

Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Belize's Maya Golden Landscape

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10815

Countries

Belize

Project Name

Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Belize's Maya Golden Landscape

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

4/28/2021

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

PIF

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/14/2021

Yes. We welcome the approach of working with indigenous peoples to promote sustainable livelihoods.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/12/2021

Yes, thank you for the edits.

6/14/2021

No, please address the following:

- 1.1.2 - Please clarify in the output that these will be sustainable or biodiversity friendly NTFPs.

- While the intention of the project seems good, the wording of some of the outputs gives the impression that the activities are being formulated outside (ex. 2.2.1). With 3.3.1, the wording is confusing to people who do not work on indigenous issues. It might be good to describe it more as recovering and sharing traditional knowledge for ecoagriculture approaches or something along those lines.
- It appears that the project largely focuses on training. How will the project ensure sustainability? How much support will be given for the implementation of these environmentally friendly practices.
- 2.2.3 - The justification for this activity is not focused on biodiversity impacts. Please revise.

Agency Response

September 9, 2021

1. Point taken. Please see revised version of Output 1.1.2 in the PIF Document and GEF Portal (*Section B. Indicative Project Description* and section *1.3 alternative scenario*).
2. Thank you for the comment. Please see revised version of Output 3.3.1 in the PIF Document and GEF Portal (*Section B. Indicative Project Description* and section *1.3 alternative scenario*). With regards to Output 2.2.1 we now note that it is not an output of the project itself, but rather a requisite for the project. We are now suggesting to delete the output, but still, an FPIC process will be done before project implementation in accordance with FAO's rules and procedures.
3. Please see revised version of Outputs 2.1.2 and 2.2.2 in the PIF Document and GEF Portal (*Section B. Indicative Project Description* and section *1.3 alternative scenario*). We have rephrased these outputs to explain how the project will implement activities beyond training.
4. Point taken, while conserving all other outputs aligned to BD, we have now removed output 2.2.3 (see *Section B. Indicative Project Description* and section *1.3 alternative scenario* in the PIF Document and GEF Portal).

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
6/14/2021

Yes. Please continue to seek out and document additional co-financing as the project progresses.

Agency Response
September 9, 2021

Thank you for this comment, we will continue to look for additional co-financing during project preparation
GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
1/25/2022

Yes, thank you for the additions.

12/9/2021

Yes, however after conversations with the Belize OFP and GEF Secretariat, they have now decided to use the balance of their STAR funds for this project. We will return this project to add these resources.

6/14/2021

Yes. However, there appears to be another \$342,180.08 remaining in Belize's STAR allocation and ideally we would make sure that they use all of it.

Agency Response
September 9, 2021

Thank you for this comment. After consultation, the OFP has indicated that the additional funds are not available for this project. Please consider this new submission with the same budget addressing the other comments.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
6/14/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
6/14/2021

Yes. Belize is fully flexible.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/14/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/14/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/12/2021

Yes.

6/14/2021

No, it does not appear that productive seascapes should be included.

Agency Response

September 9, 2021

Point taken, we have revised the taxonomy table in the PIF Document and GEF portal to include "Productive Landscapes" instead of "Productive Seascapes".

Part II "Project Justification"

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
1/25/2022

Yes, thank you for the changes.

11/12/2021

No, the text is still confusing.

6/14/2021

No, while generally good, the description of existing government support on 566 hectares is confusing. On first reading, it seemed as though the government only provided support to farmers with at least 566 hectares of land rather than the fact that the government only has resources to support a very small percentage of the farmers in the area. Please revise.

Agency Response

September 9, 2021

Point taken. We have rephrased to explain better: "Currently, within the MGL, extension services (from the Ministry of Agriculture) to farmers cover as much as 566 hectares of land"

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
6/14/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/15/2021

Yes.

6/14/2021

No, please address the following:

1.2 - Please explain the term "de-reserved".

2.2.1 - It's unclear whether this is the FPIC process as a whole or ensuring that it is gender sensitive and includes youth.

3.1.1 - It would be good to clarify the name and description of the output. The text talks about working with the private sector, but the output does not. It sounds like there is an aspect of recovering traditional practices that are more sustainable through knowledge sharing that isn't well-explained.

Agency Response

September 9, 2021

Thank you for the comment. Please see revised version of Output 3.3.1 in the PIF Document and GEF Portal (*Section B. Indicative Project Description* and *section 1.3 alternative scenario*). With regards to Output 2.2.1 we now note that it is not an output of the project itself, but rather a requisite for the project. We are now suggesting to delete the output, but still, an FPIC process will be done before project implementation. The Term "de-reserved" is now explained on paragraph 8 of the PIF in the portal and attached word document.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/12/2021

Yes.

6/14/2021

No, while generally aligned, the fire management work is not.

Agency Response

September 9, 2021

Point taken, while conserving all the other outputs aligned to BD, we have now removed output 2.2.3 (see *Section B. Indicative Project Description* and section *1.3 alternative scenario* in the PIF Document and GEF Portal).

5. Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/14/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/14/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/14/2021

Yes. This project appears to really focus on empowering indigenous peoples in conservation and increased incomes through sustainable use.

Agency Response
Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
6/14/2021

Yes.

Agency Response
Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
6/14/2021

Yes.

Agency Response
Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
6/14/2021

Yes. This is well-done and recognizes the challenges of respecting traditional systems.

Agency Response
Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/14/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/14/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/14/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
6/14/2021

Yes.

Agency Response
Knowledge Management

Is the proposed knowledge management (KM) approach in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
6/14/2021

Yes.

Agency Response
Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
6/14/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Part III ? Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/14/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1/25/2022

Yes, thank you for the patience as we worked to ensure Belize could use its full STAR allocation.

12/9/2021

No. Please make the one small text revision as well as adding the additional resources made available for the project from the Belize STAR from the government. Thank you

for your patience while this issue was discussed with the Belize government to ensure the full spending of their STAR.

6/14/2021

Not at this time, please revise and resubmit. While we will reach out to the OFP, please also inquire about the remaining amount of STAR.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	6/14/2021	9/9/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/9/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/25/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval