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1.9 Project Summary:

The PDF B project will support the design and preparation of a Full GEF project proposal that will facilitate the in situ conservation and management of economically important wild species. PDF B Activities, detailed in full in Section 9, will support steering committee meetings, a global review of in situ conservation of plants, field evaluations, national workshops, and consultant fees.
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1 Economically important wild species are defined as those that play a significant role in national economies, as food, fodder, fuel wood, medicines and aromatics, ornamentals, timber, and those that contribute to farm household incomes in traditional agricultural systems. Also included are wild relatives of crops that may be of both national and global importance and species that may be used for habitat restoration or rehabilitation.
**Section 2 - Background and Context (Baseline Course of Action)**

2.1 The validity and feasibility of many long-term *in situ* conservation strategies for individual (target) species of plants and animals is commonly based on assumptions supported with incomplete science or field experience. *In situ* conservation of individual species is quite different from ecosystem conservation or the setting up and management of a system of Protected Areas. The failure to acknowledge this has led to a subsequent ineffectiveness in the design and implementation of many conservation and sustainable use projects. Conservation project planners often assume that conservation of ecosystems *via* a system of protected areas will ensure the protection of the diversity of species that they contain – the so-called coarse filter approach to the conservation of biodiversity. But there is ample evidence to suggest that the dynamics of ecological change may lead to considerable changes in the plant and animal composition over short periods of time, unless there is active intervention in the ecosystem or specific management of individual elements of biodiversity (e.g. species’ populations). It is possible to conserve an ecosystem and still lose individual species from it or to save the species and lose genetically distinct populations through the process of ‘benign neglect’. *In situ* conservation of individual species means just that – a focus on how particular species or populations of them can be maintained. It is a critical element of a holistic plant conservation strategy, but one that most countries have so far failed to address seriously.

2.2 The UNEP *Global Biodiversity Assessment* (1995) notes that wild species of plants (and animals) are being lost at a rate equivalent to 100 to 1000 times the expected background rate. Translated into numbers of species this would amount to some 50 to 80,000, or a third of the world’s vascular flora over the course of the past century. The 2000 IUCN *Red List of Threatened Plants* lists 6856 species that are threatened today, largely as a result of habitat loss. Many of these species are important for agriculture and other economic activities. We have no direct way of measuring the amount of genetic variability within these species being lost globally or in individual countries, but it is expected to be very substantial, given the prevailing patterns of conversion and fragmentation of forests and other habitats and species populations. The CBD stresses the need for countries to strengthen both *ex situ* conservation and *in situ* conservation with an ecosystem approach, but has not developed a costed strategy for addressing the alarming loss of genetic variability.

2.3 Many wild and semi-wild species of economic interest occur in the arid and semi-arid ecosystems of North Africa and the Middle East. These make a significant contribution to the livelihoods of indigenous communities, in terms of nutrition, food security and household income. The issue of species loss thus needs to be addressed through integrated programmes of *in situ* and *ex situ* conservation. The results of this project will have particular resonance for many countries that share similar challenges as Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco and Turkey do in enacting effective *in-situ* conservation of plant species of economic importance. The four countries share many characteristics that will allow for effective project implementation and sharing of lessons across borders while securing conservation of globally significant biodiversity important from both conservation and sustainable use perspectives. These include:

- Individually and collectively they are centres of plant diversity, belonging to the Near Eastern and Mediterranean Vavilov Centres of Crop Diversity and Origins, and rich in diversity and genetic resources of globally important crop plants, including many cereals, food legumes, vegetables, forages, fruit trees and nuts, medicinal and aromatic plants and forestry species;
- agriculture plays an important part on the economy of these countries, none of which is self-sufficient in food supply;
- wild species make a significant contribution to the livelihood of indigenous communities;
- much of the land is arid or semi-arid and there are large areas of marginal habitats;
• a start has been made and some experience already gained in all four countries on the problems of in situ conservation of certain wild target species. Activities in each country will be strengthened by drawing on the experience of the others, which will enable them to learn and progress more rapidly than if each was working in isolation.

2.4 The participating countries are already promoting in situ conservation, either through their National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans and National Reports prepared under the terms of Article 6 the CBD, or, as regards wild species of importance to agriculture, in the Country Reports prepared for the Fourth International Technical Conference on Plant Genetic Resources. Egypt, for example, has prioritised in situ conservation in its National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan. Issues raised in the First National Report to the COP from Lebanon include: the need for research on the identification, study and conservation of wild species, especially forest and fruit trees; and both in situ and ex situ conservation. Strengthening national capacity for in situ conservation for biodiversity protection was the subject of a presentation by Lebanon’s Ministry of the Environment to COP IV in Bratislava. The Moroccan Country Report to the International Technical Conference highlights the diversity of wild species of significance for forestry and grazing and those that are crop relatives, and the importance of their in situ conservation as a national need. The Turkish Country Report includes among their strategic actions the fostering of ex situ and in situ conservation action, which involves identification, monitoring and management of wild species, by both government and non-government agencies.

2.5 It is generally accepted today that preference should normally be given to the conservation of biological diversity in natural or semi-natural ecosystems, i.e. in situ. Article 8 (In situ Conservation) of the Convention on Biological Diversity concerns the protection of ecosystems, natural habitats and the maintenance of viable populations of species in natural surroundings. Article 9 notes that the other main form of conservation, ex situ, is to be employed predominantly for the purpose of complementing in situ measures. This has been confirmed by COP Decision III/11. Likewise, the International Technical Conference on Plant Genetic Resources placed emphasis on the need for complementarity between in situ and ex situ approaches. The Global Plan of Action agreed by 150 governments at the Technical Conference identifies the promotion of in situ conservation of wild crop relatives and wild plants for food production as one of its 20 priority activity areas. It was generally agreed that for the majority of situations, in situ is the best method of conserving plant genetic resources. During the preparatory process for the Technical Conference, it was proposed that increased resources for in situ conservation be allocated, especially for developing countries.

2.6 While Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco and Turkey have set up Protected Area Systems, only in exceptional circumstances does the management of these involve maintenance of particular (target) species. A serious constraint is that, for most of their Protected Areas, they have not made inventories of the species they contain, even of target groups such as wild relatives of crops or other economically important species. Nor have they yet identified which economically important indigenous wild plant species, such as crop relatives, are priority candidates for in situ conservation. Without identifying such species and the ecosystems (whether under protection or not) in which they occur, no plans can be made for their conservation. A number of countries do have species recovery programmes for some highly threatened wild species, but this is usually a biodiversity conservation concern because of their tiny population size, rather than a development concern because they have any actual or potential economic value.

2.7 Globally, few serious attempts have been made to establish and maintain in situ conservation areas for target species such as crop relatives, fodder species, medicinal plants. Several of these attempts have been in the Middle East/SW Asian region, including: a major GEF-supported project in Turkey for the in situ conservation of genetic diversity of selected plant species; a GEF-supported project in the Fertile Crescent
for the conservation of agrobiodiversity, including conservation of crop relatives and wild fruit trees; and
the Ammiad Experiment for the conservation of diploid emmer wheat in Israel.

2.8 Experiments in *in situ* conservation of wild species, both within the region and in other parts of the world,
are still at an early stage. Consequently, attempts by the countries to implement that part of Article 8 of
the CBD (*In situ* Conservation) which refers to the maintenance of viable populations and genetic
resources of economically important species in natural surroundings, face considerable difficulties
because of a lack of experience on which they can draw and the failure of conservation and advisory
agencies to address the issues involved. Experience of involving local communities in the *in situ*
conservation of plant genetic resources is extremely limited. Also, with notable exceptions, little is known
about the scientific basis of achieving effective conservation of genetic variation in nature. Most of the
detailed work that has been done concerns the recovery of species that are under threat of imminent
extinction. Methodologies for *in situ* conservation of target species are so ambiguous or inconclusive as to
be of little practical value, and this has hampered progress in many countries. Most countries have had no
practical experience of implementing *in situ* conservation of genetic diversity of such species, and there is
little valid case law that can be followed.

2.9 Globally, species recovery or management programmes, that include *in situ* maintenance, have been
implemented for only a few hundred threatened species and with mixed success. Conservation
management of threatened plants is a recent initiative, with the first plant recovery plan under the USA
Endangered Species Act dating to 1979. Degree of threat rather than scientific or economic importance
has been the main criterion for selection of these species. The conservation of such threatened species is a
difficult and expensive task. It can often require a higher level of human intervention than the conservation
of, say, wild forest trees, forage species or medicinals that are the subject of this proposal. But, on the
positive side, an initial focus on threatened taxa can result in the establishment of protected areas serving
other taxa.

2.10 In the forestry context, the situation is somewhat different from other situations. Gene reserves -
samples of natural populations that are intensively managed and can be utilized under certain conditions -
are frequently established for forest trees, but there is still a long way to go before the *in situ* conservation
of the genetic resources of forest trees is widely in place, as was noted in an National Research Council
genetic conservation, changes in the status of the target species (i.e. the trees) are soon observed, whereas
in a herb or shrub in a complex community, it is difficult to establish what is happening to the target
species without a great deal of monitoring.

2.11 Likewise, little attention has been paid either to the role of local people in the *in situ* conservation of
wild species, or to its potential impact on them in social and economic terms, especially with regard to
issues like intellectual property rights and compensation for loss of access rights to materials that may
contribute significantly to their livelihoods, both in terms of income and nutrition. Strategies are thus
needed for optimizing the involvement of local people in the conservation, management and monitoring of
these species.

2.12 This proposal is primarily concerned with the *in situ* conservation within ecosystems, either inside or
outside protected areas, as circumstances require, of target species such as medicinal and aromatic
species, wild fruit trees and multi-use trees. Some of the species are semi-domesticated or pre-
domesticated and form part of multi-species traditional farming systems. Because *in situ* conservation of
target species by definition takes place within ecosystems, management plans have to take both the species
populations and the ecosystem into account, sometimes leading to conflicts of interest. This is of
particular concern as many valued plant associations of economic value have been maintained through traditional land use practices, and rapid cultural transition means that alternative in situ management regimes are urgently required.

2.13 Preliminary methodologies and guidelines have been proposed for establishing in situ reserves for crop relatives, for Genetic Resource Management Units for tree species, for rare and threatened species, for managing genetic resources for protected areas, for conservation of genetic resources in tropical forests, and for species management and recovery plans. These all address different situations and issues, as pointed out in the recommendations on in situ conservation of the Braunschweig Symposium on the implementation of the GPA in Europe. The symposium pointed out the need for a more generally applicable, consolidated and detailed set of procedures and protocols for the practical implementation of the in situ conservation of genetic resources for food and agriculture.

2.14 The lack of progress in developing scientific principles and procedures for in situ genetic conservation is the result of a number of contributing factors. The most notable is the dynamic nature of the environment, the species assemblages that make up the ecosystems and the species populations themselves, so that the targets are constantly moving. Other factors are the diversity of plant types (annuals, perennials, shrubs, trees), the diversity of breeding systems (inbreeders, outbreeders, apomicts), the range of purposes for which conservation is required, the poor understanding of the distribution of genetic traits within populations, the mosaics of metapopulations caused by habitat fragmentation and its effect on plant-pollinator and other mutual relationships, and the fact that most protected areas were set up without concern for the conservation of plants, let alone target species. Other issues to be addressed include identification of target species, selection of suitable sites, size of populations and size of area.

