



Galápagos
life fund

GALÁPAGOS LIFE FUND

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN (SEP)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMNS	5
DEFINITIONS	6
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	8
Engagement Approach	8
Stakeholder Ecosystem and ENGAGEMENT Strategy	9
1 INTRODUCTION	10
2 SCOPE	11
3 OBJECTIVES	12
4 PRINCIPLES, STANDARDS, LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK	12
4.1 GUIDING PRINCIPLES.....	12
4.2 INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS / BEST PRACTICES.....	13
A. Integration of IFC Performance Standards	14
5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	16
5.1 GLF RESPONSIBILITIES RELATED TO SEP	16
5.1.1 Facilitating Information Dissemination	16
5.1.2 Building Relationships with Implementing Partners/Grantees	16
5.1.3 Engaging the General Population/community	17
5.1.4 Ensure Grievance management Mechanism Framework	17
5.2 GLF ROLES RELATED TO SEP.....	17
6 METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH	19
6.1 STAKEHOLDER IDENTIFICATION.....	20
6.1.1 Classification by Sector	20
6.1.2 Classification by Geographical Area	21
6.1.3 Classification by Type of Beneficiary	21
6.2 STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS	22
6.3 ENGAGEMENT APPROACH.....	23
7 STAKEHOLDER ECOSYSTEM	25
7.1 STAKEHOLDERS' INSTITUTIONAL CATEGORIES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH GLF	26
7.2 STAKEHOLDER POSITIONING AND INFLUENCE RELATIVE TO GLF.....	35
8 ENGAGEMENT PLAN	41
8.1 COMMON ENGAGEMENT ACTIONS FOR ALL STAKEHOLDERS	42
A. Informative Engagement.....	42
B. Grievance Mechanism Engagement	44
8.2 ENGAGEMENT ACTIONS FOR DIRECT BENEFICIARIES	44

A.	Consultative Engagement	44
B.	Participatory Engagement	45
C.	Partnership Engagement	45
D.	Empowerment Engagement	46
8.3	ENGAGEMENT ACTIONS FOR INDIRECT BENEFICIARIES.....	46
A.	Informative Engagement	46
B.	Partnership Engagement	47
C.	Empowerment Engagement	47
D.	Participatory Engagement.....	47
9	MONITORING AND REPORTING.....	48
9.1	METHODS AND TOOLS	48
9.1.1	Informative Engagement Indicators	48
9.1.2	Grievance Mechanism Engagement Indicators	48
9.1.3	Consultative Engagement Indicators	48
9.1.4	Participatory Engagement Indicators	49
9.1.5	Empowerment Engagement Indicators	49
9.2	REPORTING	49
9.2.1	Content of Reports	50
9.2.2	Transparency and Accessibility:	50

REFERENCE OF TABLES

Table 1	Conceptual Framework for Integrating IFC Performance Standards into GLF’s Stakeholder Engagement Plan	155
Table 2:	Roles and responsibilities related to the GLF SEP	177
Table 3:	Steps of the SEP	209
Table 4	Classification by Sector	20
Table 5	Classification by Geographical Area	21
Table 6	Classification by Type of Beneficiary	22
Table 7	Detailed Analysis of Power and Influence	233
Table 8	Types of stakeholder engagement as recommended by the IFC Performance Standards for environmental and social sustainability	233
Table 9	Summary of stakeholders' institutional categories mapped	266
Table 10	Public sector stakeholders and GLF relationship	277
Table 11	Civil society stakeholders and GLF relationship.....	299
Table 12	NGO’s and GLF relationship	30
Table 13	Private organizations and relationship with GLF	32
Table 14	Academic and Research organizations with direct relation to GLF.....	34

Table 15 International organizations and GLF relationship	355
Table 16 Stakeholder Power, Influence, and Expectations Matrix	366
Table 17 GLF Stakeholder Engagement Strategy	411
Table 18 Informative engagement actions - Common engagements	43
Table 19 Grievance mechanism - Common engagements	44
Table 20 Consultative Actions for direct Beneficiaries	45
Table 21 Participatory Actions for direct Beneficiaries	45
Table 22 Partnership Actions for direct Beneficiaries	45
Table 23 Empowerment Actions for direct Beneficiaries	46
Table 24 Engagement Actions for Indirect Beneficiaries	47
Table 25 Partnership Engagement Actions	47
Table 26 Empowerment Engagement Actions	47
Table 27 Engagement Monitoring and Reporting	50

ACRONYMNS

ACRONYM	MEANING
AOI	Area of Influence
CE	Consultative Engagement
EE	Empowerment Engagement
ESMS	Environmental and Social Management System
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (German development agency)
GLF	Galápagos Life Fund
GMR	Galápagos Marine Reserve
GM	Grievance Mechanism
HMR	Hermanidad Marine Reserve
ICP	Informed Consultation and Participation
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IE	Informative Engagement
IFC	International Finance Corporation
ILO	International Labour Organization
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PE	Participatory Engagement
PP	Partnership Engagement
PS	Performance Standard
SEP	Stakeholder Engagement Plan
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme

DEFINITIONS

TERM	DEFINITION
Area of Influence (AOI)	The geographical area in which GLF's projects have a potential environmental or socio-economic impact, including the Galápagos Islands and surrounding marine ecosystems. The AOI may also extend to mainland Ecuador and international stakeholders involved in conservation efforts impacting the Galápagos.
Direct Beneficiaries/ Grantees	Organizations or groups that receive direct funding from GLF to execute projects supporting conservation or sustainable development. These may include NGOs, public sector bodies, and private entities whose activities are aligned with GLF's objectives for environmental sustainability.
Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS)	A framework designed to manage the environmental and social risks associated with GLF-funded projects, ensuring that activities align with the IFC Performance Standards, the Ecuadorian Environmental Law, and international best practices in social and environmental sustainability. The ESMS serves as the guiding policy document for all stakeholder engagement, and environmental and social risk mitigation activities of the GLF.
Grievance Mechanism (GM)	A formal system developed to allow stakeholders to submit, address, and resolve complaints or comments associated with GLF's activities. The GM ensures accountability and transparency by providing accessible, confidential, and non-retaliatory channels for submitting concerns, including online submissions, hotlines, and in-person consultations
Indirect Beneficiaries	Individuals or organizations that benefit indirectly from GLF-funded projects without receiving direct funding. They experience positive social, economic, or environmental impacts due to the enhanced ecosystem health, improved livelihoods, and sustainable practices promoted by GLF's conservation efforts.
International Finance Corporation (IFC) Performance Standards	A set of guidelines GLF follows to ensure environmental and social risk management aligns with global best practices, covering areas such as labor conditions, biodiversity conservation, community health and safety, and grievance management. The IFC Performance Standards provide GLF with a benchmark to assess, mitigate, and manage risks effectively in its operations and projects.
Potentially Affected Groups	Organizations, communities, or social groups whose activities, livelihoods, or socio-economic conditions may be adversely impacted by GLF operations or funded conservation projects or policies. These groups may not directly engage with GLF initiatives but could face changes resulting from conservation measures, such as restricted access to natural resources, modifications in land use, or economic adjustments due to new environmental regulations. To address specific concerns of Potentially Affected Groups on the Continent, GLF provides a Transitional Assistance Plan (TAP) and a specific Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) tailored to the unique challenges and conditions faced by these continental groups, ensuring their specific needs and circumstances are adequately considered and mitigated in conservation efforts.
Sustainable Blue Economy	An economic development approach that GLF promotes, aiming to balance marine conservation with economic growth by supporting initiatives that contribute to low-emission and sustainable use of marine resources. It

	integrates the socio-economic needs of local communities with the ecological requirements of the Galápagos marine ecosystem.
Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)	The strategic approach employed by GLF to actively involve stakeholders throughout the lifecycle of its projects. The SEP includes methods of stakeholder identification, classification, and engagement, facilitating transparent, participatory, and responsive communication with all stakeholders impacted by or involved in GLF-funded activities.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) serves as a strategic framework for effective stakeholder participation, fostering transparent, inclusive, and sustainable interactions throughout Galápagos Life Fund's (GLF) operations, in a manner that is both strategic and sensitive to the environmental and socio-economic dynamics of the Galápagos Islands. The methodological approach underpinning the SEP is structured to provide rigorous, scientifically grounded processes that align with the environmental, social, and governance standards central to the GLF mission. Drawing from the International Finance Corporation's (IFC) Performance Standards and established best practices in stakeholder engagement, this SEP emphasizes ethical engagement, responsiveness, and accountability.

This SEP outlines GLF's approach to stakeholder identification, engagement, and participation, addressing the specific needs and expectations of a diverse array of stakeholders—including government agencies, civil society groups, local communities, and international organizations. By classifying stakeholders into categories of direct and indirect beneficiaries, the plan ensures tailored engagement strategies that reflect each group's influence and role in the conservation ecosystem.

ENGAGEMENT APPROACH

The SEP is rooted in GLF's guiding principles of integrity, transparency, inclusivity, and respect for local cultures. These principles ensure ethical and transparent engagement, particularly with marginalized communities, to build strong and lasting partnerships. The SEP also promotes environmental and social sustainability, aligning GLF's projects with broader conservation and development objectives.

Planned stakeholder engagement is structured around various types of engagement: informative, consultative, participatory, partnership-based, and grievance mechanism-focused. Informative engagement promotes transparency by clarifying the GLF's debt-for-nature funding origin and operation through quarterly newsletters, bi-annual webinars, and annual events. Consultative Engagement gathers community input through public consultations, focus groups, and workshops. Participatory Engagement actively involves communities in project planning and monitoring, notably efforts that connect local communities with conservation outcomes. Partnership Engagement creates shared responsibilities and benefits through joint ventures and cooperative agreements, especially critical for large-scale projects requiring extensive community involvement. Empowerment Engagement targets vulnerable groups with training and capacity-building. Finally, the Grievance Mechanism Engagement provides stakeholders a confidential, non-retaliatory means to raise concerns or comments about GLF's operations and GLF-funded projects, reinforcing trust and accountability throughout the project lifecycle.

STAKEHOLDER ECOSYSTEM AND ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

GLF operates within a multifaceted ecosystem of stakeholders, each playing a vital role in influencing conservation outcomes. A detailed stakeholder mapping exercise¹ has demonstrated that approximately 38 public sector entities have a predominantly provincial influence, while 40% are social organizations, including NGOs, local associations, and grassroots groups. Public Sector stakeholders, such as the Galápagos National Park Directorate and Governing Council, hold significant regulatory authority with high expectations that GLF projects complement existing conservation mandates. Civil Society groups, while largely indirect partners, play crucial roles in promoting community engagement and environmental awareness, supporting conservation indirectly through social advocacy. NGOs, including Scalesia Foundation, ECOS, FUNCAVID or Galapagos Conservancy among others, engage directly with GLF on conservation and education, while others contribute indirectly by addressing community development and human rights. The Private Sector primarily engages indirectly, with a focus on tourism and fisheries, where sustainable practices intersect with economic goals. Academic institutions like the Charles Darwin Foundation and University San Francisco de Quito provide crucial research and expertise guiding conservation policies. Lastly, International Development Organizations, such as WWF, Conservation International, Wild Aid, ReWild, and Jocotoco, collaborate on GLF-led projects while large funders, including development banks and multilateral development corporations, indirectly synergize broader conservation efforts.

In **balancing marine conservation and development**, GLF should demonstrate the socio-economic benefits of conservation (e.g., improved fish stocks supporting local fisheries) to foster alignment with its marine conservation objectives. Through **inclusive engagement**, the SEP actively engages resistance groups² to incorporate feasible, community-centered recommendations into conservation goals, promoting a balanced approach that meets ecological and local needs. Lastly, **building trust** through consistent updates on project selection, funding, and management is essential. The grievance mechanism plays a critical role in this, offering a fair, accessible platform for stakeholders to voice concerns.

The SEP includes a structured **Monitoring and Reporting Framework**, designed to track engagement activities through predefined, outcome-oriented indicators. These indicators, such as participation rates, stakeholder feedback, and grievance resolution rates, allow for a systematic assessment of each engagement type. The methodology employs both quantitative and qualitative data collection tools, including attendance records, feedback surveys, grievance logs, and impact evaluations, to capture a comprehensive view of engagement effectiveness.

¹ Undertaken by ICSEM, in coordination with the GLF Team. To address potential biases from limited stakeholder mapping participation during this initial base line development, GLF commits to conducting periodic revisions of the stakeholder register every two years, incorporating community consultations. This action will help broaden stakeholder identification and engagement, ensuring a diverse and representative stakeholder ecosystem.

² Resistance groups refer to social groups or communities that have expressed discontent with the historic focus of conservation funds on ecological concerns without addressing local socio-economic problems.

Reports generated through this framework are categorized by frequency and purpose, including activity-specific reports immediately following key events, quarterly summaries, and an **Annual Environmental & Social Monitoring Report**, which aggregates data from all engagement actions, synthesizing findings to evaluate stakeholder satisfaction, identify successful practices, and address areas needing improvement. This feedback loop enables GLF to adapt its strategies continuously, ensuring that engagement actions remain relevant and effective as stakeholder needs evolve.

Grievance Mechanism indicators, such as complaint volume and resolution time, are reviewed quarterly to ensure responsiveness and transparency. Consultative Engagement effectiveness is assessed via workshops and advisory panels, guiding project planning by aligning proposals with GLF objectives. Empowerment Engagement, measured annually through training participation and community skill-building, is adapted in response to participant feedback to address evolving local needs.

1 INTRODUCTION

In 2022, the Ecuadorian government established the Hermandad Marine Reserve (HMR), a strategic expansion covering an additional 60,000 km² of protected marine area adjacent to the Galápagos Marine Reserve (GMR). This initiative is a component of Ecuador's broader environmental finance strategy, which included converting \$1.6 billion of commercial debt into a \$656 million marine conservation-linked loan in 2023. This innovative financial restructuring facilitated the creation of the Galápagos Life Fund (GLF), endowed with the responsibility to administer these funds to ensure the perpetuation and effectiveness of conservation efforts in the region.

GLF was inaugurated in 2023 as a non-profit organization tasked with the stewardship of the natural capital of the Galápagos Islands. Operating from Puerto Ayora on Santa Cruz Island, GLF is governed by an 11-member board comprising government representatives as well as stakeholders from the artisanal fishing, local tourism, and academic sectors. The fund's operational mandate includes allocating grants support and promote the maintenance, growth and security of the natural capital of the Galápagos Islands and their marine ecosystems and to support the biodiversity protection or management of HMR or GMR through various projects related to sustainable fisheries, climate resilience initiatives, and the blue economy.

The Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) is developed to support GLF's Environmental and Social Policy and Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS), ensuring a harmonized approach to managing environmental and social risks across all operations.

2 SCOPE

The SEP for the GLF outlines the key principles, activities, and methodologies for engaging stakeholders directly related to GLF as a grantmaking organization and throughout the lifecycle of GLF-funded projects. The scope of this plan includes the following:

- **Project Coverage:** the SEP serves as an organizational instrument for GLF, providing overarching principles, activities, and methodologies for engaging stakeholders over the next 3-5 years. While each project funded by GLF will develop its own specific SEP tailored to its unique context and stakeholders, this organizational SEP sets the framework for ensuring consistent and effective stakeholder engagement across GLF operations and all projects.
- **Geographic Focus:** The SEP focuses on the geographic area of the Galápagos Islands and its marine reserves. However, it also includes stakeholders on mainland Ecuador and international actors who have a vested interest in the conservation of the region. Engagement strategies are tailored to fit the local, national, and international contexts in which GLF operates.
- **Stakeholder Groups:** The SEP is designed to engage with a wide range of stakeholders within the Area of Influence (AOI) of the project. This includes all individuals, organizations, communities and vulnerable groups, and entities potentially impacted by or involved in GLF's conservation efforts. Importantly, the plan emphasizes a gender perspective in line with the Galápagos Life Fund's gender equality policy. It aims to correct gender imbalances in resource access and decision-making, highlighted by disparities in local tourism and conservation sectors, where women hold a minor share of permits and roles. Stakeholders are categorized into direct beneficiaries, indirect beneficiaries, and other relevant groups, including a specific emphasis on ensuring women are well-represented and actively involved, ensuring that the plan addresses the needs, interests, and concerns of all affected parties.
- **Stakeholder Engagement Activities:** Engagement activities under this SEP include information dissemination, consultations, participatory planning, partnership collaborations, and empowerment initiatives. These activities are structured to ensure that stakeholders are informed but also actively involved in decision-making processes related to project planning, design, and implementation. Special attention is given to enhancing women's participation and leadership in these processes, ensuring that gender equity principles are integrated into project planning and execution.
- **Compliance with Standards:** The scope of the SEP ensures that GLF's stakeholder engagement efforts are in full compliance with both national and international standards. This includes the IFC Performance Standards, the Escazú Agreement, and the Ecuadorian Environmental Management Law, ensuring that engagement activities are inclusive, transparent, and participatory.

3 OBJECTIVES

The main objective of the SEP is to outline a structured approach for GLF to engage with stakeholders in a manner that is both strategic and sensitive to the environmental and socio-economic dynamics of the Galápagos Islands to establish and maintain good relationships with key stakeholders. This plan is designed to ensure the comprehensive and strategic engagement of all relevant stakeholders, integrating best practices in environmental and social governance.

To systematically engage with stakeholders in a manner that supports the robust governance and effective implementation of GLF prioritized conservation projects, ensuring these initiatives align with both local priorities and international sustainability standards.

The purpose of stakeholder engagement for GLF is:

1. **To Inform and Empower:** Provide stakeholders with transparent and detailed information about GLF's operational mechanisms, project funding sources, and objectives to enhance understanding and support for GLF's conservation efforts.
2. **To Facilitate Collaboration:** By engaging stakeholders from the outset, GLF seeks to encourage collaboration that integrates diverse insights and expertise. This collaborative approach is intended to enhance the quality and sustainability of projects, ensuring they are more closely aligned with both local needs and environmental conservation goals.
3. **Mitigate Conflicts:** Proactively address potential social tensions or conflicts arising from GLF funded conservation initiatives by implementing equitable conflict resolution mechanisms.
4. **Enhance Capacity and Empowerment:** Build the capacities of local stakeholders to actively participate in and benefit from GLF conservation projects, thereby promoting sustainable economic development alongside environmental stewardship.

4 PRINCIPLES, STANDARDS, LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

4.1 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The SEP is built on the foundational principles outlined in GLF's **Environmental and Social Policy (GLF ESMS, Annex A)**. These principles ensure that all engagement activities are conducted in an ethical, transparent, and sustainable manner, aligning with GLF's broader commitments to environmental conservation and social responsibility. The guiding principles for stakeholder engagement include:

1. **Integrity and Transparency:** GLF commits to ensuring that all stakeholder engagement activities are conducted with the highest level of integrity. Transparency is a core value, and GLF will maintain open and honest communication with all stakeholders. Stakeholders will be informed about the decision-making processes, project goals, and expected outcomes, ensuring clarity and trust in GLF's operations.

2. **Inclusivity and Equity:** In line with GLF's commitment to social responsibility, the SEP ensures that all relevant stakeholders, including traditionally marginalized communities, are actively engaged. GLF will facilitate accessible and equitable participation, considering differences in age, gender, abilities, and cultural backgrounds to ensure that all voices are heard and respected throughout the project lifecycle.
3. **Respect for Local Knowledge and Cultures:** GLF recognizes the importance of local knowledge and cultural practices in the conservation and sustainable management of the Galápagos. Stakeholder engagement activities will integrate these practices, seeking ways to reinforce and support them rather than undermine or displace them. This principle aligns with GLF's broader mission to foster the ownership and participation of Galápagos communities in the stewardship of their natural resources.
4. **Accountability and Responsiveness:** GLF is committed to being accountable to all stakeholders. This includes establishing clear mechanisms for evaluation, feedback, and grievance redress. Stakeholders will have avenues to express concerns, make suggestions, and participate in monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of GLF's projects and activities. Responsiveness to stakeholder input is a priority to ensure continuous improvement.
5. **Environmental and Social Sustainability:** All stakeholder engagement activities and projects funded by GLF must contribute to the long-term sustainability of the Galápagos communities and ecosystems. This aligns with the principles of the **GLF Environmental and Social Policy**, which aims to avoid, reduce, or mitigate negative environmental and social impacts while maximizing positive outcomes for both the natural environment and local populations.

4.2 INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS / BEST PRACTICES

The GLF aligns its stakeholder engagement activities with internationally recognized environmental and social standards, as outlined in its **Environmental and Social Policy (GLF ESMS, Annex A)** and the **Environmental and Social Standards (GLF ESMS, Annex C)**. These documents provide a comprehensive framework for managing environmental and social risks and ensuring that all GLF-supported projects adhere to the highest standards of sustainability, transparency, and social responsibility.

The **GLF Environmental and Social Policy** ensures that all operations comply with national laws, including those of Ecuador and the Special Regime of the Galápagos, while also integrating international best practices. This policy serves as the foundation for GLF's commitment to avoiding negative environmental and social impacts, maximizing benefits, and ensuring ethical governance in all project activities.

The **GLF Environmental and Social Standards (GLF ESMS, Annex C)** detail specific guidelines and international frameworks to which GLF adheres. Key standards relevant to stakeholder engagement include:

1. **International Finance Corporation (IFC) Performance Standards:** GLF adheres to **IFC PS1 (Assessment and Management of Environmental and Social Risks and Impacts)**, ensuring robust risk management practices and the inclusion of local communities in the planning and execution of projects.

2. **World Bank Group Environmental, Health, and Safety (EHS) Guidelines:** These guidelines provide best practices for managing environmental, health, and safety risks, ensuring that GLF projects operate in a safe and sustainable manner.
3. **International Labour Organization (ILO) Core Conventions:** GLF is committed to upholding international labor standards as outlined in the ILO conventions, ensuring that workers' rights are respected and protected in all GLF-supported projects.

Additionally, the **SEP** incorporates specific international standards that are particularly relevant to stakeholder engagement but may not be explicitly covered in the general **GLF Environmental and Social Policy**, including:

1. **Escazú Agreement:** A regional treaty for Latin America and the Caribbean, the Escazú Agreement ensures public access to environmental information, promotes public participation in decision-making, and guarantees access to justice in environmental matters.
2. **Global Environment Facility (GEF) Guidelines:** These guidelines emphasize the importance of inclusive stakeholder engagement in biodiversity conservation, ensuring that local communities are actively involved in conservation initiatives.
3. **International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Guidelines:** IUCN provides specific guidance on stakeholder communication and participation, focusing on inclusive decision-making in conservation efforts.
4. **Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) Performance Standard 10:** This standard highlights the importance of meaningful stakeholder engagement throughout the lifecycle of projects, ensuring that stakeholder inputs are integrated into project design, implementation, and evaluation.

These international standards, along with the comprehensive framework set forth in **GLF ESMS Annex A** and **Annex C**, ensure that GLF's stakeholder engagement processes are in line with the highest global benchmarks for sustainability and social responsibility. The SEP builds on these foundations to guide GLF's ongoing and future engagement with all stakeholders, ensuring transparency, inclusivity, and collaboration in all aspects of its operations.

A. INTEGRATION OF IFC PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

IFC Performance Standard 1 necessitates that conservation investment funds like the Galápagos Life Fund (GLF) engage in an Informed Consultation and Participation (ICP) process when projects have potential impacts on communities or livelihoods. This process, integral to GLF's operations, is a systematic and iterative engagement strategy designed to foster deep exchanges of information and viewpoints, tailored to suit various stakeholder groups, including those most vulnerable.

The ICP at GLF aims to facilitate comprehensive discussions on the management and mitigation of environmental impacts, the adaptation of implementation measures to local contexts, and the identification of opportunities for sharing developmental benefits derived from conservation efforts. This consultative process is crucial in ensuring that the environmental conservation

initiatives also support socio-economic development, by aligning project goals with community needs and expectations.

Such consultations are structured to capture diverse perspectives, ensuring that gender-specific concerns and priorities about impacts, mitigation mechanisms, and benefits are addressed. The insights garnered from this process are vital, feeding directly into the decision-making framework of GLF, thus ensuring that project implementations are both environmentally sustainable and socially equitable.

This section outlines how the GLF's SEP will align its stakeholder engagement activities with the requirements of IFC Performance Standards, ensuring that all aspects of stakeholder interactions — from identification and consultation to grievance management and reporting — are conducted in a manner that respects both the letter and spirit of these standards.

Table 1 Conceptual Framework for Integrating IFC Performance Standards into GLF's Stakeholder Engagement Plan

IFC Performance Standard	Conceptual Integration into GLF's SEP
PS#1: Environmental and Social Risks and Impacts	GLF acknowledges the importance of explicitly aligning its engagement strategies with the detailed expectations set out in paragraphs 25-31 and 33 of IFC Performance Standard 1. These sections emphasize a proactive approach to identifying, assessing, and managing environmental and social risks, particularly those impacting Affected Communities and vulnerable groups..
PS#2: Labor and Working Conditions	GLF will use the SEP to ensure that grantees adhere to fair labor practices by setting clear E&S standards that grantees must meet, particularly in labor-intensive projects like fisheries management and sustainable tourism.
PS#4: Community Health, Safety, and Security	The SEP will guide grantees in incorporating community health and safety considerations into project designs, particularly in projects that have significant interactions with local communities, such as those in tourist areas or around the marine reserves.
PS#5: Land Acquisition and Involuntary Resettlement	While GLF projects do not typically involve direct land acquisition, the potential indirect impacts on land use, particularly economic displacement, if applicable, will require rigorous management. To address this, GLF will ensure that conservation projects involve comprehensive social safeguard studies to identify and mitigate any adverse impacts on local communities' land use and economic activities
PS#6: Biodiversity Conservation	Engagement strategies will focus on ensuring that all biodiversity conservation efforts funded by GLF are designed and implemented with active participation from local communities, scientists, and conservation experts, aligning with both GLF's funding objectives and broader biodiversity goals.
PS#7: Indigenous Peoples	While the Galápagos Life Fund (GLF) operates in areas without traditional indigenous communities, it acknowledges the deep connections that local communities have with natural resources. Therefore, the SEP ensures these

	communities are engaged with respect and inclusivity, emphasizing transparent communication and collaboration. The GLF seeks to incorporate their valuable insights and traditional knowledge into conservation efforts, ensuring they are informed and involved in decisions that may impact their environment and way of life. This approach, while thorough and respectful, does not extend to applying Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) protocols, which are specifically reserved for indigenous peoples as defined under international standards.
PS#8: Cultural Heritage	The SEP will ensure that projects funded by GLF respect and integrate the cultural heritage of the Galápagos, with engagement strategies aimed at preserving and promoting local cultural sites and traditions as integral components of conservation projects.

5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

As a central actor, GLF not only provides financial resources but also ensures the effective implementation and oversight of projects that contribute to the protection of natural capital. In addition to its funding role, GLF is responsible for engaging with key stakeholders—ranging from implementing partners to the general population—through clear communication, capacity building, and transparent processes.

5.1 GLF RESPONSABILITIES RELATED TO SEP

This section outlines GLF's key responsibilities in disseminating information, fostering relationships with partners, engaging the public, and ensuring effective grievance redress mechanisms. These activities are fundamental to GLF's mission and ensure that all relevant actors are informed, involved, and empowered to contribute to the success of conservation efforts in the Galápagos. Further detail related to these responsibilities and how they will be practically implemented by GLF are provided in Section 5.2.

5.1.1 FACILITATING INFORMATION DISSEMINATION

GLF should proactively disseminate information about funding opportunities and project calls. This could be achieved through a variety of channels such as a dedicated website, social media platforms, local news outlets, and community meetings, ensuring that information reaches a broad audience, including potential implementing partners and local communities.

Ensure all essential documentation, including application processes, funding criteria, project requirements, and timelines, are easily accessible. This should be available in Spanish and English where relevant to ensure comprehensibility and accessibility.

5.1.2 BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS WITH IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS/GRANTEES³

³ Implementing Partners or Grantees are those who receive funding or support to execute conservation, development, or sustainability projects aligned with GLF's mission. Implementing partners are responsible for the on-the-ground execution of projects, adhering to agreed-upon goals, timelines, and budgets.

Organize workshops and webinars specifically designed to guide potential applicants through the application process, clarifying the funding criteria and application requirements. These educational sessions aim to enhance the quality and relevance of the proposals submitted and provide a platform for interactive feedback.

Provide continuous support to implementing partners through structured check-ins and targeted resource provision, designed to assist partners in effectively managing and implementing projects. Emphasis will be placed on fostering robust stakeholder engagement within their projects.

5.1.3 ENGAGING THE GENERAL POPULATION/COMMUNITY

Engage directly with the broader population through community forums, public consultations, and informational campaigns that explain GLF's role, the benefits of the funded projects, and how individuals and communities can get involved or benefit from these initiatives.

Establish mechanisms that allow the public and other stakeholders to provide feedback on GLF's activities and the projects it funds. This could include surveys, suggestion boxes, and community meetings, which would also serve to monitor and evaluate the impact of projects and the effectiveness of the engagement strategies.

5.1.4 ENSURE GRIEVANCE MANAGEMENT MECHANISM FRAMEWORK

Implement a grievance mechanism that is easily accessible to all stakeholders, regardless of their location or the nature of their involvement with GLF. This should include multiple channels such as an online submission form, a dedicated hotline, and the option for in-person submissions at local GLF offices or through community liaisons. Establish and communicate clear procedures for the submission, handling, and resolution of grievances. Ensure confidentiality and if necessary, anonymity for all complainants and a non-retaliation policy to protect the rights and safety of all stakeholders submitting grievances.

5.2 GLF ROLES RELATED TO SEP

The Roles section outlines specific duties aligned with GLF's environmental and social governance frameworks, as detailed in Annex H and the RACI Matrix. This section ensures precise accountability and effective execution of stakeholder engagement tasks across GLF, enhancing clarity and operational efficiency in meeting strategic objectives.

Table 2: Roles and responsibilities related to the GLF SEP

Role	Responsibilities
Executive Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Holds overall accountability for SEP execution, ensuring alignment with GLF's strategic goals. - Supervises the execution of SEP actions - Liaises with high-level stakeholders for transparency and manages critical engagement needs. - Report on stakeholder engagement outcomes to the Board.
Board of Directors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides oversight and approves the GLF Environmental and Social Policy and SEP framework. - Reviews annual reports on SEP performance, including updates on stakeholder feedback.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acts as the highest decision-making authority for SEP-related escalations if needed.
<p>Sustainability Officer</p>	<p>GLF’s SEP Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manages implementation of GLF’s Stakeholder Engagement Plan ensuring that stakeholder inputs are integrated into project design and implementation. - Conducts workshops and training sessions with GLF staff and direct stakeholders to align programs with GLF’s strategic environmental and social objectives. - Monitors stakeholder feedback and engagement effectiveness, implementing adaptive management strategies. <p>GLF’s SEP Oversight</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Directly leads the development and execution of GLF’s own stakeholder engagement strategies, ensuring they meet the E&S standards. - Monitors the effectiveness of stakeholder engagement under GLF’s direct operations. This includes evaluating feedback mechanisms and engagement outcomes to identify areas for improvement. - Prepares comprehensive annual reports detailing the performance, outcomes and effectiveness of GLF’s stakeholder engagement activities. <p>SEP Oversight for Grantees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports grantees to ensure the development and implementation of their SEPs aligns with the ESMS. - Maintains regular communication with grantees to monitor the implementation of their SEPs, and offers guidance and support to resolve any challenges that arise during the execution of their projects. - Reviews and analyzes reports submitted by grantees on their stakeholder engagement activities to evaluate the overall impact of GLF-funded projects. - Collects insights from the monitoring of grantees’ SEPs to inform the development of GLF’s overarching engagement strategies.
<p>Program Officer</p>	<p>GLF’s SEP Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Includes SEP and ESMS related information in the Call for Proposal package. Support the implementation of GLF’s Stakeholder Engagement Plan and specific SEP activities, focusing on engagement with project beneficiaries and integrating E&S considerations. - Gathers feedback from stakeholders related to GLF projects, and supports the preparation of the annual E&S Performance and sustainability Reports. <p>SEP Oversight for Grantees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conducts workshops and other consultative engagements to prepare applicants and raise awareness of GLF’s SEP and E&S standards. - Supports grantees to ensure the integration and alignment with GLF’s SEP and E&S criteria in project operation and monitoring. - Collects and shares project-level stakeholder engagement monitoring indicators with the Sustainability Officer, assessing how effectively stakeholders are involved and their concerns addressed. - Supports grantees to guarantee their stakeholder engagement practices adhere to GLF’s environmental and social standards, fostering consistency across all funded projects.
<p>Communications Officer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manages information dissemination for SEP-related activities. - Oversees external communication channels, including social media, newsletters, and the website. - Monitors social media channels and other media outlets for stakeholder feedback, questions, and discussions related to GLF’s activities. Leads public

	<p>relations and media outreach to raise awareness of GLF’s work and engagement opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organizes and manages public forums and community-focused campaigns to gather public input and increase visibility.
<p>Technical Advisory Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides expert input and reviews SEP strategies to ensure alignment with GLF’s environmental and social objectives. - Offers feedback on engagement activities

6 METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

This SEP is designed to provide a clear overview of the key stakeholders, the phases/activities in which their involvement is proposed, and the modalities of participation. This plan, accompanied by the Stakeholder Matrix (Annex I) will serve as an essential tool for conducting an exhaustive mapping of all relevant stakeholders and will detail the proposed types of involvement for the different phases of the process.

In alignment with international best practices such as the IFC and the Inter-American Development Bank, the approach emphasizes a horizontal participation process that values the insights and experiences of local stakeholders.

Guided by principles of transparency, inclusion, and respect, the key purpose of the plan is as follows:

- **Identify Stakeholders:** Systematically identify all relevant stakeholders within the direct area of influence, encompassing a diverse array of groups ranging from local community members, governmental bodies, non-governmental organizations, academic institutions, to private sector entities.
- **Define Roles and Participation:** Clearly define the roles and levels of participation for each stakeholder group, ensuring flexibility to adapt to the evolving nature of the project and the dynamic context of the stakeholders.
- **Ensure Inclusivity and Participation:** Guarantee an inclusive and participatory approach throughout all phases of the project, actively seeking and facilitating the involvement of all stakeholder groups.
- **Focus on Vulnerable Groups:** Pay special attention to vulnerable groups within the stakeholder community, particularly youth and women, ensuring that their voices are heard, their concerns are addressed, and their contributions are valued.



Table 3: Approach of the SEP

Step	Objective: what each phase aims to achieve	Methods: tools and methodologies employed in each step	Application: outcome or product of the action
1. Stakeholder Identification	Identification of all potential stakeholders affected by or interested in the project.	Stakeholder mapping, public records, expert and local leader consultations.	Compilation of a comprehensive list of stakeholders categorized by interest, influence, and potential impact.
2. Stakeholder Analysis	Understand the power, influence, and interest of each stakeholder.	Power/Interest Grid, Influence/Impact matrices.	Determination of engagement approaches for each stakeholder group based on their characteristics.
3. Engagement Planning	Planning of tailored stakeholder engagement strategies.	Development of engagement strategies including informational meetings, workshops, forums.	Creation of a detailed engagement plan with timelines, responsibilities, and goals for each group.
4. Design of Grievance Mechanism	Design a comprehensive system for stakeholders to submit and resolve complaints.	Development of procedures for grievance submission, processing, and resolution.	Establishment of clear, accessible channels for grievances, along with defined processes for their review and resolution.
6. Monitoring and Evaluation	Design of the monitoring and evaluation system, including indicators for assessing the effectiveness of engagement strategies and the grievance mechanism.	Design of feedback mechanisms, development of performance indicators.	Development of a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation framework to assess engagement effectiveness and the efficacy of the grievance handling process during the project.

6.1 STAKEHOLDER IDENTIFICATION

The identification and mapping will be compiled in an Excel format matrix. This matrix serves both to define and categorize stakeholders and as a tool for planning their involvement. This mapping process identifies stakeholders, categorizes them by sector, geographical area, type of beneficiary, and assesses their influence and power.

6.1.1 CLASSIFICATION BY SECTOR

Table 4 Classification by Sector

Sector	Description
Public Sector	Government entities at local, provincial, national levels that manage or regulate natural resources and protected areas.
Civil Society	Community groups and grassroots movements advocating for local interests. Crucial in mobilizing local resources and fostering community support for sustainable practices.

NGOs	Organizations focused on conservation, environmental education, and sustainable development.
Productive/Private Sector	Businesses and cooperatives in fishing, tourism, and agriculture, directly involved in natural resource utilization and potentially impacted by conservation policies.
Universities/Academia	Educational and research institutions providing scientific studies, data, and analysis to support conservation and sustainable management efforts.
International development organizations	These entities play a pivotal role in shaping global conservation efforts through funding, policy support, and the provision of technical expertise. They include multilateral organizations such as the World Bank, regional development banks, United Nations agencies, and other international bodies that collaborate with national governments and local entities to foster sustainable development.

6.1.2 CLASSIFICATION BY GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

This section of the matrix dissects the characteristics of the analyzed stakeholder based on its geographical location and range of intervention: local, regional, national, or international.

Table 5 Classification by Geographical Area

Geographical Scope	Description
Local (Specific to one of the islands)	Stakeholders operating on a specific island, directly involved or impacted by localized conservation activities.
Regional (Across the Galápagos archipelago)	Stakeholders whose activities or influence span across the entire archipelago.
National (Across all of Ecuador)	Stakeholders based in mainland Ecuador influencing or influenced by national conservation policies.
International	Organizations outside of Ecuador participating in or impacting conservation efforts through funding, research, or policy support.

6.1.3 CLASSIFICATION BY TYPE OF BENEFICIARY

The classification into "Direct Beneficiaries", "Indirect Beneficiaries" and "Affected and Vulnerable Groups" serves as a crucial tool for the GLF to manage and engage both those stakeholders who are directly involved through funding and project implementation but also those who, while not directly linked to the fund, their economic stability and lifestyle are directly influenced by GLF activities. By distinguishing between direct and indirect beneficiaries, the GLF can identify stakeholders who might not receive direct financial support but whose economic stability, lifestyle, or environmental surroundings are influenced by the conservation efforts. Additionally, this framework includes a specific focus on affected communities and vulnerable groups, such as women, youth, and artisanal fishers, who are crucial for a comprehensive assessment of the social impacts of conservation efforts. These groups might experience changes or disruptions to their traditional ways of living or economic activities due to conservation

projects. This includes populations in areas where conservation projects are implemented, which may face disruptions or changes in their traditional ways of living.

This is especially important for understanding the broader impacts of conservation projects on the local community and economy. Therefore, being categorized as an indirect beneficiary does not imply lesser involvement or importance in the GLF's processes and activities. This distinction is particularly relevant for women groups or activist gender movements, who might often be categorized as indirect beneficiaries not due to their lack of involvement or interest, but by their eligibility for direct funding from GLF. To address the issue of gender inequality particularly in relation to the classification of stakeholders as direct or indirect beneficiaries, the approach centers on ensuring active participation and empowerment, by integrating a gender perspective throughout the GLF's stakeholder engagement strategies and project implementations. This includes providing them with the necessary tools and platforms to influence project outcomes and ensuring their representation in all planning and execution phases of GLF-funded initiatives.

Different types of involvement necessitate different engagement strategies. For direct beneficiaries, engagement might involve detailed project management, monitoring, and compliance reporting. For indirect beneficiaries, engagement strategies might focus more on information dissemination, community consultations, and inclusion in decision-making processes that help these groups understand how conservation efforts indirectly benefit them.

Table 6 Classification by Type of Beneficiary

Beneficiary Type	Description
Direct Beneficiaries	Stakeholders eligible to receive direct funding from GLF for conservation projects, including NGOs, government agencies, and academic institutions.
Indirect Beneficiaries	Groups like local businesses, farmers, artisans, not receiving direct funding but impacted by GLF funded projects. They depend on a healthy ecosystem and sustainable tourism.
Affected and Vulnerable Groups	This category includes communities and demographic segments that are directly impacted by the GLF funded projects which may alter their traditional livelihoods and socio-economic activities.

6.2 STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

As we proceed to develop the analysis section of the stakeholder mapping for the GLF, it's crucial to explore the power, influence, and other dynamics among these identified groups in a structured and practical manner. This deeper analysis will assist in understanding how various stakeholders can affect or are affected by the conservation efforts, which in turn will guide the GLF in making informed decisions regarding stakeholder engagement, resource allocation, and project implementation. This analysis should also consider and address the power dynamics and relationships between women and men concerning conservation efforts and project implementation to encourage gender equality.

- **Power:** Assessed based on the stakeholders' ability to effect change through action, non-action, and resource allocation. Power can stem from legal authority, economic size, or through critical relationships and network positions.
- **Influence:** Measured by the stakeholders' capacity to alter or sway perceptions, opinions, and behaviors of other groups or the project itself, often through communication, advocacy, or visible leadership.

Table 7 Detailed Analysis of Power and Influence

Stakeholder Group	Power Level	Influence Level	Description
High-Power, High-Influence	High	High	These stakeholders can significantly impact the project's direction and outcomes. This group typically includes government bodies, major funding organizations, and large NGOs.
Low-Power, High-Influence	Low	High	Stakeholders who may lack substantial resources or authority but can sway public opinion or decision-making through expertise, moral authority, or strategic communication channels.
High-Power, Low-Influence	High	Low	Entities that possess significant resources or formal authority but do not actively engage in shaping the conservation discourse or decisions.
Low-Power, Low-Influence	Low	Low	Often grassroots organizations or local communities that lack leverage or resources but are essential for the success and sustainability of conservation efforts due to their direct impact or stake in the local ecosystem.

6.3 ENGAGEMENT APPROACH

The IFC's *good practices SEP handbook*⁴ provides a structured approach to managing stakeholder relations, ensuring that projects meet environmental and social objectives while fostering positive relationships with affected communities and other relevant parties.

Table 8 Types of stakeholder engagement as recommended by the IFC Performance Standards for environmental and social sustainability

Engagement Type	Purpose	Methods	Application
Informative Engagement	To clarify the origin and purpose of the GLF funds and dispel misconceptions about their use. Ensure that all stakeholders have a clear understanding of the GLF	Newsletters, FAQs, websites, media engagement.	Regular communication across platforms to ensure transparency about the fund's financial sources and conservation objectives.

⁴ IFC (2007). *Stakeholder engagement: a good practice handbook for companies doing business in emerging markets* (No. 39916, pp. 1-202). The World Bank.

	procurement policies and how GLF operates its procurement processes.		
Consultative Engagement	To gather community input to ensure the fund's initiatives align with broader social and economic needs.	Workshops, focus groups, surveys, public consultations.	Engage with both supporters and opponents of the fund to understand their concerns and suggestions for project scopes.
Participatory Engagement	To involve community members in project planning and monitoring, fostering ownership and transparency.	Participatory planning sessions, community monitoring initiatives.	This can be particularly powerful in ecological monitoring, where local communities help track changes in biodiversity or water quality, providing valuable data while fostering a deeper connection to the conservation outcomes.
Partnership Engagement	To collaborate with stakeholders in project implementation, sharing responsibilities and benefits.	Joint ventures, public-private partnerships, cooperative agreements.	Relevant in large-scale projects or sectors where community cooperation is crucial.
Empowerment Engagement	To enhance the capabilities of local communities and stakeholders to engage effectively with the GLF projects.	Training programs, capacity-building initiatives, access to independent experts.	Targeting vulnerable groups, like women, providing them with the tools and knowledge needed to benefit from conservation efforts.
Grievance Mechanism Engagement	To provide a systematic way for stakeholders to express concerns or complaints regarding the GLF administration, operation and GLF funded projects.	Grievance mechanism that is accessible and ensures confidentiality and non-retaliation. Explicitly includes mechanisms to handle grievances related to procurement processes	Continuous availability throughout the GLF lifecycle, ensuring that all concerns are addressed promptly and fairly.

Key Considerations for GLF's Engagement Strategy

- **Addressing Misconceptions:** Proactive informational campaigns are essential to clarify that the GLF is funded through a debt-for-nature swap and not direct public funding. This

distinction is vital to counteract the narrative that the fund should be used for general development instead of conservation.

- **Balancing Conservation and Development:** While the fund's primary focus is on conservation, demonstrating how these efforts contribute to sustainable development can help align more stakeholders with the fund's goals. For example, showing how conservation leads to improved fish stocks can illustrate the direct benefits to the local fishing industry.
- **Inclusive Engagement:** Given the opposition to the fund, it's crucial to engage these groups actively to understand their perspectives and integrate feasible suggestions that align with the fund's conservation goals but also address community needs.
- **Building Trust:** Regular updates and transparency about how projects are chosen, funded, and managed will help build trust and support from the community. The grievance mechanism will also play a crucial role in this by showing responsiveness to community concerns.

7 STAKEHOLDER ECOSYSTEM

The GLF operates within a complex ecosystem of stakeholders, each playing a critical role in influencing and shaping the outcomes of conservation and sustainability projects in the Galápagos Islands. Understanding the intricate relationships, power dynamics, and spheres of influence of these stakeholders is essential for effective engagement and the success of GLF initiatives.

The roles, relationships, and areas of influence of various stakeholders ranging from local government bodies and civil societies to international development organizations and the private sector have been mapped. Each stakeholder's classification provides insight into their level of interaction with GLF—whether direct or indirect—as well as their influence and power within the archipelago. This analysis assists in strategizing its engagement activities to harness synergies, mitigate risks, and enhance the collaborative impact on the region's socio-economic and environmental fabric. This section presents an analysis based in the outlined parameters from the previous section to facilitate a qualitative identification of the stakeholders in the territory.

GLF relies on a combination of recognized institutions and informal groups to represent the interests and concerns of all affected communities, including vulnerable groups such as women, youth, and artisanal fishers. While these organizations facilitate connection with potentially affected groups, GLF acknowledges the critical importance of verifying that these representatives truly reflect the community's views and needs. Consistent with IFC Performance Standard 1, paragraph 27, GLF commits to making every reasonable effort to ensure that community representatives, including local government officials, civil society leaders, and other stakeholders, accurately represent the affected communities. This involves periodic verification processes through surveys and feedback mechanisms during community meetings, ensuring that representatives can be relied upon to faithfully communicate consultation outcomes to their

constituents. Additionally, GLF will periodically review and update the SEP to ensure that engagement methods continue to effectively reach and represent all stakeholder groups. This review will include assessments of the effectiveness of current representatives and adjustments to our engagement approach as needed to address any gaps in representation or changes in community dynamics

7.1 STAKEHOLDERS' INSTITUTIONAL CATEGORIES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH GLF

The data from the table below gives a look at the diverse spectrum of stakeholders interacting with the GLF, revealing both their institutional roles and geographical scopes. We identified around 20 representative public sector entities, of which more than 60% have a geographical presence at the provincial level. Almost 40% of the mapped agents are represented by social organizations (such as NGOs, collectives, associations, and activists). It is well known that large global organizations (such as WWF, CI, ReWild and others) have been establishing long-term programs or specific actions, meanwhile other multilateral organizations such as UNEP, and the World Bank have also been present for decades and support a series of projects with extensive experience and presence in the territory.

The intersection of local livelihoods and conservation efforts is exemplified by the artisanal fishing and tourism sectors, which are integral to the local economy yet operate under strict environmental oversight to safeguard the biodiversity of the archipelago.

There is a majority of stakeholders focused on a more localized presence, with a clear predominance of social organizations (such as NGOs and civil society). However, it is important to highlight that not all of these organizations are focused on marine conservation, which will be clarified further in the next section.

Table 9 Summary of stakeholders' institutional categories mapped

Institutional Category	Number of Entries	Key Roles	Geographical Scale
Public Sector	20	Policy implementation, regulatory oversight	Local, Provincial, National
Civil Society	16	Advocacy, community mobilization, grassroots activities	Local, Provincial
NGOs	12	Specialized skills, international networks	Local, Provincial, International
Private Sector	28	Local economy, tourism, fisheries, commercial activities	Local, Provincial
University/Academic	4	Research, education, academic partnerships	National

Media	11	information dissemination, public awareness, and opinion mobilization	Local, Provincial, National
International Development	12	Funding, expertise for large-scale projects	International

7.1.1.1 PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The administration of the Galápagos province is governed by a special regime, established by Article 258 of the Ecuadorian Constitution managed by the Governing Council of the Special Regime of Galápagos (CGREG), responsible for planning, resource management, and organizing territorial activities. This council includes representatives from various governmental layers and sectors such as the environment, tourism, agriculture, and local decentralized autonomous governments.

The administrative and governance organizations play a crucial role in management and conservation of the region, such as the Galapagos National Park Directorate (DPNG), the Special Governing Council of Galápagos (CGREG), the National Directorate of Aquatic Spaces (DIRNEA) have direct relationships connections, actively collaborating in conservation, policy-making, and resource management. These entities are fundamental in implementing and enforcing environmental regulations and policies.

The majority of local governance structures including local municipal governments of San Cristóbal, Santa Cruz, and Isabela, operate with an indirect relationship to the GLF. These entities manage local infrastructure, health, education, and cultural activities, influencing conservation and sustainability indirectly through local governance and administrative actions. Their role is vital in supporting the broader social and economic fabric of the islands, ensuring that the local communities' needs and welfare are addressed in alignment with conservation goals.

Both groups of stakeholders are geographically located primarily on the island of San Cristóbal but have a broader provincial influence across the Galápagos.

Table 10 Public sector stakeholders and GLF relationship

Stakeholders	Direct		Indirect		
	Location	AOI	Location	Location	AOI
Special Regime Governing Council of Galapagos	2. San Cristobal (branch office in Isabela and Santa Cruz)	4. Galápagos	GAD Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz
Galapagos National Park Directorate	1. Santa Cruz (branch office in San Cristobal, Isabela and Floreana)	4. Galápagos	GAD Isabela	3. Isabela	3. Isabela
Agency for Regulation and Control of Biosecurity and	2. Santa Cruz (branch office in San Cristobal,	4. Galápagos	GAD San Cristobal	2. San Cristobal	2. San Cristobal

Quarantine for Galapagos	Isabela and Floreana)				
DIRNEA	2. San Cristobal with offices in Santa Cruz, Isabela and Baltra. In Floreana is a little office called "Reten Naval". Branch of its National Merchant Marine School in Santa Cruz.	4. Galápagos	Galapagos Subzone, National Police of Ecuador	2. San Cristobal branch offices in Santa Cruz and Isabela. Environmental Police (UPMA) in Santa Cruz, San Cristóbal and Isabela in charge of controlling illegal Wildlife trafficking in ports and airports	4. Galápagos
Regional Director of Insular Aquatic Spaces (DIRNEA)	2. San Cristobal	4. Galápagos	Integrated Security System ECU 911	2. San Cristobal	4. Galápagos
Risk Management Secretariat	2. San Cristobal	4. Galápagos	Galapagos House of Culture	2. San Cristobal	4. Galápagos
Ministry of Production, Foreign Trade, Investment, and Fisheries	2. San Cristobal	4. Galápagos	District Director 20D01 - Health	2. San Cristobal	4. Galápagos
Zonal Insular Tourism Director	1. Santa Cruz	4. Galápagos	District Director of Education 20D01 - Galapagos	2. San Cristobal	4. Galápagos
District Director of MAG (Ministry of Agriculture) - Galapagos	2. Santa Cruz Branch offices in San Cristobal and Isabela	4. Galápagos	District Director, Ministry of Economic and Social Inclusion	2. San Cristobal	4. Galápagos

7.1.1.2 CIVIL SOCIETY

Civil society organizations in the Galápagos are involved in a wide range of social, cultural, and economic activities that significantly impact community development and well-being. However, they are not directly engaged with the GLF as their primary activities do not align with direct marine conservation objectives. Consequently, no civil society organization mapped has been identified as having a direct relationship with the GLF.

For instance, the Asamblea Comunitaria de San Cristóbal facilitates decision-making processes for residents, impacting social cohesion and ensuring community perspectives are integrated into local governance. Similarly, grassroots movements in Santa Cruz advocate for sports and recreational activities, while collectives such as Tejido Violeta support social causes like fighting gender violence, enriching community life and fostering a sense of identity and belonging.

Additionally, representatives from commerce and transport sectors advocate for sustainable business practices and logistical adaptations that indirectly support conservation efforts. Feminist collectives across the islands focus on empowering women and promoting gender equity, intersecting with environmental efforts as they navigate the socio-economic changes driven by conservation initiatives. Youth and cultural organizations also play a critical role in engaging younger populations and maintaining cultural vibrancy, which supports the overall community resilience necessary for successful conservation efforts.

These organizations, though not directly connected to GLF through funding or conservation projects, are crucial in shaping the local response to environmental initiatives. By addressing essential social needs and enhancing community engagement, they create a supportive environment that indirectly benefits the broader conservation goals of the GLF, showcasing the interconnected nature of social welfare and environmental sustainability in the Galápagos.

GLF should actively seek partnerships with these organizations to leverage their local influence and deep community ties. Collaborating on projects that integrate social welfare with conservation goals can enhance project acceptance and success, such as blending local cultural practices with sustainable tourism initiatives. Regular community consultations facilitated by these organizations can provide GLF with valuable local insights and feedback on ongoing or upcoming projects. GLF could offer training and resources to these organizations, helping to strengthen their operational capabilities and effectiveness in community mobilization and advocacy. Utilizing the networks and platforms of these civil society organizations to disseminate information about conservation issues and the role of the GLF can increase public awareness and foster a conservation-minded community ethos.

Investing in or supporting programs that address key social issues such as gender equity, youth engagement, and economic diversification can help mitigate the socio-economic impacts of conservation policies, leading to more resilient communities.

Civil society organizations can act as vital intermediaries in advocating for policies that align local development with sustainable practices. GLF should engage these groups in policy discussions to ensure that community voices are considered in conservation strategies.

Table 11 Civil society stakeholders and GLF relationship

Name	Location	Area of Influence	Relation with GLF
Asamblea Comunitaria de San Cristóbal	2. San Cristobal	2. San Cristobal	2. Indirect
Representatives of surfing in Santa Cruz (2 clubs)	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz	2. Indirect
Representatives of surfing in San Cristobal (1 club)	2. San Cristobal	2. San Cristobal	2. Indirect
Tejido violeta /MAGMA	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz	2. Indirect
Youth representatives and sports in Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz	2. Indirect
Representatives of the Commerce Sector	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz	2. Indirect
Representatives of the transport cargo sector	1. Santa Cruz	4. Galápagos	2. Indirect
Galapagos Women's Activist on Alert	2. San Cristobal	2. San Cristobal	2. Indirect
Mi Diario Grita	2. San Cristobal	2. San Cristobal	2. Indirect
Tejido Violeta	2. San Cristobal	2. San Cristobal	2. Indirect
Galápagos Women Movement	2. San Cristobal	2. San Cristobal	2. Indirect
Women Artisans / Manos reciclando	3. Isabela	3. Isabela	2. Indirect

Productive Women of Galapagos	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz	2. Indirect
Arabesque Galápagos Dance Academy	2. San Cristobal	2. San Cristobal	2. Indirect
Santa Cruz Youth Advisory Board	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz	2. Indirect
Provincial Cruz Roja / Voluntary	1. Santa Cruz	4. Galápagos	2. Indirect
Asociación Interprofesional de Maestros	2. San Cristobal	2. San Cristobal	2. Indirect

Potentially Affected Groups: The following groups have the potential to face unintended adverse effects due to new or updated conservation policies, such as changes in land use, resource availability, or economic adjustments driven by GLF-supported initiatives:

- **Representatives of the Commerce Sector:** Economic adaptations due to restrictions on certain activities in conservation areas.
- **Transport Cargo Sector Representatives:** May face increased logistical challenges or costs due to environmental regulations.
- **Youth Sports Representatives:** Coastal conservation efforts may restrict access to recreational areas, impacting youth and sports groups.
- **Surfing Representatives in Santa Cruz and San Cristóbal:** May face restricted access to popular surf spots due to marine conservation zones.

7.1.1.3 NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (NGOS)

Most NGOs identified in the stakeholder mapping process have a potential direct relationship with the GLF, indicating active engagement and likely financial or operational support from GLF for these organizations. These NGOs primarily focus on conservation, education, and sustainable development, aligning with GLF's objectives. The types of NGOs include those focused on conservation and environmental education such as Amiguitos del océano, Naveducando Foundation, and Scalesia Foundation, which focus heavily on educating the local population and protecting natural resources. Organizations like Fundación Un Cambio por la Vida and Frente Insular drive initiatives that integrate community development with conservation efforts.

A few NGOs have indirect relationships, such as the Fundación Regional de Asesoría en Derechos Humanos, CENDA or INREDH emphasize cultural preservation and human rights, expanding the scope of stakeholder engagement beyond environmental issues. These organizations are involved in broader initiatives that may overlap with GLF's conservation goals.

Most NGOs operate locally, aiming to influence community practices and local policies directly related to the archipelago's sustainability. Santa Cruz dominates the geographical presence of NGOs, being the location for the majority of them. San Cristobal hosts several NGOs, with activities that include cultural development and legal advocacy supporting the community and environmental governance. Isabela is less represented in direct NGO activity.

This analysis reveals a robust network of NGOs that directly contribute to and benefit from the GLF's mission, with a significant focus on Santa Cruz as a hub for conservation and education activities.

Table 12 NGO´s and GLF Relationship

Stakeholders	Direct		Indirect		
	Location	AOI	Location	Location	AOI
Amiguitos del Océano	1. Santa Cruz	4. Galápagos	CENDA Galápagos	2. San Cristóbal Branch in Santa cruz	2. San Cristóbal
ECOS	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz	Fundación Regional de Asesoría en Derechos Humanos	2. San Cristóbal	4. Galápagos
FUNCAVID	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz	Fundación para el Desarrollo Alternativo Responsable de Galápagos	2. San Cristóbal	4. Galápagos
Frente Insular	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz	Projects Abroad	1. Santa Cruz	4. Galápagos
Naveducando	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz			
Scalesia	1. Santa Cruz	4. Galápagos			
ReWild	1. Santa Cruz	4. Galápagos			
Fondo de Especies Invasoras de Galápagos	1. Santa Cruz	4. Galápagos			

No NGOs have been identified as potentially affected. The activities and objectives of the NGOs mapped in this analysis are generally aligned with the conservation and sustainability goals promoted by the GLF. While some NGOs may not have a direct relationship with GLF, their broader mandates and initiatives indirectly support or benefit from conservation efforts, ensuring that their operations are not adversely impacted by GLF-funded projects.

7.1.1.4 PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS

The private and productive sector encompasses a diverse range of industries, including fisheries, agriculture, manufacturing, commerce and tourism. Engaging with stakeholders from these sectors, such as industry associations, business clusters, and economic development agencies, allows for a comprehensive understanding of local economic dynamics and challenges.

Analysing the data for the productive/private sector identified, we see that most organizations in this sector are categorized as having indirect relationships with GLF. This indicates these entities may not directly be potential beneficiaries to received funds by GLF but are influenced by or have an impact on GLF's conservation efforts due to their operational activities in the same geographic area.

Approximately 40% of the private sector entities listed have a potential direct relationship with GLF, indicating active collaboration in conservation and sustainable development projects. These direct interactions are predominantly seen in sectors like fisheries and tourism, where local

practices are closely tied to environmental health. The artisanal fishing sector is organized through various cooperatives such as Copesan and Copes-Promar in San Cristobal, Copahisa in Isabela, and Copropag in Santa Cruz. These cooperatives are directly engaged with the GLF, playing a crucial role in implementing sustainable fishing practices that align with conservation laws designed to prevent overfishing and protect marine life.

Tourism, another vital sector, ranges from registered guides to diving, onboard, and daily tour operators, along with experiential fishing activities. These entities contribute significantly to the islands' economy but also bear the responsibility of minimizing their environmental impact. Tourism operators collaborate closely with local and international conservation bodies to ensure that their activities are conducted responsibly, enhancing visitors' experiences while educating them on the ecological significance of the islands and the importance of conservation.

The remaining 60% of entities have indirect relationships with GLF. This includes sectors like agriculture, artisan crafts, and financial services.

The majority of private stakeholders, approximately 70%, are found in Santa Cruz. These include a diverse array from tourism operators to productive organizations and local banking institutions. San Cristobal hosts about 20% of the stakeholders, with entities engaged in sustainable tourism and artisanal fisheries that contribute to community development and environmental conservation. Isabela, while having the smallest share of stakeholders at around 10%, plays a vital role in the archipelago's ecological and economic fabric. Stakeholders here are mostly involved in fishing and artisan crafts, sectors critical to the island's sustainability and economic independence.

Table 13 Private organizations and relationship with GLF

Direct			Indirect		
Stakeholders	Location	Area of Influence	Stakeholders	Location	Area of Influence
CAPTURGAL	1. Santa Cruz	4. Galápagos	Drum Academy	2. San Cristobal	2. San Cristobal
ADATUR	1. Santa Cruz	4. Galápagos	Artisanal Centre of the Craft Sector	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz
COPAHISA	3. Isabela	3. Isabela	Cooperative "I Only Sell What I Produce"	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz
ASOARMAISABELA	3. Isabela	3. Isabela	Santa Cruz Coffee Growers Association	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz
COPESPROMAR	2. San Cristobal	2. San Cristobal	COPGALACAF	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz
COPESAN	2. San Cristobal	2. San Cristobal	Associated Cattle Ranchers of Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz
COPROPAG	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Poultry Farmers Association	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz
COOPABAPE	2. San Cristobal	2. San Cristobal	Livestock Production Association of Santa Cruz Island	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz
Tourism Guides - Galapagos Odyssey	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Cantonal Agricultural Center	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz
Galapagos Tourism Guides Association	1. Santa Cruz	4. Galápagos	Interprofessional Association of Ecological	2. San Cristobal	2. San Cristobal

			Artisans of the Galapagos Islands		
OMPAL	3. Isabela	3. Isabela	Hotel Association / Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz	1. Santa Cruz
Blue Fish Organization	3. Isabela	3. Isabela	Hotel Association / Isabela	3. Isabela	3. Isabela
			Hotel Association / San Cristobal	2. San Cristobal	2. San Cristobal
			Pacific Bank	1. Santa Cruz	4. Galápagos
			Pichincha Bank	1. Santa Cruz	4. Galápagos
			Savings and Credit Cooperative "COAC FUPROGAL"	1. Santa Cruz	4. Galápagos

The majority of potential grantees (direct beneficiaries) within the private sector are in the fisheries and tourism sectors, closely aligned with GLF's marine conservation objectives. Indirect Beneficiaries include craft and agricultural associations as well as financial institutions that benefit from the broader socio-economic stability promoted by conservation initiatives. Potentially Affected Groups expand beyond organizations to include artisanal fishing communities, small-scale tourism operators, and vulnerable social groups such as low-income families, women, and youth reliant on traditional livelihoods.

Potentially Affected Groups: Private organizations and local communities that may face unintended challenges due to GLF-funded conservation policies, such as operational restrictions or economic adjustments:

- **Artisanal Fishing Communities:** Although direct beneficiaries, tighter conservation regulations could restrict fishing areas or quotas, impacting livelihoods. Members of artisanal fishing cooperatives and independent fishers may face restrictions on fishing zones or quotas due to the expansion of marine protected areas.
- **Hotel and Tourism Operators:** May face access restrictions to sensitive conservation zones or increased costs due to sustainability requirements.
- **Agricultural Communities and Associations:** Small farmers and livestock producers might encounter land-use restrictions or changes in resource availability due to conservation-driven land management policies.

7.1.1.5 ACADEMIA / RESEARCH

Several universities and academic research centers have been captured in the matrix, which participate in the generation of knowledge, the training of human resources and the promotion of scientific research. Their involvement in data collection, analysis, and knowledge sharing enhances the project's credibility and effectiveness. Collaborative efforts with academia ensure that project strategies are evidence-based and aligned with best practices in sustainable development, specifically in the coastal areas.

The Fundación Charles Darwin (FCD) has outlined a strategic plan for 2021-2027 to enhance its role in tackling the pressing challenges of the Galápagos Islands. Focuses on several key areas of research to support ocean conservation in the Galápagos, including studying the mangrove ecology to understand their role in carbon capture and habitat provision, marine turtle conservation efforts aim to protect key nesting and feeding sites for the critically endangered East Pacific green turtle, the impact of invasive species and other anthropogenic pressures on marine biodiversity, deep ocean exploration within the Eastern Tropical Pacific involves studying largely uncharted deep-sea ecosystems, addressing the challenges of effective management and protection from threats like overfishing and potential deep-sea mining. Additionally, the foundation's work on ocean governance seeks to improve international maritime zoning to reflect ecological rather than geopolitical boundaries.

Universidad San Francisco de Quito (USFQ) has a primary focus on the social and economic development of the Galápagos through its Galápagos campus located on San Cristóbal Island. This campus is the only university extension in the archipelago accredited by Ecuador's Council for Higher Education Accreditation and Quality Assurance. USFQ offers undergraduate degrees in Business Administration and Environmental Management and a master's program in Environmental Management with a focus on socio-ecosystem management. Moreover, the Galapagos Science Center (GSC), a collaborative initiative between USFQ and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, serves as a hub for multidisciplinary research projects that contribute to the conservation and sustainability of the islands. Located in Puerto Baquerizo Moreno on Isla San Cristóbal, the GSC focuses on five key research areas: environmental change, community and human health, conservation, oceans, and biodiversity. The center emphasizes experiential education and community engagement, involving students and the community in various research activities to foster a deeper understanding of environmental and conservation challenges.

The Escuela Superior Politécnica del Litoral (ESPOL) contributes to marine research in the Galápagos through the Galapagos Marine Research and Exploration (GMaRE), a collaboration with the Fundación Charles Darwin. Strategically, GMaRE has a comprehensive strategic plan that includes an annual research agenda focusing on key areas within the GMR. Projects under this plan cover a range of topics such as the evaluation of Fish Aggregating Devices (FADs) installed in the GMR, the effects of anthropogenic pollutants on planktonic and benthic communities around the islands of Santa Cruz, San Cristóbal, and Isabela, and the monitoring of ocean acidification.

Table 14 Academic and Research organizations with direct relation to GLF

NAME OF THE ORGANIZATION	GEOGRAPHICAL PRESENCE	LOCATION	AREA OF INFLUENCE	RELATION WITH GLF
ESPOL	3. NATIONAL	2. SAN CRISTOBAL	4. GALÁPAGOS	1. DIRECT
USFQ	3. NATIONAL	2. SAN CRISTOBAL	4. GALÁPAGOS	1. DIRECT
INDP	3. NATIONAL	2. SAN CRISTOBAL	4. GALÁPAGOS	1. DIRECT
FCD	2. PROVINCE	1. SANTA CRUZ	4. GALÁPAGOS	1. DIRECT
UTPL	3. NATIONAL	1. SANTA CRUZ	4. GALÁPAGOS	1. DIRECT

No academic institutions or associated groups have been identified as potentially affected by GLF-funded activities. The operations and objectives of academic organizations are fully aligned with the conservation goals promoted by GLF, ensuring a mutually supportive relationship that enhances project outcomes without negative impacts. Academic stakeholders remain critical partners in achieving the broader sustainability objectives of the Galápagos.

7.1.1.6 INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Finally, International Development Organizations play a crucial role in promoting global progress and mitigating social, economic and environmental challenges around the world. Their development efforts range from poverty reduction to promoting gender equality and environmental sustainability.

Bilateral cooperation organizations like Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (German development agency, GIZ), USAID or Spanish Cooperation primarily provide resources for local development projects that are linked to both marine and terrestrial ecosystems. Multilateral organizations and development banks, such as the World Bank, UNDP or IDB offer financial resources to local organizations that carry out sustainable local development projects.

On the other hand, organizations like Conservation International (CI), World Wildlife Fund (WWF), WildAid, Sustainable Fisheries Partnership (SFP), Jocotoco, Rewild, or the Galapagos Conservation Trust (GCT) not only leverage international funds but also implement conservation projects directly on the ground. These organizations are identified as having a direct relationship with the GLF due to their active roles in project implementation.

Table 15 International organizations and GLF relationship

Direct			Indirect		
Stakeholders	Location	Area of Influence	Stakeholders	Location	Area of Influence
SFP	4. Continent	4. Galápagos	USAID	4. Continent	4. Galápagos
WWF	4. Continent	4. Galápagos	GIZ	4. Continent	4. Galápagos
Wild Aid	1. Santa Cruz	4. Galápagos	Rewild	1. Santa Cruz	4. Galápagos
CI	1. Santa Cruz	4. Galápagos	UNDP	4. Continent	4. Galápagos
GCT	1. Santa Cruz	4. Galápagos	WB	4. Continent	4. Galápagos
GC	1. Santa Cruz	4. Galápagos	IDB	4. Continent	4. Galápagos
Jocotoco	1. Santa Cruz	4. Galápagos			

7.2 STAKEHOLDER POSITIONING AND INFLUENCE RELATIVE TO GLF

The analysis provides a structured breakdown of stakeholder groups within the GLF framework, classified by their level of power and influence, their relationship (direct or indirect) with the fund, and their specific expectations. The aim is to enhance the GLF's engagement strategy by tailoring its approach to address each group's unique needs, roles, and influence within the Galápagos' socio-environmental ecosystem.

Table 16 Stakeholder Power, Influence, and Expectations Matrix

Category	Relation	Influence	Expectations	Stakeholders
Public	Direct 6%	High High- High	This group comprises the highest echelon of regulatory and management entities in the Galápagos, holding substantial authority and influence over conservation and environmental policies. They are directly involved in the enforcement of laws and regulations that protect the Galápagos ecosystems. Their expectations are likely centered on obtaining adequate funding, support, and alignment from GLF projects that complement their stringent conservation mandates and enhance the sustainability of the islands.	Galapagos National Park Directorate, Consejo de Gobierno de Régimen Especial de Galápagos, Director Regional de los Espacios Acuaticos Insular, District Directors of Tourism and Fisheries
		Medium High- Low	These organizations possess significant regulatory authority but have a more focused influence, primarily responsible for biosecurity and risk management in the Galápagos. While they do not command the broad sweeping powers of the top-tier group, their roles are critical for the prevention of ecological risks, such as the introduction of invasive species and emergency response. They seek to ensure that their specific mandates are recognized and supported by the GLF, potentially through targeted projects that align with their biosecurity and risk management objectives.	Agency for Regulation and Control of Biosecurity and Quarantine for Galápagos, Risk Management Secretariat (local and zonal)
	Indirect 13%	High High- High	These government bodies oversee significant local administrative functions and have the power to influence local infrastructure and welfare initiatives, indirectly affecting the conservation efforts by shaping the socioeconomic landscape of the islands.	Municipal Governments of Cantón San Cristóbal, Santa Cruz, and Isabela and District Directors of Health, Education, Agriculture, and Social and Economic Inclusion
		Medium High- Low	while not wielding broad regulatory power, holds significant influence over the community through cultural and educational programs that can promote conservation awareness and community engagement in environmental stewardship. they look to GLF for opportunities to collaborate on projects that align cultural heritage with environmental sustainability, enhancing the local community's connection to conservation values. This group also looks for recognition of their regulatory roles in the conservation framework, expecting GLF to integrate their priorities and challenges in project planning.	Casa de la Cultura
Private	Direct 12%	High High- High	These organizations play significant roles in the tourism and fisheries sectors, which allows them to influence policies and practices directly in the Galápagos. They expect to lead projects, influence GLF funding decisions, and play a pivotal role in shaping sustainable development strategies within the archipelago.	Galápagos Provincial Tourism Chamber, Artisanal Fishermen's Cooperative

		Medium High- Low	This group consists of a mix of tourism operators and local fishing cooperatives. While influential in their sectors, they may not have the extensive reach of the higher power groups. These entities expect to be involved in GLF projects that directly affect their operations and to receive support for implementing sustainable practices.	Galápagos Touristic Shipowners Association (ADATUR), Isabela Shipowners Association, Galápagos Tourism Guides Association
		Low Low-Low	This category includes smaller scale tourism guides and local artisan organizations. They have less influence over broad industry standards but are directly engaged in community-level activities. They likely hope to increase their visibility through GLF initiatives, gain access to training, and enhance their operational capacities to benefit from conservation-related improvements.	Galapagos Odyssey Tourism Guides, Pinzón Women's Artisanal Organization of Isabela Island, Blue Fish Organization (Pescado Azul Organization)
	Indirect 16%	Medium High- Low	This organizations, includes a variety of organizations from financial institutions like Banco Pacifico and Banco Pichincha to agricultural cooperatives and artisan groups, while influential in local agricultural practices, interacts with GLF on a more consultative basis. They aim to leverage GLF's initiatives to benefit local agriculture, promoting sustainable practices among community members.	Artisanal Centre of the Craft Sector, Cooperative of Coffee Producers of the Galápagos Islands, Pacific Bank, Pichincha Bank, Association of Coffee Growers of Santa Cruz, Associated Cattlemen of Santa Cruz Canton, Association of Poultry Farmers of Santa Cruz, Association of Cattle Producers of Santa Cruz Island, Interprofessional Association of Ecological Artisans of the Galápagos Islands
		Low Low-Low	This group predominantly consists of smaller organizations focused on community-level engagement and education and very localized cooperative efforts in agriculture They expect to receive support in terms of capacity building, small grants, and recognition of their contributions to the local culture and economy.	Drum Academy, Cooperative "I Only Sell What I Produce", Hotels Association, Savings and Credit Cooperative
	Potentially Affected Groups	Low Low-Low	Members of artisanal fishing cooperatives and independent fishers may face restrictions on fishing zones or quotas due to the expansion of marine protected areas. Independent tour guides, small hotel owners, and operators of experiential tourism activities may face limitations in accessing certain conservation-sensitive areas, impacting their revenues.	Artisanal Fishing Communities, Small-Scale Tourism Operators, Agricultural Communities
NGO	Direct 8%	Medium High- Low	This category includes NGOs that are actively involved in conservation, education, and sustainable community development. They have moderate power and influence through their expertise, partnerships, and local community engagement. These organizations expect to collaborate closely with GLF, leveraging their networks and expertise to co-manage projects and influence conservation policies directly. Their goals are to secure	ECOS, FUNCAVID, FRENTE INSULAR, Scalesia, Rewild, Galápagos Invasive Species Fund

			<p>funding and resources to implement significant environmental and community development projects that align with the GLF’s objectives.</p>	
		Low Low-Low	<p>This group consists of NGOs focused on educational initiatives, with specific aims towards environmental awareness and youth engagement. Their power in terms of resource control or political influence is limited, but they play key roles in community education and awareness. They expect to receive support from GLF to enhance their educational programs and extend their outreach within the local communities.</p>	<p>Naveducando, Amiguitos del Océano</p>
		Indirect 4%	Medium High- Low	<p>These NGOs, while not directly funded by GLF, are involved in significant areas such as human rights advocacy and sustainable development practices in Galápagos. They have substantial expertise and are capable of influencing community opinions and policies related to human rights and sustainable practices. Their expectation is to influence broader policy changes and gain support for their initiatives that complement the conservation goals of GLF, even though they are not directly funded by the fund.</p>
		Low Low-Low	<p>This group consists of NGOs that, despite having an indirect connection to GLF, play important roles in specific sectors like cultural development and volunteer-driven projects. Their limited power and influence are primarily due to their peripheral roles relative to core conservation and development activities directed by GLF.</p>	<p>CENDA Galápagos, Projects Abroad</p>
Civil society	Indirect 16%	High High- High	<p>These organizations are active in promoting community engagement and environmental awareness. They influence local policy and social dynamics through advocacy, community mobilization, and educational activities. Their expectations involve influencing broader policy changes and influencing investment decisions made by GLF. These groups aspire to ensure that these decisions reflect and align with the needs of local communities.</p>	<p>Asamblea Comunitaria de San Cristóbal, Representatives of surfing and citizens in Santa Cruz, Youth representatives and sports promotion in Santa Cruz, Tejido Violeta (San Cristóbal), Santa Cruz Youth Advisory Board</p>
		Low Low-Low	<p>This group includes various local activist groups, artisan cooperatives, and community organizations focused on cultural, gender, and economic issues. Despite having lower influence and power, these organizations are crucial for grassroots support and local community development. Their expectations are primarily centered around gaining more recognition and support from larger entities like GLF to enhance their local initiatives. They seek to benefit from improved community infrastructure and social welfare initiatives driven by broader conservation and development projects.</p>	<p>Tejido violeta (Santa Cruz), Representatives of the Commerce Sector, Representatives of the transport and cargo sector, Galapagos Women's Activist Movement on Alert, Mi Diario Grita, Galápagos Women Movement Organization of Women Artisans of Isabela / Manos reciclando,</p>

				Organization of Productive Women of Galapagos, Arabesque Galápagos Dance Academy, Asociación Interprofesional de Maestros y Operarios del cantón San Cristóbal
Media	Indirect 11%	Medium High- Low	These media outlets have significant influence through their ability to shape public perception and discourse around the issues affecting the Galápagos. However, they do not possess direct power to enforce policies or decisions. Media organizations covering conservation funding primarily expect transparency and regular updates from funds like the Galápagos Life Fund. They aim to provide their audiences with timely and accurate reports on project outcomes, funding decisions, and operational insights. Additionally, they seek recognition as essential partners in disseminating the importance and impacts of such initiatives to a broader audience.	Universidad San Francisco de Quito (USFQ) and Fundación Charles Darwin
Academia	Direct 4%	High High- High	Universidad San Francisco de Quito (USFQ) and Fundación Charles Darwin both have significant impact within the Galápagos. USFQ, through its research programs and educational outreach, plays a pivotal role in shaping environmental policy and sustainable practices. Similarly, the Charles Darwin Foundation, with its extensive research on biodiversity and conservation, influences both local and international conservation strategies.	
		Medium High- Low	Escuela Superior Politécnica del Litoral (ESPOL) and Instituto Público de Investigación de Acuicultura y Pesca (IPAP) have considerable influence due to their specialized research capabilities and contributions to the marine sciences, affecting local conservation efforts and policies. Their work is critical in areas such as marine biodiversity, sustainable fisheries, and ecological research, providing essential data and expertise that guide conservation initiatives.	Escuela Superior Politécnica del Litoral (ESPOL) and Instituto Público de Investigación de Acuicultura y Pesca (IPAP)
International organizations	Direct 7%	High High- High	This group comprises major international conservation organizations with substantial resources and influence. They expect to significantly shape conservation policies and practices in the Galápagos through direct project funding, strategic partnerships, and impactful conservation programs. Their goals align closely with the GLF’s objectives, focusing on large-scale impact such as habitat preservation, species recovery, and enforcement against illegal activities.	WildAid World Wildlife Fund (WWF) Jocotoco
		Low Low-Low	Organizations in this category have considerable influence and are involved in direct collaborations with the GLF but may have slightly less power to enact changes single-	Sustainable Fisheries Partnership (SFP) Conservation International

			handedly compared to the top-tier group. They aim to contribute to sustainable management practices and effective conservation strategies. These organizations work on both the scientific and community levels, aiming to integrate local ecological knowledge with global conservation standards.	Galapagos Conservation Trust Galápagos Conservancy
	Indirect 5%	High High- High	This group consists of prominent international agencies and development banks that, while not directly involved in funding or project execution with GLF, exert significant influence on regional development through large-scale funding and policy guidance. Their expectations are likely focused on aligning GLF's conservation efforts with broader sustainable development goals and international environmental standards. They aim to see their funding and policies contribute to sustainable development outcomes, indirectly benefiting from the strengthened environmental governance and improved conservation status in the Galápagos.	

8 ENGAGEMENT PLAN

The SEP comprises a comprehensive plan designed to foster active and inclusive participation from all groups connected to the GLF. The engagement framework recognizes the diverse expectations and roles of stakeholders, ranging from direct beneficiaries actively involved in funded projects to indirect beneficiaries impacted by the wider conservation and sustainability goals. The strategy aims to ensure clear communication, build trust, and empower stakeholders at all levels through tailored engagement types, including informative, consultative, participatory, and partnership-based approaches. This multi-tiered engagement plan is integral to aligning stakeholder interests, managing expectations, and maximizing the positive environmental and socio-economic impacts of the GLF's initiatives in the Galápagos.

Table 17 GLF Stakeholder Engagement Strategy

Beneficiary Group	Engagement Type	Purpose	Methods	Application in GLF Context
Common to All	Informative Engagement	To ensure all stakeholders understand the management of funds and the project selection process.	General information sessions, FAQs, website updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bi-annually informational webinars. - Quarterly newsletters detailing funding criteria and project status updates. - Participation in community events
	Grievance Mechanism Engagement	To address concerns and enhance trust among all stakeholders.	Accessible grievance mechanism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish an online and phone-based Grievance Mechanism. - Quarterly review of grievance reports and implementation of resolutions. - Annual grievance process audit to ensure efficacy and fairness.
Direct Beneficiaries	Consultative Engagement	To gather insights and expertise for project planning and implementation.	Technical workshops, stakeholder advisory panels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Workshop to detail the application process and fund policies. - Regular advisory panel meetings for continuous

				feedback and project refinement.
	Participatory Engagement	To involve stakeholders in decision-making processes affecting the funded projects.	Joint planning sessions, co-management structures	- Annual Project Showcase to present project results and foster networking.
	Partnership Engagement	To build strong collaborations to enhance project impact through shared objectives.	Strategic alliances, formal agreements	
Indirect Beneficiaries + Potentially Affected Groups	Informative Engagement	To address misconceptions and inform about the broader benefits of conservation efforts and ensure compliance with IFC PS 1 para 29. Disclosure of relevant project information helps Affected Communities understand the risks, impacts, and opportunities of the project.	Public forums, Community Meetings, social media engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Host workshops or webinars in local communities twice a year. - Participation in community events and school fairs with an itinerant booth. - Monthly updates on social media about project impacts and community benefits.
	Empowerment Engagement	To enhance the capacity of communities to benefit indirectly from conservation activities.	Capacity-building programs, skills training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Launch a yearly community training program focused on circular economy and sustainable practices. - Evaluate training impacts biannually and adjust curriculum as needed.

8.1 COMMON ENGAGEMENT ACTIONS FOR ALL STAKEHOLDERS

A. INFORMATIVE ENGAGEMENT

IE1. Biannual Informational Webinars: Host webinars every six months to provide all stakeholders with updates on GLF funded projects, insights into funding mechanisms, and

progress on conservation efforts including supply chain ethics. These webinars serve to keep everyone informed and engaged with GLF's activities and strategic directions.

IE2. Project Data Base Initiative: where all stakeholders can view data on project progress, financial expenditures, and impact assessments. Actions related to open data seek to promote transparency, collaboration and the reuse of data of public interest. These actions may include:

1. Release of data sets Identify and prioritize data that can be opened to the public without compromising privacy or security. Publish data in accessible formats, such as CSV, JSON or APIs, to facilitate reuse. Ensure data is well documented and up to date.
2. Creation of platforms and portals Design web portals where users can explore, download and view open data. Ensure that the platform is intuitive and accessible to diverse audiences, from researchers to citizens.
3. Policies and regulations Develop open data policies that regulate transparency and access to information. Implement regulations that define quality standards for open data.

IE3. Quarterly Newsletters: Distribute newsletters quarterly to all registered stakeholders, which include updates on ongoing projects, highlights of new and upcoming initiatives, and details on GLF's operational impact and future plans.

IE4. Educational and Clarification Campaigns: To correct misconceptions about the nature of the GLF funds and emphasize the benefits of conservation efforts that extend beyond environmental protection to include economic and social improvements.

IE5. Media Outreach and Public Relations: Regularly issue press releases to local and national news outlets to announce new projects, grants, significant milestones, and major events.

IE6. Participation in community events with an itinerant booth. GLF's itinerant booth is a flexible, interactive platform designed to engage with the community during key local events, such as World Oceans Day fairs, Turtle Day celebrations, the Lobster Festival, and other significant occasions. These events provide valuable opportunities for GLF representatives to share insights on ongoing projects and initiatives, present GLF's mission and impact, and connect directly with local stakeholders. The booth offers educational materials, interactive displays, and one-on-one conversations, fostering an inviting space for community members to learn more about conservation efforts and ways they can get involved with GLF

Table 18 Informative engagement actions - Common engagements

Code	Action Item	Responsible Party	Timeline
IE1	Biannual Informational Webinars	Communications Officer + Programm officer	Every six months
IE2	Project Data Base Initiative	Communications Officer + Programm officer	Setup followed by continuous updates
IE3	Quarterly Newsletters	Communications Officer	Quarterly
IE4	Educational and Clarification Campaigns	Communications Officer + Programm officer	As needed

IE5	Media Outreach and Public Relations	Communications Officer	Ongoing
IE6	Participation in Community Events with an Itinerant Booth	Communications Officer + Programm officer	During specific events

8.1.1 GRIEVANCE MECHANISM ENGAGEMENT

GM1. Establishment of a web-based and Phone-Based Grievance Management System:

Implement a readily accessible grievance system that allows stakeholders to easily submit their concerns and complaints confidentially and, if necessary, anonymously. This system will be available via online platforms and a dedicated Ethics Hotline⁵, ensuring stakeholders can reach out at their convenience.

GM2. Quarterly Review of Grievance Reports: Conduct a quarterly analysis of the grievances filed, focusing on the effectiveness of the resolution processes and the responsiveness of the system. This helps continuously improving the grievance mechanism.

GM3. Annual Grievance Process Audit and public reports: Perform an annual report audit of the grievance mechanism to ensure its effectiveness and fairness. The audit results are used to make necessary adjustments and enhance the system's reliability and trustworthiness. Summaries of the grievance handling performance, including resolution timelines and stakeholder satisfaction, will be included in the annual E&S Monitoring report which is made available on the GLF's official website.

Table 19 Grievance mechanism - Common engagements

Code	Action Item	Responsible Party	Timeline
GM1	Establishment of a Web-based and Phone-Based Grievance System	Sustainability officer	Continuous Implementation
GM2	Quarterly Review of Grievance Reports	Sustainability Officer	Quarterly
GM3	Annual Grievance Process Audit	Sustainability Officer	Annually

8.2 ENGAGEMENT ACTIONS FOR DIRECT BENEFICIARIES

A. CONSULTATIVE ENGAGEMENT

CE.1 Call for Proposal Workshop: These workshops will provide potential applicants with comprehensive guidance on how to complete the application forms, understand the funding criteria, and comply with GLF's policies. This aims to increase the quality of applications and ensure alignment with GLF's strategic goals.

⁵ <https://glf.lineaconfidencial.com/>

Table 20 Consultative Actions for direct Beneficiaries

Code	Action Item	Responsible Party	Timeline
CE.1	Call for Proposals Workshop	Program Officer	When each Call for Proposals is open

B. PARTICIPATORY ENGAGEMENT

PE.1 Annual Project Showcase: Host an event where beneficiaries present the results and progress of their projects. Facilitate breakout sessions and discussion panels to encourage interaction and the exchange of ideas. This will allow project teams to explore potential areas for collaboration and integration, ultimately leading to more cohesive and powerful conservation efforts.

PE.2 Joint Planning Sessions: Hold sessions where direct beneficiaries can collaborate with GLF in planning and decision-making processes. These sessions will focus on gathering feedback from beneficiaries on the monitoring and supervision processes, discussing potential improvements, and co-developing solutions to enhance project execution and outcomes.

Table 21 Participatory Actions for direct Beneficiaries

Code	Action Item	Responsible Party	Timeline
PE.1	Annual Project Showcase	Program Officer	Annually
PE.2	Joint Planning Sessions	Program Officer	Annually

C. PARTNERSHIP ENGAGEMENT

PP.1 Strategic Alliances: Formulate partnerships with relevant organizations that can provide additional expertise, resources, or networks to enhance the impact of conservation projects to create synergies that amplify project outcomes beyond what GLF or individual grantees could achieve alone.

PP.2 Formal Agreements: Establish formal agreements that define the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of both GLF and its partners, ensuring that all parties are committed to shared objectives and understand their contributions.

Table 22 Partnership Actions for direct Beneficiaries

Code	Action Item	Responsible Party	Timeline
PP.1	Strategic Alliances	Sustainability Officer	Ongoing
PP.2	Formal Agreements	Sustainability Officer	As needed

D. EMPOWERMENT ENGAGEMENT

EE.1 Capacity Building Programs: Develop and implement training programs and workshops aimed at enhancing the skills and knowledge of project teams, particularly in areas such as project management, environmental best practices, and community engagement. This ensures that beneficiaries are well-equipped to execute projects effectively.

EE.2 Technical Support and Mentoring: Provide ongoing technical support and mentoring to project teams, helping them to overcome operational challenges and enhance project outcomes.

EE.3 Training Sessions on Project Design: Conduct specialized training sessions focused on project design fundamentals. These should include defining clear objectives, creating measurable outcomes, ensuring sustainability, understanding and integrating environmental and social impacts, budgeting accurately, and risk management. This action would be particularly beneficial, providing a structured approach to building capacity among new grantees.

Table 23 Empowerment Actions for direct Beneficiaries

Code	Action Item	Responsible Party	Timeline
EE.1	Capacity Building Programs	Program Officer + Sustainability Officer	Annually
EE.2	Technical Support and Mentoring	Program Officer + Sustainability Officer	Ongoing
EE.3	Training Sessions on Project Design	Program Officer	Annually

8.3 ENGAGEMENT ACTIONS FOR INDIRECT BENEFICIARIES

A. INFORMATIVE ENGAGEMENT

IE.1 Public workshops: Host workshops in local communities twice a year to discuss GLF's conservation initiatives, their importance, and (in)direct benefits to the local economy and environment. Special attention will be given to potentially affected communities, vulnerable groups, community leaders, and stakeholders who will be engaged in the planning and execution of these initiatives to ensure the content is community-specific and meets local needs. To guarantee that these events are inclusive and accessible for vulnerable groups, necessary accommodations such as language translation services, physical accessibility measures, and materials tailored to different literacy levels will be provided. GLF will use a range of communication platforms to engage diverse segments of the population effectively. Social media will target a younger demographic, while traditional media channels such as radio, local newspapers, and community bulletin boards will reach older community members and those without internet access.

IE.2 Social Media Campaigns: Run ongoing campaigns on social media platforms to reach a broader audience, sharing success stories, project impacts, and educational content about conservation and sustainability.

Table 24 Engagement Actions for Indirect Beneficiaries

Action Code	Action Item	Responsible Party	Timeline
IE.1	Public Workshops	Program Officer	Twice a year
IE.2	Social Media Campaigns	Communication Officer	Ongoing

B. PARTNERSHIP ENGAGEMENT

PP.1 Strategic Alliances: Partner with radio stations to feature interviews and discussions with GLF project leaders and conservation experts. These radio spots can focus on explaining the importance of conservation efforts, detailing the specific projects underway, and discussing the impacts of these projects on local communities and ecosystems.

Table 25 Partnership Engagement Actions

Action Code	Action Item	Responsible Party	Timeline
PP.1	Strategic Alliances	Sustainability Officer	Ongoing

C. EMPOWERMENT ENGAGEMENT

EE.1 Capacity Building Programs: To demonstrate GLF's commitment to supporting local economic development alongside conservation. Implement training programs focused on circular economy, sustainable practices, and other related skills that enable community members to engage in and benefit from conservation-related economic activities.

Table 26 Empowerment Engagement Actions

Action Code	Action Item	Responsible Party	Timeline
EE.1	Capacity Building Programs	Program Officer	Ongoing

D. PARTICIPATORY ENGAGEMENT

PE. Art in Conservation Showcases: launch exhibitions, or host exhibitions of photography or art work, inviting local artist to showcase artworks that resonate with specific conservation themes related to GLF projects. This could include marine biodiversity, sustainable practices, or cultural heritage related to the Galápagos ecosystems.

9 MONITORING AND REPORTING

Monitoring and reporting activities will be closely aligned with the engagement actions outlined in sections 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3 of the SEP. By linking monitoring and reporting mechanisms directly to these engagement activities, the GLF can effectively track the effectiveness of each action and adjust strategies accordingly. The participation records and reports will indeed be disaggregated by sex to monitor gender balance effectively. Additionally, the type of sectorial and geographical participation will be reported. This will allow us to assess the representativeness of participation across different social and geographical groups.

The objective is to systematically assess the effectiveness of each engagement activity detailed in the engagement plan, ensuring adaptive management of stakeholder interactions and continuous improvement of engagement practices. All indicators should register the participation of men and women to be able to encourage an equal representation of men and women stakeholders. Other parameters like ethnicity/cultural background, age, level of education etc. should be considered as well to ensure inclusiveness.

9.1 METHODS AND TOOLS

To ensure the effectiveness of engagement strategies with stakeholders and align them with the objectives of the GLF, various specific engagement indicators have been proposed. These indicators will be implemented and reported as follows:

9.1.1 INFORMATIVE ENGAGEMENT INDICATORS

- **Implementation Frequency:** Informational webinars will be held biannually, and updates will be disseminated quarterly through newsletters.
- **Monitoring Indicators:** Attendance at webinars disaggregated by gender, sector, and geography, newsletter open and click rates, and feedback gathered from post-event surveys.
- **Reporting Methods:** Compilation of biannual reports summarizing engagement metrics and feedback to adjust future sessions and newsletter content.

9.1.2 GRIEVANCE MECHANISM ENGAGEMENT INDICATORS

- **Implementation Frequency:** Quarterly review of grievance reports and annual audit of the process.
- **Monitoring Indicators:** Number of grievances received, average response and resolution time, stakeholder satisfaction post-resolution.
- **Reporting Methods:** Quarterly performance reports of the grievance mechanism and an annual audit report to evaluate the system's effectiveness and fairness.

9.1.3 CONSULTATIVE ENGAGEMENT INDICATORS

- **Implementation Frequency:** Call for Proposals workshops and advisory panels will be conducted according to the project call schedule.

- **Monitoring Indicators:** Number of participants in each session, broken down by gender, sector, and geography, quality of received proposals, and degree of alignment of proposals with GLF's strategic objectives.
- **Reporting Methods:** Post-event reports detailing outcomes and how feedback has been integrated into project planning processes.

9.1.4 PARTICIPATORY ENGAGEMENT INDICATORS

- **Implementation Frequency:** Annual joint planning sessions and project showcases to foster collaboration.
- **Monitoring Indicators:** Level of active participation by beneficiaries, broken down by gender, sector, and geography quality and effectiveness of collaborations, and alignment of projects with community expectations.
- **Reporting Methods:** Annual summaries reflecting the effectiveness of the sessions in influencing project decisions and the success of the showcases in terms of knowledge exchange and networking.

9.1.5 EMPOWERMENT ENGAGEMENT INDICATORS

- **Implementation Frequency:** Annual training programs designed to enhance community skills and foster local economic development.
- **Monitoring Indicators:** Number of participants, broken down by gender, sector, and geography, increase in technical skills, and applicability of acquired skills in local economic activities.
- **Reporting Methods:** Biannual impact evaluations of training and necessary curriculum adjustments based on participant feedback and changes in local market needs.

9.2 REPORTING

To ensure that the GLF maintains transparency and accountability in its stakeholder engagement activities, a structured reporting system is essential. This system will allow for regular assessment and adjustment of engagement strategies, ensuring they remain effective and responsive to stakeholder needs and expectations. **Types of Reports:**

- **Activity-Specific Reports:** concise, immediate post-event reports should be produced summarizing execution details, participation data, and feedback highlights.
- **Annual Environmental and Social (E&S) Monitoring Report:** an annual E&S report should be compiled that summarizes data from all engagement activities, providing analysis on effectiveness, stakeholder satisfaction, and areas for improvement, including narrative case studies to illustrate successes and challenges.

9.2.1 CONTENT OF REPORTS

- **Engagement Effectiveness:** Analysis of how effective the engagement actions have been in achieving their intended outcomes, using indicators like participant feedback, degree of stakeholder involvement in decision-making, and alignment with GLF's strategic goals.
- **Stakeholder Feedback:** Summaries of feedback collected from all engagement activities, highlighting areas of success and those requiring improvement.
- **Grievance Mechanism Performance:** Overview of the functioning and responsiveness of the grievance management system, including types of complaints received, resolution timelines, and stakeholder satisfaction with the process (integrated within the Annual E&S Monitoring Report).

9.2.2 TRANSPARENCY AND ACCESSIBILITY:

- **Public Access to Reports:** reports should be accessible via the GLF's website and distributed through newsletters. Consider using straightforward, visual formats like infographics and short video summaries to make findings easily understandable.
- **Inclusive Reporting Practices:** reports should be provided in multiple formats to ensure accessibility, such as simple, visual presentations for those with limited literacy or technical proficiency and translated summaries for non-English speakers.

Table 27 Engagement Monitoring and Reporting

Engagement Type	Engagement Action	Monitoring Indicators	Reporting Frequency	Reporting Methods
Informative Engagement	Biannual Informational Webinars	Attendance, engagement rates, stakeholder feedback	Biannual	Webinar performance reports, Stakeholder feedback analysis
Informative Engagement	Quarterly Newsletters	Readership metrics, engagement statistics	Quarterly	Distribution and readership analytics report
Informative Engagement	Participation in Community Events with an Itinerant Booth	Participant feedback, interaction quality	Annually	Event feedback summary, Annual engagement report
Grievance Mechanism Engagement	Online and Phone-Based System	Number of grievances, resolution rate, stakeholder satisfaction	Quarterly reports, Annual audit	Grievance resolution report, Annual audit report
Consultative Engagement	Call for Proposals Workshops and Advisory Panels	Feedback applicability, implementation rate of suggestions	Post-event, Annually	Workshop summary reports, Annual feedback integration report
Participatory Engagement	Annual Project Showcase and	Beneficiary involvement level,	Annually	Showcase outcomes report,

	Joint Planning Sessions	effectiveness of sessions		Session effectiveness analysis
Partnership Engagement	Strategic Alliances and Formal Agreements	Number and impact of partnerships, contributions to project success	Annually	Partnership impact assessment, Annual collaboration review
Informative Engagement	Public Forums and Social Media Campaigns	Forum reach and impact, changes in public perception	Biannually, Monthly social media analytics	Public forum summary, Monthly social media reports
Empowerment Engagement	Capacity Building Programs	Participation rates, long-term impacts on community development	Annually	Training effectiveness report, Community impact analysis
Participatory Engagement	Art in Conservation Showcases	Engagement levels, community feedback on artistic initiatives	Annually	Exhibition feedback summary, Annual arts engagement report