



Sustainable Management of Conservation Areas and Improved Livelihoods to Combat Wildlife Trafficking in Madagascar

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10233

Countries

Madagascar

Project Name

Sustainable Management of Conservation Areas and Improved Livelihoods to Combat Wildlife Trafficking in Madagascar

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

3/12/2021

Review completed by PM

4/15/2021

Program Manager

Adriana Moreira

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement **Part I ? Project Information****Focal area elements****1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-30-21 AM : Project is well aligned with the Biodiversity Focal Area and the Global Wildlife Program (GWP) framework.

4-8-21 AM: There is one issue that needs to be amended in the transfer from UNEP to UNDP: the Letter of Endorsement provided to UNEP did not include the amount for the Agency fee (\$18,000). Hence, the total amount allocated to this project through the LoE (\$6,282,000) does not match the actual amount (\$6,300,000). Please, revise and re-submit.

Agency Response

Agency Response to 4-8-21

Many thanks for the comment. The LoE has been revised as advised.

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4-1-21 AM: Project structure is technically sound.

4-20-21: In relation to the PMC costs presented in Table B, please note the need to show proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$35,493,200 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,774,660 instead of \$250,000 (which is 0.7%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

	Sub Total (\$)	5,488,860.00	35,493,200.00
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ			
	GET	274,443.00	250,000.00
	Sub Total(\$)	274,443.00	250,000.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	5,763,303.00	35,743,200.00
	Sub Total (\$)	5,488,860.00	35,493,200.00
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ			
	GET	274,443.00	250,000.00
	Sub Total(\$)	274,443.00	250,000.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	5,763,303.00	35,743,200.00

Agency Response

UNEP Agency Response to GEF Sec comment from 4-20-21:
 Table B represents actual co-financing that was secured by the PPG team per project Component, which has decreased to \$ 14,642,944 after confirmation from Ministry of Interior and Decentralization that they could not commit the amount indicated at PIF stage. The only organization that can contribute PMC for the project is MEDD and given the impact of the pandemic on their budget the amount confirmed at this stage is \$250,000 for project management. It is important to note that the amount for PMC co-financing from MEDD is sufficient for the management, along with funds provided by GEF. We have reflected these changes in the project document (p. 1-2 and table 10 p. 88) and CEO ER, Table B, p. 1-3.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4-1-21 AM: Co-financing is adequate.

4-20-21: Co-financing from CSOs (TRAFFIC and Grace Farms Foundation) has been reported as in-kind and investment mobilized. However, both letters indicate "recurrent expenditure". Please revise table C or provide justification. Please also revise the description under table C.

The co-financing letter for the 29M USD from Ministry of Interior & Decentralization is missing, please, attach it for review.

5-6-21: Co-financing justification is satisfactory.

Agency Response

UNEP Agency Response to GEF Sec comment from 4-20-21:

Thank you for the comment. Co-financing from TRAFFIC and GFF have been corrected as suggested. Please, see CEO ER, Table C, p. 3.

Unfortunately, the Ministry of Interior and Decentralization withdrew its co-financing commitments to the project during the transfer between GEF Agencies totaling the co-financing confirmed at this stage at \$ 14,642,944. This amount includes increased MEDD co-financing commitment (\$1,000,000) and additional in-kind co-financing secured from the Foundation for Biodiversity and Protected Areas of Madagascar (FAPBM)- \$ 7,499,744. It is important to note though that MEDD and UNEP have been closely working with other partners (UNODC, World Bank, USAID, WWF, and Ministry of Justice) who have indicated potential to provide adequate co-financing to the project. UNEP undertakes to follow up and do what is needed to increase the co-financing commitment during implementation. This has been reflected respectively in the CEO ER, Tables A, B, and C; pp. 1-3.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4-1-21 AM: Proposed financing structure is adequate.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4-1-21 AM: Status of PPG utilization is reported in Annex C.

Agency Response
Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4-1-21 AM: The area under indicator 4.1 (area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity) outside PAs have been reduced from 80,000 ha at PIF stage to 10,000 ha. However, this reduction was compensated by the increase of areas under indicator 1.2 (terrestrial PAs under improved management effectiveness) from 100,000 ha to 196,410 ha (3 PAs). The proposed indicators are technically satisfactory.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4-1-21 AM: The barriers, threats and root cause analysis presented is technically sound.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4-1-21 AM: The baseline analysis and gaps are well presented.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-1-21 AM: Alternative scenarios and proposed project structure is adequate and technically sound.

