

**United Nations Development Programme  
Country: INDIA 2015 Annual Work Plan**

**Project Title:** Mainstreaming Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants Diversity in Three Indian States

**Implementing Partner:** Ministry of Environment and Forests

**UNDP Strategic Plan Outcome:** Outcome 2: Stronger Democratic Governance to meet citizen expectations

**UNDP Strategic Plan Output(s):** Output 2.5: Conservation, sustainable use, access and benefit share of natural resources biodiversity and ecosystem

**UNDAF/CPD Outcome:** Government, industry and other relevant stakeholders actively promote environmental sustainability and enhanced resilience of communities in the face of challenges of climate change, disaster risk and natural resource depletion.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

**A. State the specific development challenge or gap that this AWP is addressing.**

India's natural forest are home to about 8000 medicinal plants that form the primary source of health care for 60 – 80% of the country's population, particularly the rural poor. However, efforts aimed at equitable use of these resources are largely ineffective and harvesting remains uncontrolled. The Forest Policies of India do not adequately address conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants, especially given the fact that most of the rural poor depend on the medicinal plant resources for their health and livelihood needs. The activities in this AWP aim to mainstream the long term conservation, sustainable and equitable use of India's medicinal plant diversity into forest management policy and practice at the national, state and local level in three Indian states: Arunachal Pradesh in North-East India, Chhattisgarh in Central India and Uttaranchal in North-west India. Outcome 1 and 2 of the project, therefore, focus on revision of forest policies in favour of medicinal plants, enhanced capacity of stakeholders through introduction of course curriculum in the national and state forest academy, etc.

**B. Select one or more of the below strategies for addressing the above mentioned challenge/gap and describe in the context of this AWP:**

- ✓ Changes in attitudes and access to decision making through awareness raising, brokering, convening
- ✓ Changes in policies, plans, budgets and legislation through support to national assessment, planning, budgeting, policy making
- ✓ Changes in the lives of individuals and communities through implementation for inclusive development

**C. List the possible improvements in the capacities of institutions, individuals and systems that will occur as a result of this AWP.**

Not applicable due to project closure

**D. List the gender issues in this AWP and specific ways in which they will be addressed.**

Not applicable due to project closure

**E. List the South-South cooperation opportunities in this AWP and specific ways in which they will be addressed.**

Not applicable due to project closure

Programme Period:	2013-2017
Key Result Area (Strategic Plan):	Environment & Sustainable Development
Atlas Project ID:	00042968
Atlas Output ID:	00049929
Start date:	18 Mar 2008
End Date:	30 June 2015
PAC Meeting Date:	09 Jul 2007
Implementation modality:	NIM

2015 AWP budget: **USD 182,500**

- Regular: NIL
- Donor (GEF): USD 182,500
- Government: NIL
- In-kind Contribution (GEF): NIL

Government Contributions: USD 6,479,121 for the total project period not through UNDP budget

**PROJECT BUDGET AND EXPENDITURE so far: \*provision figures**

Project Budget	Exp 2008	Exp 2009	Exp 2010	Exp 2011	Exp 2012	Exp 2013	Budget 2014	Budget 2015
4,935,000	14,157	570,288	313,972	652,314	13,43,714	990,375	867,680	182,500

Agreed by (Implementing Partner): Mr Hem Pande, Additional Secretary, MoEFCC

Agreed by UNDP: Mr. Jaco Cilliers, Country Director, UNDP, India.




**(हेम पाण्डे)  
(HEM PANDE)**  
अपर सचिव/Additional Secretary  
पर्यावरण वन एवं जलवायु परिवर्तन मंत्रालय  
Min. of Environment Forests & Climate Change  
भारत सरकार, नई दिल्ली  
Govt. of India, New Delhi

**Jaco Cilliers  
Country Director**

**I. ANNUAL WORK PLAN**

**Year: 2015**

**Key area of UNDP strategic Plan:**

**UNDAF/CPD Outcome:** Government, industry and other relevant stakeholders actively promote environmental sustainability and enhanced resilience of communities in the face of challenges of climate change, disaster risk and natural resource depletion.

**Relevant UNDP Strategic Plan result:** Environment and sustainable development; crisis prevention and recovery

**CPAP OUTCOME Indicators:**

Number of government's schemes and missions which incorporate climate resilience measures.

**CONTRIBUTING TO CPAP OUTPUT:**

Sustainable management of biodiversity and land resources is enhanced

**CONTRIBUTING TO CPAP 5 year target:**

Making management of natural resources more sustainable with the use of community-based approaches

Annual OUTPUTS	PLANNED ACTIVITIES	Month of completion	RESPO NSIBL E PARTY	PLANNED BUDGET	
				Funding Source	Budget Description Amount <sup>1</sup>
<b>OUTCOME 1: An Enabling Environment for Mainstreaming the Conservation and Sustainable Use of MAPs into inter-sectoral Management Policies and Practices at the National Level.</b>					
<b>OUTCOME INDICATORS:</b>					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. National forest policy revised to favour sustainable use &amp; conservation of MAPs</li> <li>2. Strengthened capacity within NMPB to fulfil their mandate.</li> <li>3. Greater inter-sectoral cooperation at national level to achieve sustainable use and conservation of MAPs.</li> </ol>					

**OUTCOME BASELINE:**

1. No specific focuses on MAPs in national forest policy e.g. JFM guidelines do not address sustainable use or conservation of MAPs.
2. Limited technical and institutional capacity to fulfil key parts of its mandate such as assessing supply of MAPs, actively managing supply and demand and particularly for inter-sectoral national coordination.
3. No formal inter-sectoral cooperation in relation to MAPs to date. However, State and Central agencies involved with medicinal plants issues have been identified and committed themselves to provide their expertise for coordinating project components.

**OUTCOME TARGETS:**

1. Revised national JFM guidelines with stronger focus on conservation of MAPs.
2. Capacity needs assessment of NMPB in inception phase. Targeted capacity development of key staff based on results of capacity assessment in Yrs 2 & 3. Mechanisms for assessing supply and demand of MAPs developed and adopted by NMPB by Yr 5. Mechanisms for inter-sectoral coordination developed and functioning effectively by Yr 3.
3. No formal inter-sectoral cooperation in relation to MAPs to date. However, State and Central agencies involved with medicinal plants issues have been identified and committed themselves to provide their expertise for coordinating project components

<p><b>Output 1.1:</b> A national strategy that addresses conservation, cultivation and the sustainable use of medicinal plants</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> No such strategy exists.</p> <p><b>Indicators:</b>A comprehensive national strategy on MAPs</p> <p><b>Targets:</b> A holistic national strategy paper which addresses conservation, cultivation, sustainable use and trade of MAPs and protection of associated Traditional knowledge developed by Yr 3 and issued in the form of a policy guideline to the states by GoI by Yr 5.</p>	<p>Joint meeting between MoEFCC, MoAYUSH and FRLHT</p>	<p>Mar 2015</p>	<p>IAIM, FRLHT</p>	<p>GEF Funds</p>	<p>72100- Contractual services (FRLHT)– US \$ 8,200</p>	<p>UNDP - 3,200 FRLHT- 5,000</p>	
	<p>Submission of final draft</p> <p>Cabinet Note prepared by MoAYUSH</p>	<p>Apr 2015 Jun 2015</p>					
<b>OUTPUT TOTAL US \$</b>						<b>8,200</b>	<b>8,200</b>

**NOTES:**

GEF Total Budget as per Project Document- USD 82958  
 Co – Finance Budget as per Project Document – USD 67,449.  
 Total Contract (Rs.) – 32,00,000  
 Amount released so far (Rs.) 30,08,000/-

<p><b>Output 1.2:</b> Revised national JFM guidelines with a stronger focus on conservation &amp; sustainable use of MAPs.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> Current JFM guidelines do not address sustainable use or conservation of MAPs.</p> <p><b>Indicators:</b> The revised national guidelines for JFM</p> <p><b>Targets:</b> Revised national JFM guidelines with stronger focus on conservation and sustainable use of MAPs especially GSMPs are issued by GoI by year 3.</p>	National Consultation	Jan 2015	<p>GEF Funds</p> <p>MoEF/ UNDP and IIFM</p>	<p>72100- Contractual services</p>	<p>NIL</p>
	Joint meeting between MoRD, MoTA, MoEFCC, MoPR and IIFM	Mar 2015			
	Submission of Final Draft report	Apr 2015			
	Review of Final Draft Report	May 2015			
	Submission of Report after incorporation of comments and sharing recommendations with respective Government Departments namely MoEFCC (namely NAEB, FP), MoRD, MoTA, and MoPR	May 2015			
	Adoption of recommendations as deemed necessary by the respective Government Departments	Jun 2015			
<b>OUTPUT TOTAL US \$</b>					<b>NIL</b>

**NOTES:**

GEF Total Budget as per Project Document- USD 111,110  
 Co – Finance Budget as per Project Document – USD 44,442  
 Total Contract – Rs 3,859,000/-

Amount released so far (Rs.) 34,72,200/- (balance payment of USD\$6,450/- would be arranged by UNDP through other project such as other GEF and NRM project)

<p><b>Output 1.4</b> Development of criteria for identifying and evaluating the suitability of medicinal plant species for cultivation and potential inclusion in Govt. planting programmes.</p>	Submission of draft report after data collection from mandis/stock points	Jan 2015	<p>NMPB/ UNDP/ MoEF</p>	<p>72100- Contractual services – US \$ 35,000</p>	<p>35,000</p>
	Submission of draft final report	Apr 2015			

<p><b>Baseline:</b> NMPB has identified and notified 32 species with regional prioritization for cultivation and augmentation, but the list is not based on field information</p> <p><b>Indicators:</b> Field verified list of MAPs suitable for cultivation and inclusion in NAEB &amp; MoRD afforestation &amp; income-generating programmes</p> <p><b>Target:</b> Legally notified state specific and field verified species specific list of actions and interventions in place on rolling basis in each of project states in Years, 3, 4 and 5</p>	<p>Review of draft report and submission of final report to NMPB, MoEFCC, UNDP</p>	<p>June 2015</p>				
<b>OUTPUT TOTAL US \$</b>					35,000	<b>35,000</b>
<p><b>NOTES:</b>  <i>GEF Total Budget as per Project Document-USD 74,810</i>  <i>Co – Finance Budget as per Project Document – USD 740935</i>          (balance payment of US\$50,000/- would be co-financed by NMPB or arranged by UNDP through other project such as other GEF and NRM projects)</p> <p><b>Output 1.6</b> Long term strategy for threat assessment and monitoring the conservation status of medicinal plants in India</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> Currently methods for generating field information for assessment of threat and conservation status of MAPs, including GSMPS do not exist.</p>						
	<p>Submission of draft Final Report along with the strategy</p> <p>Joint meetings MoEFCC, IUCN, BSI and FRLHT</p> <p>Review of Final Draft Report</p> <p>Submission of Report after incorporation of comments</p> <p>Completion of threat assessments of select Med Plants as per Red Data process</p>	<p>Mar 2015</p> <p>Apr 2015</p> <p>May 2015</p> <p>May 2015</p> <p>Jun 2015</p>	<p>IAIM – FRLHT</p> <p>GEF Funds</p>	<p><b>72100-Contractual services (I-AIM, FRLHT)– US \$ 7,750</b></p>	7,750	

<p><b>Indicators:</b> Threat assessment &amp; conservation status monitoring strategy and protocols</p> <p><b>Target:</b> Scientifically developed and field tested threat assessment protocol for MAPs developed (building on existing rapid threat assessment methods) and published by Yr 4 together with overall MAP monitoring strategy. Strategy and protocols adopted by the project state governments in the management of MAPs by Yr 5.</p>	<p>Sharing recommendations of the study and strategy with relevant Government Departments and NGOs</p>	<p>Jun 2015</p>		
<b>OUTPUT TOTAL US \$</b>				<b>7,750</b>
<p><b>NOTES:</b>  <i>GEF Total Budget as per Project Document- USD 103,897</i>  <i>Co – Finance Budget as per Project Document – USD 19,834.</i>            Total Contract: Rs. 46,47,500/-            Amount Released so far: Rs. 41,82,500/-</p>				
<b>TOTAL US \$ FOR OUTCOME 1</b>				<b>50,950</b>
<p><b>OUTCOME 2: Forest Management Policies in the Three Project States Promote and Support the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants.</b></p>				
<p><b>OUTCOME INDICATORS:</b></p>				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. State forest policies revised to favour sustainable use &amp; conservation of MAPs.</li> <li>2. Strengthened and new legal mechanisms to protect community interests over MAPs, including IPR.</li> <li>3. Strengthened capacity within SMPBs to fulfil their mandate.</li> <li>4. Greater inter-sectoral cooperation to achieve sustainable use and conservation of MAPs.</li> </ol>				

**OUTCOME BASELINES:**

1. Limited focus on MAPs in key state forest policies, eg JFM Guidelines do not refer to MAPs & Forest Division Working Plans do not address conservation management of MAPs. Other opportunities for forest policy changes at state level to be identified by Yr 1.
2. Existing forest laws do not relate to medicinal plants
3. Limited to non-existent capacity. Capacity needs of each SMPB to be assessed by Yr2/Q2.
4. Minimal. No dedicated policy for MAPs although growing interest, eg Chhattisgarh & Uttaranchal declared as 'Herbal States'. Baseline studies by Yr 2/Q2 to include: a) Detailed analysis to establish extent of conflict and cooperation and main requirements for effective consultation and inter-sectoral action; and b) A detailed review of state-level policies and key sectors to be undertaken to identify key areas for policy harmonization.

**OUTCOME TARGETS:**

1. Revised JFM orders/circulars with stronger focus on conservation of MAPs. Nature of required revisions to be determined based on policy analysis by Yr 1 Forest Division Working Plans in project districts revised.
2. Appropriate legal mechanisms and measures that build on existing mechanisms identified and developed in years 3 & 4 and adopted by end of project.
3. Over 80% of SMPB management and technical level staff to be sufficiently trained to deliver their mandate effectively by Yr 5.
4. State-level inter-sectoral & technical coordination committees established. Individual state strategies for the Sustainable Use & Conservation of MAPs signed off by at least 2 government departments in each state by Yr 6.

<p><b>Output 2.1.</b> Develop medicinal plant conservation and sustainable management strategies for Arunachal Pradesh, Chhattisgarh &amp; Uttarakhand.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> No state-specific MAP conservation and sustainable use strategies other than in Uttarakhand State which has a plan, but that is not as comprehensive as the strategies to be developed through this project.</p> <p><b>Indicators:</b> The state-specific strategies</p> <p><b>Targets:</b> State-specific strategies addressing the conservation, cultivation, sustainable use and trade of MAPs and</p>	<p><b>ARUNACHAL PRADESH</b> Submission of Final Strategy</p>	Mar 2015	APSMPB	GEF Funds	72100-Contractual services 11,400	UNDP-11,400
	<p>State Government to endorse Strategy</p>	May 2015				
	<p>Submission of strategy to MoEFCC, UNDP and NMPB after endorsement of State Government</p>	May 2015	CG SMPB			
	<p>Sharing the strategy with relevant stakeholders</p>	Jun 2015				
	<p><b>CHHATTISGARH</b> State commissioned a combined study under Output 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 to Legal Initiative for Forest and Environment</p>	Mar 2015				
	<p>Submission of draft strategy</p>	Apr 2015				
	<p>Review of Strategy and provide comments to agency</p>					

protection of associated traditional Knowledge formulated for Arunachal Pradesh by year 3 and Chhattisgarh and Uttaranchal by year 4 and notified by each of the three state governments by the following year	Submission of Final Report along with strategy	May 2015				
	State Government to endorse Strategy	May 2015				
	Submission of strategy to MoEFCC, UNDP and NMPB after endorsement of State Government	Jun 2015				
	Sharing the strategy with relevant stakeholders.	Jun 2015				
	<b>Uttarakhand</b>					
	Submission of Final Strategy	Feb 2015	Dr Ramesh Uniyal (FRLHT) and SMPB			
	State Government to endorse Strategy	May 2015				
	Submission of strategy to MoEFCC, UNDP and NMPB after endorsement of State Government	Jun 2015				
	Sharing the strategy with relevant stakeholders.	Jun 2015				
	<b>OUTPUT TOTAL US \$</b>					

**NOTES:**

GEF Total Budget as per Project Document - USD 72,475

Co – Finance Budget as per Project Document – USD 126,830.

**Output 2.2 & 2.3.**

- a) Revised state forest policies that support conservation & sustainable use of MAPs.
- b) Revised state-level JFM Orders & Guidelines that integrate and strengthen MAP conservation and sustainable use objectives within overall JFM programmes and practices.

**Baseline:**

**CHHATTISGARH**

State commissioned a combined study under Output 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 to Legal Initiative for Forest and Environment

Submission of draft strategy

Review of Strategy and provide comments to agency

Submission of Final Report along with strategy

Cabinet Note and department/ministry note preparation

UNDP/  
CGSMPB

GEF  
Funds

**72100 -  
Contractual  
services – US \$  
10,000**

UNDP-  
10,000



<p>a) No specific focus on MAPs in forest policies of these three states.</p> <p>b) State-level JFM orders and guidelines do not address sustainable use or conservation of MAPs.</p> <p><b>Indicators:</b></p> <p>a) Revised state forest policies</p> <p>b) Revised state-level orders and guidelines for JFM</p> <p><b>Targets:</b></p> <p>a) Revised forest policies that favour sustainable use and conservation of MAPs formulated and adopted by the Publication of the revised forest policies in the three states. 93 MAPs three project states by year 4.</p> <p>b) Revised state-level JFM orders and guidelines with stronger focus on conservation and sustainable use of MAPs especially GSMPs are issued by the respective state governments by year 4.</p>	<p>Submission of final report to MoEFCC, UNDP and NMPB after endorsement of State Government</p> <p>Sharing the strategy with relevant stakeholders.</p>	<p>Jun 2015</p> <p>Jun 2015</p>			<p><b>OUTPUT TOTAL US \$</b> 10,000</p>	<p>10,000</p>	<p><b>OUTPUT TOTAL US \$</b> 10,000</p>	<p><b>10,000</b></p>									
<p><b>NOTES:</b></p>																	
<p>GEF Total Budget as per Project Document - USD 88,028 Co – Finance Budget as per Project Document – USD 44,443.</p>																	
<p><b>Output 2.8.</b> Comprehensive baseline and Monitoring &amp; Evaluation system developed for monitoring the status of medicinal plant resources in each project State.</p>																	
<p><b>Baseline:</b> Currently none of the project states have specific information on the status of MAPs or monitoring protocols.</p>																	
<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1324 1541 1460 2132"> <p><b>Output 2.8.</b> Comprehensive baseline and Monitoring &amp; Evaluation system developed for monitoring the status of medicinal plant resources in each project State.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1324 976 1460 1541"> <p><b>Arunachal Pradesh</b></p> <p>Study on status and distribution of prioritized medicinal plants of Arunachal Pradesh (RME study)</p> <p>Draft Report</p> <p>Review of report and provide comments to agency</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1324 819 1460 976"> <p>Mar 2015</p> <p>Mar 2015</p> <p>Apr 2015</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1324 273 1460 819"> <p>SMPB FRLHT</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1324 94 1460 273"> <p>GEF Funds</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1324 273 1460 819"> <p><b>NIL</b></p> </td> <td data-bbox="1324 819 1460 1435"> <p><b>NIL</b></p> </td> <td data-bbox="1324 1435 1460 2132"> <p><b>NIL</b></p> </td> </tr> </table>										<p><b>Output 2.8.</b> Comprehensive baseline and Monitoring &amp; Evaluation system developed for monitoring the status of medicinal plant resources in each project State.</p>	<p><b>Arunachal Pradesh</b></p> <p>Study on status and distribution of prioritized medicinal plants of Arunachal Pradesh (RME study)</p> <p>Draft Report</p> <p>Review of report and provide comments to agency</p>	<p>Mar 2015</p> <p>Mar 2015</p> <p>Apr 2015</p>	<p>SMPB FRLHT</p>	<p>GEF Funds</p>	<p><b>NIL</b></p>	<p><b>NIL</b></p>	<p><b>NIL</b></p>
<p><b>Output 2.8.</b> Comprehensive baseline and Monitoring &amp; Evaluation system developed for monitoring the status of medicinal plant resources in each project State.</p>	<p><b>Arunachal Pradesh</b></p> <p>Study on status and distribution of prioritized medicinal plants of Arunachal Pradesh (RME study)</p> <p>Draft Report</p> <p>Review of report and provide comments to agency</p>	<p>Mar 2015</p> <p>Mar 2015</p> <p>Apr 2015</p>	<p>SMPB FRLHT</p>	<p>GEF Funds</p>	<p><b>NIL</b></p>	<p><b>NIL</b></p>	<p><b>NIL</b></p>										

<p><b>Indicators:</b> Scientifically compiled comprehensive baseline on the status of MAPs in each of the project states.</p> <p><b>Target:</b> By year 5 the project states will have a dataset on the status of MAPs (i.e. species wise quantitative data on plant density and distribution in the FGBs and state-wide assessments of distribution and abundance) and operational systems for MAP monitoring.</p>	<p>Submission of Final Report and Developing Data base on medicinal plants of Arunachal Pradesh.</p>	<p>Jun 2015</p>		
<b>OUTPUT TOTAL US \$</b>				<b>NIL</b>
<p><b>NOTES:</b>  <i>GEF Total Budget as per Project Document-USD 96,897</i>  <i>Co – Finance Budget as per Project Document – USD 300,000</i>            (balance payment of US\$15,000/-, if required, to be arranged by UNDP through other project such as other GEF and NRM projects)</p>				<b>27,600</b>
<p><b>OUTCOME 3: Conservation and Sustainable Use of MAPs Mainstreamed at Local Level into Government and Community Management Norms and Practices at Demonstration Sites in Three Project States.</b></p>				
<p><b>OUTCOME INDICATORS:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ha of government forest actively managed for sustainable use of MAPs and maintenance of MAP diversity.</li> <li>2. Numbers of SFD officers actively applying their training in conservation management of MAPs.</li> <li>3. Ha of community forest actively managed for sustainable use of MAPs and maintenance of MAP diversity.</li> <li>4. Number of MAP species, including GSMP, for which sustainable harvesting techniques developed.</li> <li>5. Number of MAP collectors and other groups practicing sustainable harvesting.</li> <li>6. Extent of documentation of Traditional Knowledge on MAPs.</li> <li>7. Improved knowledge among MAP collectors and community forest users/managers about MAPs generally and about their legal rights, obligations and the requirements for maintaining MAP diversity and abundance.</li> </ol>				

**OUTCOME BASELINES:**

1. 0 ha. Criteria for "active management" to favor sustainable use & maintenance of MAP diversity and suitable ecological indicators to be determined in Yr 1.
2. 0. Criteria for measuring this to be developed by Yr 2/Q2 at same time as when training module being developed.
3. Minimal, Indicators to be established in Yr 1 along with criteria for what constitutes 'active management to favor sustainable use & maintenance of MAP diversity including suitable ecological indicators.
4. 0
5. 0
6. Documentation is minimal
7. Documentation is minimal

**OUTCOME TARGETS:**

1. At least 4 MPCAs/FGBs (established in each project state by Yr 4 (3 in state forest & 1 in community forest - 12 in total covering 18,000 ha) & 7 in total per project state by Yr 6 (5 in state forest and 2 in community forest – 21 in total or c. 32,000ha). Mid-way through the project and by the end of the project, respectively, an additional 2,000,000 ha and 6,000,000 ha of forest will be under active management for sustainable use and maintenance of MAP diversity.
2. To be established of Yr 2/Q3
3. Capacity gaps of communities, such as those for management and monitoring to be established by end of Yr 1. Subsequently developing monitoring protocols and management practices.
4. 5 GSMPs per year from the Yr 3 onwards
5. 75% of MAP collectors and all JFM groups practice sustainable harvesting in forest divisions for which sustainable harvesting protocols have been developed for target GSMPs by Yr 6.
6. Target values for mid and end of project to be determined during Yr 1.
7. Target values for mid and end of project to be determined during Yr 1.

<p><b>Output 3.2.</b> Strengthen MAP conservation management capacity within SFDs</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0</p> <p><b>Indicators:</b> Numbers of SFD officers actively applying their training in conservation management of MAPs.</p> <p><b>Targets:</b> To be established by end of year 1.</p>	<p>Three project State Forest Training Academies to incorporate the modules in their curriculum and continue to train in-service and probationers.</p>	<p>Jun 2015</p>	<p>SMPB and TSG</p>	<p>GEF Funds</p>	<p><b>71300 - Local consultant and/or 72100- Contractual services- US \$- 6,450</b></p>	<p>UK-6,450</p>
	<p>Printing and dissemination of training material at UFTA and Forest guard training center</p>	<p>Jun 2015</p>				

<b>OUTPUT TOTAL US \$</b>				<b>6,450</b>	<b>6,450</b>	
<p><b>Note:</b>  <i>GEF Total Budget as per Project Document - USD 76,671</i>  <i>Co - Finance Budget as per Project Document - USD 32,048.</i>          (any additional funding, if required, to be arranged by UNDP through other project such as other GEF and NRM projects)</p>						
<p><b>Output 3.5.</b> Improved community capacity for documenting and conserving traditional knowledge relating to MAPs, including traditional medicine, harvesting techniques and how to protect their IPRs.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> Currently none although the process was started under the National Biodiversity Act 2002</p> <p><b>Indicators:</b> Extent of documentation of Traditional Knowledge on MAPs by the local communities in the form of documents like community biodiversity registers</p> <p><b>Targets:</b> 10 such registers to be produced every year in the villages around the FGBs (i.e. 1 per village) from year 2 onwards, with a total of 70 community registers/state produced by end of project</p>	<p>Registration of Medicinal Plants species of Arunachal Pradesh and Uttarakhand under the Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration and Protection) Act, 1999</p>	<p>Jun 2015</p>	<p>SMPB and TSG</p>	<p>GEF Funds</p>	<p><b>71300 - Local consultant and/or 72100 - Contractual services -1,500</b></p>	<p>FRLHT- 1,500</p>
<b>OUTPUT TOTAL US \$</b>				<b>1,500</b>	<b>1,500</b>	
<p><b>Note:</b>  <i>GEF Total Budget as per Project Document - USD 288,887</i>  <i>Co - Finance Budget as per Project Document - USD 166,666.</i>          (any additional funding, if required, to be arranged by UNDP through other project such as other GEF and NRM projects)</p>						
<b>TOTAL US \$ FOR OUTCOME 3</b>					<b>7,950</b>	
<p><b>OUTCOME 4: Materials and Methods Developed for Replicating the Successful Models of Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants Across Other Sites in the Three States and More Broadly.</b></p>						

**OUTCOME INDICATOR:**

Number of additional forest divisions in project states and in replication states adopting successful models. Precise criteria to be determined by mid project. These could include policy changes, new policies, capacity development of SMPBs, SFDs, MAP collectors, community forest users/managers increased sustainable harvesting of MAPs in state forests and community forests. Number of states developing strategies for Conservation & Sustainable Use of MAPs based on national and project state strategies. Revision of forest division working plans in at least 2 forest divisions in each of the 4 replication states. Training material and modules used and applied. Establishment of effective FGB/MPCA complex in each replication state.

**OUTPUT BASELINE:**

Baseline values where known, others to be established by end Yr 1 Policies No state in India has dedicated strategies for the sustainable use and conservation of MAPs Capacity of different stakeholder groups To be established mid project Forest Working Plans Probably none that take MAPs into account but to be confirmed Training materials & course modules Probably none, but to be confirmed FGBs/MPCAs None in target replication states in either state or community forests.

**OUTPUT TARGET:**

All targets to be determined by end of Yr 1

**Output 4.2** Experience sharing and exchanging best practices at national and international level through south-south co-operation.

**Baseline:****Indicators:****Targets:**

MoEF, UNDP and FRLHT	Jun 2015	MoEF, UNDP and FRLHT	GEF Funds	71300 - Local consultant and/or 72100 - Contractual services – US \$ 10,200	UNDP- 6,000 4,200 FRLHT- 3,900
Publication of knowledge products and resource materials such as manuals, reports, books, periodicals, training and communication materials, etc.	Jun 2015				
Developing an Ethno-medicinal Garden in Bhiwadi Industrial Area, Rajasthan by Santhigiri Ashram (thru FRLHT)	Jun 2015			71600 – Travel – US \$ 5,000	
Travelling Exhibition on Medicinal Plants and Health (UNDP)	Jun 2015	FRLHT		72300 - Materials Goods and Supplies – US \$ 3900	
<b>OUTPUT TOTAL US \$</b>				<b>14,100</b>	<b>14,100</b>

**Note:**

GEF Total Budget as per Project Document - USD 315,954  
Co – Finance Budget as per Project Document – USD 448,026.

1. The National and International Level Workshops/Seminars/Conferences/Training Programmes, etc. for dissemination of project achievements and sharing of best practices and knowledge emanating from the project may be undertaken with the due authorization of either MoEF or UNDP.
2. The National Project Management Unit will organize at least one Workshops/Seminars/Conferences/Training Programmes, etc. for sharing of experiences emanating from the project to the relevant stakeholders.

(any additional funding, if required, to be arranged by UNDP through other project such as other GEF and NRM projects)

**Technical agencies/ individuals may be engaged by UNDP, MoEF to facilitate the same.**

**TOTAL US \$ FOR OUTCOME 4**

**14,100**

**OUTCOME 5: Effective Project Monitoring and Evaluation, Lessons Learning and Adaptive Management**

Output 5.1 Monitoring and evaluation	May 2015	the three SMPBs/T SG/ UNDP	GEF Funds	71400 Service Contract US \$ 26,400
<b>Baseline:</b> Collate, prepare and document Project achievements vis-à-vis the indicators, targets and finances including co-finance in the Final Technical Report (NPMU)	May 2015			
	Jun 2015			
	May 2015			
<b>Indicators:</b> Terminal evaluation of the project 11th National Project Steering Committee Meeting				
<b>Targets:</b> Miscellaneous tasks to be completed in the states (individual contracts)		SPMU and NPMU		
<b>OUTPUT TOTAL US \$</b>				<b>39,000</b>

**Note:**

GEF Total Budget as per Project Document- USD 200,000

(any additional funding, if required, to be arranged by UNDP through other project such as other GEF and NRM projects)

**Technical agencies/ individuals may be engaged by UNDP, MoEF, FRLHT and three project States to facilitate the abovementioned activities.**

<b>Output 5.2</b> Technical Support Group (TSG) at FRLHT will guide the states on various activities.	Carry out tasks requested by UNDP and MoEFCC	May 2015	FRLHT	GEF Funds	<b>71300 -Local consultant and/or 72100 - Contractual services – US \$ 7,000</b>  <b>71600 – Travel – US \$ 486</b>	FRLHT- 7,486
<b>OUTPUT TOTAL US \$</b>					<b>7,486</b>	<b>7,486</b>

**Note:**  
 GEF Total Budget as per Project Document- USD 293,000  
 (any additional funding, if required, to be arranged by UNDP through other project such as other GEF and NRM projects)

<b>TOTAL US \$ FOR OUTCOME 5</b>						<b>46,486</b>
	<b>National Project Management Unit Cost (Salary + Space Cost)</b>			GEF Funds	<b>71400-Service Contract US \$ 16,914</b>  <b>71600 Travel – US \$ 1,000</b>	17,914
<b>OUTPUT TOTAL US \$</b>					<b>17,914</b>	<b>17,914</b>

**Note:**  
 GEF Total Budget as per Project Document- USD 161,667  
 Co – Finance Budget as per Project Document – USD 211,784.  
 (any additional funding, if required, to be arranged by UNDP through other project such as other GEF and NRM projects)

State Project Management Unit Cost		71300 Local consultant and/or 72100 Contractual services – US \$ 8,000 71600 Travel – US \$ 2,000	10,000
<b>OUTPUT TOTAL US \$</b>		10,000	10,000
<b>Note:</b>			
GEF Total Budget as per Project Document- USD 323,334			
Co – Finance Budget as per Project Document – USD 423,566.			
(any additional funding, if required, to be arranged by UNDP through other project such as other GEF and NRM projects)			
<b>TOTAL US \$ FOR PROJECT MANAGEMENT</b>			27,914
<b>TOTAL USD \$</b>			177,600
Final Financial Audit including DPC			7500
<b>AWP TOTAL IN USD</b>			182,500

**\*Note: Some of the components of this AWP will be implemented using the MCG modality. Any additional funding, if required, to be arranged by UNDP through other project such as other GEF and NRM projects.**



## **II. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS**

**The Project Management is as mentioned in the approved Project Document.**

### **1. Roles and responsibilities of the parties involved in managing the project, oversight mechanism, fund management and project support staff.**

At the national level the project is executed by MoEF through the National Project Director (NPD) and Nodal Officer. The NPD is supported by the National Project Management Unit (NPMU) and the National Project Steering Committee (NPSC). NPSC has recommended that the NPMU which is currently housed at FRLHT, should be shifted to New Delhi, under the direct supervision of the NPD.

#### ***National Project Management Unit (NPMU)***

The National Project Management Unit (NPMU) consists of the Project Manager, Project Associate (Monitoring), Project Associate (Livelihood), Communication Specialist (UNV), Project Accountant, and Project Assistant. As per the Sixth NPSC, consultants and Interns may be engaged to support the NPMU. The salaries of all the NPMU members are charged to Outcome 5 – Monitoring and Evaluation and NPMU.

