GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	**9913**		
Country/Region:	**Bangladesh**		
Project Title:	**Implementing Ecosystem-based Management in Ecologically Critical Areas in Bangladesh**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5854 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-4 Program 9;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$150,000**	Project Grant:	**$3,046,347**
Co-financing:	**$6,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$9,196,347**
PIF Approval:	**October 30, 2017**	Council Approval/Expected:	**November 01, 2017**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Manuela Ravina da Silva**	Agency Contact Person:	**Michael Greeen**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	MRS/JC, Sept 19,2017. Yes. But see comment on Global Environmental Benefits under item Point 5. 9-28-17 Cleared	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MRS/JC, Sept 19,2017.Yes	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	MRS/JC, Sept 19,2017. No, regarding	

[1] For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	environmental issues under section 1 please move information on paragraph 9,10,12,13,14,15,16 to other sections in the document as these do not refer to the description of the section. Please add also information on industrial pollution which contaminate the priority rivers targeted with the project as stated in paragraph 26. For the barriers list, please also include information on land tenure issues. Please further elaborate on Sustainability and scaling-up. If this project targets all ECAs how can this be scaled-up? 9-28-17 Cleared	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MRS/JC, Sept 19,2017. Yes. There are a number of projects on ECAs taking place and that will run whether or not the GEF grant is approved. 9-28-17 Cleared	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MRS/JC, Sept 19,2017. The GEF appreciates the submission of this project in support of the	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Ecologically Critical Areas (ECAs). These have been institutionalized for some time, given legitimacy to they structure and objectives. While ECAs are a commendable approach to solving the socio-economic and conservation problems of some parts of Bangladesh, it is difficult to see how the proposed project will have an impact on the ground: both people and biodiversity. Below are some generic comments that should summarize the issues the GEF Secretariat wants to raise. 1) The project has a strong Top-Down design. While this is not necessary bad, one would expect to see the Local Communities more directly involved in the design as this dictates the benefits to be received at the ground level. Please look at the list of Stakeholders on p. 14. The project is loaded with soft interventions (frameworks, coordination, planning, strategy, reforms, system, etc.) with very little direct interventions except output 2.2.3. This approach is likely to render a number of documents that may never see the light of implementation because of the lack of funding. While at least one of the	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		outputs aims at resolving this matter (1.1.3), the reading of the project continues giving the impression of well intended interventions at the highest of level with little chance of getting implemented on the ground. 2) There are 13 ECAs and a new one being proposed. Of these, only six have received attention in projects that date back to 1988. Its difficult to believe that this project of $3,046,347, will have measurable impacts on the ground for all 13 ECAs totaling 395,229 hectares (In Table F) and 379,021 hectares on Annex 1. The GEF understands that the proposed activities are being presented because they have the potential to deliver benefits to all ECAs. While this is true in theory, it is not in practice because the top-level activities are unlikely to trickle down to the ECAs themselves. No funding to get the job done. After presenting this argument, the GEF suggest restructuring the project with a more limited number of activities at the top, fewer ECAs and more detailed interventions on the ground. 3) If the project consider essential some of the elements listed below, please explain in plain English what	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		the following concepts will look in reality once implemented and how the Local Communities will benefit. Include these clarifications in the text, as the Response to GEF Comments will be left behid at one point. "Ecosystem-based management framework", "Ecological Framework for effective planning", "Strategic Environmental Assessment" (same as EIAs?), "Monitoring Systems", "web-based information and monitoring systems for ECA", "Communications Strategy and Action Plan". 4)Under component 2- Please be more specific what type of activities will be implemented on the ground for improvement of communities livelihood thanks to the proposed ecosystem based framework. 5) How will the local communities use the outputs under Component 3? Are these sophisticated solutions the best for Local Communities or are these for managers only. 6) Paragraph 22 - Please clarify you sentence on how ECA system will enhance the scientific basis of the governance framework. 7) Paragraph 43 please revise it so it	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		becomes easier to read. 8) Please provide a map of the region including the ECAs. That will complement the Table in Annex 1. 9) What are the Global Environmental Benefit of the target ECAs? Are there tangible Biodiversity GEBs or this is mostly about ecosystem services? Adding column to Table in Annex 1 to state what these areas offer would help. 9-28-17 Cleared	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MRS/JC, Sept 19,2017. Regarding gender and inclusion of communities there is information under the gender equality and women's empowerment section. However, as stated above there is little involvement of Local Communities in the design of the project, and receiving very little direct benefits. If the GEF were to ask Local Communities what they think about this project, would they support it? Please add more details to strengthen the involvement of communities and gender inclusion on table B. 9-28-17 Cleared	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	MRS/JC, Sept 19,2017. Yes.There are enough funds under STAR to cover this project as of today. 9-28-17 Cleared	
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MRS/JC, Sept 19,2017. No. Please address outstanding issues under items 1,3,4,5 and 6. If clarifications are needed on the part of the GEF Secretariat or further explanations from UNDP on the proposed activities, the GEF can organize a Conference Call. 9-28-17 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.	
Review Date	Review	September 19, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 26, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

[3] If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.