

Biodiversity Conservation, Restoration and Integrated Sustainable Development of Mangoky sub-watersheds

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10371

Countries

Madagascar

Project Name

Biodiversity Conservation, Restoration and Integrated Sustainable
Development of Mangoky sub-watersheds

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

11/30/2021

Review completed by PM

3/17/2022

Program Manager

Adriana Moreira

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

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

12-21-21: Project is satisfactorily aligned with BD and LD focal area elements.

Please revise project dates, since the proposed expected implementation start date is not feasible within the current review period.

Submission Date	Expected Implementation Start	Expected Completion Date
10/10/2019	2/1/2022	2/1/2027

Agency Response

Project dates revised in Prodoc and Portal.

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

12-21-21: The proposed project design has improved meaningfully from PIF stage and the proposal has addressed the comments received satisfactorily in relation to better elaboration of expected outcomes and outputs.

Guidance is provided on the Council decision GEF/C.39.9, including that there should be proportionality between the PMC covered by co-financed amounts and the PMC covered by the GEF funding. Please explain the proposed co-financing figures.

02-15-22: On the PMC: there is no proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$48,474,968 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$2,423,784 instead of \$1,445,119 (which represents 3%). 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 (\$)	6,984,996.0
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ		
	GET	349,250.0
	Sub Total(\$)	349,250.0
	Total Project Cost(\$)	7,334,246.0

Agency Response

Cofinancing figures are described in the annexes of each cofinancing letter. In MEDD's and MINAE's cofinancing letter, PMC related costs are listed in respective annexes item b) this includes: (i) MEDD's/MINAE's administrative staff time supporting project operationalization as well as additional drivers that PMU staff may require to undertake consultations and project activities; (ii) MEDD's/MINAE's management staff time participating to consultation meetings, PSC's, other management related meetings; (iii) other expenses such as: office expenses, provision of meeting facilities and office space and utilities (water, internet, electricity) for PMU staff as well as vehicle maintenance costs.

02-22-22: The cofinancing portion was increased, as we spotted our own mistake in accounting PMC cofinancing from MICC concerning the PTASO project. MICC has indeed merged cofinancing towards project Component 4 with PMC related cofinancing. The PMC cofinancing portion was therefore adjusted accordingly. Although cofinancing sources will provide substantial PMC related support, additional

full time and dedicated staff covered by project PMC resources will be necessary to mitigate any risks and bottlenecks during the project's implementation.

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

12-21-21 The co-financing letter from Conservation International is missing, please attach for review.

The proposed co-financing from government sources classified as "grant" are substantial (US\$42.9 million) and probably represent a sizable share of the budget of these institutions. Please explain how these resources were identified and how they meet the definition of investment mobilized and are consistent with the GEF's co-financing policy and guidelines.

02-15-22: We were unable to locate English translated co-financing letters (except the FAO co-financing letter). Also when one reads "*how investment mobilized was identified*" it is understood that most of the Government related co-financing is coming from projects ? if that is the case, the "type" of these must be "Public Investment" instead of "Grant".

03-01-22: Thanks for providing the translation. Regarding the co-financing letters we have the following comments:

In case our understanding is correct, the Ministries are not promising co-financing from the funds provided by external entities but the letters stipulate in-kind co-finance/ Investment mobilized (not grant) from other parallel project that are taking place. While reviewing the co-financing guidelines, in this case, the following applies:

9. Agencies may report Co-Financing that is expected to be mobilized during project implementation from entities that are not known at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval, particularly in the case of Co-Financing from the private sector or beneficiaries. In such cases, Agencies may provide supporting evidence in the form of official project documents that demonstrate requirements that such Co-Financing be mobilized at a clearly expressed minimum amount and a pre-defined time frame.

6. Supporting evidence may include:

- (a) an official project document for an approved project financed fully or in part by the entity that provides the Co-Financing;
- (b) a legal agreement or memorandum of understanding between the entity that provides the Co-Financing and the Agency, the recipient country government, or an executing partner;
- (c) agreed minutes of negotiations (such as between a multi-lateral development bank [MDB] and a government);
- (d) signed and dated letter from the entity that provides the Co-Financing; or
- (e) other written documentation, provided that it meets the criteria set out in Paragraph 7 below.

7. Supporting evidence should:

- (a) confirm the information provided by the Agency, including the name of the entity that provides the Co-Financing, the type of Co-Financing provided, the amount of Co-Financing, and the time frame over which the Co-Financing will be provided;
- (b) confirm that the Co-Financing identified supports the implementation of the GEF-financed project or program for which GEF financing is sought, and the achievement of its objective(s); and
- (c) be presented in English, where feasible, or be accompanied by an English

On the co-financing from the Ministry of Agriculture: it's clear that \$283,753 will be provided in-kind, but please provide clarification on what "other elements" for \$230,479 mean.

TEFIALACofinancementMINAEsign.pdf 2 / 2 100%

RUBRIQUES	Montant 2022 –	
	Matsiatra Ambony	Atsi Andre
(a) COÛTS DES INVESTISSEMENTS MOBILISES PAR COMPOSANTE DU PROJET		
Composante 1: Amélioration d'un environnement favorable à l'intégration de la RPF et de la conservation de la biodiversité		
Composante 2: Mise en œuvre à grande échelle des options locales de RPF identifiés dans les SAIP dans les paysages ciblés qui répondent de manière intégrée aux besoins en matière de conservation de la biodiversité, d'intensification durable et de moyens de subsistance durables		
Composante 3: Investissement accru pour améliorer la RPF, la conservation de la biodiversité et la diversification des moyens de subsistance		
Composante 4: Suivi et évaluation du projet et gestion des connaissances		
Sous-total (a)		
(b) COÛTS DE GESTION DU PROJET (PMC): En nature		
Personnel	158 688	12
Autres éléments	109 755	12
Sous-total (b)	268 443	24
TOTAL (a) + (b)	268 443	24

On the co-financing from **MICC**: It looks like resources from MICC will be provided in-kind and resources from BAD are Investment mobilized. This needs to be adequately reflected in Table C of the portal since at the moment we have \$34,161,724 in Grant.

Bailleur du projet (BAD) (comme détaillé en annexe) / Investissement mobilisé Ressources directes du MICC (comme détaillé en annexe) / En nature	Composante 1: Amélioration d'un environnement favorable à l'intégration de la RPF et de la conservation de la biodiversité	703 785,00
	Composante 2: Mise en œuvre à grande échelle des options locales de RPF identifiés dans les SAIP dans les paysages ciblés qui répondent de manière intégrée aux besoins en matière de conservation de la biodiversité, d'intensification durable et de moyens de subsistance durables	
	Composante 3: Investissement accru pour améliorer la RPF, la conservation de la biodiversité et la diversification des moyens de subsistance	23 816 084,40
	Composante 4: Suivi et évaluation du projet et gestion des connaissances et DIVERS	9 641 854,50
	Montant total du cofinancement	34 161 723,90

Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Industry, Commerce and Consumption (MICC)	Grant	Investment mobilized	34,161,724.00
Total Co-Financing(\$)				49,920,087.00

On the co-financing from **MEDD**: the number associated to the investment mobilized also does not match what is stipulated in the portal. Please review and also confirm what ?Other Elements? mean and how they can be identified as in-kind co-financing. Thanks!

03-21-22: While FAO's type of co-financing is now corrected as 'in-kind', still it is classified as 'Investment Mobilized'. Please amend.

Agency Response

CI's letter is now uploaded. Each cofinancing letter includes a table identifying the source of cofinancing (table 1) as well as an annexed itemized budget. Resources classified as grants and investment mobilized are those coming from investment projects outside of recurrent expenditures, these include: (i) MEDD's investment projects in Matsiatra Ambony and Atsimo Andrefana regions (total: \$8,961,914); (ii) MNP's programme Sustainable Coastal Fisheries II (total: \$290,030); (iii) MICC's PTASO project (total: \$34,161,724). These investment projects are all mentioned in Prodoc section 2) pg. 90-95 under the baseline projects providing cofinancing sub section.

2/22/22: English translated cofinancing letters uploaded in RoadMap/Documents section of the Portal. For MEDD's investment projects the type of cofinancing was changed from Grant to Public Investment. The other Government projects are not covered by Public Investment but rather Grants.

07/03/2022: Sorry for the misunderstanding. The investment mobilized from the Ministries (MEDD, MINAE, MICC) and other partners is actually either in kind or from Public Investment. Table C was revised accordingly. A revised letter from MEDD was uploaded with correct totals specifying what other elements stands for. For MINAE other elements represent: office supplies, use of vehicles, vehicles maintenance costs, utilities for project staff (electricity, internet provision, water).

03/22/22: Amended.

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

12-21-21: The proposed financing presented in Table D 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

12-21-21: The status and utilization of the PPG resources is reported in Annex C.

02-15-22: The Status of Utilization of PPG misses the detailed information of which budget lines (activities) have committed amounts as well as the value of these committed amounts ? please amend.

ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG). (Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

Annex C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

(Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG GRANT APPROVED AT PIF: USD 200,000 PROJECT SYMBOL: GCP/MAG/091/GFF ENTITY: 667165			
PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES IMPLEMENTED	GETF/LDCF/SCCF AMOUNT (\$)		
	BUDGETED AMOUNT	AMOUNT SPENT TO DATE	AMOUNT COMMITTED
(5011) SALARIES PROFESSIONAL			
(5013) CONSULTANTS	123,000	126,164	
(5014) CONTRACTS	22,000	13,643	
(5020) LOCALLY CONTRACTED LABOR		244	
(5021) TRAVEL	30,600	19,504	
(5023) TRAINING	20,000	4,001	
(5054) EXPENDABLE PROCUREMENT		1,763	
(5028) GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES	4,400	3,679	
TOTAL	200,000	168,998	31,002

Agency Response 2/22/22: Committed amount now inserted, sorry for oversight.

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

12-21-21: All core indicators targets expected at CEO Endorsement stage are not reported in the Portal. Please revise and provide the confirmed values. The proposed areas of land restored (1,500 ha) in CI 3 and under improved practices (6,000 ha) in CI 4 remains quite low in comparison to the project's investment (GEF + co-financing). Please explain and include the values for CEO Endorsement stage and correct the

discrepancies in the numbers presented in the CEO Endorsement document uploaded in the Portal and the ProDoc.

02-15-22: Core Indicators:

- Table ?Core Indicators? ? please include CEO-indorsement-level targets for Indicator 6 GHG emissions mitigated
- Annex A ?Project Results Framework? ? please include targets for GEF Core indicators 6 (GHG emissions mitigated) and 11 (beneficiaries disaggregated by gender)

Agency Response

Addressed. Please consider corrected figures.

2/22/22:

- Core Indicator 6 included in the Core Indicator table and in Annex F.
- Annex A now includes Core Indicators 6 and 11 (disaggregated by gender).

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

12-21-21: The proposal presents satisfactory elaboration on threats, root causes and impacts of environmental degradation to be addressed by the project.

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

12-21-21: Baseline scenario and associated projects are well described.

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

12-21-21: Components and expected outcomes are well described.

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

12-21-21: The alignment with the strategies of the BD and LD focal areas is satisfactory.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12-21-21: Incremental reasoning is well articulated.

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

12-21-21: Project's expected contributions to Global Environment Benefits has improved since PIF stage. However, there are many discrepancies in the values provided for the GEF Core Indicators in the CEO Endorsement document uploaded in the Portal and the ProDoc (see table below). Please revise and adjust accordingly for further review.

▪ F.→PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GEF 7 CORE INDICATORS

Project Core Indicators		Expected at CEO Endorsement
1	Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (Hectares)	
2	Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (Hectares)	
3	Area of land restored (Hectares)	2,700
4	Area of landscapes under improved practices (excluding protected areas) (Hectares)	58,740
5	Area of marine habitat under improved practices (excluding protected areas) (Hectares)	
	Total area under improved management (Hectares)	
6	Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated (metric tons of CO ₂ e)	
7	Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management	
8	Globally over-exploited marine fisheries moved to more sustainable levels (metric tons)	
9	Reduction, disposal/destruction, phase-out, elimination and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials and products (metric tons of toxic chemicals reduced)	
10	Reduction, avoidance of emissions of POPs to air from point and non-point sources (grams of toxic equivalent gTEQ)	
11	Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment	31,200 (50 % women)

Agency Response

Addressed ? targets were adjusted in both Portal and Prodoc. Core Indicator 6 was purposely not reported as the project is not targeting the CCM FA window.

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

12-21-21: Description of innovation, sustainability and scaling up aspects is adequate.

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
10-21-19

None of the maps or figures are visible on this side of the portal. Please upload them differently.

11-20-19

Cleared

12-21-21: Please attach the project area map provided in the description of the project landscapes in the ProDoc to Annex 1b in CEO Endorsement document in the Portal. Please also note the coordinates are missing in part 1.b of the ProDoc.

Agency Response
Comment addressed. Maps and figures are now uploaded correctly.

Addressed.

2/22/22: Project area map now provided in Portal. Coordinates added in part 1.b of Prodoc.

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
N/A

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

12-21-21: Project includes adequate stakeholders engagement plan.

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

12-21-21: The project conducted gender analysis and includes gender-sensitive activities and indicators linked with project objectives.

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

12-21-21: Engagement with private sector is adequately described.

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

12-21-21: Risk analysis and proposed mitigation measures are adequate.

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

12-21-21: Institutional arrangements are adequate with clear indication of roles and responsibilities. Coordination with other relevant projects/initiatives is also described.

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

12-21-21: The alignment with the national strategies and plans is satisfactory.

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

12-21-21: Proposed knowledge management approach is adequate.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

12-21-21: Environmental and social risks are well described and are consistent with the GEF guidelines requirements.

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

12-21-21: Project includes adequate M&E plan with specific budget. Please take the yellow highlights out of the CEO Endorsement document.

Agency Response Addressed.
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

12-21-21: Socioeconomic benefits are adequately described.

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12-21-21: Budget: Please provide justification for the proposed purchase of motorized vehicles with GEF resources. An assessment of the existing vehicle fleet would be needed, as well as the number and status of vehicles used/bought up by co-financing partners. Preference would be given to the purchase and management of vehicle by co-financing. Please, specifically address the use of GEF resources for motorbikes (22 for 11 municipalities) and 4x4 vehicle (2 units).

02-15-22: 1. Budget table:

- a. There are some budget items (Window 2 ? Procurement and subtotal expandable procurement) whose costs are not numbers but ##### - please amend.

and out of \$39.8 million of co-financing, \$48.2 million (80%) are represented in grants ? there is enough room for these costs to be covered by the co-financing resources. Please amend.

Agency Response

Government lacks appropriate vehicles (basic motorcycles and pickups) required to support project implementation and monitoring. Lack of mobility will hinder project delivery and compromise the quality of delivery. Ensuring farmers' adoption of innovative systems and technologies and the transition towards sustainable intensification in agriculture and forest production in remote areas with limited/poor communication infrastructures is only possible if project facilitators and extensionists have the means to visit all target areas with high frequency. This implies having transport autonomy that the project would be ensuring in a basic way through the procurement of simple motorbikes and pickups. Otherwise, the possibility to visit target areas will be extremely reduced or simply not possible.

MEDD's and MINAE's existing vehicle fleet is not sufficient to support project implementation, considering also the extent of the project intervention area (11,243 ha covering 3 landscapes in 10 municipalities, 3 districts and 2 regions) and poor road conditions.

Based on a vehicles fleet assessment (table 1), the following adjustments were made to the project budget, reducing the overall cost for vehicles: the project intends to procure 16 motorbikes instead of 22 and 3 basic pickups, that will be based in Vohibato, Morombe and Lalangina Districts (table 2)? these will be at disposal of implementing partners to deliver restoration and agricultural services in the target landscapes. Drivers will be provided as cofinancing. In addition to these vehicles MEDD and MINAE committed to make available additional vehicles in support to the daily coordination transportation of the PMU members, as well maintenance costs for the vehicles.

Table 1 ? Vehicles fleet assessment at MEDD's and MINAE's regional headquarters.

Type of Vehicle	R?gion Atsimo andrefana	R?gion Matsiatra Ambony	
	Bas Mangoky Landscape Morombe district)	Volanony - Matsiatra Landscape (Vohibato district)	Ranomainty Landscape (Vohibato et Lalangina districts)
Pickup 4*4			

MEDD	No 4*4 pickup is available in Morombe. The regional office has 4 pickups in decent conditions from the PAGE/GIZ project active in the region from 2011-2020 (the cars were then transferred to MEDD once the project ended in 2020). The 4 vehicles are based in the regional capital in Toliara, very far from the GEF project intervention district in Morombe (distance 280 km or 11 hours away with road in poor condition): 1 vehicle is intended specifically for missions in the Sakaraha district (management and monitoring of the largest nursery and reforestation activity in the region) + the 3 other vehicles are used for missions in the 8 remaining districts which extend over 57,971 km² and are very distant from each other. 1 of the vehicles is also used by the regional coordinator day to day field work.	The regional team is based in Fianarantsoa where there is 1 pickup available in decent conditions, used both by the regional director for day to day transportation as well as for field missions in the 7 districts which cover 23,035 km² in total. There are also 2 additional pickups in very poor conditions (hazards).	
MINAE	No pickup is available in Morombe The regional management avails of 2 pickups from previous projects. For missions to Morombe (very rare), MEDD staff is obliged to align travels with the PEPBM / BAD project team (if space is available), this is negatively impacting on results on the ground.	The regional team is based in Fianarantsoa, and avails of 1 pickup from the CASEF project (in good condition) which is also used for field missions + 1 pickup (in poor condition) from the BVPI PURSAPS project used for missions in the Ambohimahasoia district (outside of the GEF the project target area).	
Motorcycles			
MEDD	No motorcycles available	No motorcycle available	
MINAE	No motorcycles available	No motorcycle available	1 motorcycle available from the COKETES/GEF project (2021) used for travel in the vast Lalangina district (1,450 km²)

Table 2- Proposed vehicle purchase.

Vehicle	No. of units	Unit cost	TOTAL	REMARQUES
---------	--------------	-----------	-------	-----------

Type	Atsimo Andrefana Region (1 landscape, 4 municipalities in 1 district)	Matsiatra Ambony Region (2 landscapes, 6 municipalities in 2 districts)	TOTAL (3 landscapes, 10 municipalities in 3 districts)	(USD)	(USD)	
4x4 pickup	1	1	3	30 000	90 000	2 based in Fianarantsoa covering Volanony - Matsiatra et Ranomainty landscapes 1 based in Morombe for th Bas Mangoky landscape
motorbikes	8	8	16	4 300	68 800	1 motorcycle per municipality if target area is ? 7 500 ha (Vohitrafeno, Ihazoara, Alatsinainy Ialamarina, Ampatsy Ampangabe) 2 motorbikes per municipali if the target area is > 7 500 ha (Vinanitelo, Andranomiditra / AVAL: toutes les 4 communes)
TOTAL					158 800	

2/22/22:

a) Addressed, the budget has been replaced in the Portal so that all numbers are now visible.

b) The Project Coordinator and the CTA will be tasked with technical deliverables beyond PMC related tasks, this is why associated costs are also spread over technical outcomes. Please see PMU staff TORs on Prodoc Annex L. TORs have also been uploaded as a separate document in the RoadMap/Document section of the Portal.

3/7/22: As clarified by the cofinancing partners, the Type of cofinancing was amended for the Investment mobilized under MEDD, MNP, MICC & BAD - grants now represent only 1.6% of the overall cofinancing. Complex institutional arrangements (2 main executing entities and several sub partners) require a high level of coordination. Cofinancing alone is not expected to be sufficient to ensure the desired level of coordination and operational support required to deliver the project. To ensure that support functions essential to the smooth and consistent delivery of the project are carried out a small team of full time dedicated project staff including the project coordinator are necessary. As for the technical outputs linked to the respective components, to be delivered by the project coordinator and the Chief Technical Advisor these are clearly mentioned in the TORs in Annex L.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12-21-21: Project results framework is satisfactory. However, there are many discrepancies in the values provided for targets of the GEF Core Indicators in the CEO Endorsement document uploaded in the Portal and the ProDoc. Please revise and adjust accordingly for further review.

Agency Response Addressed.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12-21-21: Please respond to the comments above, revise and resubmit the CEO Endorsement package for further review. Thanks!

02-15-22: Please address the additional comments and resubmit. Thanks!

03-01-22: Please respond to the comments on co-financing and budget above and resubmit. Thanks!

03-21-22: Please address the minor comment related to the co-financing table and resubmit. Thanks!

Agency Response

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

12-21-21: The status and utilization of the PPG resources is reported in Annex C.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12-21-21: Please attach the project area map provided in the description of the project landscapes in the ProDoc to Annex 1b in CEO Endorsement document in the Portal. Please also note the coordinates are missing in part 1.b of the ProDoc.

Agency Response Addressed.

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

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

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

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)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations