

Government of India

United Nations Development Programme

Biodiversity conservation through community based natural resource management

Brief description

This project seeks to pilot various community based natural resource management initiatives with the objective of ensuring livelihood security and at the same time addressing biodiversity conservation. This project has two major components: field-based activities with a focus on grass roots interventions and national-level activities with a focus on providing lessons from the field-based activities for informing the legislative and policy frameworks of the country. The project seeks to facilitate and enable the process of making the national and state-level policies and programmes more responsive to linkages between sustainable rural livelihoods and biodiversity conservation. It aims to enhance the capacity of communities and institutions of decentralized governance for integrating sustainable biodiversity based livelihoods in participatory micro planning while ensuring equity, transparency and accountability. It seeks to demonstrate gender-equitable and community-driven approaches to poverty elimination through ecologically sustainable livelihoods for strengthening public policy.

SIGNATURE PAGE

Country: India

UNDAF Outcome(s)/Indicator(s): Strengthening decentralization.

Expected Outcome(s)/Indicator (s): Energy and environment for sustainable development.

~~Frameworks and strategies for sustainable development~~

Expected Output(s)/Annual Targets: ~~_____~~

(CP outputs linked to the above CP outcome)

Executing Agency : Ministry of Environment and Forests, Govt. of India

Implementing Agencies Various NGOs, CBOs, PRI and State Govt. Partners

Sub-Programme sites: About 15 sites spread across different Eco regions of India.

Responsible parties: To be identified

Programme Period: 2006-2010
 Programme Component:
 Project Title: Biodiversity conservation through community based natural resource management
 Project ID: _____
 Project Duration: 4 years
 Management Arrangement: NEX

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| Budget | 3,000,000 US dollars |
| General Management Support Fee | Nil |
| Total budget: | 3,000,000 US dollars |
| Allocated resources: | _____ |
| • Government | _____ |
| • Regular | _____ |
| • Other: | _____ |
| ○ Donor | _____ |
| ○ Donor | _____ |
| ○ Donor | _____ |
| • In kind contributions | _____ |
| Unfunded budget: | _____ |

Agreed by
 (Department of Economic Affairs): 
 (M. PRASAD) 9/11/2007

Agreed by
 (Ministry of Environment and Forests): 
 G. BALACHANDRAM, JS, 2nd Jan 07.

Agreed by (UNDP):  12. 1. 2007
 Maxine Olson
 UN Resident Coordinator &
 UNDP Resident Representative

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page No |
|---|---------|
| SECTION I | |
| Elaboration of the narrative | |
| Part I Situation Analysis | 1 |
| I Back Ground | 1 |
| II Country Programme and its thematic focus | 1 |
| III Project Background | 3 |
| IV Indicators of National Priority | 6 |
| V Reasons for UNDP Development Cooperation | 8 |
| Part II Project Strategy | 9 |
| National level activities | 11 |
| Site Based activities | 13 |
| Rationale for multiple site selection | 15 |
| Part III Management arrangements | |
| Prior obligations and pre-requisites | 18 |
| Implementation arrangements – Institutional Mechanisms & monitoring | 19 |
| Fund flow arrangements and Financial Management | 21 |
| Audit | 22 |
| Part IV – Monitoring and Evaluation | 22 |
| Part V - Risk Analysis | 24 |
| Part VI – Legal Context | 25 |
| SECTION II | |
| Results and Resources Framework | 26 |
| Project Budget | 30 |

Section I – Elaboration of the Narrative

Part I – Situation Analysis

I. Background

The Tenth Five-year Plan proposed “a shift in the focus of planning from merely resources to the policy, procedural and institutional changes which are essential for every Indian to realise his or her potential”. This resonates with the overarching goals of the work of the United Nations system in India and the Millennium Development Goals – to work towards the promotion of sustainable human development and the elimination of human poverty and inequalities – as well as the global mandate of United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to establish ‘partnerships to fight poverty’. The Government of India (GoI)-UNDP Country Programme for 2003 to 2007 is aligned with these priorities, and is a reflection of the recognition that international co-operation can play a significant role in supporting GoI in addressing these issues. The Approach Paper for the 11th Plan emphasizes the need to translate the economic growth into actual decline in poverty and amongst the proposed strategies is the formulation of sustainable livelihood opportunities for people living in and around forests and the establishment of strong partnerships with local communities for management of the natural resources.

With an average growth rate in the gross domestic product of 5.8 per cent during the first decade of reforms (1992-2001), India is among the 10 fastest growing economies in the world. India’s steady progress over the last decade towards meeting the goals of human development is reflected in the improvement of the country’s Human Development Index (HDI) from 0.406 in 1975 to 0.571 in 1999. Yet the challenges for human development remain formidable¹. Statistics on critical development indicators such as female literacy, life expectancy at birth, child mortality and incomes show that regional and interstate disparities are increasing². There is growing public consensus on the need for proactive measures to tackle the situation of disadvantaged and vulnerable groups. The pressures on environmental and natural resources and the repercussions of their degradation on low-income livelihoods have become a source of increasing concern. In the context of rapid strides in decentralisation, there is an urgent need to strengthen the capacity of organs of local governance-rural and urban, as also to make public administration more efficient, open and accountable to the public.

II. The Country Programme (2003-07) and its Thematic Focus

The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), which is the document expressing the agreement on programme priorities between the United Nations System in India and the Government of India, has as its main focus the

¹ <http://planningcommission.nic.in/appdraft.pdf>

² <http://www.un.org.in/CCA2.htm#The state of human development>

promotion of gender equality and the strengthening of decentralisation³. These two themes form the underlying thrust of the new Country Programme (2003-2007) and interventions as reflected in the following four inter-linked thematic areas:

1. Promotion of human development and gender equality
2. Capacity-building for decentralization
3. Poverty eradication and sustainable livelihoods
4. Vulnerability reduction and environmental sustainability

Based on specific roles for UNDP development co-operation identified through a comprehensive review and stakeholder consultation process, all projects build on the following qualities:

- A perspective 'from below', of low-income households and marginalised communities - rural or urban, in order to strength their self-help and self-reliance capacities through innovative and catalytic, 'action-research' type of interventions.
- A common platform to bring a diverse set of development partners (Government agencies at the Central, State and district levels; PRIs, Village Councils, Non-Governmental Organizations {NGOs} and Community Based Organisations {CBOs}, and; other UN system and bilateral donor partners) together to devise innovative solutions to development challenges.
- Emphasis on addressing the multi-sectoral dimensions of development programming and when possible, integrating programming at selected geographical locations/districts.
- Comprehensive monitoring and documentation of development innovations from proven success stories and effective pilot initiatives, and dissemination of lessons of value for policy-makers with regard to the design and implementation of much larger public sector schemes.

The new Country Programme reflects a continued commitment to national direction and ownership. Partnerships with government agencies and civil society partners initiated under the first Country Cooperation Framework (CCF- I, 1997-2002) will be vigorously pursued and alliances with the Indian corporate sector and the voluntary sector built to draw on their experience and expertise.

The current country programme ends in 2007 and a new country programme starts from 2008 till 2012. However as the current programme starts only during December 2006 and therefore remainder part of the programme continues under the new country programme.

³ <http://www.un.org.in/UNDAF/undafstatement.pdf>

III. Project Background

a. The Development Context

India became a signatory to the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in June 1992. The Convention came into force on December 29, 1993. So far, 188 countries, including India have ratified the CBD.

Article 6 of the CBD requires parties to prepare National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs). These NBSAPs are to serve as the main instruments for implementation of the CBD at a national level. Article 6b of the CBD specifically mandates the integration of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into various sectors of development and governance.

In 1994, the Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India, (MoEF, GoI) initiated consultations with representatives from various ministries, governmental agencies, NGOs, and academicians for preparing a national action plan for biodiversity conservation. A core group comprising of representatives from various governmental authorities and autonomous institutions under the GoI was constituted for this purpose.

Adopting an extensive consultative process, the MoEF prepared a National Policy and Macro-level Action Strategy on biodiversity, in 1999. This document is a macro-level statement of policies, gaps and strategies needed for conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. A need for a more detailed plan, including state level action planning, was felt. For this purpose, the MoEF accessed funds from the GEF, through the UNDP to start the process of preparing India's NBSAP, reflecting the widely felt need for a consolidated report on the direction that India should take for conservation, and sustainable and equitable use of biodiversity and biological resources, as also of the country's commitments under the CBD.

As part of the NBSAP process a Final Technical Report has now been prepared for possible review by the GoI as a basis for formulating and finalising India's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan. The NBSAP process has attempted to be highly participatory in nature, with complete transparency, and with openness to all points of view and interest groups, reaching out to a large number of village-level organisations and movements, NGOs, academicians and scientists, government officers from various line agencies, the private sector and others who have a stake in biodiversity, its use and conservation.

Strong linkages with past and ongoing processes were built into the NBSAP process, including a review of several national plans and policies relating to natural resources. The MoEF's Macro-Action Plan on Biodiversity was a base document; other documents built on were the National Wildlife Action Plan, the National Forestry Action Plan, National Environment Action Programme, National Conservation

Strategy, Agenda 21 reports, and reports of the Biodiversity Conservation Prioritisation Project.

Increasingly it is being recognised by all stakeholders that for sustainable development to take place and for effective biodiversity conservation, all plans have to be grounded in the two important principles of **Ecological Security** and **Livelihood Security**. This is primarily because in a country like India, the livelihoods of the vast majority of the rural population are directly dependent on natural resources and elements of biodiversity in them. Ecological security is critical because it provides for the survival of tens of thousands of species of plants and animals, as also the basic ecosystem services upon which human food, health, water, and cultural security are dependent. The intense interdependence between livelihood security and ecological security makes this segment of the rural population the primary rights-holders and stakeholders in biodiversity conservation with sustainable use. The women and men of communities living in biodiversity rich areas have acquired rich indigenous ecological knowledge through generations of interaction with local ecosystems, which they have shaped, and which, in turn have shaped their cultures, lifestyles and livelihoods. Community based natural resource management (CBNRM) is hence a very vital approach to enabling both the conservation of biodiversity as well as supporting local livelihoods.

Amongst the major policy and programmatic thrusts that have emerged from a review of on-going and past activities in the field of biodiversity conservation, are the following:

1. The need for a greater understanding of the impacts of human activities on biodiversity, and on the levels of sustainability of ecosystems and species;
2. Re-orientation of conservation and developmental activities, towards a much greater integration of biodiversity conservation along with livelihood security of the communities most critically dependent on natural resources;
3. Strengthening of the protected area network to secure habitat for wildlife and adoption of innovative methods to ensure more effective conservation;
4. Need for focused actions to enable the recovery of populations of threatened species and for restoration of degraded ecosystems;
5. Need to prevent and mitigate human-wildlife conflicts;
6. More secure access of rights holders and primary stakeholders to resources, information, institutions, technologies, and markets, to ensure security of livelihoods based on biological resources;
7. Recognition of the current importance of socio-economically and gender differentiated traditional and community knowledge, and its continued use in ensuring conservation and also in securing biodiversity-based livelihoods of diverse groups of women and men;
8. Revitalisation of relevant traditional institutions of decentralised decision-making, and the nurturing of appropriate new ones, to ensure sustainability in conservation and livelihood uses, with a strong thrust towards equity in the

- relations between women and men and between diverse socio-economic and ethnic groups and sectors of the society;
9. Empowering the women and men of local communities to secure their interests (with respect to fair and equitable access and use of bio-resources) in the face of major change caused by globalisation and other factors;
 10. Planning and management at landscape and waterscape levels, integrating various kinds of land/water uses on a eco/bio-regional scale with a long-term vision, and strengthening inter-departmental and inter-sectoral coordination through institutionalised mechanisms; and
 11. Building capacity across all sectors, to play their respective roles in achieving the above.

b. Issues to be addressed

Biodiversity, both wild and domesticated, provide a range of livelihood support to local communities. Historically, rural women have been playing a key role in selection, conservation and management of domesticated biodiversity in India primarily to meet the household food and nutritional security. However all over the world and also in India, biodiversity is facing serious threats from different human activities. Some of the major threats include: mining in biodiversity rich areas; large development projects; poaching; human-wildlife conflicts; habitat loss and habitat fragmentation due to a variety of human actions; diversion of grazing lands and other common pool resources to other uses; growing demand for fuel and fodder resources; and loss of crop and livestock diversity with the promotion of commercial agriculture and animal husbandry. Despite the multiple schemes for improving the livelihood of the vulnerable sections of the population, there has been no major effort for livelihood improvement, which recognizes and integrates the close linkages that the livelihoods of local communities have with local biodiversity resources. These linkages are facing serious problems due to degradation of ecological systems, loss of traditional resource management practices and certain government policies. Biodiversity conservation efforts have tended to focus on specific species with almost total neglect of the basic issues of livelihood support to the local human population. Inadequate attention has been paid to the indigenous knowledge of communities, particularly of women, depending on biodiversity for livelihood, food, health and nutritional security.

In urban areas, there is inadequate recognition of biodiversity as an important asset in providing ecosystem benefits, including as pollution sinks, flood buffers, pest control and organic waste recycling. Very little is even known about the extent of direct livelihood dependence on biodiversity resources in urban and peri-urban areas, including for fodder, seeds/leaves/fruits, fuel wood, fishing / other food. Some urban areas are in the migratory routes of mobile communities but there is no recognition of the bio-resources and natural areas needed by such mobile communities when they pass through urban areas. With little understanding and almost no recognition of the role biodiversity plays in urban areas, the pressures on natural areas in cities are vast. The communities that have direct dependence on such resources in urban areas

are among the poorest and most vulnerable. On the other hand, slums often establish next to water bodies in cities, and slum rehabilitation programmes may evict slums from such areas but then use the reclaimed land for commercial or high income residential use.

The proposed site-based activities will help in the recognition of these linkages in a biodiversity conservation and livelihood framework, which takes into account the diverse and unique conditions prevailing across the country. This project aims to demonstrate, through the implementation of national-level and site-based activities in select eco-regions, sustainable livelihood options for the local people and at the same time ensure the conservation of biodiversity.

IV. Indicators of National Priority –

The National Environmental Policy, 2006 is intended to be a guide to action: in regulatory reforms, programmes and projects for environmental conservation, and review and enactment of legislation, by agencies of the centre, State and Local Governments. The dominant theme of this policy is that while conservation of environmental resources is necessary to secure livelihood and well being of all, the most secure basis for conservation is to ensure that people dependent on particular resources obtain better livelihood from the fact of conservation than from the degradation of the resources. The policy also seeks to stimulate partnership of different stakeholders i.e. public agencies, local communities, academic and scientific institutions, the investment community and international development partners in harnessing the restricted resources and strength for environmental management.

It may be reiterated that the 10th Plan document of the Planning Commission, GOI, has placed emphasis on the need for biodiversity conservation and also for these efforts to involve the participation of the local communities. Some of the "thrust areas" outlined in the 10th Plan for sustainable development of natural resources include:

- a. Utilisation of wastelands and un-utilised and under-utilised lands
- b. Reclamation of problem soils
- c. Rainwater harvesting and conservation for the development of rain-fed areas
- d. Conservation and utilisation of biological resources
- e. Promotion of organic farming
- f. Development of coastal regions

In the context of natural resources, the 10th Plan emphasizes the need for rainwater harvesting, conservation of all life forms and sustainable utilization of resources while seeking to enhance sustainable livelihood systems in any given area. While referring to global concerns - deteriorating conditions of fragile ecosystems, deforestation, loss of biodiversity and pollution, it stresses that the national development agenda must recognise the necessity of protecting the long-term

ecological security. It is also mentioned that conservation should be assigned a high priority both at the central and state levels and this should be the objective of all development programmes.

Specifically, the 10th Plan:

- Stresses the need to protect the fragile ecosystems such as hills and mountains, wetlands, deserts and shifting cultivation areas in order to sustain the livelihood of a large number of people, apart from the ecological benefits they bring.
- Given the critical importance of agro-biodiversity, it emphasizes the need for agricultural research to focus on conservation and enhancement of the ecological foundations of farming and fisheries (land, water, biodiversity, forests, oceans and the atmosphere) through an integrated natural resources management strategy involving PRIs and NGOs.
- Encourages the states and NGOs to focus on sustainable development of coastal areas, by linking ecological security with livelihood security.
- Recognizes that no strategy to conserve the forest ecosystem would be successful unless the basic needs of the society are met. The future management strategy must, therefore, take into account this compelling need of the community to meet their requirements. Therefore strategies like JFM are to be adopted to protect and regenerate degraded forests.
- Recommends the need for initiatives required for conservation of wild and endangered species and their habitat - control of poaching and illegal trade in wild animal and plant species. There is a need to emphasize on anti-poaching camps, mobile squads, capacity building of frontline staff in intelligence gathering, detection and successful prosecution of cases and providing necessary infrastructure to them.

Further, supporting the 10th plan's perspective, the approach paper for the 11th Plan emphasizes the need to translate the economic growth into actual reduction in poverty formulating sustainable livelihood opportunities for people living in and around forests.

Therefore, there is a need to establish strong partnerships with local communities for management of the natural resources, which this proposal envisages.

The World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) held at Johannesburg in August 2002 recognised the critical role of biodiversity, in overall sustainable development and poverty eradication as well for human well-being and the

livelihood and cultural integrity of people. The Plan of Implementation⁴ acknowledges the unprecedented rates at which biodiversity is being currently lost and states that this trend can be reversed if the local people benefit from the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, in particular in countries of origin of genetic resources. Further, a significant reduction in the current rate of loss of biological diversity will require the provision of new and additional financial and technical resources to developing countries, and will need to include actions at all levels – from international to national to local levels. GoI has made firm commitments at the WSSD to implement these resolutions and achieve the goals set.

Submission of the Final Technical Report of the NBSAP project and the ongoing preparation of the NBSAP have been a part of the GoI's commitment as a signatory to the CBD, and to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources. In addition, The Biological Diversity Act, 2002 provides a legislative framework for such initiatives. The dominant theme of the National Environment Policy (2006) is that while conservation of environmental resources is necessary to secure livelihoods and well being of all, the most secure basis for conservation is to ensure that people dependent on particular resources obtain better livelihoods from the fact of conservation, than from degradation of the resource. The objectives of this policy include the conservation of critical environmental resources, ensuring the livelihood security of the poor and better environmental governance which enables greater levels of equity and decentralization. The policy advocates the establishment of multi-stakeholder partnerships including Public-Community partnerships for better management of the environmental resources. Capacity building of all the stakeholders has been identified as a key requirement.

IV. Reasons for UNDP Development Cooperation

UNDP's Country Cooperation Framework (CCF-II) for the years 2003-2007 has four major thrust areas and this includes a strong focus on eradicating poverty through promoting sustainable livelihoods and reducing vulnerability through sustainable environmental management. The latter includes strengthening community capacities for sustainable natural resource management and strengthening national capacities for influencing global debates on the environment and responding to international environmental agreements. CCF-II notes the particular need to focus on community based natural resource management (CBNRM) within a framework that promotes gender equality and democratic decentralization of governance.

The key focus of this project will be on testing field based approaches linking biodiversity conservation with livelihood security of the poor, particularly of women, mainstreaming them through strengthened democratic and gender equal institutions of local self governance, and initiating or strengthening advocacy processes for appropriate state and national policy changes.

⁴ <http://www.iisd.ca/wssd/portal.html>: Refer Plan of Implementation (Advance unedited text dated September 4 2002)

UNDP is uniquely placed to initiate a dialogue between the various stakeholders on the complex issue of Sustainable Development and CBNRM, and then to play a catalysing role in facilitating the co-operative and collaborative development of the plans and their implementation under this project, due to its strong and long-standing links with both the GoI and various state governments, NGOs across the country and with various community-based organisations working at the grassroots-level. UNDP is also able to provide a platform for a frank and free brainstorming on these issues and to experiment with new ideas and to bring innovation in this field. The ultimate objective of course is to eradicate poverty amongst some of the poorest communities in India and this project will draw attention to the strong link between biodiversity conservation, CBNRM and poverty eradication.

At the same time, close linkages will be forged with other ongoing and proposed natural resource management programmes in which UNDP is involved like "Conservation and sustainable use of the Gulf of Mannar Biosphere Reserve's coastal biodiversity," "National programme on promoting conservation of medicinal plants and traditional knowledge for enhancing health and livelihood security," "Strengthening sustainable livelihoods for biodiversity conservation in Sundarbans," "Social mobilisation around natural resources management for poverty alleviation," and "Vulnerability reduction through community management and control of water in the Marwar region," and those relating to social mobilization around natural resource management and food security issues.

Part II - Project Strategy

This project seeks to pilot various community based natural resource management initiatives with the objective of ensuring livelihood security and at the same time addressing biodiversity conservation. This project has two major components: (a) field-based activities with a focus on grass roots interventions and (b) national-level activities with a focus on providing lessons from the field-based activities for informing the legislative and policy frameworks of the country.

The project objectives are to:

- Facilitate the process of making the national and state-level policies and programmes more responsive to linkages between sustainable rural livelihoods and biodiversity conservation.
- Enhance the capacity of communities and institutions of decentralised governance for integrating sustainable biodiversity based livelihoods in participatory micro planning while ensuring equity, transparency and accountability.

The project also aims to demonstrate gender-equitable and community-driven approaches to poverty elimination through ecologically sustainable livelihoods for strengthening public policy.

This project will support two broad types of activities:

Field based activities: Grassroots efforts in about 15 sites in different eco-regions will be supported to demonstrate the need and feasibility of CBNRM, which combines sustainable rural livelihoods with conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use of bio-resources. Proposals submitted will be reviewed by a committee consisting of MoEF, UNDP and the National Support Organizations (NSO) and officials of the concerned state governments from the appropriate departments (details are given below) and recommended to the National Steering Committee (NSC) for approval. **The MoEF will invite proposals from credible NGOs, CBOs, PRIs, State Forest Departments and conservation organisations for implementing site-level activities and these will be reviewed to ensure that they meet the required overall project objectives and are of the required quality.** The capacities of the site-level partners will be assessed while reviewing the proposals to ensure that they will be able to deliver the outputs as outlined in their proposals. Officials of the respective state governments will be part of this evaluation process. In order to ensure that there is widespread implementation of CBNRM, efforts will be made to bring in new partners doing similar work to facilitate horizontal learning and networking. It is vital to bring in state-level support for this, through relevant state government institutions.

National level activities: In addition to the site level activities, national level activities of this project will be implemented which would provide lessons from the field-based activities for informing the larger legislative and policy frameworks through policy analysis and advocacy. Efforts will also be made to facilitate the sharing of relevant international experiences and best practices to enable learning by all the stakeholders of this project. UNDP and MoEF shall identify agencies to function as National Support Organisation (NSO), to coordinate most of these activities and provide and provide facilitative support to the field based activities and upscale lessons from the field.

Both field based and national level activities will attempt to demonstrate sustainable livelihoods on the ground based on:

- Conservation of wild species and natural ecosystems, linked to the sustainable (consumptive and non-consumptive) use of resources such as non-timber forest produce (NTFP), aquatic produce, and habitats.
- Sustainable agriculture (both settled and rotational) based on conserving agro-biodiversity and enhancing food and nutritional security.
- Sustainable livestock rearing (both nomadic and sedentary) based on conserving domesticated livestock diversity and associated cultural and lifestyle diversity.
- Use of ecologically-sensitive technologies, including the development of urban-focused solutions.

The project aims engage with the following issues and most of these will be common at both local and national levels, with responsibilities shared jointly or individually by site-based partners and national level teams:

- Conservation of species and habitats through responsible community-based management.
- Efforts at ecological restoration including species recovery programmes.
- Issues of gender and equity sensitive security of land tenure and land and resource rights, especially over common pool resources.
- Revitalisation of indigenous knowledge, equitable customary laws and practices and ethical values recognizing socio-economic and gender differences.
- Nurturing existing as well as new self-governing community institutions following principles of participatory decision-making, gender equality and socio-economic equity.
- Empowerment of women and other marginalised groups to secure their resource rights and entitlements, and gain a voice in household and community decision making.
- Facilitating democratisation of existing formal and informal institutional structures and processes such as Joint Forest Management (JFM)/Community Forest Management (CFM) committees, Eco-Development Committees (EDCs), Protected Area (PA) management, producers (including NTFP) co-operatives, Women's Self-Help Groups (WSHGs) and enterprises, community conservation institutions for forests, water, fisheries and wildlife.
- Facilitating the establishment and capacity building of Biodiversity Management Committees including in urban areas.
- Strengthening the participation and effective representation of marginalized communities, particularly the poor and tribal groups, in the formal and informal institutions mentioned above.
- Influencing and strengthening the policy context for planning, laws and administration for CBNRM.
- Mainstreaming and strengthening organic links with, and enhancing the functioning of, PRIs and *Gram Sabhas*, Village Councils, urban local bodies and ward committees building their capacity for participatory micro planning for local natural resource management.
- Facilitating integration between various sectors and coordination in the functioning of line departments.
- Undertaking gender and equity sensitive community based documentation, mapping, monitoring and evaluation.
- Networking, exchange visits, information exchange, both among project partners and beyond for policy advocacy.
- Use of communication and education tools from folk media to remote sensing.
- Planning for social, institutional, financial and ecological sustainability.

National level project activities

The national level project activities will be coordinated and implemented by the NSOs (with the exception of activities (i) and (ii), for which the coordination mechanism will be decided at the planning or a later stage) with the assistance of the Project Management Unit (PMU) set up by MoEF and guidance from the Steering Committee. These will include the following:

i. Support to policy analysis, advocacy and coordination:

Various reviews and studies have identified specific gaps in policies and laws related to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in India and these have also presented possible strategies and action points for addressing these gaps. The gaps identified are based on an analysis of both threats as well as ongoing initiatives in this regard. There is a strong need for building a momentum across various ministries and departments of both GoI and state governments to implement the suggested actions. To achieve these goals requires a reasonably high level of inter-sectoral and inter-departmental coordination, which will attempt at reaching a common understanding on the fundamental issues.

Consultations and workshops will be held to bring in the relevant stakeholders in this field and also to prepare status papers on various aspects of this complex area of work, which will document global best practices and initiatives.

The proposed activities under this section of the project will have national, regional and site based components. The main objective of these activities will be to focus on 'inter-sectoral and inter-departmental coordination and raising the awareness of all stakeholders regarding conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and its links to the livelihoods of local communities and to propose solutions to improve the situation.

Policy advocacy tools include process documentation, multi-stakeholder sensitization workshops, campaigns, and training in policy advocacy strategies.

ii. Stakeholder exchanges and study tours:

The planned stakeholder exchanges and study tours will be important instruments for facilitating cross learning. These will also provide opportunities for multi-stakeholders at community level, site-level partners, NSOs and government officials to visit sites that are important from the community-based biodiversity conservation perspective to strengthen CBNRM process at appropriate levels.

These visits within India will include:

- Community to community exchanges amongst project sites: 3-4 per annum.
- Community visits to other sites where good models of CBNRM exist: 3-4 per annum.

- Other stakeholder (government officials, NGOs, academics) visits to project sites and other sites: 3-4 per annum.

iii. Participatory documentation, communication and advocacy:

This shall be an important component for the entire duration of the project incorporating written as well as visual documentation through filming. CEE will be coordinating this component and will organise both national as well as local level workshops for orienting project partners. Special emphasis shall be given to encouraging groups of community women and men to undertake process documentation on their own initiative.

Audio-visual documentation through participatory filming at selected sites through technical training and capacity building of community groups will be undertaken besides producing thematic advocacy films and films in local languages.

iv. Information and communication systems:

FES will take the lead in coordinating the implementation of this component and it will include the following initiatives;

- a. Use of mapping at each site, and organising training workshops for local people.
- b. Hosting a website for active communication and information exchanges amongst sites, and with other potential partners.
- c. Media outreach in the national and regional press, including by commissioning media fellowships and holding media workshops.
- d. Producing a newsletter (both hard copy and electronic versions) for regular interaction and information exchange.
- e. Development of relevant and simple literature, in local languages for capacity development and advocacy.
- f. A documentation and information unit with books, journals, and databases on CBNRM with a special focus on the North East.
- g. Case study documentation of CBNRM initiatives from across the country.

v. Biodiversity festivals and *yatras*:

Lokayan will be coordinating this activity and this will involve organising;

- a. Local level biodiversity festivals at each or selected sites (one each year).
- b. Participation by project site partners in festivals and *yatras* at other sites.
- c. Regional and national level biodiversity festivals (about 2 or 3 in each region, and 2 or 3 nationally, over the project period).

vi. Capacity building and skill enhancement:

This very important component of the project will involve orientation sessions and workshops on a range of skills, for the site-level partners to ensure that all of them possess the required capacities to not only implement their specific initiatives and monitor its progress but also to feed into the larger network and national and international

processes. This will include training for skill enhancement in undertaking socio-economic and gender analysis, developing and implementing empowerment strategies, NTFP processing and marketing, and nurturing self-governing institutions. FES will take the lead in coordinating the implementation of this component.

vii. Community-based biodiversity conservation network:

A strong and dynamic network of conservationists, local community representatives, state and central government functionaries and other stakeholders will be a vital body for sharing information and discussing issues related to initiatives in the field of biodiversity conservation and its linkages to the livelihood of local communities. This project could facilitate the establishment and expansion of this network and support its activities, by providing a hub for the activities of the network, and facilitating continued information exchange through appropriate means such as a newsletter (which could be dovetailed with the newsletter proposed in Activity **iv.** above). Additionally, forums of diverse user groups for advocacy at state and national levels (such as pastoralists' forum; NTFP collectors' forum) shall be facilitated, or existing ones (such as fisher folk and forest workers' forums) will be supported. Efforts will be made to link this with the UN's knowledge management initiative "Solution Exchange". CEE will take the lead in coordinating the implementation of this component.

viii. Participatory monitoring and evaluation:

ATREE will take the lead in coordinating the implementation of this component and this will involve participatory socio-economic and ecological monitoring and evaluation at each site, based on the system developed by the PMU in consultation with other partners. Orientation material for undertaking Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation sensitive to gender and equity concerns will be developed and national and local orientation workshops will be organised to empower the local people to effectively undertake these tasks. National workshops with project partners on financial and project management will be held every year. Similarly national workshops to share field experiences and national-level experiences and to share lessons learnt will also be conducted annually.

Site-based activities

The thrust of this project is to support plans developed by communities to strengthen natural resource based livelihood opportunities, sustainable management of natural resources and biodiversity conservation. Each implementing partner at the sites will be requested to build in a larger vision, which places the site-based activities within a more general context of biodiversity conservation and sustainable livelihoods while ensuring that gender and equity issues are also adequately addressed. A preliminary list of sites has been identified based on the biogeographic coverage, diversity of issues that can be addressed and also the ability to explore a variety of livelihood options by this project. The sites are listed below:

1. Aravallis - Alwar, Jaipur and Sikar districts, Rajasthan
2. Coastal districts of northern Andhra Pradesh - Srikakulam, Vizianagaram & Visakhapatnam
3. Kachchh district, Gujarat
4. Development of community based ecotourism in in Sikkim
5. Agro-biodiversity, ecological agriculture and food security in Jashpur, Rajnandgaon, Dhamtari and Nagri districts, Chhattisgarh
6. Innovative approaches to land management in areas immediately adjoining the Protected Areas in Chhattisgarh
7. Strengthening women's seed network and document and publish home garden diversity in Uttara Kannada district, Karnataka
8. Community conservation of indigenous breeds of animals in Madurai, Virudhunagar, Dindugal, Karur, Erode, and Theni districts, Tamil Nadu
9. Conservation of Deccani breed of sheep and management of native fodder species using traditional knowledge in Satara district, Maharashtra and Medak district, Andhra Pradesh
10. Ukhrul district, Manipur
11. Urban biodiversity conservation and management in Nagpur or Pune, Maharashtra
12. Participatory biodiversity conservation and improved processing and marketing of NTFP in Chandrapur, Gondia and Nagpur districts of eastern Vidarbha, Maharashtra
13. Biodiversity conservation and sustainable livelihoods in Gadchiroli district, Maharashtra
14. Sustainable models for agriculture, strengthening community-based forestry management and providing stronger and more sustainable links to the market in Chamba, Kangra and Mandi districts of Himachal Pradesh
15. One more site from the north east most probably from Arunachal Pradesh or Meghalaya or Assam.

Rationale for multiple site selection

The site-based activities will help in the recognition of the linkages between human welfare and biodiversity in a biodiversity conservation and livelihood framework, which takes into account the diverse and unique conditions prevailing across the country. Selection of multiple sites in different regional, ecosystem, governance and cultural contexts will help demonstrate the robustness of the project's basic principles in varied contexts. The strong biodiversity-livelihood linkages existing in different regions and ecosystems in India cut across a wide diversity of cultures and lifestyles as well as differing state laws, policies and governance systems. Practical demonstration of effective approaches and strategies relevant for particular livelihood groups will require fine-tuning for the unique conditions prevailing in specific ecosystems and states and this will also reflect in the differing cultural and socio-economic contexts in which people are living across the country.

Some of the broad approaches for the field activities are detailed below. Only a subset of these would be implemented at each site. The aim is to pilot the majority of these approaches through the project using the field sites in a collective manner.

i. Generating and revitalizing sustainable livelihoods

- Enhancing diverse biomass production through natural regeneration and plantations of native species.
- Value addition and marketing of biological materials, including non-timber forest produce, aquatic produce, agro and pastoral produce, and medicinal plants.
- Facilitating alternative non-consumptive livelihoods such as eco-tourism including in urban and peri-urban areas.
- Reviving sustainability of ecosystem-based livelihoods: pasture management and conservation, short-cycle shifting cultivation, inland and coastal fisheries (and other marine resources such as sea weed, marine algae) management, harvest and use of non-timber forest products.
- Developing models for replication: bio-diverse farms, home gardens, and bio-resource-based enterprises including in urban and peri urban areas.
- Supporting community-based water harvesting structures and water conservation zones in urban areas.
- Supporting initiatives to conserve traditional seeds.
- Supporting traditional health practices by linking organisations with the medicinal plants project.
- Revitalizing biodiversity based food security systems (both collected and cultivated foods) with a focus on women.
- Developing new livelihood options based on priority access to local resources (like fishery, NTFPs & medicinal plants).
- Supporting seed exchange projects.
- Supporting organisations involved with indigenous livestock issues.
- Revitalization of terrace cultivation for livelihood security and biodiversity conservation together with revitalization of traditional institutions.
- Integrating ecology and promoting income generation approach in participatory *panchayat* microplanning for mainstreaming livelihoods and conservation in decentralised governance.
- Mainstreaming gender and equity sensitive community forest management in the functioning of *Van Panchayats* and Joint Forest Management.
- Supporting agro biodiversity Resource Cells.
- Replicating successful community initiatives for regenerating forests and conserving wildlife and water resources of the area.
- Supporting community management of fodder by developing grasslands in the villages.
- Promoting pastoral livelihoods and domesticated animal diversity through support for training programmes, documentation of indigenous knowledge on animal breeding and ethno veterinary practices.

- Improving livestock healthcare and disease management including *in situ* conservation of local breeds.
- Revitalizing and supporting the rich socio-cultural practices of pastoral communities.
- Understanding and strengthening the linkages between river eco-systems, biodiversity and livelihoods.
- Understanding and revitalizing sacred groves, and the relationship between biodiversity, livelihood and spirituality.

ii. Capacity building, communication, and public outreach

- Orientation and skill development for the above activities.
- Skill development for socio-economic and gender analysis, empowerment of women and other under-privileged groups for playing a more pro-active role in decision making and securing their entitlements, transparent and accountable institutional and financial management, participatory monitoring and evaluation, process documentation, and policy analysis and advocacy.
- Integrating ecological management by incorporating income generation and sustainable livelihoods in participatory microplanning by PRIs and *Gram Sabhas* for mainstreaming democratic CBNRM into larger structures of governance.
- Development and use of various media tools, from folk to electronic.
- Media outreach and communication.
- Developing biodiversity databases and information centres, at local community, district, state, and national levels.

iii. Networking and advocacy

- Exchange visits amongst project sites, and multi-stakeholder group exposure visits to other sites in India.
- Information exchange amongst project partners and others.
- Advocacy support, including through existing or new national forums.
- Multi-stakeholder dialogue and conflict resolution.
- Biodiversity festivals and *yatras*.
- Seed exchange.

iv. Research, analysis, documentation, and monitoring

- Gendered baseline data generation on socio-economic, ecological, institutional and economic status.
- Thematic documentation and analysis (e.g., biodiversity and its linkages with gender, health, culture, and livelihoods).
- Participatory monitoring and evaluation.
- Policy analysis.
- Process and case study documentation, written and visual.
- Participatory mapping, including use of Geographical Information System (GIS).

Site-specific studies will be undertaken to enable the following and to create strong baselines:

- Understanding the dependence of local communities and particularly of poor women and marginalised communities on natural resources and biodiversity for livelihoods.
- Assessing the natural resource base and biodiversity from ecological as well as livelihood perspective.
- Understanding the livelihood asset base (natural, social, financial, physical and human) base of local communities.
- Identifying the threats to the natural resource base, biodiversity and livelihoods and studying the internal and external factors as well as differential impact on the poor and vulnerable groups, including women.
- Identifying a range of livelihood and biodiversity conservation interventions, with a strong focus on sustainable utilisation of resources and sensitivity to gender and equity concerns.

v. Institutional development

- Creating and strengthening user groups and other CBNRM institutions.
- Developing equitable frameworks for partnerships between communities and the government for managing common property resources based on redistribution of rights and responsibilities.
- Mainstreaming CBNRM initiatives through developing mutually supportive and organic linkages with institutions of local self-government (*uup gram sabhas/gram sabhas/PRI*s at all three levels, and at the ward committee and the urban local body level).
- Highlighting the values of biodiversity in urban areas and developing planning and management systems for conservation.

Part III – Management Arrangements

Prior Obligations and Pre-requisites

- The MoEF, GoI, will closely monitor the implementation of the project and assist in linking this project with other externally and centrally sponsored projects related to biodiversity conservation in the related Ministries and Departments.
- The implementing partners (NSOs & site-level agencies) will ensure the effective implementation of the project.
- The respective state governments will ensure the participation of officials from the relevant departments in the facilitation, management and monitoring of the project activities.
- The National Steering Committee and the Project Management Unit (PMU) will implement the project with full autonomy. The PMU will

work with the NSOs and facilitate project implementation. It will also establish in consultation with partners a participatory monitoring and evaluation system and streamline procedures to ensure timely release of funds to partner organizations.

- UNDP assistance will be provided subject to the satisfactory fulfillment of the above pre-requisites. If anticipated fulfillment of one or more pre-requisites fails to materialize, UNDP may, at its discretion, either suspend or terminate its assistance.
- The National Steering Committee will designate a National Project Director who will be responsible to GoI and UNDP for the implementation of the project.
- The capacities of all site-level partners will be verified by field visits and technical assistance will be provided to develop and fine tune their proposals. MoEF and UNDP will take the lead in this effort with the technical assistance from the NSOs and assistance from officials of the concerned state governments.

Implementation Arrangements – Institutional Mechanisms & Monitoring

Government Co-ordinating Agency: The Department of Economic Affairs (DEA) in the Ministry of Finance, the Government aid co-ordinating agency will be responsible for the overall co-ordination of the Country Programme activities. In order to guide and support the Implementing Agencies towards meeting the Country Programme goals, DEA will participate in the National Steering Committee. DEA will also catalyse consultations on broader development co-operation issues emerging out of different programmes supported by UNDP as well as programmes assisted by other agencies. As a part of its overall mandate of resource mobilisation, DEA in collaboration with the concerned government departments and UNDP will also assist in raising additional resources to support project objectives.

Project Executive: In line with the National Execution Guidelines (July 1998) issued by the DEA, Ministry of Finance and the UNDP corporate procedures as outlined in its RMG (May 2006), this project will be executed nationally. The MoEF, GoI will be the Executing Agency for the project, and will be responsible for its overall management including achievement of planned results and for the use of UNDP funds. The main institutional mechanisms for guiding the Project at this level would be the National Steering Committee chaired by the appropriate level official from MoEF as detailed below. The MoEF will facilitate the required level of inter-sectoral coordination with other relevant ministries and departments of GoI and also ensuring the required level of participation from the concerned state governments in which the project is to be implemented. The concerned Joint Secretary, MoEF, will be the National Project Director (NPD). The NPD will coordinate project execution on behalf of GoI and ensure its proper implementation.

Implementation Arrangements: The implementation arrangements for the Project under CCF-II are as follows:

A **National Steering Committee (NSC)**, representing different disciplines relevant to the project from within and outside government, the national partners (NSOs), DEA, UNDP, and chaired by the appropriate level official from MoEF, would be responsible for overseeing project planning, approving proposals, monitoring progress and reporting. The NSC will meet at least twice a year. It will approve the annual work plans, annual budgets and review the achievement of planned targets. At the request of the MoEF, the budgets approved by the NSC will directly be released by the UNDP to the NSOs.

A **Project Management Unit (PMU)** will be established in New Delhi and this PMU will also administer two other CCF-II projects; "National programme on promoting conservation of medicinal plants and traditional knowledge for enhancing health and livelihood security" and "Strengthening sustainable livelihoods for biodiversity conservation in Sundarbans". A dedicated team of 2 or 3 professionals with good understanding and experience of dealing with biodiversity and livelihoods inter-relationships, headed by a committed technical and policy person who will be the **Project Coordinator**. The Project Coordinator will be responsible for the project's technical and financial management and will work very closely with the NSOs, MoEF and UNDP. The PMU will also review the progress of the project through participatory mechanisms. The PMU will be responsible for the day-to-day management of the project activities.

MoUs defining the roles and responsibilities, reporting structure and related details, will be signed between the MoEF (the Executing Agency) and the **NSOs**. Each NSO will sign MoUs with a subset of the site-level implementing agencies and this will be decided on the basis of geographical and thematic convergence. Funds to the site-level agencies will flow through the NSOs. The NSOs will provide technical advice and capacity development inputs as a collective by pooling their resources to all the site-level partners. Field visits and desk reviews will be undertaken to assess the capacities of the site-level partners and the feasibility of their proposals prior to approval of the proposals and signing of the MoU.

At the request of the Executing Agency (MoEF), UNDP will also provide support for implementing specific activities under the project. These activities are termed as **UNDP Country Office support services**. These activities could include direct payment to implementing partners at the written request of GoI.

Implementing agencies: The role of Implementing Agencies, including the NSOs and site-level partners, will be: a) to take responsibility for the effective implementation of specific project components being implemented by them, b) to receive and utilise funds as per approved budgets c) to cooperate with the NSC and PMU in implementing: i) research programmes, ii) policy studies, iii) training programmes, iv) communication and advocacy programmes, v) development of databases and websites, and vi) the participatory monitoring and evaluation exercises.

The site-level agencies are expected to constitute a site-level project management committee of 5-7 members who will represent the key stakeholders of the project including state government officials from the appropriate departments. This committee is expected to play a role, at the site-level similar to that of the NSC and PMU, at the GoI level. NSOs are required to submit brief quarterly progress reports and detailed annual reports capturing the progress of implementation against the approved work plan, key highlights of project implementation and successes and failures.

UNDP Collaboration: UNDP will support the management of this project and towards this participate in various project management and advisory committees. UNDP will support drawing and up scaling of development lessons. UNDP will provide support (termed as UNDP Country Office support services) for sub-contracting and for monitoring and evaluation. Country Office support may be provided in other areas also as agreed between UNDP and the Executing Agency. Such support activities will be carried out in accordance with UNDP rules and regulations and in consultation with GoI.

Project Assurance: UNDP's primary responsibility under this partnership will be to support the Project Assurance function which provides an independent feedback (through periodic monitoring, assessment and evaluation) on how appropriate project milestones are managed and completed.

Fund Flow Arrangements and Financial Management

As per the GoI-NEX Guidelines, the Union Ministry of Environment and Forests, the Executing Agency, shall make suitable provision for UNDP funds in its annual budget. At the request of the Executing Agency, UNDP will make direct payments to the NSOs and other implementing partners and suitable accounting entry will be made in the budget of the Ministry and the Controller of Aid, Accounts and Audit to reflect receipt of such funds by GoI. UNDP will release funds only on receipt of written intimation from the MoEF after the approval of the work plans and budgets by the NSC.

The Implementing Agencies shall maintain a separate bank account in order to receive and disburse UNDP funds. Separate books of accounts on cash basis of accounting shall also be maintained in order to ensure accurate reporting of expenditure and providing a clear audit trail. In all cases, fund transfers will be on the basis of MoUs/contracts between the MoEF and the NSOs.

Requests for release of funds by UNDP will be made by the PMU through the MoEF as per the UNDP Financial Report Format. The Financial Report will contain, in addition to the information on funds required, information on annual budget, year-to-year expenditure and available budget.

Each NSO will send an annual work plan and budget to the PMU which will seek approval at the NSC meeting. Upon receiving written authorization from the MoEF,

UNDP will release funds in advance every quarter, based on the approved annual work-plan. The NSOs will report disbursement and expenditure to the PMU on a quarterly basis, in the Financial Report Format referred to earlier which will then be consolidated by the PMU and submitted to UNDP through MoEF.

NSOs will need to meet regularly (may be every quarter) to share information, review progress and also to plan for the future. These meetings are best held regionally so that it also provides an opportunity for the site-level partners in the specific region to interact with all the NSOs.

Audit

As per the GoI-NEX Guidelines, the project shall be subject to audit in accordance with UNDP procedures. In order to meet the UNDP requirement of covering 90% of the annual NEX expenditure under audit, an annual audit plan will be drawn up in consultation with DEA. The project shall be informed of the audit requirements by January of the following year. The audit covering annual calendar-year expenditure will focus on the following parameters: (a) financial accounting, documenting and reporting; (b) monitoring, evaluation and reporting; (c) use and control of non-expendable equipment; and (d) UNDP Country Office support.

The auditor shall be appointed in consultation with DEA. In line with the UN Audit Board requirements for submitting the final audit reports by 30th April, the auditors during February/March will carry out field visits. Detailed instructions on audit will be circulated by UNDP separately.

Part IV – Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation of the project results shall be an on-going exercise through regular reporting of the project progress. The results and resource framework developed will form the basis for M&E. M&E will be embedded in the project implementation methodology, so as to enable robust sharing of lessons learnt and incorporation of mid-course corrections and/or revisions. The primary responsibility of the M&E will be that of the PMU, supported by the NSOs and the site-level partners.

The NSC will give an emphasis to reviewing the activities of the project in a more holistic manner i.e., for its objectives, achievement of outputs as per the success indicators mentioned in the proposal document and will also ensure a closer examination of substantive issues of the project.

In general, UNDP is trying to practice outcome evaluation. This entails assessment of a cluster of projects instead of a single project in order to evaluate relevance, performance and success in the broader context of agreed outcomes. The project will be guided by this approach in their decisions regarding the evaluation of its activities and impact.

The project's monitoring and evaluation strategy should be built around the principles of mutual learning and stakeholder participation. Evaluations will be interpreted as "shared reflections" and the process of monitoring would also be of "revising" strategies in the light of freshly acquired knowledge through group reflection. These "evaluations" will look at both quantitative and qualitative dimensions and will adopt gender-sensitive and participatory tools and processes.

A baseline survey to determine the conservation status of biodiversity and the prevailing threats and the bio-resources at each site will be carried out. The status of biodiversity and bio-resources will be monitored through the project to determine the impacts of the interventions.

A gendered baseline survey will be carried out before initiating project activities at each site. Information on basic indicators of human development and in particular women's development, including population, education, health status, work participation and issues and problems specific to the area will be collected. Data from secondary sources such as the Census 2001, National Sample Surveys and previous research studies, will be supplemented with data from interviews, field surveys, focussed group discussions and household sample surveys. Data on women's situation and that of other under-privileged sections of the society will be collected from local groups and NGOs working in the area.

Systems for routine monitoring will be developed and implemented both at the national-level as well as at each site. This will enable reviewing the project in a holistic manner i.e., for its objectives, achievement of outputs as per the success indicators and for a closer examination of substantive issues. In terms of processes, the project will encourage the use of participatory processes of monitoring and learning such as peer reviews, self-evaluation, social and development audit, event track, and group feedback.

A mid-term review of the project will be undertaken to track progress on mainstreaming gender, equity and decentralisation issues and also overall progress of the project and suggest mid-course corrections.

A gender impact assessment will be carried out on completion of the project. The following broad parameters will be reviewed:

- Women's participation in planning and implementing project activities.
- Direct benefits accruing to women from the project, and resulting changes in women's material condition.
- Impact of the project on women's access to resources, access to information, autonomy within the family, ability to access public services, ability to participate in social/economic/political decision-making and vulnerability to violence.

Appropriate project-specific indicators will be evolved for measuring changes in women's status and situation along the above parameters.

An independent agency/consultant will be engaged for the final evaluation of this project.

Part V – Risk analysis

| Risk | Risk Rating (high/medium/low) | Risk Minimisation Measures |
|--|----------------------------------|---|
| ■ Risk of outputs failing to translate into outcomes (e.g. complex policy environment, local ownership) | | |
| MoEF (GoI) and partner State Governments are unable to fulfil its counterpart obligations. | Low | |
| Inter-sectoral coordination (between different departments) is weak which undermines the effort to conserve all kinds of biodiversity. | Medium | Regular meetings spearheaded by the MoEF and supported by regular feedback from states on difficulties encountered. |
| GoI and partner state governments are unable to introduce policy changes that are conducive for community-driven and gender equitable sustainable rural livelihoods and biodiversity conservation. | Medium | Regular meetings with the government to share lessons from the project which have policy implications. Documentation and dissemination tools applied regularly to build awareness and public opinion in favour of conservation. |
| ■ Risk of outputs not being produced (e.g. constraints in partnership strategy, counterpart support, complex management arrangement) | | |
| Project Management Unit and the NGO partners are not effective in managing the Project's multidimensional thrust areas. | Low | PMU and NGO partners strengthened to respond to Project needs. |
| The partnerships and networks essential for the implementation of this project do not gather enough momentum due to low levels of multi-stakeholder consultation and participation. | Medium | Communication and advocacy tools used effectively to share lessons from the field with a range of stakeholders and initiating wider debate on critical issues. |

| | | |
|--|--------|--|
| Gender dimensions are not adequately addressed in the field sites. | Medium | Capacity of PMU and partners strengthened to engender the planning of site-based activities, screening of proposals and the monitoring and review systems. |
|--|--------|--|

Part VI – Legal Context

1. This project document shall be the instrument envisaged in the Supplemental Provisions to be the Project Document, attached hereto.
2. The following types of revisions may be made to this document with the signature of the UNDP Resident Representative only, provided he or she is assured that the other signatories of the project document have no objections to the proposed changes.
 - a. Revisions which do not involve significant changes in the immediate objectives, outputs of activities of the project but are caused by the re-arrangements of inputs already agreed to or by cost increases due to inflation; and
 - b. Mandatory annual revisions, which replace the delivery of, agreed project inputs or increased experts or other costs due to inflation.
 - c. The Implementing Agency shall, at all times, ensure compliance with the NEX Guidelines annexed hereto and also comply with the requirements contained in the UNDP Procedures for National Execution (April 1998) to the extent they do not conflict with the said NEX Guidelines or extant rules and provisions of GoI.

Section II - Results and Resources Framework

PROJECT RESULTS AND RESOURCES FRAMEWORK

Outcome 1: National and state-level policies and programmes made more responsive to linkages between community driven and gender-equitable sustainable natural resource based livelihoods and biodiversity conservation.

Outcome 2: Enhanced capacity of communities and institutions of decentralized governance for integrating sustainable biodiversity based livelihoods and biodiversity conservation in participatory microplanning, ensuring equity, transparency and accountability.

Applicable MYFF Service Line: 3.1 Frameworks and strategies for sustainable development.

Partnership Strategy: Four NSOs have been selected and several site-level partners have also been identified. MoEF and UNDP will work with the NSOs and the State Governments to establish strong partnerships with site-level NGOs and local communities to implement this project.

Project title and ID (ATLAS Award ID):

| Intended Outputs | Output Targets for (years) | Indicative Activities | Responsible parties | Inputs |
|--|----------------------------|--|---|--|
| 1.1 Concepts, methods and tools for integrating sustainable natural resource based livelihoods with gender equality concerns into biodiversity conservation and development strategies, evolved. | Year 1 | 1.1 Commission research to compile and analyse the existing and emerging concepts, tools and methods for integrating biodiversity conservation with sustainable natural resource based livelihoods, with specific focus on gender and equity concerns, across biogeographic zones to evolve the most suitable tools and methods. | The National Support Organisations (NSOs) will implement most of the national level activities with assistance from PMU and guidance from Steering Committee, | Consultant services, need assessments, appropriate media inputs, institutional capacity building, exchange visits, capacity building of stakeholders and networking. |
| 1.2 Lessons from site based activities and policy analysis disseminated for programme formulation and policy reformulation. | Years 2 to 4 | 1.2 Identify specific areas for public awareness and policy dialogue in consultation with key stakeholders and | | |
| 1.3 Local, sub-national and national networks promoting community- | Years 2 and 3 | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| <p>based biodiversity conservation established.</p> <p>1.4 Institutional and technical issues that impinge on the integration of poverty and gender concerns into implementation of CBD explored.</p> | <p>Years 2 and 3</p> | <p>on emerging challenges locally, nationally and globally.</p> <p>1.3 Support institutional arrangements and processes at the levels of local communities, state and national to promote greater sharing of knowledge and experience.</p> <p>1.4 Support documentation of good practices for implementation as well as policy advocacy.</p> <p>1.5 Support consultation, experience sharing workshops and media events for generating public awareness among stakeholders at all levels.</p> <p>1.6 Support existing or new fora for multi-stakeholder consultation, conflict resolution and policy dialogue.</p> | <p>and coordinate the site level activities with the site level partners.</p> <p>MoEF, GoI is the Executing Agency for the project.</p> <p>UNDP's main role is in monitoring project implementation to ensure that the activities and outputs meet the prescribed quality standards.</p> | |
| <p>2.1 Establishment of partnerships for community-based, gender-equitable approaches to pilot ecologically secure sustainable livelihoods which also address biodiversity conservation in 15 sites across various biogeographic zones.</p> <p>2.2 Capacity of locally elected</p> | <p>Year 1</p> <p>Years 1 to 3</p> | <p>2.1 Field assessments of all site-level partners to assess their capacities and to fine tune their proposals.</p> <p>2.2 Support skill development of staff of project partners for socio-economic and gender analysis and empowerment of women and other underprivileged groups.</p> | <p>Four National Support Organisations (NSOs); will coordinate the site level activities with the site level partners.</p> | <p>Consultant services, technical assessments, consultations, need assessments, exchange visits, capacity building of stakeholders and fellowships.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| <p>bodies (rural/urban), civil society organisations and communities strengthened to address biodiversity concerns in the generation of sustainable natural resource based livelihoods and natural resource management.</p> <p>2.3 Equitable frameworks for community/government partnerships for managing common property resources based on equitable sharing of rights and responsibilities demonstrated.</p> <p>2.4 Development and demonstration of initiatives to mainstream CBNRM through mutually supportive and organic linkages with institutions of local self-government (<i>uup gram sabhas/gram sabhas/PRI</i>s at all three levels).</p> <p>2.5 Register of innovations on poverty eradication through CBNRM based sustainable livelihood approaches evolved and disseminated.</p> | <p>Years 1 & 2</p> <p>Years 1 to 4</p> <p>Years 1 to 4</p> | <p>2.3 Commission site-specific assessments to understand the dependence of local communities on natural resources and biodiversity for livelihoods and identify the threats to the natural resource base, biodiversity and their livelihoods.</p> <p>2.4 Identify in consultation with local communities a range of livelihood and biodiversity conservation interventions, with a strong focus on enhancing access to biomass and natural resources, ecosystem services, sustainable utilisation of resources and sensitivity to gender and equity concerns.</p> <p>2.5 Support capacity building of local communities to identify, plan, implement and monitor the proposed interventions.</p> <p>2.6 Support processes at different levels for information exchange, transparent and accountable institutional and financial management, participatory monitoring and evaluation, process documentation, and policy analysis and advocacy.</p> <p>2.7 Support training of <i>PRIs, Gram Sabhas</i> and Village Councils for integrating ecological management by incorporating income generation and</p> | <p>Site level partners will take the lead in implementing the activities at each of the sites.</p> <p>MoEF, GoI is the Executing Agency for the project.</p> <p>UNDP's main role is in monitoring project implementation to ensure that the activities and outputs meet the prescribed quality standards. UNDP along with MoEF will conduct the mid-term and final project evaluations.</p> | |
|---|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>sustainable livelihoods in participatory microplanning.</p> <p>2.8 Support development of biodiversity databases, information centres and cultural events (such as <i>yatras</i>, fairs) at local community, district, state, and national levels.</p> <p>2.9 Facilitate exchange visits amongst project sites, and multi-stakeholder group exposure visits to other sites in India, amongst project partners and others.</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| Project budget in US\$ | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| S.No. | Particulars | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Total |
| 1 | National Coordination (PMU) | | | | | |
| 1.1 | Salaries | 8105 | 8916 | 9807 | 10788 | 37616 |
| 1.2 | Travel | 3000 | 3500 | 3500 | 3000 | 13000 |
| 1.3 | Office Costs | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 8000 |
| 1.4 | Contingencies | 2000 | 2000 | 2500 | 2500 | 9000 |
| | <i>Sub-total</i> | <i>15105</i> | <i>16416</i> | <i>17807</i> | <i>18288</i> | <i>67616</i> |
| 2 | UNDP monitoring | | | | | |
| 2.1 | Mid-term evaluation | | 20000 | | | 20000 |
| 2.2 | Final evaluation | | | | 30000 | 30000 |
| 2.3 | Duty travel | 15000 | 15000 | 10000 | 5000 | 45000 |
| 2.4 | Miscellaneous | 2000 | 2000 | 2500 | 2500 | 9000 |
| | <i>Sub-total</i> | <i>17000</i> | <i>37000</i> | <i>12500</i> | <i>37500</i> | <i>104000</i> |
| 3 | Coordinated project implementation and implementation of activities under Outcome 1 | 200000 | 275000 | 275000 | 78384 | 828384 |
| 4 | Implementation of activities under Outcome 2 by site-level partners with technical support from NSOs | 600000 | 800000 | 500000 | 100000 | 2000000 |
| | Total | | | | | 3000000 |