

Generating opportunities for livelihoods and biodiversity through participatory governance of natural resources and the economic diversification of the communities of the central forest corridor of Honduras

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11213

Countries

Honduras

Project Name

Generating opportunities for livelihoods and biodiversity through participatory governance of natural resources and the economic diversification of the communities of the central forest corridor of Honduras

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

4/12/2023

Review completed by PM

5/1/2023

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

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

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

a) Yes, cleared.

b)

b.1. Please complete the GEF Agency ID.

b.2. The taxonomy is very limited and should include much more relevant information. Please complete.

May 16, 2023:

b) Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

b.1 Comment Address. GEF ID: 11213/ FAO ID: 745092

b.2 Comment Address. Information included

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

1. No, the "summary" exceeds by far the limit of 250 words (it currently includes 746 words). Please provide a shorter summary with a number of words up to 250 including all the following elements: (i) the problem and issues to be addressed and indication of the targeted landscape(ii) the project objectives, and if the project is intended to be transformative, how will this be achieved? iii), the approach to deliver on objectives, and (iv) the GEBs and other key expected results.

2. Please check the experssion "broadleaf or broadleaf forests" (is it a typo?).

May 16, 2023:

1 and 2. Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

1&2. Comment address. Summary has been reduced and the expression *broadleaf* eliminated.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 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 and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

a) Yes, cleared.

b)

b.1. For component 2, the "Component Type" is missing. Please complete.

2 Support for implementation of nature-based solutions (NBS) for improved management of agroecosystems and landscapes.		2.1 Increased adoption of NBS linked to sustainable and climate smart production practices for sustainable forest management in target landscapes	2.1.1 NBS linked with Climate-smart and bd friendly production practices implemented.	GET	3,038,453.00	22,011,857.00
			2.1.2. Capacity building activities developed to			

b.2. Considering the co-financing as investments mobilized and concrete results are expected on the ground in terms of sustainable practices, NBS and restoration, there should be at least one "Component Type" referred as "Investment" (as opposed to "Technical assistance"). Please amend accordingly.

b.3. In the project overview table, the core indicator 4 (number of hectares of landscapes under Improved practices) is split in component 1 and component 2. Please make clear in the table the reason why the 2 targets are reported in 2 different components.

b.4. Is there a target for the indicator "Number of OECMs with bd criteria established"? If yes, please complete with a number; if no, please indicate the target is to be determined during PPG).

b.5. In component 1, there isn't any outputs explicitly mentioning the establishment of OECMs while this is an expected outcome. Please clarify the outputs to enable the realization of the expected outcome.

b.6 In component 3, the identified indicator corresponds only to the output 3.1.1. Please identify indicators allowing the monitoring of all the outputs.

May 16, 2023:

Thank you for the clarification and additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

B1: Comment address. added

B2: Address. Component 2 is *Investment* now

B3: Component 1 include 40,000 has supposed to be linked with potential OECM figure (watershed declaration for example) into the landscape with the objective of promote conservation outside protected areas. Component 2, 122,000 has are linked with Nature Based Solutions linked to best productive practices linked to sustainable and climate smart production practices for sustainable forest management

B4: Comment address. Target to be determined during PPG

B5: Comment address. Please see new output 1.1.7 OECM standards/guidelines included in national or regional policy framework.

B6: Indicators added:

At least one (1) productive practice documented, including a description of how they are culturally appropriate and gender-responsive.

At least one (1) guideline developed on the application of gender mainstreaming strategy to sustainable value chains implementing CSA-BD enhanced practices.
At least ten (10) products developed and disseminated through the communication channels.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

May 5, 2023:

Regarding the gender consideration, in outcome 1, please ensure that development of plans, tools, criteria, are gender-responsive (i.e., goes beyond just consulting women, but the plans themselves are gender-responsive?); Same with Component 3 on Knowledge Management - publications, guidelines, documentation should include gender perspectives, best practices on gender mainstreaming, women's voices, etc..

May 16, 2023:

Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

Comment address. We have modified the description of component 1 to include that the project will ensure that women are actively engaged in the entire process to develop OECMs. New indicators of component 3 mention gender responsive documents to be develop during project implementation.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

a) Yes, the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC are proportional both with 5%. Cleared.

b) Yes, the PMC is equal to 5% of the total GEF grant. Cleared.

Agency's Comments 5/12/23

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

a)

a.1. In the description of the problems to be addressed, we learn that the project aims to implement a mosaic-based approach over 106,133 hectares under management. This number is not consistent with the project expected results as reported in the core indicator section. Please clarify.

a.2. The description indicates an average deforestation of 23,303 hectares per year. Is it at national level? if yes, what is the deforestation level in the targeted landscape. Please clarify how important is the deforestation in the area of intervention (at least at the department level) as it is an important element of the project rationale.

b) The barriers 2 and 3 seem to overlap: barrier 2 includes among others "Limitations in... financial incentives... hindering the adoption of sustainable agricultural and livestock" while barrier 3 includes "lack of incentives to promote sustainable value chains". Please formulate these barrier more clearly ensuring they are totally different.

May 16, 2023:

a) and b). Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

A1: Comment address. Project will work in landscapes to reduce pressure over Protected areas. It will promote OECM and implement NbS in order to reduce forest fragmentation.

In order to achieve that project will be working in 162,000 has. Under sustainable management, 40,000 has are associated with the OECMs and the remaining area with the Project activity on productive landscapes and NbS with sustainable practices. Please see the adjusted text into project summary (p. 2) and on problems to be addressed and justification section in p. 10 with the explanation.

A.2 Comment Address. It is estimated that there is an average deforestation of 23,303 hectares per year at national level (Honduras reference level, analysis 2000-2017) and 1,797.30 has per year in the project targeted area. Project aims to reduce deforestation in the targeted landscape through the implementation of sustainable land use practices, reforestation and forest restoration, include OECM at landscape level and strengthened natural resource management capacity. Please see the texts clarifying deforestation rate at landscape and national level in page 11.

b) Comment Address. Barriers have been modified to avoid overlapping. Please, see section of barriers.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

a) The project approach is the result of consultations with key stakeholders and as presented it looks relevant to address the identified problems and barriers. Cleared.

b) Yes, the proposed activities (in particular land use planning, restoration, improved governance capacity and development of incentives) should enhance resilience to future changes. Cleared.

c) No, there is no presentation of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region. Please elaborate on this important aspect, including among others the participation of the country in the GEF-8 Integrated Program on Critical Forest Biomes in Mesoamerica which targets landscapes which are very close to the targeted areas of this project and must share similar challenges and solutions.

d) Partially. In the project and components description there is a limited consideration of the relevant stakeholders. Please elaborate further on the stakeholders involved and their expected role in the project (particularly in the components description).

May 16, 2023:

c) and d) Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

C: Noted with thanks. Please, see new text in section: Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.

D: References to stakeholders involvement have been included in the 3 components of the project. Section B.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

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 key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

a)

a.1. In the TOC, the links between the barriers and the outputs/outcomes are not presented so that we don't see clearly which project activities are addressing which barriers. This is important to understand the logic of the project and the choice of the proposed activities. Please provide a TOC with links between the barriers and the outputs/outcomes.

a.2. The description of the TOC presents separately the problems, barriers and proposed solutions. We don't see clear causal pathways linking the problems and barriers with the solutions and taking into account the assumptions. Please add a brief description of the key causal pathways underlying the TOC (linking clearly problems, barriers, assumptions, outputs and outcomes).

b)

b.1. 83% of the GEF resources for this project come from the BD Focal Area. Conserving key biodiversity should be a major objective of the project. Nevertheless, as described the most important use of GEF resources seems to be focused on improving production practices (component 2). No consideration is made on the PAs included in the project

area. Please clarify the importance of the project investments to conserve forests and key biodiversity.

b.2. Lack of land tenure and property rights is identified as a cause of the environment degradation. Nevertheless the TOC doesn't show clearly how this problem will be tackled. Please clarify.

b.3. In the description of the barriers, we learn that "without policies that recognize and accommodate connections and dependencies between natural and productive systems, there is a fundamental lack of integrated planning efforts". Nevertheless, we don't see in the components description how this problem will be addressed by the project with specific work on policy issues. Please clarify.

b.4. Please correct the typo "biodiversity conversation".

May 16, 2023:

a) Thank you for improving the description of the TOC logic and pathways. Cleared.

b) Thank you for the clarification and additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

A1: Noted with thanks. Please see the new ToC.

A2: Comment address. New improved text included in section B.

B1: This proposal aims to address the challenges of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and deforestation in Sierra de Agalta (KBA), Boquerón, and La Muralla buffer zones and productive landscapes by implementing a mosaic-based approach for sustainable production and conservation (162,000 hectares under management). The project seeks to reduce the degradation and fragmentation of strategic ecosystems, while improving the livelihoods of local communities in the vicinity of the protected. The aim is to reduce pressures on protected areas and the degradation and fragmentation of forests and critical ecosystems in the area. To achieve this, the project will focus on implementing OECMs and NBS, with specific criteria to measure biodiversity within productive activities and conservation efforts. This will be achieved by working directly with organized smallholders present in and the wider target landscape of 3 protected areas.

B2: While we acknowledge the importance of land tenure and property rights in the broader context of environmental degradation, we have determined that the issue is beyond the scope of the project. Our focus is on promoting sustainable land-use practices and conserving natural resources through community-led interventions that are relevant and appropriate to the local context.

B3: Comment address. Please see new output 1.1.7 related to OEMC standards/guidelines included in national or regional policy framework. Also, please see information related to this issue, included in section C: To address the regulatory framework and coordination challenges described in Barrier 1, Component 1 will work closely with national and local

government institutions to develop and promote policy solutions that recognize the importance of connections between natural and productive systems, including the establishment of integrated territorial planning mechanisms and the alignment of economic activities with biodiversity conservation goals. Through targeted capacity building, policy dialogue, and knowledge exchange initiatives, we will support the development and adoption of policies that enable integrated planning efforts at the national and local levels. Specifically, we will work with government institutions to identify potential national policies that can incorporate the creation of OMECs, study the potential of incorporating the declaration of micro-watersheds as OMECs, and explore the possibility of incorporating OMECs into the national reforestation program.

Key elements for develop an OEMCs as indicated in component 1, will establish standards and guidelines that will be included into national or regional policy frameworks that allow for improved connectivity between natural and productive systems, which will be critical to achieving the project's conservation and sustainable development objectives. The project will work closely with government institutions to ensure that policies are developed and implemented in a manner that is context-specific and tailored to local needs and priorities.

B4: ok with thanks

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

n/a

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

May 5, 2023:

a) The institutional setting, including potential executing partners, and the rationale for it is not described. Please complete.

b) The proposal doesn't respond to the question "Does the GEF Agency expect to play an execution role on this project?". Please complete.

c) No, there isn't any description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area. Please complete.

Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.

Does the GEF Agency expect to play an execution role on this project?

If so, please describe that role here. Also, please add a short explanation to describe cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects, including potential for co-location and/or sharing of expertise/staffing

[Redacted text]

d) Partially. While knowledge management is included in component 3, the approach to knowledge management and learning is not fully described in the Project Description (beyond a so-called "systematization" of OECMs developing process, NBS practices and culturally appropriated productive practices). Please clarify the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and the overall communication strategy/plan of the project. In response, the agency may consider addressing the following key GEF KM&L expectations at PIF stage in a bit more detail:

- i. an overview of existing lessons and best practice that inform the project concept
- ii. plans to learn from relevant projects, programs, initiatives & evaluations
- iii. processes to capture, assess and document info, lessons, best practice & expertise generated during implementation
- iv. tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning & collaboration, including knowledge platforms and websites
- v. knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders (at community, national and international levels as appropriate)
- vi. a discussion on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project impact and sustainability
- vii. plans for strategic communications and outreach

May 16, 2023:

a) Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

b) The question is not responded but we understand from the project description that SERNA and ICF are expected to be the executing partners and it is clarified in the review sheet that the GEF Agency does not expect to play any execution role in this project. Cleared.

c) and d) Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

A: Thank you for the feedback. Comment address.

The potential executing partners for this project are SERNA (Secretaría de Recursos Naturales y Ambiente) and ICF (Instituto de Conservación Forestal). These institutions have been identified as key partners due to their roles in natural resource management and conservation in the project area, as well as their expertise in implementing projects funded by the GEF.

The endorsement letter has been adjusted accordingly to reflect the involvement of SERNA and ICF as potential executing partners for this project.

B: Comment address. The GEF Agency does not expect to play an execution role in this project. Our role will primarily be to provide funding and technical support to the executing partners, who will be responsible for implementing the project activities on the ground. We understand the importance of clearly defining roles and responsibilities in project implementation, and we have made sure to reflect this in the corrected endorsement letter.

C: N/A

D: Using the inputs provided, please find a new text for component 3: Component 3 is focused on knowledge management, monitoring, and evaluation (M&E). The primary outcome of this component is to ensure that project efforts are well-documented, sustainable, and effective in achieving the project's goals.

To meet this outcome, the component will include the following elements:

- i. An overview of existing lessons and best practices that will inform the project design and implementation.
- ii. Processes to capture, assess, and document information, lessons, best practices, and expertise generated during implementation will be established. This will include the development of an M&E plan spelling out the activities to track progress towards the project's outcomes and outputs, as well as documentation of project activities and results.
- iv. Tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning, and collaboration, including knowledge platforms and website, will be developed. These will allow stakeholders to access project information, exchange knowledge, and collaborate on project activities.
- v. Knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders at the community, national, and international levels, as appropriate, will be identified. This will include project reports, case studies, and other knowledge products.
- vi. A plan on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project impact and sustainability will be included in the project document. This will highlight the role of knowledge management and learning in achieving project outcomes, as well as how knowledge management will contribute to the sustainability of project results.
- vii. Plans for strategic communications and outreach will be developed to ensure that project results and lessons learned are disseminated effectively to stakeholders and the wider

community. This will include developing a communication strategy that outlines the key messages, target audiences, and communication channels to be used throughout the project. Overall, this component is critical for ensuring that the project's efforts are well-documented, sustainable, and effective in achieving the project's goals, and that project information and knowledge are shared effectively with stakeholders and the wider community.

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

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

May 5, 2023:

a)

a.1. The component 2 is focused on the improvement of production practices. Nevertheless, there is no target reported under the indicator 4.3 "Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems". Please clarify the land uses and activities leading to the expected result under the indicator 4.1 and amend the core indicators 4.1 and 4.3 accordingly as needed.

a.2. The project is expected to establish OECMs but there isn't any target for the Indicator 4.5 "Terrestrial OECMs supported". Please complete and note that the OECM indicator does not feed into the main Core Indicator 4, as it is of contextual nature. As a result, kindly report the sub-indicator 4.5 in the sub-indicators 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 or 4.4 (presumably most of these OECMs should be added to 4.1). There will not be double counting between 4.5 and other sub-indicators.

a.3. For the sub-indicator 6.1, the duration of accounting should be 20 years (not 5) unless strongly justified. Please amend accordingly or explain.

a.4. For the sub-indicator 6.1, please indicate the methodology used for the assessment and provide the calculation.

a.5. For the sub-indicator 11 on Direct beneficiaries. Please review the number to ensure it includes only direct beneficiaries as it seems large. Pages 24-25 of the GEF-8 Results Measurement Framework Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01) provide examples of what might be counted as direct beneficiary.

May 16, 2023:

a.1. The response isn't clear as we still don't find any target reported for the core indicator 4.3. During PPG, please clarify and ensure the indicator 4.3 is considered to capture the area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems. Cleared.

a.2. Thank you for the clarification. We take note that the target for indicator 4.5 will be determined during PPG. Cleared.

a.3 and a.4. It is strange to have the same expected result as in the previous version while the duration of accounting has been changed from 5 to 20 years. The expected result for the core indicator 6.1 is relatively low for this kind of project and the calculation is not provided. At PPG stage, please revise and provide the calculation (the EX-ACT tool if it is the methodology used).

a.5. Thank you for the adjustment. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

A1: changed with thanks

A2: target to be determined during PPG for indicator 4.5.

Honduras currently does not have a specific standard on the declaration of areas considered as OECMs, which makes it difficult to set a specific target for the number of terrestrial OECMs to be supported by the project at this stage. However, it is important to note that the project will work towards promoting the establishment of OECMs as a key strategy for enhancing biodiversity conservation and sustainable development in the project area.

Furthermore, while the declaration of micro-watersheds may be considered as OECMs, there is currently no national standard in the country for this designation. Therefore, at the implementation stage, we will analyze the feasibility of including micro-watersheds as OECMs and work with relevant stakeholders to establish clear guidelines and criteria for their identification and declaration.

A3 and A4: Comment Address. Please see the adjustment about the timeframe (20 years) and the methodology for calculation of CI6, carbon avoided. Please see page 21.

Core indicator 6: The above-mentioned activities will result in the capture and avoided emissions of nearly -956,114 Ton CO₂eq. This preliminary calculation was developed with EXACT tool for a period of 20 year. Calculation will be refined during PPG stage.

A5: Comment address. Direct beneficiaries estimates are 26,400 (15,840 men and 10,560 women). Confirmation of direct beneficiaries will be develop during PPG.

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

n/a

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

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

Secretariat's Comments

May 5, 2023:

a) Yes, cleared.

b) The mitigation measures are missing for the following identified risks: Climate, Political and Governance and Macro-economic. Please complete.

c) We note that the GEF Agency has attached the ESS screening checklist and an overall ESS risk of the program is classified as moderate. In the PPG phase, a consultation process and Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) will be developed to identify the work to be carried out within the framework of the project, possible Nature-Based solutions (NBS) for their crops and productive activities, and integration into OECMs, along with mechanisms for management and monitoring. Please provide a plan to assess potential impacts on indigenous peoples and develop an engagement plan with indigenous peoples throughout the project during the project design stage. (Comment for 5.6 Risks, c).

May 16, 2023:

b) The response to the comment in the review sheet is not relevant but we do note the required information has been added in the Risks table. Cleared.

c) Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

B: Noted with thanks. Included in the section ?Key barriers and enablers to achieving the objectives?

C: Please find the new text into the risk section marked as other.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

a) Yes, cleared.

b) Yes, cleared.

c) As mentioned above, the contribution of the projet to improved policies is unclear. Please clarify.

May 16, 2023:

c) This comment has been addressed above. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

C: The project aims to identify existent tools of landscape management such as watershed declaration, sustainable forest management and policies such as national restoration plan, in order to include new conservation figures that promotes the reduction of ecosystem degradation and fragmentation. To clear this, please see new product 1.1.7 as mentioned above.

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

n/a

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

n/a

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

Please clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target.

May 16, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

Noted with thanks. Please find new text in Section C

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

n/a

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

Please add the dates of the consultations and clarify the name of the Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, Civil Society Organizations and Private Sector stakeholders that were consulted (as stated at the beginning of the description).

May 16, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

Comment address. Please see dates added in the chart in the stakeholder engagement section.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

n/a

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

n/a

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

n/a

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

n/a

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

n/a

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

N/A

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

n/a

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

May 5, 2023:

The PPG Agency fee of Climate Change is a bit higher (9.6%) than the allowed 9.5% - please amend.

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ G	Focal Area	Programmng of Funds	Grant / Non-Grant	PPG(\$)	Agency Fee(\$)	Total PPG Funding(\$)		
FAO	GET	Honduras	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation: BD-1	Grant	125,000	11,875	136,875		9.5%
FAO	GET	Honduras	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation: CCM-1	Grant	750	72	822		9.6%
FAO	GET	Honduras	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation: LD-1	Grant	21,825	2,073	23,898		9.5%
FAO	GET	Honduras	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation: LD-2	Grant	2,425	230	2,655		9.5%
Total PPG Amount						150,000.00	14,250.00	164,250		9.5%

May 16, 2023:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

Noted with thanks. It is amended.

8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

1. Under "Name of Co-financier", please only indicate the name or the organization and inform as relevant under the co-financing table the name of the funds and programs where the resources are coming from.
2. Please describe as requested how the "Investments Mobilized" were identified (under the co-financing table).

May 16, 2023:

1. Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.
2. The description of how the "Investments Mobilized" were identified (under the co-financing table) remain limited and vague and will need to be further develop during PPG. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

1. Comment address. Co-financing table amended.
2. With the government project implemented on the area of intervention or with related scope were used as a co- financing sources. It is expected to develop articulation with those initiatives in order to increase project impacts.

Annex B: Endorsements

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

Secretariat's Comments

May 5, 2023:

The executing partner in LoE (FAO) is different than those in Portal (Secretary of Energy, Natural Resources and Mining (SERNA) and National Institute of Forest Conservation (ICF)). As there is no possibility of leaving FAO as the executing partner, there are two options: (i) under exceptional basis, sending an email from the OFP clarifying that the above mentioned Governmental institutions will be the executing partners (the email will be appended to the documents tab); or (ii) providing a new LoE (in which case, the Agency and Country need to use the correct GEF-8 template).

Subject: Endorsement for Project **Generating opportunities for livelihoods and biodiversity through participatory governance of natural resources and the economic diversification of the communities of the central forest corridor of Honduras.**

In my capacity as GEF Operational Focal Point for the Republic of Honduras, I confirm that the above project proposal is in accordance with my government's national priorities and our commitment to the relevant global environmental conventions; and was discussed with relevant stakeholders, including the global environmental convention focal points.

I am pleased to endorse the preparation of the above project proposal with the support of the GEF Agency listed below. If approved, the proposal will be prepared and implemented by the **Food and Agriculture Organization**. I request the GEF Agency to provide a copy of the project document before it is submitted to the GEF Secretariat for CEO endorsement.

General Project information

Project Title:	Generating opportunities for livelihoods and biodiversity through pa economic diversification of the communities of the central forest co
Region:	Honduras
Country(ies):	Honduras
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO
Executing Partner:	Secretary of Energy, Natural Resources and Mining (SERNA) National Institute of Forest Conservation (ICF)

May 16, 2023:

Thank you for providing a revised Letter of Endorsement. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

Noted with thanks. This has been corrected in the endorsement letter.

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

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

n/a

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

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

n/a

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

n/a

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

n/a

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

Yes, the ESS screening document has been uploaded to the GEF Portal. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

n/a

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

n/a

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

Partially. The taxonomy is very limited and should include much more relevant information under each level 1 categories. Please complete the Annex F and, as mentioned above, the General Project Information at the very beginning of the PIF description.

May 16, 2023:

Yes, the Taxonomy has been completed as mentioned above. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

Noted with thanks. A new taxonomy has been included in annex F

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

n/a

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

April 30, 2023:

Not yet. Please address the comments raised above.

May 16, 2023:

Yes, the PIF is now recommended for technical clearance.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

n/a

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

May 16, 2023:

1. During PPG, please clarify and ensure the indicator 4.3 is considered to capture the area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems.
2. A target for indicator 4.5 is expected to be determined during PPG.
3. The expected result for the core indicator 6.1 is relatively low for this kind of project and the calculation is not provided. At PPG stage, please revise and provide the calculation (the EX-ACT tool if it is the methodology used).
4. The description of how the "Investments Mobilized" were identified (under the co-financing table) remain limited and vague and will need to be further develop during PPG.

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	5/5/2023	5/12/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/16/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Review

Agency Response

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