



Strengthening Biodiversity in Agriculture, Restoring Ecosystem Resilience, and Empowering IPLCs in Lao PDR

Review PPG Request and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11793

Countries

Lao PDR

Project Name

Strengthening Biodiversity in Agriculture, Restoring Ecosystem Resilience, and Empowering IPLCs in Lao PDR

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

10/31/2024

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Hannah Fairbank

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

GBFF

GEF-8 Project Preparation Grant request Review Sheet

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GBFF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

II. Indicative Project Overview

a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

c) Are the components adequately funded?

d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional (only for Multi-trust Funds PPGs with BD from the GEF Trust Fund)?

e) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for projects of more than \$2 million or 10% for projects of less than \$2 million? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

III. Project Rationale

a. Does the project adequately describe the: (i) current situation/baseline conditions within the project geographic area or project thematic area; (ii) problem(s) that the project will address; (iii) goal and objectives of the project; and (iv) justification for the project intervention; and (v) expected results including the Global Environmental Benefits and an estimate of the project's contributions to the relevant biodiversity core indicators.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

IV. Project Description

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the project components and activities identified in the theory of change adequately described.

c) Is a list of stakeholders that will be involved in the project and their roles in the design and implementation of the project provided?

d) Are the Specific Action Area(s) that the project is aligned with identified and an explanation provided on and how the project will support the achievement of the specific Action Area objective(s).

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

V. Does the proposal adequately describe how the project meets the following criteria:

a) Potential to generate global environmental benefits (GEBs) (include a description of the GEBs the project will generate per the GEF-8 Core Indicators for biodiversity);

b) Alignment with the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and/or National Biodiversity Finance Plans or similar instruments to identify national and/or regional priorities;

c) The level of policy coherence and coordination across multiple ministries, agencies, the private sector, and civil society that the project aims to support;

d) Whether the project will mobilize the resources of the private sector and philanthropies'; and

e) Whether and how the project will engage with and provide support to IPLCs.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

VI. Project results indicators

Is the table correctly populated and consistent with the Project Description?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

VII. Project Financing Tables

a) Are all the tables correctly populated?

b) Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines (only for projects with GEF TF components)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

VIII. Project Endorsement

a) Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) OFP and has the OFP at the time of PPG request submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

8 December, 2024:

Cleared

December 2, 2024:

1.) The Executing Partner in Portal doesn't match that in LoE ? please amend the information in Portal to match that in LoE (executing partner can be modified during project preparation); and

2.) The last paragraph of the LOE makes reference to the GEF TF instead of GBFF. Please submit to the GEF Portal documents tab an email from the OFP clarifying that the project only requires resources from the GBFF.

Agency's Comments

Dec 4, 2024

Thanks for the two comments. Action has been taken as below:

- 1) The executing partner in the portal (and prodoc) and the LoE are now similar.
- 2) The mail from the GEF OFP clarifying that resources required will be accessed from GBFF funds is now annexed in the roadmap.

IX. GEFSEC Decision

a. Is the PPG recommended for technical clearance?

b. Additional comments to be considered by the Agency during project preparation

Secretariat's Comments

December 8, 2024:

- a.) Yes, recommended for clearance.
- b.) **GEBS:** During PPG and CER development please clearly explain and articulate biodiversity GEBS, outcomes and outputs expected, as well as the global biodiversity values of the project sites. Project focus is biodiversity friendly and one health practices in agriculture landscapes (9,000 hectares) and restoring degraded land (3,000 hectares) without a clear picture of the expected biodiversity outcomes, results or impacts. In addition the impact and results in the theory of change graphic are food security, nutrition and agriculture-focused, rather than indicative of biodiversity outcomes. Biodiversity values of the target provinces are unclear.
- c.) **Design and scope:** In PPG ensure that there is clarity regarding the actions/activities would be undertaken through this project, the TOC that underpins the design and that the scope of the project is commensurate and realistic given the level of resources available.
- d.) **IPLCs:** Please ensure that the entire amount reported as ?amount to support action by IPLCs [for] biodiversity? in the CEO endorsement requests corresponds to project activities supporting action by IPLCs, and that the project documentation describes the IPLCs who will benefit from the project and details their role in the project. Activities where IPLCs are mere beneficiaries

should not be counted in this amount. Support to stakeholders that are not IPLCs (i.e. indigenous peoples or local communities that embody traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity) should not be counted either. Whether the project as a whole or certain project activities support action by IPLCs could entail a number of circumstances including but not limited to: IPLCs directly receive resources through the GEF agency for execution of project components/activities; IPLCs lead the design and management of some project activities but do not manage financial resources; the project provides in-kind support to actions led by IPLCs for biodiversity, etc.

December 2, 2024:

No. Please make two corrections to the LOE and resubmit to the GEF Portal as soon as possible for further consideration.

Agency's Comments Duly noted. Corrections have been made, as advised.

Review Dates

	PPG Request Review	Agency Response
First Review	12/2/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/8/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		