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-30-21 AM : Yes, the project is well aligned with the Biodiversity Focal Area and the Global Wildlife Program (GWP) framework.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4-1-21 AM: Incremental reasoning is satisfactory.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4-1-21 AM: Proposed Project's contribution to Global Environmental Benefits is well described.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4-1-21 AM: Yes, project contains realistic proposals for innovation and scaling up.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4-1-21 AM: Project Map and Coordinates are adequate.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-30-21 AM : Project is well aligned with the Global Wildlife Program (GWP) framework and directly contributes to its objectives.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4-1-21 AM: Stakeholder analysis and engagement plan are adequate.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4-1-21 AM: Project includes gender-responsive activities and indicators.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4-1-21 AM: Project identifies potential private sector partnerships related to value chains/community livelihoods.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4-1-21 AM: Risks are well identified and proposed mitigation measures are realistic.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4-1-21 AM: Institutional arrangements are well described with clear roles and responsibilities for each participant agency.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-30-21 AM : Yes, project is well aligned with national strategies.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4-1-21 AM: Knowledge management approach is adequate and technically sound.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4-1-21 AM: Monitoring and evaluation plan is satisfactory.

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4-1-21 AM: Socioeconomic benefits are well described.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4-1-21 AM: Required annexes are adequate. Project budget includes acquisition of pick up trucks and motorcycles for patrolling and wildlife crime investigation that are justified and pertinent for the proposed project activities.

4-20-21: Budget Tables: With the exception of the Financial and Administration Assistant, other Project staff (Project Manager; NPA Manager Officer; Sustainable Livelihood Officer; M&E, KM and Communication Officer) are partially or completely charged to the Project's components ? they must be charged to the Project Management Costs from both ?the GEF portion and the co-financing portion? (see Guidelines paragraph 5 ? page 49) ? Please amend the tables accordingly.

The preferred practice is for vehicles and associated costs to be charged to the co-financing part. Please check if the co-financing resources can cover these costs.

The submission UNDP projects require the Audit Checklist Annex. Please include the required annex.

5-6-21: Justification for vehicles is technically cleared.

Agency Response

UNEP Agency Response to GEF Sec comment from 4-20-21:

Thank you for the comment. In this context it is important to note that 1)substantive co-financing is provided as indicated in the co-financing budget in Appendix 2 for staff costs and 2)that the Project Manager, NPA Manager Officer, and Sustainable Livelihood Officer will implement some project management functions while also providing direct technical support to delivery of the project Outputs under respective Outcomes. In accordance to Table B - *Execution Functions eligible for funding by the GEF portion of PMC* of the GEF-7 Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy, direct technical support to deliver the project Outputs is not an eligible function for the PMC funding. That has served as the basis for budgeting relevant functions of the mentioned staff to relevant project Components. We had included that information in Appendix 9 that provides details per project staff. Furthermore, the M&E, KM and Communication Officer is fully budgeted under Component 4 as he/she will deliver the *Monitoring of project indicators and periodic monitoring report?* and provide direct technical support to delivery of the Output 4. We understand that this should be budgeted under the M&E

Budget as these functions cannot be budgeted under PMC in accordance to Tables B and C of the mentioned GEF-7 Guidelines.

We take good note of the GEF Guidelines indicating that the use of GEF funds to purchase vehicles is strongly discouraged from PMC budget only (footnote 104, page 53). The project does not suggest purchasing any vehicles from PMC budget or for use by the PMU. Vehicles proposed for purchase from the GEF budget under Components 1 and 2 are essential for effective law enforcement at the national level and in the project area. As noted by the technical review of 4-1-21, *acquisition of pick up trucks and motorcycles for patrolling and wildlife crime investigation are justified and pertinent for the proposed project activities?*. Furthermore, it should be mentioned that one of the most serious gaps for wildlife crime law enforcement in Madagascar is almost full lack of vehicles and other equipment for raids and law enforcement operations. Our developing country governmental counterparts (Madagascar ranks amongst the poorest countries in the world) regularly highlight the need to provide adequate means for wildlife crime enforcement. Unfortunately, vehicles for law enforcement and other equipment cannot be funded by co-financing for the project (that all is in-kind) and cannot be provided by the MEDD.

Please note that this is not UNDP project anymore as it was very recently transferred to UNEP (February 2021).

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4-1-21 AM: Project results framework is technically sound.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4-1-21 AM: Project is technically sound and recommended for CEO endorsement.

4-8-21 AM: Please, address comments above and re-submit with the amended LoE. Thanks.

4-20-21: Please address the comments above and re-submit. Thanks

Agency Response

UNEP Agency Response to GEF Sec comment from 4-20-21

Please refer to responses above.

Agency Response: 4-8-21

LoE amended as requested.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4-1-21 AM: Status of PPG utilization is reported in Annex C.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4-1-21 AM: Project Map and Coordinates are adequate.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations