that (1) projected benefits are equitably distributed among stakeholders; (2) women are fully engaged; and (3) that gender-specific indicators (participation rates, leadership roles held and feedback on inclusivity) can help monitor results. Finally, the structure and composition of policy makers and scientists working groups for the project will aim to attain balance in gender composition, with particular emphasis on encouraging the participation of young women scientists.

## IIX. Communications, Outreach and Learning

***All KBF funded projects are expected to have a communication, outreach and learning component to promote project results. Activities and products under this plan are expected to target broader audiences beyond the project's stakeholders to***

[10] https://www.giz.de/en/worldwide/13474.html

*enhance and catalyze further impactPlease describe how the proposed project will achieve this requirement.*

The project will follow a Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA) approach, in line with Article 13 of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

**Communication objectives** include raising awareness about the importance of landscape connectivity for ecosystem resilience, engaging communities and stakeholders, communicating project progress and funding opportunities, and ensuring collaboration with national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs).

**Target audiences** are local communities, government officials, NGOs, researchers, the private sector, and youth across El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras.

**Key activities:**

- **Workshops in local communities to encourage participation and provide training;**
- **Multimedia campaigns using social media, radio, and videos to highlight the benefits of landscape connectivity;**
- **Roundtables and briefings with decision-makers to address funding and policy;**
- **Host a youth forum to engage younger generations in conservation efforts, encouraging them to participate in biodiversity monitoring or volunteering initiatives.**
- **Partnerships with media and NGOs to promote project visibility.**
- **Meetings with government representatives to ensure the project supports national biodiversity strategies. Share project data and findings to inform NBSAPs updates, ensuring the integration of landscape connectivity actions into national biodiversity policies.**

The plan includes regular monitoring to assess the effectiveness of communication strategies and ensure long-term project sustainability.

## Annex:

1. Budget

| Project Activities | | | Expenditure category | Description of expenditure | Estimated amount | PSC | % of Funding |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***Outcome 1.*** *An updated baseline assessment of ecological corridors and landscape connectivity is made available for the TFTBR* | ***Output 1.1.*** *landscape connectivity effectiveness assessment (baseline)* | ***Activity 1.1.1.*** *Geospatial mapping of existing conservation corridors within the TFTBR* | *4. Contractual services* | Hiring geospatial analysts and GIS specialists, acquiring necessary software and tools, conducting field-level data collection, and covering associated travel and logistics. | $20,000 | $1,400 | 7% |
| | | | *6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts* | | $9,000 | $630 | 3% |
| | | ***Activity 1.1.2.*** *Assessment of ecological corridor's current performance of key functions* | *1. Staff and other personnel* | Costs for hiring landscape ecologist /conservation biologists/ geographers, conducting field surveys and data collection, and analyzing and reporting the data. | $10,000 | $700 | 3% |
| | | | *6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts* | | $14,000 | $980 | 5% |
| | ***Output 1.2.*** *Integration of knowledge gaps and lessons learned into planning* | ***Activity 1.2.1.*** *Review of past ecological landscape restoration projects experiences* | *1. Staff and other personnel* | Costs for consulting and analyzing past projects, accessing relevant data, and compiling insights into a report. | $8,000 | $560 | 3% |
| | | | *6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts* | | $8,000 | $560 | 3% |
| | | ***Activity 1.2.2.*** *Three (3) national technical workshops to identify missing data, tools, and capacity-building needs for inclusive and participatory planning of ecological corridors associated with socio-economic opportunities* | *6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts* | Costs for organizing the events (venue, catering, materials), hiring facilitators and experts. | $15,000 | $1,050 | 5% |
| ***Outcome 2.*** *The TFTBR develops a comprehensive strategy and funding plan to implement landscape connectivity-related GBF Target 2 and 3* | ***Output 2.1.*** *Mapping of landscape connectivity opportunities and scenarios* | ***Activity 2.1.1.*** *Geospatial and socio-economic analysis of ecological corridor design options* | *1. Staff and other personnel* | Costs for hiring analysts (landscape ecology / geographers), collecting and analyzing data, using specialized software, producing decision-making oriented maps | $10,000 | $700 | 3% |
| | | | *4. Contractual services* | | $5,000 | $350 | 2% |
| | | | *6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts* | | $7,000 | $490 | 2% |
| | | ***Activity 2.1.2.*** *Development of landscape connectivity scenarios (feasibility, fit, transparency, and monitoring indicators)* | *1. Staff and other personnel* | Costs for hiring scenario land-use planners/ analysts / social scientists, modelling different connectivity options, and creating monitoring indicators. | $10,000 | $700 | 3% |
| | | | *6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts* | | $10,000 | $700 | 3% |
| | ***Output 2.2.*** *Development of a strategic, transboundary, and multi-level funding plan* | ***Activity 2.2.1.*** *One (1) trinational, inclusive and participatory workshop for identification short- and long-term funding strategies and cooperation opportunities at all governance levels* | *6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts* | Costs for organizing the event (venue, catering, materials), hiring facilitators and experts, participants' travel and accommodation. | $20,000 | $1,400 | 7% |

| Project Activities | | | Expenditure category | Description of expenditure | Estimated amount | PSC | % of Funding |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | ***Activity 2.2.2.*** *One (1) trinational, inclusive and participatory workshop to prioritize scenarios based on multi-criteria framework and alignment with local and regional land-use planning* | *6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts* | Costs for organizing the event (venue, catering, materials), hiring facilitators and experts, participants' travel and accommodation. | $20,000 | $1,400 | 7% |
| ***Outcome 3.*** *Local stakeholders are informed and are included in landscape connectivity decisions (Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA))* | ***Output 3.1.*** *Community engagement and education* | ***Activity 3.1.1.*** *Workshops in local communities to encourage participation and provide training on landscape connectivity.* | *6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts* | Costs for organizing the event (venue, catering, materials), hiring facilitators and experts, participants' travel and accommodation. | $12,000 | $840 | 4% |
| | | ***Activity 3.1.2.*** *Youth Forum to engage younger generations in conservation efforts, including biodiversity monitoring and volunteering.* | *6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts* | Costs for organizing the event (venue, catering, materials), hiring facilitators and experts, participants' travel and accommodation. | $9,000 | $630 | 3% |
| | | ***Activity 3.1.3.*** *Multimedia campaigns using social media, radio, and videos to highlight the benefits of landscape connectivity and raise awareness.* | *4. Contractual services* | Conception, design of audio/video products | $10,000 | $700 | 3% |
| | | ***Activity 3.1.4.*** *Production of educational material/brochure meetings with decision-makers, NGOs, and donors* | *4. Contractual services* | Conception, design and printing of the material | $6,000 | $420 | 2% |
| | ***Output 3.2.*** *Stakeholder collaboration and policy integration* | ***Activity 3.2.1****: Meetings with government representatives, decision-makers, NGOs, and donors* | *6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts* | Costs for covering participants' travel | $6,000 | $420 | 2% |
| | | ***Activity 3.2.2:*** *Production of briefings* | *4. Contractual services* | Conception, design and printing of the material | $6,360 | $445 | 2% |
| **Project management** | | | ***1. Staff and other personnel*** | Staff cost | $52,769 | $3,694 | 18% |
| | | | ***5. Travel*** | Travel | $12,245 | $857 | 4% |
| ***Sub-Total Direct Cost*** | | | | | | $280,374 | |
| ***Programme support cost (7%)*** | | | | | | $19,626 | 7% |
| **Project Total** | | | | | | $300,000.00 | 100% |

**The project will be co-funded by OAPN (Spain), with a $30,000 USD contribution** that will support Activity 1.2.2. Three (3) national technical workshops to identify missing data, tools, and capacity-building needs for inclusive and participatory planning of ecological corridors associated with socio-economic opportunities ($15,000 USD) and Activity 3.1.2: Youth Forum to engage younger generations in conservation efforts, including biodiversity monitoring and volunteering ($15,000 USD).

## 2. Implementation arrangement/Workplan

| Project Activities | | Timeline | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Month 1 | Month 2 | Month 3 | Month 4 | Month 5 | Month 6[11] | Month 7 | Month 8 |
| *Output 1.1. landscape connectivity effectiveness assessment (baseline)* | *Activity1.1.1 Geospatial mapping of existing conservation corridors within the TFTBR* | ■ | ■ | | | | | | |
| | *Activity 1.1.2: Assessment of ecological corridor's current performance of key functions* | | ■ | ■ | | | | | |
| *Output 1.2: Integration of knowledge gaps and lessons learned into planning* | *Activity 1.2.1: Review of past ecological landscape restoration projects experiences* | ■ | ■ | | | | | | |
| | *Activity 1.2.2. Three (3) national technical workshops to identify missing data, tools, and capacity-building needs for inclusive and participatory planning of ecological corridors associated with socio-economic opportunities* | | | ■ | ■ | | | | |
| *Output 2.1: Mapping of landscape connectivity opportunities and scenarios* | *Activity 2.1.1: Geospatial and socio-economic analysis of ecological corridor design options* | | | | ■ | | | | |
| | *Activity 2.1.2: Development of landscape connectivity scenarios (feasibility, fit, transparency, and monitoring indicators)* | | | | ■ | ■ | | | |
| *Output 2.2: Development of a strategic, transboundary, and multi-level funding plan* | *Activity 2.2.1: One (1) trinational, inclusive and participatory workshop for identification short- and long-term funding strategies and cooperation opportunities at all governance levels* | | | | | | ■ | ■ | |
| | *Activity 2.2.2: One (1) trinational, inclusive and participatory workshop to prioritize scenarios based on multi-criteria framework and alignment with local and regional land-use planning* | | | | | | ■ | ■ | |

[11] It is expected that the assignment is completed within six months. If more time is required for exceptional circumstances, please add additional months to the table.

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Output 3.1. Community engagement and education* | *Activity 3.1.1: Workshops in local communities to encourage participation and provide training on landscape connectivity.* | ■ | | | | | | | ■ |
| | *Activity 3.1.2: Youth Forum to engage younger generations in conservation efforts, including biodiversity monitoring and volunteering.* | | | | ■ | | | | |
| | *Activity 3.1.3: Multimedia campaigns using social media, radio, and videos to highlight the benefits of landscape connectivity and raise awareness.* | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ | ■ |
| | *Activity 3.1.4: production of educational material/brochure meetings with decision-makers, NGOs, and donors* | | ■ | | | | | ■ | |
| *Output 3.2 Stakeholder collaboration and policy integration* | *Activity 3.2.1: Meetings with government representatives, decision-makers, NGOs, and donors* | ■ | | ■ | | | ■ | ■ | ■ |
| | *Activity 3.2.2: production of briefings* | | | ■ | | | | | ■ |

3. Risk Management Framework

| Risk category | Description | Probability | Mitigation action |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Contextual risks** Risks related to conflicts, safety and political insecurity jeopardizing the delivery of the project outputs | **Environmental contingency (earthquakes, forest fires and floods)** | *Possible* | *Close contacts and links between national and local authorities and UNESCO Field Offices will ensure to reschedule the work plan* |
| | **Safety** | *Likely* | *Close contacts and links between national and local authorities, UNESCO Field Offices, and UNDSS will ensure to reschedule the work plan* |
| **Institutional risks** Risks related to the beneficiary country's institutions participation in the project activities | **Lack of political commitment may lead to weak institutional and operational engagement** | *Unlikely* | *1. Close contacts and links between national and local authorities and UNESCO Field Offices will contribute to ensure commitment*<br>*2. Contacts with Permanent Delegations at Headquarters* |
| **Project level risks** Risks that my negatively affect the delivery of the project outputs. | **Lack of technical capacity** | *Possible* | *1. Close contacts and links between national and local authorities and UNESCO Field Offices will contribute to ensure adequate expertise can be mobilized*<br>*2. Contacts with Permanent Delegations at Headquarters* |
| | **Weak community and beneficiaries' engagement** | *Possible* | *1.Develop a stakeholder engagement plan that can measure the impact and engagement and ensures ownership of the project for the benefit of the key actors.*<br><br>*2.Organize workshops throughout the project life to exchange experiences and provide support and assistance among beneficiaries of the project.* |