#### ***Technical Support Group, FRLHT (TSG)***

Technical support for the project is provided by a team of experts from Foundation for Revitalisation of Local Health Traditions (FRLHT). The expenses (such as remunerations, travel, office expenses, etc.) of the experts that are part of the Technical Support Group (TSG) are booked under Outcome 5.2.

At the State level the project is implemented by CEO/Member Secretary, State Medicinal Plants Board, supported by State Project Management Unit (SPMU) and the State Project Steering Committee.

#### ***State Project Management Unit (SPMU)***

The State Project Management Unit (SPMU) consists of the Project Coordinator, Project Associate and the Project Accountant. The SPMU is supported by a technical unit engaged under Outcome 3 and Outcome 5.

### **2. UNDP Support Services**

- a) Project Monitoring
- b) Procurement
- c) Auditing
- d) Facilitating communication through Solution Exchange

### 3. Audit Arrangements

UNDP engages a Chartered Accounting firm to audit the financial accounts of the 3 project states, FRLHT and UNDP. The Auditor is also responsible to ensure due compliance of audit observation for previous years and taking of corrective actions.

### 4. Agreement on intellectual property rights and use of logo on the project's deliverables.

The project partners have been advised to ensure use and/or display GEF, MoEF, UNDP and FRLHT logos on all knowledge products and display boards developed with financial support from this project.

### 5. Fund Flow Arrangements and Financial Management:

According to the present fund flow arrangement, with the concurrence of the Executing Partner (Ministry of Environment and Forests), UNDP will directly release funds to the bank account created for the implementation of this project with the Project Management Unit housed in the Foundation for Revitalization of Local Health Traditions (FRLHT), Bangalore (bank details given below). The Implementing Partner will account for funds received from UNDP. The request from the Implementing Partner will come through the standard Fund Authorization and Certificate of Expenditures (FACE) Report duly signed by the Project Director or person assigned/delegated by the Implementing Partner. Only after 80% of last advance and 100% of all the previous advances are spent will the next advance be released.

Separate books of account shall also be maintained in order to ensure accurate reporting of expenditure and providing a clear audit trail. Any interest accrued on the project funds during the project cycle will be ploughed back into the project in consultation with Implementing partner and UNDP and project budgets will stand revised to this extent. If there is no scope for ploughing back the interest will be refunded to UNDP.

**Bank Name** : CANARA BANK  
**A/C No** : 0425101047981  
**Branch** : Hebbal Branch, Bangalore  
**Branch Code** : 0425  
**IFSC code** : CNRB 0000425  
**Customer Name** : NPMU India UNDP GEF

Note: The National Project Steering Committee discussed the fund flow mechanism in its sixth meeting held on January 11, 2013 at Bengaluru.

### III. MONITORING FRAMEWORK AND EVALUATION

In accordance with the programming policies and procedures outlined in the UNDP User Guide, the project will be monitored through the following:

- A. **MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT:** The Implementing Partner, in consultation with the project teams, will provide brief monthly updates on progress against planned activities and budgets. These monthly reports will be provided in the format provided at **Annex1**. These monthly reports will be consolidated, as required, by UNDP's quality assurance team for progress review meetings.
- B. **ONE TIME RISK LOG:**Based on the initial risk analysis, a risk log shall be activated in Atlas and regularly updated by reviewing the external environment that may affect the project implementation. This will be completed by UNDP project assurance team in consultation with the Implementing partner. Use the standard Risk Log template
- C. **QUARTERLY FINANCIAL REPORT:**The Implementing Partner (IP) will make use of the Funding Authorization and Certificate of Expenditures (FACE) to request for advances and report on expenditures made on a quarterly basis, or more frequently if agreed. The implementing partner must submit the FACE at the end of each quarter, within the first 10 days of the following quarter. Together with the FACE, the project has to send

a copy of the bank statement as up to the date of the end of the period reported and the itemized cost estimates of the activities to be funded. The FACE form has to be certified by the designated official from the IP.

D. In case a project **EVALUATION** is required, please indicate the justification and proposed timing for the evaluation. A project evaluation is required only when mandated by partnership protocols such as GEF. However, a project evaluation may be required due to the complexity or innovative aspects of the project.

E. **ANNUAL REVIEW REPORT:** An Annual Review Report shall be prepared by the Project Manager and shared with the Project Board and the Outcome Board. The reporting format at **Annex 2** will be used to provide brief description of results achieved in the year against pre-defined annual targets.

F. **ANNUAL PROJECT REVIEW.** Based on the above report, an annual project review shall be conducted during the fourth quarter of the year or soon after, to assess the performance of the project and appraise the Annual Work Plan (AWP) for the following year. In the last year, this review will be a final assessment. This review is driven by the Project Board and may involve other stakeholders as required. It shall focus on the extent to which progress is being made towards outputs, and that these remain aligned to appropriate outcomes.

\*\*\*\*\*