2.15 As noted in the Section on Eligibility (para. 22), the GEF’s conservation programme emphasizes in situ conservation within and adjacent to Protected Areas, which is also recommended in the GPA and elsewhere. However, since most wild species of economic interest and conservation concern occur outside protected areas, emphasizing those that occur in protected areas would not effectively conserve those resources and the dynamic links between traditional use and the generation of valued plant diversity. On the other hand, the very fact that an area is protected gives some degree of guarantee of its continued existence and maintenance. The conservation of wild target species outside protected areas necessarily involves the establishment of some form of management. The role of local communities in this will certainly be critical.

2.16 It is evident that in situ conservation of the germplasm of wild species is still very much in its infancy. In this field, FAO and IUFRO, along with other forestry organizations, have focused much attention on gene conservation of forest tree species, and less on wild relatives of cultivated plants. IPGRI has concentrated mainly on the on-farm conservation of land races, in situ conservation of some forestry species, workshops and reviews of underutilized Mediterranean species, promotion of the conservation and use of underutilized and neglected crops, and development of international crop networks that include genetic diversity from wild sources. DIVERSITAS has planned a programme of action for the conservation of genetic diversity of wild species, especially those used in human activities. The in situ conservation of genetic diversity of wild species of economic importance, despite its acknowledged importance by them, goes beyond the normal programme activities of these organizations.

---

2 *In situ* conservation was for many years regarded by agricultural and genetic resource scientists as equating with on-farm conservation of land races of crops, not with wild species’ populations, but this is a different although related kind of situation and is not covered in this project.
2.17 The observation made at the Braunschweig Symposium on the Implementation of the GPA in Europe, that conservation of wild relatives in situ is a major weakness of the implementation of the GPA in Europe applies with even more force to other wild species and regions of the world. The report by FAO, IUCN, UNEP and UNESCO entitled Plant Genetic Resources: Their in situ conservation for human use (1991), states that massive support is needed to conserve and develop such resources in situ, in view of both the short and the long-term needs of the people presently utilizing these resources. It emphasizes the great need for raising awareness of the value of these resources and for political leaders and decision-makers to understand both the problem and the means that exist to solve it. The report recommends: (a) identification and inventory of threatened and endangered genetic resources and natural habitats in each country; (b) identification and inventory of vulnerable species and ecosystems already included in one or other form of protected area and evaluation of the management needed to safeguard genetic diversity in them; and (3) elaboration of national strategies to conserve and sustain such ecosystems and inter-and intra-specific genetic variation of priority species.

Section 3 - Summary of Project Objectives and Description

3.1 The objective of the full project – to be fully elaborated with the PDF B funds requested herein – is to facilitate the in situ conservation and management by the participating countries of wild or semi-domesticated species identified by them as important to agriculture or forestry or having other economic importance, (such as medicinal or aromatic species) in natural or semi-natural habitats and in traditional farming systems through the implementation of three components detailed below:

i. Development of National Strategies and methodologies based on best practice, for the inventory, selection, in situ conservation management and monitoring of wild species of economic importance.

The participating countries will develop the set of recommendations made in the PDF B for implementation at a national level into National Strategies for the in situ conservation of target species and of the areas in which they should be conserved, which may be inside or outside already protected areas. The strategies will provide for assessment of training needs and implementation of capacity building, and measures to create an enabling policy, legal and institutional environment for effective in situ conservation of plants of economic importance. Development of national strategies will be undertaken by national specialists, following the procedures designed and recommendations made in the PDF B phase, and will involve the participation of agricultural, botanical gardens, conservation, forestry, genetic resources, planning, protected area, NGOs, local community and other relevant institutions within the country. The national strategies will designed in such a way as to serve as models for use by other countries. Technical support during the development of the strategies will be provided by FAO, DIVERSITAS and IPGRI.

National surveys will need to be undertaken, either de novo or building on existing data, of wild species of economic importance, leading to the drawing up of a list of candidates for conservation, assessment of their distribution, threats to which they are exposed, demographic and conservation status, and identification of priority sites, especially those that occur in protected areas.

The international information management system being developed by UNEP/GEF project on "In situ Conservation of Crop Wild Relatives through Enhanced Information Management & Field Application" will be used, and modified as needed.

Methodologies will be developed on the basis of the global review of guidelines and methodologies to be undertaken in the PDF stage, taking into account existing use patterns and benefit strategies. Particular
attention will be paid to reviewing the infrastructure needed to undertake the *in situ* conservation activities and identifying the need for capacity building.

Information on indigenous knowledge, ethnobiology, traditional resource rights and customary law systems that affect these species will be recorded to help decide on which should be selected for *in situ* conservation management. At this, and at all other stages of the project, due consideration will be given to concerns at national, institutional, local and community levels about ownership of information.

With the understanding and consent of its owner/s, the information and data gathered will be stored and made available, along with all other information gathered during the project, through the information management system developed as part of by UNEP/GEF project on "In situ Conservation of Crop Wild Relatives through Enhanced Information Management & Field Application” which will allow ready access by a range of different users. A link will be established with the EU-funded Euro+Med PlantBase project that is setting up an electronic plant database and information system for Europe and the Mediterranean region.

**ii. Implementation of demonstration projects.**

The National Strategy will then be applied and demonstration projects set up in Egypt (Sinai), Lebanon, Morocco and Turkey. These will be designed to test the feasibility and effectiveness of the structure, procedures and methodologies indicated in the National Strategy for devising and implementing management plans to achieve the *in situ* conservation of a small number of individual or clusters of target species considered of high priority that occur in priority ecosystems, whether inside or outside existing protected areas. This will be undertaken by national institutions and specialists, assisted by experts from the executing agencies involved. Arrangements will be made to ensure that all stakeholders are involved during the process.

The target species in each country will be identified during the PDF B phase, the main criteria for selection being degree of threat and level of economic importance, with the highest priority being given to severely threatened species of high economic importance. As far as possible a range of plant species representing different biological situations (in terms of habit, breeding system, population and distribution structure) will be selected for these demonstration projects.

The demonstration projects, covering a number of different situations and types of species, will have an additional common objective of demonstrating solutions and procedures that could be replicated by other countries wishing to developing *in situ* species conservation. Complementary experience will be obtained from the UNEP/GEF project on "In situ Conservation of Crop Wild Relatives through Enhanced Information Management & Field Application” with which close liaison will be maintained.

The current status of *in situ* conservation in each of the countries is summarized in the ANNEX 1, and shows that all of the participating countries are already engaged in *in situ* conservation and that the full project will complement the existing weak baseline situation within the countries.

**iii. Establishment of long-term monitoring and evaluation systems.**

The success of *in situ* conservation of target species cannot be determined in the short term, so systems for the long-term monitoring and evaluation of the changes in the environment, the ecosystem and the target species’ populations will be designed and put in place in at the selected sites in Egypt (Sinai) Lebanon, Morocco and Turkey.
iv. Information dissemination

During the project there will be a systematic exchange and dissemination of information, both between the participating countries and with other interested and relevant countries and institutions. This could involve publication on the FAO website, CDs, reports, and annual workshops from year three to discuss lessons learned and exchange information. An information dissemination strategy will be designed during the PDF B that will seek to maximize application of the preliminary experiences of the project amongst the GEF IAs and other relevant agencies.

At the end of the project, a report will be prepared on the feasibility and effectiveness of *in situ* conservation of target species as a major conservation strategy suitable for global application. The report, which will be directed towards the CBD, GEF and other parties, will document lessons learned and make an assessment of the likely long-term success of *in situ* under various management regimes, its cost-effectiveness and its integration and complimentarity with *ex situ* approaches. It will also address the socio-economic and legal issues involved in *in situ* conservation that affect local people, such as traditional knowledge and intellectual property rights, access to resources, and compensation packages.

3.2 National institutions and specialists in each country will play the central role in both project development and implementation. In view of the interdisciplinary nature of the project, it will involve a wide range of national institutions and organizations, and will be supported by relevant international agencies from the agricultural, forestry, genetic resources, conservation and development sectors, each contributing their special expertise and experience. These will include DIVERSITAS, FAO, IPGRI and the delineation of their individual responsibilities will be agreed in the PDF B phase. FAO will provide expertise on agriculture, plant genetic resources, forest management and access to its extensive databases. IPGRI will contribute expertise on *in situ* conservation in agroecosystems. DIVERSITAS will provide access to its programme on genetic conservation of wild species, to its expertise on the conservation of wild relatives and links to other of its programmes such as dynamics, origins and maintenance of biodiversity, land use practice and human dimensions.

3.3 The *in situ* conservation methodologies to be tested will include strategies to provide alternative sources of access to the target conservation species with a view to enhancing rural development. Local, indigenous and traditional peoples (such as the Bedouins in Sinai, Egypt and the Berbers in Morocco) on whose land target species occur will be invited to participate in their conservation through participatory management of the areas concerned and in undertaking monitoring of the populations of target species. Capacity building in the form of organizing local community groups that would be trained in *in situ* conservation and management will be needed. Finally, for semi-domesticated target species used in traditional agriculture, the management knowledge about these species and the ecosystems in which they occur held by indigenous peoples will form the foundation of effective conservation and thus their contribution will be crucial.

3.4 In response to the impact that involvement of local communities *in situ* conservation, as described in the preceding paragraph, will have on their livelihoods, the full project will deploy national consultants in each country to analyze the economic and legal implications of *in situ* conservation of wild species for local communities, and to make recommendations for addressing these implications. Potential mechanisms for doing this include incentive schemes to compensate for lost income, protection of intellectual property rights through formalizing of current use regimes, adaptation of existing systems and development of unique new systems based on traditional resource rights and other models that protect the rights of indigenous peoples.
Section 4 - Eligibility


4.2 The GEF Framework for GEF Activities Concerning Conservation And Sustainable Use Of Biological Diversity Important To Agriculture, adopted by the GEF Council, October 14 – 16, 1998, notes the “lack of in situ conservation strategies for genetic resources, normally leads to a simplification of the components of the environment and to unsustainable production systems.”

4.3 Operational Program #13 on Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Important to Agriculture identifies that under OP #13 activities will be sought both within and adjacent to conservation areas and in the wider agricultural landscape giving attention to areas that are particularly important for their agricultural biodiversity and/or threat of genetic erosion or other forms of biodiversity loss. Furthermore, both Operational Programme #1 Arid and Semi Arid Zone Ecosystems and # 13 identify the following as relevant in addressing conservation of agricultural biodiversity and biodiversity of arid and semi-arid ecosystems: a) demonstrating and applying techniques to sustainably manage biodiversity important to agriculture, including wild relatives of domesticated plants, animals and their gene pools; b) supporting capacity building efforts that promote the preservation and maintenance of indigenous and local communities knowledge, innovation, and practices relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of agrobiological diversity, with their approval and involvement.

4.4 The CBD agrobiodiversity priorities outlined in decision III/11 include: Piloting selected activities that are country-driven national priorities and which develop and/or test methods and tools.

4.5 Therefore this project is fully eligible under Operational Programmes 1 and 13.

Section 5 - Incremental Costs

Baseline scenario

5.1 With regard to the conservation and sustainable use of wild species, the four participating countries have to date focused most of their attention on the identification of threatened species and the establishment and management of Protected Areas. Most gene banks concentrate on maintaining accessions of cultivars and landraces of crops. An exception is the project in Turkey that has been implemented since 1992, which involves collecting seeds from the country’s endemic taxa and depositing them at seed banks. Botanical gardens, which elsewhere play a significant role in wild species conservation, are not well developed in the participating countries.

5.2 In the participating countries few inventories of wild species of economic importance have been done, and information about their distribution and uses is very incomplete. What is known is scattered in numerous publications and difficult to access. Some information is held by, herbaria, botanical gardens, and research institutions in the countries, but is not brought together under any system. Red Lists of threatened species do exist for Egypt, and the EU/CIHEAM-funded MEDUSA project has compiled a limited database of the most widely used species for most countries of the Mediterranean countries, but has met considerable difficulties obtaining accurate and comparable data.
5.3 Although some inventory work has been carried out as part of GEF, Darwin and other projects in Lebanon and Morocco, few protected area biodiversity inventories have been done in the participating countries, so that it is usually not possible to ascertain which economically important plant species occur in them. Detailed information on the use and conservation status medicinal plant species has been compiled in Turkey. Few management plans have been prepared for those species known to occur in protected areas. The conservation of these species in situ is thus simply a by-product of protected area management, which in most cases does not take into account the requirements of individual species. As a result, the continued existence of many species or populations is now at risk due to the lack of targeted management intervention.

Alternate scenario

5.4 The GEF project would establish a system that would organize and bring together the presently scattered information sources. It would be nationally operated and would enable each of the participating countries to develop a national strategy for the inventory and evaluation of its wild species, thereby facilitating the establishment of priorities for their conservation in situ and sustainable use. By making effective use of existing information and providing a uniform national system, it will be possible to avoid duplication of effort and allow gaps to be identified which can then be filled with minimal effort.

5.5 The project would bring together various constituencies in each country that currently do not work together effectively. These include universities, agricultural research stations, gene banks, botanical gardens, protected area systems, as well as specialist UN and other international agencies and programmes such as FAO, UNESCO, UNEP, IPGRI and DIVERSITAS. All this will lead to considerable synergy as each would contribute their specialist knowledge and expertise to tackling the problems of in situ conservation, monitoring and sustainable use of wild species.

5.6 A major benefit that will derive from the project will be the provision of a conceptual framework and a set of protocols and procedures for conservation of target plant species in situ. While the participating countries are anxious to undertake such conservation procedures, they are handicapped in doing so by the lack of such agreed and tested procedures.

5.7 The project will allow the countries to address and contribute significantly to meeting their obligations under the CBD Articles 7 (especially identification and monitoring) and 8 (especially the maintenance of viable species of populations in natural surroundings and of knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity).

Section 6 - Linkages with other GEF Interventions

6.1 Links will be developed with all GEF supported projects in the region, which include both national initiatives, such as the UNDP/GEF project entitled “The Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants in Arid and Semi-Arid Ecosystems in Egypt, and regional initiatives, such as the regional UNDP/GEF project involving Lebanon, Jordan and Syria which is entitled "Conservation and Sustainable Use of Dryland Agro-Biodiversity of the Fertile Crescent" whose overall goal is to maintain agrobiodiversity in the Fertile Crescent.

6.2 This project has been partly designed to complement the UNEP/GEF Project (the full project brief is to be submitted for approval at the May 2002 GEF Council) "In situ Conservation of Crop Wild Relatives through Enhanced Information Management & Field Application". The latter, as its title indicates, focuses only on wild species that are crop relatives, while this project covers a wider range of species. Also, the
Crop Wild Relatives Project particularly emphasizes the development of an information management system for all aspects of in situ conservation, together with testing its use. The present project proposes the development of National Strategies and methodologies based on best practice, for the inventory, selection, in situ conservation management and monitoring of different classes of wild species, such as medicinal and aromatic species, fuelwood species, fruit shrubs and trees, of importance to the local economies. In order to ensure close liaison and avoidance of overlap, it is proposed to have cross-representation on the Steering Committees of both Projects. Furthermore, as the Implementing Agency for both projects, UNEP will ensure close coordination of the two projects.

Section 7 - National Level Support

7.1 The need to broaden conventional in situ activities to include wild plant genetic resources for local food security and future crop improvement, and to prepare national plans for these, was stressed in the State of the World’s Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, in the Global Plan of Action, and in many of the Country Reports and sub-regional meetings that formed part of the preparation process for the International Technical Conference on Plant Genetic Resources. In the context of this project, discussions have been held with institutions in all the participating countries, including the Faculty of Agriculture, American University of Beirut, the Desert Research Centre, Sinai, Ministry of Agriculture, Egypt, Department of Botany, University of Mansourah, Egypt, the Faculty of Agriculture, Ege University, Izmir, Turkey, Anadolu University, Aromatic Plant and Drug Centre, Eskisehir, Turkey, INIAV, Rabat, Morocco. All the participating countries include in situ conservation in their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and have provided letters of support for this project.

Section 8 - Sustainability (including financial) and Replication

8.1 The project design (as noted in paragraphs 3, 8, 17, 18 (i), 18 (ii), 26-28) and the nature of the activities that will be implemented lend themselves to adoption and replication not only within the recipient countries but to other countries as well. The following factors are strongly conducive to the replicability of the project:

- the target species for in-situ conservation are of economic importance and contribute to rural livelihoods, which provides non-participating countries with a strong incentive for replicating the project;
- the synergies which the project generates between participating countries will also occur with countries in the region that are not initially participating;
- the information that the project will generate for each of the participating countries will fill an important gap that other countries also need to fill in order to optimize benefits from their national flora;
- explicit demonstration activities of the project and systematic dissemination of the results of these activities will facilitate replication of the project;
- linkage to the UNEP GEF Project "In situ Conservation of Crop Wild Relatives through Enhanced Information Management & Field Application" will provide another mechanism for dissemination of results and replication.

8.2 The in situ conservation and management of wild species, as opposed to ecosystems, under various management regimes, although required under the CBD, has not so far been addressed seriously and countries have been given little guidance on how to proceed. The project, if successful, will provide an assessment given of its likely long-term success, its cost-effectiveness and its integration and complimentarity with ex situ approaches and will therefore make a major contribution to strategic programming by GEF. It will provide guidance and protocols applicable to all countries and greatly assist other projects which include the conservation of wild species as a component.
8.3 The actual and potential contribution of project activities to the improvement of rural livelihoods is a strong incentive for governments to provide whatever financial support is needed to sustain the activities initiated by this project.

Section 9 - Description of PDF B Activities

9.1 Project development and design will be undertaken as a set of national level activities executed by the national executing agencies and local consultants and other complementary activities coordinated by a consortium of representatives of FAO, DIVERSITAS and IPGRI. Each will bring its particular expertise and perspective to bear on the issues, from the point of view of conservation, sustainable use, development, genetic resources, agriculture, forestry, and conservation and restoration ecology. This consortium will act as an expert Steering Group and will nominate a Technical Advisory Group of Experts that will include national experts from countries where major *in situ* activities have been carried out or are planned.

Activity 1: Establishment of a Steering and Technical Advisory Groups and Project Administrative Arrangements.

9.2 At the beginning of the project planning process, an initial meeting will be held in month 2, to:

- Establish the general procedures to be adopted throughout the development and design of the project.
- Form a Steering Group under the Chairpersonship of FAO, to oversee the implementation of the project (see Annex 2 for terms of reference).
- Nominate a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) to advise the Steering Group. The TAG will include specialists from the countries.
- Finalise the work plan and identify resource people to be recruited for project planning workshops.

Activity 2: Critical global review of existing guidelines and methodologies and other relevant literature on *in situ* conservation of target species and of current activities in this area being undertaken by national and international agencies.

9.3 This will be undertaken by an International Consultant under the supervision of the Technical Advisory Group. It will include a detailed assessment of: (1) the various guidelines and methodologies published by FAO, IUCN, DIVERSITAS/Council of Europe, BGCI and other bodies on *in situ* conservation; (2) the data collected in the process of country reporting during preparations for the International Technical Conference on Plant Genetic Resources, and reviewed in the State of the World’s Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture; (3) National Biodiversity Actions Plans and Strategies and National Reports prepared by Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (under Article 6); (4) results obtained from GEF-financed projects involving *in situ* conservation of target species. It will review different kinds of *in situ* activities involving wild species undertaken by local and national conservation bodies, including species recovery programmes, genetic resource conservation of agricultural and forestry species, habitat restoration and rehabilitation. This will be the first global survey of this field and will be of importance to all countries attempting *in situ* conservation of target species.

Activity 3: Field Evaluation.

9.4 A Field Evaluation Team drawn from the Steering and Technical Advisory Groups and accompanied by expert national consultants, will undertake a critical field evaluation of major *in situ* projects for
conservation of target species in Lebanon (medicinal plants in Horsh Ehden and cedar in Al-Shouf Cedar Forest Reserves) and Turkey (GEF in situ project sites).

Activity 4: National Workshops

9.5 A National workshop in each country will be organized by the expert national consultants in association with local institutions and the TAG in each of these countries so as to obtain the views of local and national experts, planners and officials and representatives of local communities and other stakeholders on the effectiveness of these projects, identify constraints and reasons for shortcomings.

Activity 5: Problem analysis.

9.6 Following the literature review, field evaluation and workshops, a critical analysis will be made of issues relating to in situ conservation of target species, and a set of recommendations made for implementation at a national level. This will be undertaken at two workshops by the TAG. The issues to be addressed will include:

- **The identification of target taxa.** Estimates of numbers of candidate species, category of threat, and their geographical location. Review of existing methodologies to identify priorities (e.g. SSC CAMP protocols).
- **Criteria for selection.** A set of criteria for species and site selection will be prepared. Potential criteria include: (1) existence of a range of suitable target species, such as nationally and regionally or globally important genetic resources; (2) existence of suitable protected area(s) with a well developed management structure, ability and willingness to incorporate in situ management plans into the reserves’ management plans; (3) a suitable scientific and technical infrastructure; (4) availability of trained personnel; (5) socio-economic considerations; (6) existence of NGOs with strong farmer participation; (7) grass roots movements for community management of genetic resources.
- **Role of protected areas – their value and potential.** Review of effectiveness and utility of existing models including gene sanctuaries, gene conservation areas, gene management zones, forest gene reserves, mini-reserves, MAB reserves, home gardens.
- **The management of reserve areas.** Size of reserves, size and extent of population samples. The constraints imposed by the dynamics of the environment, the species assemblages that make up the ecosystems and the species populations themselves, in managing and conserving target species.
- **The monitoring and management of target populations.** Feasibility, advantages and disadvantages of conservation outside formally protected areas. The effects of fragmentation of ecosystems and species populations and the problems posed by mosaics. Significance of marginal populations. Techniques to monitor short, medium and long term changes in the target species and in their ecosystems (morphological, molecular and ecological).
- **The identification of effective complementary techniques.** Role and participation of ex situ facilities in conserving target species in situ. Link between in situ management and habitat restoration. Assessment of grass roots needs and provision of assistance to farm households and local communities to help them obtain, maintain and conserve genetic material of their locally used crops and semi-domesticates.
- **Establishing a local and national context.** Role of existing professional networks in facilitating in situ management (e.g. SSC National Groups). Community action and participation of indigenous peoples in conserving target species in situ and the complementary role of community nurseries and seed banks. How to integrate in situ conservation into national conservation and development policies, plans and strategies.
• **The wild-domesticated interface** and the role of traditional agriculture in conserving semi-domesticates *in situ*. Documentation of indigenous and ethnobiological knowledge that is an essential element in understanding how to conserve species used in traditional communities/farm households.

• **Proposals to overcome the problems posed by land tenure** that can be a major obstacle to the implementation of *in situ* conservation.

• **Proposals regarding intellectual property rights and compensation packages for restriction of access to target species by local people.** This will be prepared by the TAG in the light of the experience gained during the Field Evaluation.

**Activity 6: Development of the full scale Project Brief for GEF financing**

9.7 Based on the results of the above, a full scale Project Brief for GEF funding will be prepared, including all required information and analysis. Of particular note, the brief will elaborate the development of National Strategies for testing the use of the methodologies recommended in the PDF B, in areas and situations that are representative of the whole gamut of *in situ* situations in Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco and Turkey. A Public Participation Plan will be developed for the full involvement in the execution of the project of all stakeholders, including local communities and institutions. In addition to the role of the national executing agencies, FAO, DIVERSITAS and IPGRI in the execution of the project, local institutions that can participate in project activities will be identified in all the participating countries.

**Section 10 - PDF Block B Outputs**

10.1 The outputs of the PDF Block B will be: (1) a global review of the current situation regarding *in situ* conservation of wild species of economic importance and identification of any best practices; (2) a critical analysis of the issues involved and the preparation of a preliminary set of methodologies and procedures, including criteria for site and species selection; (3) a field evaluation of existing *in situ* projects; and (4) a full scale Project Brief for submission to the GEF, elaborating the development of a strategy for the design and implementation of *in situ* conservation of target species by countries and for testing the recommended procedures and methodologies in Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco and Turkey.

**Justification for the PDF B**

10.2 The project concerns an area of biodiversity of major importance, which has hitherto been neglected. There is thus considerable ambiguity and uncertainty about how its conservation should be addressed, and a substantial amount of preparatory work will accordingly be needed to design a quality project.

**Section 11 - Items to be Financed (in US $)**

11.1 As detailed in Table 1, the PDF grant will be allocated to support steering committee meetings, a global review of *in situ* conservation of plants, the field evaluations, the national workshops, consultant fees, and the preparation of a Full Project Proposal to present to the GEF.

**Section 12 - Workplan and Implementation Arrangements**

12.1 PDF B financed activities will be implemented in 15 months, commencing in November 2001, as detailed in Annex 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>GEF</th>
<th>FAO</th>
<th>Diversitas</th>
<th>IPGR</th>
<th>Govts</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Project initiation and formulation of administrative arrangements by FAO</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 [a] First meeting of Steering Committee, adoption of admin arrangements – DSA &amp; Travel 15 people, 3 days – then</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[b] First Technical Advisory Group Meeting – 7 participants, 1 day [DSA 1 day, 8 people]</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[c] General operating expenses</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Global review of guidelines and methodologies for in situ conservation by International consultant – 3 months</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 [a] Critical evaluation of major in situ projects by Field Evaluation Team drawn from Steering Committee and TAG – DSA &amp; Travel 8 participants</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>77,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[b] 14 days technical backstopping by FAO, Diversitas, IPGRI</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Critical reviews of national in situ activities – 4 national consultants, 2 months each [Fee $6,000 plus travel &amp; expenses]</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Four national workshops to review constraints on and opportunities for in situ conservation</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>104,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[a] Facilitators from FAO/ Diversitas/ IPGRI, 1 per meeting – a total of 12 days technical backstopping, plus DSA &amp; travel</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[b] Government staff time [preparing &amp; holding meetings]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[c] General operating expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[d] Travel/DSA 80 participants for 3 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 [a] Meeting of TAG and International Consultant to design problem analysis and selection of methods and criteria – DSA &amp; Travel 8 participants, 2 days</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[b] General operating expenses</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Analysis by International Consultant of problems, methods and criteria – 2 months</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 [a] Meeting of Steering Committee and Consultant to review analysis – DSA &amp; Travel 16 participants, 3 days</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[b] General operating expenses</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Preparation of Project Brief – technical backstopping by FAO, Diversitas, IPGRI, International Consultant, 2 months</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>67,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Meeting of Steering Committee and Consultant to finalize Full Project Brief – 16 participants, 3 days</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[b] General operating expenses</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting organization and facilitation</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Consultant – 5 meetings over 1 year, total 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Technical Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[a] Technical backstopping – 14 days visiting 4 countries</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>42,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[b] Travel costs – visit to all 4 participating countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[c] Professional staff time – 28 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390,500</td>
<td>94,500</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>592,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12.2 Direct project oversight for the PDF B will be provided by a Steering Group (terms of reference in Annex 8), which will be supported by a Technical Advisory Group. The Steering Group will be composed of representatives of the participating countries, UNEP, FAO, DIVERSITAS and IPGRI. Each organisation representative will bring particular expertise and perspective to bear on the issues, from the point of view of conservation, sustainable use, development, genetic resources, agriculture, forestry and conservation and restoration ecology, and participatory development.

12.3 FAO will be the lead executing agency and will be responsible for coordinating and facilitating the project, and, in close consultation with the Steering Committee, will provide technical support and quality control. The relevant technical departments of FAO will provide necessary technical support for the implementation of the project. The FAO Forestry Resources Division will serve as the lead technical and operations unit, and will be supported by technical staff in FAO Regional Office for North Africa and the Near East in Cairo, and by an inter-departmental Project Task Force at Headquarters. The Departments to be represented in this Task Force are Forestry, Agriculture, Sustainable Development, Economic and Social, Technical Cooperation.
SECTION 13– PROJECT BUDGETING AND FINANCING

13.1 ITEMS TO BE FINANCED BY THE PDF-B ACTIVITIES

The requested PDF Block B Grant will be used to prepare the project proposal as described above in Section 9. The preparation activities outlined above will cost an estimated US$ 592,000 of which the PDF Block B contribution from GEF will be limited to US$390,500. The balance of the budget as noted on page one is supplied by in-kind and cash donations by Diversitas, FAO, IPGRI, and the Governments.

13.2 – BUDGET

A detailed budget following UNEP format can be found in Annex 1 of this document.

13.3 – CASH ADVANCE REQUIREMENTS

An initial cash advance of US$ 140,000 will be made upon signature of the project document by both parties and will cover expenditures expected to be incurred by FAO during the first three months of the project execution. Subsequent advances are to be made quarterly, subject to:

(ii) Confirmation by FAO at least two weeks before the payment is due, that the expected rate of expenditure and actual cash position necessitate the payment, including a reasonable amount to cover “lead time” for the next remittance (see format of request in Annex 3)

(iii) The presentation of:

• A satisfactory financial report showing expenditures incurred so far (see format in Annex 5).
• Timely and satisfactory reports on project implementation.

13.4 – WORKPLAN AND TIMETABLE

A detailed workplan and timetable can be found in Annex 2.

SECTION 14 – INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND EVALUATION

14.1 INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

Project development and design will be undertaken as a set of national level activities executed by the national executing agencies and local consultants and other complementary activities coordinated by a consortium of representatives of FAO, DIVERSITAS and IPGRI. This consortium will act as an expert Steering Group and will nominate a Technical Advisory Group of Experts that will include national experts from countries where major in situ activities have been carried out or are planned.

FAO will act as the manager of the funds provided by the GEF.

The person at FAO responsible for project management, to whom all correspondence regarding substantive and technical matters should be sent, is:
At: FAO:
Mr. Douglas Williamson  
Forest Conservation, Research and Education Service (FORC)  
Forestry Department  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,  
00100, Rome, Italy  
tel: 0039-06-5705-2332  
fax: 0039-06-5705-5188  
e-mail: douglas.williamson@fao.org

correspondence should be copied to:  
Ms. Barbara Cooney  
GEF Focal Point  
FAO, TCII  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,  
00100, Rome, Italy  
tel: 0039-06-5705-5478  
fax: 0039-06-5705-4657  
e-mail: barbara.cooney@fao.org

At UNEP:
Mr. Mark Zimsky  
Senior Programme Officer  
Biodiversity  
UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination  
P.O. Box 30552  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Telephone: (+254) 2 623257  
Fax: (+254) 2 623696/624041  
e-mail: mark.zimsky@unep.org

With a copy to:  
Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaf  
Executive Coordinator  
UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination  
P.O. Box 30552  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Telephone: (+254) 2 624165  
Fax: (+254) 2 624041

All correspondence regarding financial and administrative matters should be addressed to:

At FAO:
Mr. D.L. Baugh  
Chief, Projects Accounting Group (AFFR)  
FAO  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,  
00100, Rome, Italy
EVALUATION

Upon completion of the project UNEP and Division of GEF Office will undertake a desk evaluation to measure the degree to which the objectives of the project have been achieved.
SECTION 15 – MONITORING AND REPORTING

15.1 Progress Reports

Every six months, (as at 30 June and 31 December), FAO shall submit to UNEP, with a copy to Division of GEF Coordination, using the formats given in Annex 6A and Annex 6B, reports for the GEF and the UNEP on the progress in project execution, to be submitted by FAO within 30 days of the end of the reporting period.

15.2 Terminal Reports

Within 60 days of the completion of the project, FAO will submit to UNEP a terminal report using the format given in Annex 7.

15.3 Financial Reports

(a) Project Expenditure Accounts

(i) Details of project expenditures will be reported on a project-by-project basis, in line with project budget codes as set out in the project document, as at 30 June and 31 December (see Annex 5). All expenditure accounts will be dispatched to UNEP within 30 days of the end of the period to which they refer, certified by a duly authorised official of FAO.

(ii) The expenditure accounts as at 31 December will be received by UNEP by 31 March each year.

(iii) A final statement of accounts in line with UNEP project budget codes reflecting actual final expenditure under the project, when all obligations have been liquidated.

(b) Cash advance accounts

A statement of advances of cash provided by UNEP should be submitted biannually in the format shown in Annex 3 as at 30 June and 31 December.

15.4 Terms and Conditions

15.5 Non-Expendable Equipment

NA

15.6 Responsibility for Cost Overruns

FAO is authorized to enter into commitments or incur expenditures up to a maximum of 20 per cent over and above the annual amount foreseen in the project budget under any budget sub line, provided the total cost of the UNEP annual contribution is not exceeded. This may be done without prior authorization, but once the need for the additional funds becomes apparent, a revised budget request should be submitted to UNEP immediately.
FAO will not be obliged to continue the provision of services, or to assume any liability connected with the provision of services, in excess of the funds advanced from UNEP. If, due to unforeseen circumstances, the funds stipulated in Annex 1 prove to be insufficient to cover the costs of the activities, FAO will notify UNEP, and the parties will consult on an acceptable solution. Cost overruns are the responsibility of FAO unless a revised budget has been agreed with UNEP.

Any cost overrun (expenditure in excess of the budgeted amount) on a specific budget sub line over the 20 per cent flexibility mentioned above should be met by the Organization which originally assumed responsibility for authorizing the expenditure, unless a revision has been agreed by UNEP prior to the authorization to cover it.

Savings in one budget sub line may not be applied to overruns of over 20 per cent in other sub lines, even if the total cost to UNEP remains unchanged, unless this is specifically authorized by UNEP upon presentation of such a request. In such a case, a revision of the project document amending the budget will be issued by UNEP.

15.7 Claims by third parties against UNEP

UNEP does not accept any responsibility for the handling of claims which may be brought by third parties against UNEP and its staff. UNEP and its staff shall not be liable in case of any claims or liabilities resulting from operations carried out by FAO under this project document.

15.8 Reports and Publications

All publications must be produced/published, according to UNEP’s publications manual with the approval of the UNEP Editorial Committee to ensure peer review of manuscripts, and distribution and marketing strategies. FAO and UNEP will hold joint copyright of the said manuscript.

For publications issued with the Executing Agency, both the cover and the title page of the publication will carry the logo of UNEP and the title of the United Nations Environment Programme, together with that of the Executing Agency and the collaborating agencies. The Executing Agency will submit three copies of any manuscript prepared under the project for clearance prior to their publication in final form. UNEP’s views on the publication and any suggestions for amendments of wording will be conveyed expeditiously to the Executing Agency, with an indication of any disclaimer or recognition which UNEP might wish to see appear in the publication.
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## ANNEX 1: BUDGET IN UNEP FORMAT

### Year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNEP BUDGET LINE</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNEP BUDGET LINE</strong></td>
<td>US $</td>
<td>US $</td>
<td>US $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT PERSONNEL COMPONENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 Project Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Show title/grade)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Give description of activity/service)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201 International consultant review of guidelines, 3 months</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203 National consultants (4), 2 months @ $6000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1204 International consult. for analysis of problems, methods and criteria, 2 months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1205 International consult. for prep. of project brief, 2 months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1206 Inter. consultant to facilitate 5 meeting over year, total 3 months</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1299 Total</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>149,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Show title/grade)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301 Support services cost</td>
<td>3,660</td>
<td>18,444</td>
<td>22,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1399 Total</td>
<td>3,660</td>
<td>18,444</td>
<td>22,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel on official business (above staff)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601 Travel on official business</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699 Total</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1999 Component Total</strong></td>
<td>33,600</td>
<td>170,444</td>
<td>204,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-CONTRACT COMPONENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3200 Group training (study tours, field trips, workshops, seminars, etc) (give title)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3201 4 National workshops to review constraints/opport.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3203 Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meetings/conferences (give title)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301 First meeting-Steering Committee</td>
<td>30,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3302 First Technical Advisory -7 participants</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3303 Critical eval.of in situ projects-steering committee team</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3305 Meeting of TAG to design problem analysis/selection criteria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3306 Steering committee meeting to review analysis of criteria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3307 Steering committee meeting to review project brief</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,456</td>
<td>31,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3399 Total</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>110,456</td>
<td>142,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3999 Component Total</strong></td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>154,456</td>
<td>186,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>65,600</td>
<td>324,900</td>
<td>390,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 2: PDF B WORKPLAN AND TIMETABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PDF-B Activities</th>
<th>PDF Project Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 1.1</strong> – Project initiation and formulation of administrative arrangements</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 1.2</strong> [a] First meeting of Steering Committee – 15 participants, 3 days – adoption of admin arrangements: followed by [b] first meeting of Technical Advisory Group – 7 participants, 1 day</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 2</strong> Global review of guidelines and methodologies for <em>in situ</em> conservation by International Consultant</td>
<td>xx xx Xx xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 3.1</strong> - Field evaluation of <em>in situ</em> conservation projects by Field Evaluation Team – 8 participants, 14 days</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 3.2</strong> – Critical reviews of national <em>in situ</em> activities by national consultants</td>
<td>xx xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 3.3</strong> – Four national workshops to review constraints on and opportunities for <em>in situ</em> conservation – facilitated by FAO or Diversitas or IPGRI</td>
<td>xx xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 4.1</strong> – Meeting of TAG and international consultant – 8 participants, 2 days – to design problem analysis and selection of methods and criteria</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 4.2</strong> – Analysis by International Consultant of problems, methods, criteria – 2 months</td>
<td>xx xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 4.3</strong> – Meeting of Steering Committee and International Consultant to adopt initial methods and criteria - 16 participants, 3 days</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 5.1</strong> – Preparation of Full Project Brief by International Consultant and FAO – 2 months</td>
<td>xx xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 5.2</strong> – Meeting of Steering Committee and International Consultant to finalize Project Brief - 16 participants, 3 days</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 3: FORMAT FOR CASH ADVANCE STATEMENT

Cash advance statement
Statement of cash advance as at .................................................................
And cash requirements for the quarter of .....................................................

Name of cooperating agency /
Supporting organization ___________________________________________
Project No. ___________________________________________
Project title ___________________________________________

I. Cash statement
1. Opening cash balance as at ......................... US$ __________________
2. Add: cash advances received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Total cash advanced to date US$ __________________
4. Less: total cumulative expenditures incurred US$ (_________________)
5. Closing cash balance as at ........................... US$ __________________

II. Cash requirements forecast
6. Estimated disbursements for quarter ending ........................................ US$ __________________
7. Less: closing cash balance (see item 5, above) US$ (_________________)
8. Total cash requirements for the quarter ........................................ US$ __________________

Prepared by______________________      Request approved by_______________________
Duly authorised official of cooperating agency/ supporting organisation
ANNEX 4

UNEP
INVENTORY OF NON-EXPENDABLE EQUIPMENT PURCHASED AGAINST UNEP PROJECTS
UNIT VALUE US$1,500 AND ABOVE AND ITEMS OF ATTRACTION

As at ______________________________

Project No._______________________

Project Title _________________________________________________________________

Implementing Agency: ________________________________________________________

Internal/SO/CA (UNEP use only)________________________________________________

FPMO (UNEP) use only)___________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Date of Purchase</th>
<th>Original Price (US$)</th>
<th>Present Condition</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Remarks/recommendation for disposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The physical verification of the items was done by:

Name:_____________________________________ Signature:_________________________________

Title:_______________________________________ Date:_____________________________________
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ANNEX 5: FORMAT OF PROJECT EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS FOR THE CASH CONTRIBUTION FOR COOPERATING AGENCIES

Quarterly project statement of allocation (budget), expenditure and balance (expressed in US$) covering the period ............................ to ..............................

Project No. ................................................. Agency Name ................................................................

Project title: .....................................................................................................................................................................................

Project commencing: ......................... (date)  Project ending: ......................... (date)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object of expenditure by UNEP budget code</th>
<th>Project budget Allocation for year.......</th>
<th>Expenditure For the quarter ..........</th>
<th>Total unliquidated obligations</th>
<th>Unspent balance of budget for the year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1100 Project personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Amount (2) m/m (3) Amount (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300 Administrative support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400 Volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600 Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100 Sub-contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200 Sub-contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300 Sub-contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3100 Fellowships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3200 Group training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300 Fellowships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4100 Expendable equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4200 Non-expendable equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4300 Premises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5100 Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5200 Reporting costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5300 Sundry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5400 Hospitality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

99 GRAND TOTAL

NB: The expenditure should be reported in line with the specific object of expenditures as per project budget
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ANNEX 6A: Format of Progress Report to GEF

1. IDENTIFIERS

Country:

Project title:

Focal Area:

Implementing Agency:

GEF Funding:

Co-funding:

2. FINANCIAL STATUS

(Commitment and disbursement data as of the date of the report).

3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS

(Statement of progress of the project components in relation to agreements or plans. Assessment of Overall Status. Report on the reasons, in the event of delays, cost over-run or positive deviations).

4. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES

(Assessment of likelihood that project objectives will be achieved).

5. SPECIFIC ASSESSMENT OF FACTORS RELATING TO THE BIODIVERSITY FOCAL AREA
ANNEX 6B Format for Progress Report to UNEP

as at 30 June, and 31 December

Implementing Organization:
_____________________________________________________________________________

Project No:________________________________________________________________________

Project Title:________________________________________________________________________

Reporting Period:
_____________________________________________________________________________

1. **Project Personnel required (Task Manager/Project Coordinator and Administrative Assistants)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name / Functional Title</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Duration of Contract</th>
<th>Fee (in US$)</th>
<th>Brief Terms of Reference</th>
<th>Object of Expenditure (code per the budget e.g 1101, 1301 etc..)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Experts/Consultants required:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name / Functional Title</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Duration of Contract</th>
<th>Fee (in US$)</th>
<th>Brief Terms of Reference</th>
<th>Object of Expenditure (code per the budget e.g 1201, 1202 etc..)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Sub-contracts required:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Address of Organisation</th>
<th>Object of Expenditure (code per the budget e.g 2201, 2301 etc..)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Major items of equipment ordered:** (Value over $1,500)

Please attach to the 2nd quarter (April - June) and 4th quarter (Oct - Dec) progress reports an **inventory** of all non-expendable equipment, indicating date of purchase, description, serial number, quantity, location, cost and remarks, and for vehicles, give mileage report (see separate inventory list format).
5. Status of the implementation of the activities listed under WORKPLAN in the project document, and status of documents, reports, manuals, guidelines, etc.

(a) List actual activities/outputs* **completed/produced** under the following headings where appropriate:

(Please tick appropriate box)

(i) **Meetings** (envisaged under the project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intergovernmental (IG) Mtg</th>
<th>Expert Group Mtg</th>
<th>Training/Seminar Workshop</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Title________________________________________________________________________________________________________
Venue and Dates________________________________________________________________________________________________
Convened by______________________________________ Organized by__________________________________________________
Report issued as doc. no. /symbol________________________ Languages__________________________________ Dated__________
For Training Seminar/Workshop, please indicate: No. of participants_________ and attach Annex giving names and nationalities of participants.

Annex (Participants List, Quarterly Progress Report))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(ii) **Printed Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report to</th>
<th>IG Mtg</th>
<th>Technical Publication</th>
<th>Technical Report</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Title________________________________________________________________________________________________________
Author(s)/Editor(s)_______________________________________________________________________________________________
Publisher_______________________________________________________________________________________________________
Symbol (UN/UNEP/ISBN/ISSN)____________________________________________________________________________________
Date of publication______________________ (when the above reports have been distributed, attach the distribution list).

(iii) **Technical Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>__________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>__________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>__________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>__________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>__________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>__________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(iv) **Technical Cooperation**

- Grants and Fellowships
- Advisory Services
- Others (describe)

**Purpose**

**Place and Duration**

For Grants/Fellowships, please indicate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Countries/Nationalities</th>
<th>Cost (in US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) **Status of activities/outputs underway:**

(i) Meetings, seminars, workshops, study tours, training courses, fellowships under preparation
(ii) Status of documents, reports, manuals, guidelines being prepared
(iii) Status of studies, surveys underway
(iv) Status of implementation of other activities

6. **Summary of the problems encountered in project delivery (if any)**

7. **Actions taken or required to solve the problems identified in (5) above**
ANNEX 7: FORMAT FOR TERMINAL REPORT

TERMINAL REPORT
(For External Projects Only)

Implementing Organization
_____________________________________________________________________________

Project
No.__________________________________________________________________________

Project
Title:_________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

1. **Project Needs and Results**
   Re-state the needs and results of the project.

2. **Project activities**
   Describe the activities actually undertaken under the project, giving reasons why some activities were not undertaken, if any.

3. **Project outputs**
   Compare the outputs generated with the ones listed in the project document.
   List the actual outputs produced but not included in previous Progress Reports under the following headings
   (Please tick appropriate box)

   (a) **MEETINGS** (UNEP-convened meetings only)
      Inter-governmental (IG) Mtg.  Expert Group Mtg.  Training Seminar/Workshop  Others
      Title:_________________________________________________________________________

      Venue and dates_______________________________________________________________________
      Convened by _______________________________ Organized by _______________________________
      Report issued as doc. No/Symbol____________ Languages ______________ Dated ______________
      For Training Seminar/Workshop, please indicate: No. of participants ______ and attach annex giving names and nationalities of participants.
### (b) PRINTED MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)/Editor(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol(UN/UNEP/ISBN/ISSN):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of publication:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(When technical reports/publications have been distributed, attach **distribution list**)

### (c) TECHNICAL INFORMATION

**PUBLIC INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (d) TECHNICAL COOPERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants and Fellowships</th>
<th>Advisory Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Missions</td>
<td>Others (describe)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose:**

| Place and duration: | |

For Grants/Fellowships, please indicate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Countries/Nationalities</th>
<th>Cost(in US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Use of outputs**
   State the use made of the outputs.

5. **Degree of achievement of the objectives/results**
   On the basis of facts obtained during the follow-up phase, describe how the project document outputs and their use were or were not instrumental in realizing the objectives/results of the project.

6. **Conclusions**
   Enumerate the lessons learned during the project execution. Concentrate on the management of the project, indicating the principal factors which determined success or failure in meeting the objectives set down in the project document.

7. **Recommendations**
   Make recommendations to:
   (a) Improve effect and impact of similar projects in the future;
   (b) Indicate what further action might be needed to meet the project objectives/results.

8. **Non-expendable equipment (value over US$1,500)**
   Please attach to the terminal report a **final** inventory of all non-expendable equipment (if any) purchased under this project, indicating the following:
   Date of purchase, description, serial number, quantity, cost, location and present condition, together with your **proposal** for the disposal of the said equipment.
ANNEX 8: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PROJECT PERSONNEL

Terms of Reference

International Consultant

Organization and Facilitation of Meetings

BACKGROUND

This consultancy is being implemented in the context of a project development initiative which is supported by the Global Environment Facility [GEF] through a PDF B grant. The partners in this initiative are the four participating countries – Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco and Turkey – and four other partners – UNEP GEF, FAO, IPGRI and DIVERSITAS.

FAO is responsible for the implementation of this phase of the initiative.

The objective of the project that is being developed is to facilitate the in situ conservation and management by the participating countries of wild or semi-domesticated species identified by them as important to agriculture or forestry or having other economic importance, (such as medicinal or aromatic species) in natural or semi-natural habitats and in traditional farming systems through the implementation of the four activities listed below:

1) Development of National Strategies and methodologies based on best practice, for the inventory, selection, in situ conservation management and monitoring of wild species of economic importance.

2) Implementation of demonstration projects.

3) Establishment of long-term monitoring and evaluation systems.

4) Information dissemination

SCOPE OF WORK

Objective: to organize and facilitate five meetings that will be held in the course of the project development initiative.

Specific Tasks:

The consultant will work in close collaboration with FAO and it is envisaged that the consultancy will involve at least the following activities:
1. Assisting with preparation of meeting documentation

2. Pre-planning of meetings

3. Logistical organization of meetings

4. Informal facilitation of meeting activities

5. Acting as meeting rapporteur

6. Preparation of meeting reports.

This list of activities is not exhaustive and it is expected that the consultant will show the initiative that is needed to ensure that meetings are efficiently prepared and run.

**Outputs:**

1. Meeting documentation

2. Meeting reports

**Location of consultancy:** Home based with travel for preparing and implementing meetings

**Timing and Duration:** The consultancy will start as soon as the dates of the first meeting have been fixed and will conclude when the report for the fifth meeting has been finalized. A total of three months work is envisaged.

**Qualifications Required:**

- An academic background which provides the capacity to grasp the technical issues involved

- Five or more years of organizing and facilitating international technical meetings

- An ability to prepare meeting documentation and meeting reports in a timely fashion

- Ability to work both independently and in a team.

- Computer literacy
Reporting and contacts: The consultant will report to the Technical Advisory Group and at FAO to:

Mr. Douglas Williamson  
Forest Conservation, Research and Education Service (FORC)  
Forestry Department  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,  
00100, Rome, Italy  
tel: 0039-06-5705-2332  
fax: 0039-06-5705-5188  
e-mail: douglas.williamson@fao.org
Terms of Reference

for

International Consultant

Global Review of Guidelines and Methodologies for In-Situ Conservation

BACKGROUND

This consultancy is being implemented in the context of a project development initiative which is supported by the Global Environment Facility [GEF] through a PDF B grant. The partners in this initiative are the four participating countries – Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco and Turkey – and four organizations – UNEP GEF, FAO, IPGRI and DIVERSITAS.

FAO is responsible for the implementation of this phase of the initiative.

The objective of the project that is being developed is to facilitate the in situ conservation and management by the participating countries of wild or semi-domesticated species identified by them as important to agriculture or forestry or having other economic importance, (such as medicinal or aromatic species) in natural or semi-natural habitats and in traditional farming systems through the implementation of the four activities listed below:

5) Development of National Strategies and methodologies based on best practice, for the inventory, selection, in situ conservation management and monitoring of wild species of economic importance.

6) Implementation of demonstration projects.

7) Establishment of long-term monitoring and evaluation systems.

8) Information dissemination

SCOPE OF WORK

Objective: The purpose of this consultancy is to conduct a global review of in-situ conservation of plants of actual or potential economic importance, other than wild relatives of crops. It is a crucial part of project development which will strongly influence subsequent stages of the development process.
Specific Tasks:

1. A literature review

2. A detailed critical assessment of current methodologies and guidelines published by FAO, IUCN, DIVERSITAS/Council of Europe, BGCI and other bodies on *in situ* conservation

3. A review of the data collected in the process of country reporting during preparations for the International Technical Conference on Plant Genetic Resources, and reviewed in the State of the World’s Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture

4. An assessment of National Biodiversity Actions Plans and Strategies and National Reports prepared by Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (under Article 6)

5. A review of the results obtained from GEF-financed projects involving *in situ* conservation of target species

6. A review of the full range of *in situ* activities involving wild species undertaken by local and national conservation bodies, including species recovery programmes, genetic resource conservation of agricultural and forestry species, and habitat restoration

7. Identification and description of commonly occurring problems

This list of activities is indicative only, and the consultant is free to amend it in any way that facilitates the objectives of this consultancy.

A general consideration which should influence the implementation of this consultancy is that this will be the first global survey of this field and will be of importance to all countries attempting *in situ* conservation of target species

Outputs:

1. A global review of the current situation regarding *in situ* conservation of wild species of economic importance and identification of any best practices
Location of Consultancy: Home based with the possibility of travel if this is found to be necessary by the TAG.

Timing and Duration: To start immediately after the completion of the first meetings of the Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Group. Duration – three months

Qualifications Required:

- A PhD in an appropriate scientific or natural resources discipline
- A detailed understanding of the *in situ* conservation of plants
- A sound understanding of policy, legal and institutional considerations, especially in relation to the issues of decentralization and community and local participation
- A demonstrated capacity for analysis and synthesis at scales ranging from the local to the global
- A demonstrated capacity to present issues clearly, comprehensively and concisely

Reporting and contacts: The consultant will report to the Technical Advisory Group and at FAO to:

Mr. Douglas Williamson  
Forest Conservation, Research and Education Service (FORC)  
Forestry Department  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,  
00100, Rome, Italy  
tel: 0039-06-5705-2332  
fax: 0039-06-5705-5188  
e-mail: douglas.williamson@fao.org

Terms of Reference
For

Problem Analysis Consultancy

BACKGROUND

This consultancy is being implemented in the context of a project development initiative which is supported by the Global Environment Facility [GEF] through a PDF B grant. The partners in this initiative are the four participating countries – Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco and Turkey – and four other partners – UNEP GEF, FAO, IPGRI and DIVERSITAS.

FAO is responsible for the implementation of this phase of the initiative.

The objective of the project that is being developed is to facilitate the in situ conservation and management by the participating countries of wild or semi-domesticated species identified by them as important to agriculture or forestry or having other economic importance, (such as medicinal or aromatic species) in natural or semi-natural habitats and in traditional farming systems through the implementation of the four activities listed below:

9) Development of National Strategies and methodologies based on best practice, for the inventory, selection, in situ conservation management and monitoring of wild species of economic importance.

10) Implementation of demonstration projects.

11) Establishment of long-term monitoring and evaluation systems.

12) Information dissemination

SCOPE OF WORK

Objective: drawing on the global review of in situ conservation, field evaluation and workshops, to make a critical analysis of issues relating to in situ conservation of target species, and to produce a set of recommendations for its implementation at a national level.

SPECIFIC TASKS

The consultant’s activities will involve consideration of at least the following:

1. The identification of target taxa. Estimates of numbers of candidate species, category of threat, and their geographical location. Review of existing methodologies to identify priorities (e.g. SSC CAMP protocols).
2. **Criteria for selection.** A set of criteria for species and site selection will be prepared. Potential criteria include: (1) existence of a range of suitable target species, such as nationally and regionally or globally important genetic resources; (2) existence of suitable protected area(s) with a well developed management structure, ability and willingness to incorporate *in situ* management plans into the reserves’ management plans; (3) a suitable scientific and technical infrastructure; (4) availability of trained personnel; (5) socio-economic considerations; (6) existence of NGOs with strong farmer participation; (7) grass roots movements for community management of genetic resources.

3. **Role of protected areas – their value and potential.** Review of effectiveness and utility of existing models including gene sanctuaries, gene conservation areas, gene management zones, forest gene reserves, mini-reserves, MAB reserves, home gardens.

4. **The management of reserve areas.** Size of reserves, size and extent of population samples. The constraints imposed by the dynamics of the environment, the species assemblages that make up the ecosystems and the species populations themselves, in managing and conserving target species.

5. **The monitoring and management of target populations.** Feasibility, advantages and disadvantages of conservation outside formally protected areas. The effects of fragmentation of ecosystems and species populations and the problems posed by mosaics. Significance of marginal populations. Techniques to monitor short, medium and long term changes in the target species and in their ecosystems (*morphological, molecular and ecological*).

6. **The identification of effective complementary techniques.** Role and participation of *ex situ* facilities in conserving target species *in situ*. Link between *in situ* management and habitat restoration. Assessment of grass roots needs and provision of assistance to farm households and local communities to help them obtain, maintain and conserve genetic material of their locally used crops and semi-domesticates.

7. **Establishing a local and national context.** Role of existing professional networks in facilitating *in situ* management (e.g. SSC National Groups). Community action and participation of indigenous peoples in conserving target species *in situ* and the complementary role of community nurseries and seed banks. How to integrate *in situ* conservation into national conservation and development policies, plans and strategies.

8. **The wild-domesticated interface** and the role of traditional agriculture in conserving semi-domesticates *in situ*. Documentation of indigenous and ethnobiological knowledge that is an essential element in understanding how to conserve species used in traditional communities/farm households.

9. **Proposals to overcome the problems posed by land tenure** that can be a major obstacle to the implementation of *in situ* conservation.
10. **Proposals regarding intellectual property rights and compensation packages for restriction of access to target species by local people.** This will initially be investigated by the TAG in the light of the experience gained during the Field Evaluation and will be elaborated by the consultant.

This list of activities is indicative only, and the consultant is free to amend it in any way that facilitates achievement of the objectives of this consultancy.

**Outputs:**
A report which provides detailed recommendations for the implementation of *in situ* conservation at national level in the four participating countries.

**Location of Consultancy:** Home based with participation in pre- and post consultancy meetings of TAG and Steering Committee – travel to the region may be deemed necessary by the TAG.

**Timing and Duration:** Starts with the TAG meeting to initiate problem analysis and concludes with Steering Committee Meeting to review the analysis, covering a total period of two months.

**Qualifications Required:**

- A higher degree [preferably PhD] in an appropriate natural resources discipline
- Knowledge of the principles of in-situ conservation and their practical application in the field
- International experience, preferably including experience in the region.
- Knowledge and understanding of the conditions in which projects in the region operate
- Proven ability in both analysis and synthesis of technical issues and of integrating socio-economic considerations into implementation of practical activities

**Reporting and contacts:** The consultant will report to the Technical Advisory Group and at FAO to:
Mr. Douglas Williamson
Forest Conservation, Research and Education Service (FORC)
Forestry Department
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00100, Rome, Italy
tel: 0039-06-5705-2332
fax: 0039-06-5705-5188
e-mail: douglas.williamson@fao.org
Terms of Reference

International Consultant

Development of Project Brief

BACKGROUND

This consultancy is being implemented in the context of a project development initiative which is supported by the Global Environment Facility [GEF] through a PDF B grant. The partners in this initiative are the four participating countries – Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco and Turkey – and four other partners – UNEP GEF, FAO, IPGRI and DIVERSITAS.

FAO is responsible for the implementation of this phase of the initiative.

The objective of the project that is being developed is to facilitate the in situ conservation and management by the participating countries of wild or semi-domesticated species identified by them as important to agriculture or forestry or having other economic importance, (such as medicinal or aromatic species) in natural or semi-natural habitats and in traditional farming systems through the implementation of the four activities listed below:

13) Development of National Strategies and methodologies based on best practice, for the inventory, selection, in situ conservation management and monitoring of wild species of economic importance.

14) Implementation of demonstration projects.

15) Establishment of long-term monitoring and evaluation systems.

16) Information dissemination

SCOPE OF WORK

Objective: to draft the project brief for the full project envisaged in the PDF B component

Specific Tasks:

1. Work with project partners on the preparation of the final Project Brief, using the outputs for all the earlier Consultancies as the starting point for this exercise

2. Present a draft Project Brief to a final Steering Committee meeting and participate in the discussion and finalization of the draft
Outputs:

1. A draft of the final Project Brief

**Location of Consultancy:** The consultant will based at their own office while drafting the brief and will travel to the meeting where it will be reviewed and finalized.

**Timing and Duration:** The consultancy will start after the finalization of the problem analysis, will involve two months of continuous work and will require close collaboration with the Technical Advisory Group and the Project Steering Committee.

**Qualifications Required:**

- An academic background which provides the capacity to rapidly master the technical issues
- Ten or more years of relevant practical experience
- Detailed and comprehensive knowledge of the GEF biodiversity focal area, the GEF operational strategy and the two operational programmes involved [arid and semi-arid ecosystems, agricultural biodiversity]
- International experience, preferably including in one or more of the countries in the region
- An ability to grasp the cultural and socio-economic considerations that will influence the development and implementation of the project
- Ability to write and finalize project documents in a timely fashion
- Ability to work independently and in a team

**Reporting and contacts:** The consultant will report to the Technical Advisory Group and at FAO to:

Mr. Douglas Williamson  
Forest Conservation, Research and Education Service (FORC)  
Forestry Department  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,  
00100, Rome, Italy  
tel: 0039-06-5705-2332  
fax: 0039-06-5705-5188  
e-mail: douglas.williamson@fao.org
Terms of Reference

National Consultant

Review of National in-situ Activities

BACKGROUND

This consultancy is being implemented in the context of a project development initiative which is supported by the Global Environment Facility [GEF] through a PDF B grant [the PDF B brief is attached to these TOR as ANNEX 1]. The partners in this initiative are the four participating countries – Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco and Turkey – and four other partners – UNEP GEF, FAO, IPGRI and DIVERSITAS.

FAO is responsible for the implementation of this phase of the initiative.

The objective of the project that is being developed is to facilitate the in situ conservation and management by the participating countries of wild or semi-domesticated species identified by them as important to agriculture or forestry or having other economic importance, (such as medicinal or aromatic species) in natural or semi-natural habitats and in traditional farming systems through the implementation of the four activities listed below:

1) Development of National Strategies and methodologies based on best practice, for the inventory, selection, in situ conservation management and monitoring of wild species of economic importance.

2) Implementation of demonstration projects.

3) Establishment of long-term monitoring and evaluation systems.

4) Information dissemination

SCOPE OF WORK

Objective: to conduct of review of national activities relating to the in-situ conservation of plants of economic importance, other than wild relatives of crops, which will serve as the background document for a national workshop to obtain the views of local and national experts, planners and officials and representatives of local communities and other stakeholders on the effectiveness of ongoing activities, identify constraints and reasons for shortcomings.

Specific Tasks:
It is expected that it will be necessary investigate to the following questions:

1. What are the existing policies that relate to in-situ conservation [ISC]?
2. What are the existing laws and regulations that relate to ISC?
3. Which institutions are responsible for ISC?
4. Who are the local and national experts on ISC?
5. What are the main plant species that are currently of economic importance and how important are they?
6. What is the current status of these plants?
7. Who are the main stakeholders with an interest in these plants?
8. What are the current activities in ISC?
9. What are the major problems and constraints being experienced in ISC?
10. What should the priorities be in promoting and upgrading ISC?

This list of questions is not exhaustive and the consultant should address other questions and issues if this is necessary in order to identify what actions are needed to promote effective ISC at the national level.

**Outputs:**

1. A background document for a national workshop on in situ conservation of plants of economic importance

**Location of Consultancy:** The consultant will work out of their own office and travel within the country as required to implement review

**Timing and Duration:** The consultancy will start after the completion of the Field Evaluation and will last for two months
Qualifications Required:

An academic background in an appropriate scientific or natural resources discipline

- Knowledge of the principles of *in situ* conservation of plants
- Ten or more years of relevant practical experience
- Knowledge of policy, legal and institutional considerations that have a bearing on *in situ* conservation, especially with regard to stakeholder participation at the local and community level
- Knowledge of the national and local NGO communities
- Proven analytical and reporting skills
- Ability to produce a technical report in a timely fashion
ANNEX 9: Annexes Contained in the UNEP GEF PDF B as approved by GEF

Annex 1: In situ Conservation in the Participating Countries

The status of in situ conservation [ISC] in the participating countries is briefly summarised below with the objective of demonstrating their involvement in and commitment to ISC.

EGYPT

[1] Institutional responsibility for ISC of plants
a) Faculty of Science, Flora Research Dept.
   b) Desert Institute, Flora Research Dept.
   c) Field Crops Research Institute – Gene bank – Bahteen
   d) Island Plant at Aswan – Upper Egypt
   e) Environmental Affairs System – Prime Minister Office
   (Information provided by University of Cairo)
   f) Nature Conservation Sector (NSC) at Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (EEAA) is the responsible body for management of protected areas and conservation of biodiversity in Egypt and the sole candidate to act as the counterpart for the proposed project.

Contacts: Dr. Moustafa Fouda
   Director, Nature Conservation Sector
   Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency
   14 Shagaret El-Dor, Zamalek, Cairo

NFP - Dr. Ibrahim Abd El Gelil, Chief Executive Officer, Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs, Office of the Minister.

[2] Recent and ongoing activities in ISC

A US$ 4.3 million UNDP/GEF Project entitled “The Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants in Arid and Semi-Arid Ecosystems” is becoming operational. The project document is the output of a PDF-B phase that started in 1998 and the project activities will start this year. The objective of the project is to conserve globally significant medicinal plant species and associated habitats in St Katherine’s Protectorate. It focuses on protection, registration and regeneration of endangered endemic species (42 species), training of Bedouins on cultivation, harvesting, processing and marketing of medicinal plants. As part of the project activities the Egyptian Government will use the experience gained in the Sinai project to develop a National Strategy for Medicinal Plants in Egypt which can be one area of cooperation between the two projects.

(Information from UNDP Cairo)

El-Gazar Project directed by Drs. El-Gazar, El-Kasas, El-Batanony and Nabeel El-Hadide.(Inf. from Cairo University)

Some activities initiated by Dr. Mamdouh Riad, Undersecretary of state For Afforestation and Environment, Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation – species: Khaya, Acacia, Mulberry, Jatropha, Cupressus, Casuaria, Poplar.
[3] **Priority Species**

- *medicinal and aromatic plants* Salyx spp.
- *ornamental plants*
- *fibres*: Papyrus spp., Typha spp.
- *oil plants*
- *fuel wood*
- *fodder and grazing plants*

[4] **People who make use of these categories**

These categories are mainly used by artisans.

[5] **Trade in species in these categories**

No information is available.

[6] **Conservation of these species**

Limited information.

[7] **Availability of genetic resources from these species in gene banks, field gene banks or protected areas**

Limited information.

[8] **Protection of these species by national laws or regulations**

Some general protection is provided by laws and regulations and Egypt has recently acceded to CITES.

[9] **Inclusion of these species in country reports, biodiversity strategies and action plans**

Salyx spp. features in Egypt’s national Afforestation/Forestry Action Plan.
LEBANON

[1] Institutional responsibility for ISC of plants
Two ministries have responsibilities relating to in-situ conservation, namely:
- the Ministry of Environment;
- the Ministry of Agriculture.
The GEF Focal Point is the Director General of the Ministry of the Environment, Dr Berj Haljian.

[2] Recent and ongoing activities in ISC
Ongoing activities include an Agrobiodiversity Project, an in situ Econursery Project, and inventories of plant species in protected areas.

Also, a GEF in-situ project was launched by the Ministry of Environment in 1996. It will come to an end in November 2001. It is entitled “Strengthening of National Capacity in Grassroots in-situ Conservation for Sustainable Biodiversity Protection” and is supported by UNDP, GEF, and technically by IUCN.

The project objectives are the elaboration of a management strategy for Protected Areas to safeguard endemic, rare and endangered species of flora and fauna, the conservation of their habitats and the incorporation of biodiversity conservation as an integral part of sustainable human development. It has also promoted national reconciliation between different parties through the incorporation of education (building capacities) and sensitization components (documentary films, TV spots, Posters) directed towards the local communities.

Within the framework of this project, the ministry initiated a one year project ‘Flora & Fauna diversity in the Protected areas’. It was launched by the Lebanese National Council for Scientific Research (LCNRS). On the basis of surveys of fauna and flora in each reserve, lists of species were elaborated and species of biological importance were highlighted.

[3] Priority species
herbs, aromatic and medicinal plants: Oregano, Salvia, and Allium spp.
horticultural plants: Almond, Fig, Pear, Pistachia, Plum
fuel wood: Oak, Pine
fodder and grazing plants: Alfalfa, Clover, Vetch

[4] People who make use of species in these categories
At the local level, farmers and villagers. At the national and global level, plant breeders and researchers

[5] Trade in species in these categories
There is no information on this.
[6] Conservation of these species
Some work is ongoing in the Agrobiodiversity Project on in situ conservation through awareness rising in farming communities and fencing plots. Some general protection is provided by protected areas and forest conservation measures.

[7] Availability of genetic resources from these species in genebank, field genebanks, or protected areas
Genebanks have been and are being established in cooperation with institutions such as FAO, ICARDA, LARI and Kew.

The Agrobiodiversity Project is developing field gene banks for fruit trees in cooperation with ACSAD.

[8] Protection of these species by national laws or regulations
Species which have explicit legal protection include conifers and medicinal plants.

[9] Inclusion of these species in country reports, biodiversity strategies and action plans
MOROCCO

[1] Institutional responsibility for ISC of plants
ISC of wild plants is the responsibility of the Directorate for the Conservation of Forest Resources [DCRF] in the Ministry of Water and Forests [MCEF].

The GEF Focal Point is the Division of Wildlife, Fisheries and Biodiversity in the DCRF.

[2] Recent and ongoing activities in ISC
Activities relating to ISC are being implemented by the following institutions:
- in the Ministry of Water and Forests, both the Directorate for Conservation of Forest Resources [DCRF], and the Division for Forestry Research and Experimentation [DREF];
- the Department of Biology in the Institute of Science in the Mohammed V University;
- the Department of Ecology in the National College of Forest Engineers;
- the Department of Ecology and the Complex for Horticulture of Agadir in the Hassan II Agronomic and Veterinary Institute;
- Moroccan Committee of Man and the Biosphere programme;
- Association of Aromatic and Medicinal Plants [NGO];
- Moroccan Biodiversity Association [NGO].


[3] Priority species
- herbs, aromatic and medicinal plants: Carob, Lavender, Mint, Myrtle, Oregano, Rosemary, Thyme
- ornamental plants: Laurier Rose, Rosemary
- fibre: Doum, Sisal
- oil plants: Argan
- fuel wood: Argan, Cypress, Fir, Juniper, Oak
- fodder and grazing plants: Argan, Carob, Hawthorn, Heather
- Used for handicrafts: Heath, Thuya

[4] People who make use of species in these categories
Local populations are the main users of plants for fuel wood, forrage and oil.
Private enterprise makes use of herbs, aromatic and medicinal plants, and plants for fibre under licence.

[5] Trade in species in these categories
The annual volume of exports in herbs, aromatic and medicinal plants is over 10,000 tonnes

[6] Conservation of these species
Carob, Lavender, Mint and Rosemary are cultivated.
Argan and Jujube are regarded as vulnerable.
[7] Availability of genetic resources from these species in genebank, field genebanks, or protected areas
Genetic resources of most species are available in the wild and/or in protected areas

[8] Protection of these species by national laws or regulations
There is no specific legal protection, but the Forestry Law provides general protection.

[9] Inclusion of these species in country reports, biodiversity strategies and action plans
Some species are mentioned in the National Biodiversity Report [Department of Environment], an in the Report on the Plan of the Director of Protected Areas.
**TURKEY**

The following is a concise summary of a modest subset of the copious information that exists on ISC of plants in Turkey.

[1] **Institutional responsibility for ISC of plants**

Three institutions have responsibilities related to ISC in Turkey, namely:

- the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, which is responsible for in situ conservation of wild crop species – the Executing Agency for this project;
- the Ministry of Forestry, which has responsibilities for ISC of forest genetic resources, including trees and other plants of economic importance;
- the Ministry of the Environment has responsibilities for ISC through its coordination of activities related to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

There are two GEF Focal Points, the Undersecretary of the Treasury and the Department of Foreign Relations in the Ministry of the Environment.

[3] **Recent and ongoing activities in ISC**

In addition to regular program activities of departments involved in ISC in the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs and the Ministry of Forestry, substantial project based ISC activities have been and continue to be implemented.

Between March 1993 and September 1998 the $5.2 million In-situ Conservation of Genetic Diversity Project, GEF Grant No. 28632-TU was implemented. The objectives of this project were: [i] to identify and establish in-situ conservation areas for the protection of genetic resources and wild relatives of non-woody and woody species and associated forest germplasm; [ii] to develop institutional capacity for preparing and implementing a national strategy for in-situ conservation. The project outcome was rated as highly satisfactory.

Early in 2001 implementation of the $ 8.2 million World Bank/GEF Biodiversity and Natural Resources Management Project began. This includes a component “Developing Prototypes for Effective Protected Area Management”.

[4] **Priority species**

The distribution of priority species has not been precisely mapped, but in general terms they occur primarily along the Black Sea, Mediterranean and Aegean coastlines. Examples of priority species and types include:

- **herbs, medicinal and aromatic plants:** Incense, Thyme, Oregano, Rosemary, Carob, Myrtle, Bay, Sumac, Chestnut, Madder
- **ornamental plants:** Tulip, Crocus, Snowdrop, Cyclamen, Fritillaria, Lily
- **horticultural plants:** Almond, Cherry, Pear, Plum
- **oil plants:** Storax (liquid amber oil)
- **fuel wood:** Oak – more than 20 species
- **fodder and grazing plants:** Alfalfa, Clover, Vetch
[5] People who make use of species in these categories
These species are used by forest villagers, rural people, plant breeders, traders, exporters and industrialists. In other words, they are used by a wide spectrum of people in activities ranging from the traditional to modern commercial and industrial.

[6] Trade in species in these categories
There is substantial trade in these species. Trade in aromatic, medicinal and ornamental species is documented. In 1996 it provided revenue of nearly $7 million to villagers.

[7] Conservation of these species
Information on the conservation of individual species is limited, but more than 3 million hectares of land have been allocated to various forms of in-situ conservation, including conventional protected areas, Conservation Forests, Seed Stands, Seed Orchards, Seed Plantations, and Gene Management Zones.

[8] Availability of genetic resources from these species in genebank, field genebanks, or protected areas
Existing genebanks are mainly for crops and some related wild species. The availability of genetic resources of individual species in in-situ conservation areas is generally not well documented, but it can be inferred that a substantial number of species will be represented in one or other of the various types of in-situ conservation area, precisely because these are established for conservation purposes.

[9] Protection of these species by national laws or regulations
There is no national protection of individual species, but national regulations cover:
- the collection, storage and use of plant genetic resources;
- the collection, production and export of wild flower bulbs;
- the collection of plant material in Turkey;
- research on plants by foreigners.

The Forest Law allows the General Directorate of Forestry to regulate the use of wild plant species on State Forest lands through a system of licensing.

[10] Inclusion of these species in country reports, biodiversity strategies and action plans
These species are mentioned in general terms in both the “Draft Report on the National Plan for In-situ Conservation of Plant Genetic Diversity in Turkey” and the “Draft Biodiversity Assessment Strategy and Action Plan of Turkey.”
Annex 2: Terms of Reference for Steering Committee

The Steering Committee [SC] will be the primary mechanism for integrating the interests and concerns of the participating countries and the institutional executing agencies. In general terms it will be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the project and evaluating its outputs. Specifically this will involve:

- Revising and approving the project work plan
- Approving the choice of International and National Consultants
- Reviewing the terms of reference for all consultants
- Reviewing the reports of consultants
- Reviewing the results of the field evaluation of in situ conservation sites
- Approving the planning and reports of national workshops
- Participating in the problem analysis
- Finalizing and endorsing the full scale Project Brief to be submitted for GEF funding

Project Number: GF/2715-02-

Implementation: FAO

Approval: This project was:

For GEF: cleared by the GEF Secretariat in a letter from its Chief Executive Officer dated 14 July, 2002

For UNEP: Document circulated to SMG members on 11/06/02.

Duration of Project: 15 Months
Commencing: October 2002
Completion: December 2003

Recommendation: To approve this project with a duration of 15 months at a cost of US$390,500 to the GEF Trust Fund.

A. Djoghlaf, Director, UNEP GEF Co-ordination Office

Date: ______________

E. F. Ortega, Chief Budget and Financial Management Service (UNON)

Date: ______________

S. Kakakhel, Deputy Executive Director, Chairman, GEF Programme Co-ordination Committee
Date:______________

UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

PROJECT ACTION SHEET


Project Number: GF/2715-02-4570
GF/3010-02-14

Implementation: FAO

Duration of Project: 15 months
Commencing: November 2002
Completion: January 2004

This Action Sheet, which is transmitted with a copy of the project document, lists the actions required in connection with the implementation of the project. It constitutes the authority from UNEP to the Budget and Financial Management Service (BFMS) to effect the disbursements listed therein.

Signature _______________________________
E. F. Ortega, Chief
Budget and Financial Management Service, UNON
Date: ________________________________

Date: Actions                                               Responsible Office:
November 2002 Record Commitment in US$ PRDB/BFMS/UNON
Year Amount US$
2002 65,600
2003 324,900

Cost to UNEP/GEF Trust Fund 390,900
STANDARD DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR
PROJECT DOCUMENTS/REVISIONS

To: Chief, Financial Resource Management Service (UNON/FRMS) (1 copy)

c.c.: Fund Management Officer: Mr. John Mukoza (1 copy)
Programme Officer: Mr. Mark Zimsky (1 copy)
GEF Data Management Officer: Mr. Neil Pratt (1 copy)
Chief, Programme Coordination and Management Unit (1 copy)
Chief, Project Design and Evaluation Unit (1 copy)

Director, Division of Regional Representation (2 copies)

For external projects (or Sub-projects):

Co-operating Agency/Supporting Organization (1 copy)

For specific country projects:

UNDP Country Office (1 copy)

BFMS:

Project Reports and Data Base (PRDB) (1 copy)
Report on New projects (1 copy)