



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

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|------------------|
| GEF ID: | 9068 | | |
| Country/Region: | Chile | | |
| Project Title: | Establish a Network of National Important Agricultural Heritage Sites (NIAHS) | | |
| GEF Agency: | FAO | GEF Agency Project ID: | |
| Type of Trust Fund: | GEF Trust Fund | GEF Focal Area (s): | Biodiversity |
| GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | BD-3 Program 7; BD-4 Program 9; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$150,000 | Project Grant: | \$3,046,347 |
| Co-financing: | \$21,670,000 | Total Project Cost: | \$24,716,347 |
| PIF Approval: | | Council Approval/Expected: | April 01, 2016 |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Mark Zimsky | Agency Contact Person: | Benjamin Kiersch |

| 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 | <p>March 26, 2015</p> <p>The project is aligned with Program 7 and 9 of the biodiversity strategy. However, please note the results framework of the project in Table B should reflect the results framework outcomes for these two programs which at present it does not.</p> <p>08/20/2015 Additional information is briefly</p> | |

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 |
|-----------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| | | <p>listed on P23. Please ensure this is reflected in Table B using language that is common with the GEF's BD Strategy and not only the numbers as given in P23.</p> <p>September 24, 2015</p> <p>Cleared.</p> | |
| | 2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions? | <p>March 26, 2015</p> <p>Yes.</p> | |
| Project Design | 3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation? | <p>March 26, 2015</p> <p>This PIF is a very solution driven project design. That is, NIAHS/GIAHS as a model is presented a solution to the fact that agricultural biodiversity is threatened by extensive monoculture farming systems and underutilization, neither which is adequately addressed in the project's intervention strategy.</p> <p>The project notes that a "lack of strategies to assess and conserve agricultural diversity" prevents areas being converted into NIAHS model areas. This theory of change is not convincing, particularly when one considers the very small area that the</p> | |

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | | <p>project proposes to transform vis a vis the threat posed by extensive monocultural systems and the cost per hectare for this transformation (\$600/hectare). The strategy does not make the case that the NIAHS model is economically or ecologically viable enough to counteract these two threats to genetic diversity.</p> <p>If it were economically viable, the previously funded GEF project on GIAHS would have served as the proof of concept. It is a concern that the previous GEF investment, which the PIF cites on a number of occasions as being a successful model with a successful pilot in Chile, was apparently not successful enough to result in replication by farmers once they saw how economically viable the approach is, or through the Ministry of Agriculture's own programs. This can only be interpreted that the model is only sustainable if funded by external sources, which means that it is not sustainable at all.</p> <p>Please clarify how the design of this project, which is basically a replication of the previous global project which had investments in Chile simply being executed in different regions, is developed to</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | | <p>ensure both the sustainability and scalability that was not achieved with the previous investment. The various components are not at all constructed to address drivers of loss of diversity of plant or animal genetic resources, but rather are geared towards delivering a pre-designed model, that assumes said economic viability.</p> <p>The policy component is also vague as to how the policy change that is being proposed is meant to address, at the scale necessary, the drivers of agrobiodiversity loss. Please clarify what the specific policy changes are that will be promoted as part of the project's theory of change and how they will create the incentives necessary to counteract the threats to agrobiodiversity identified in the PIF.</p> <p>08/20/2015</p> <p>a) The PIF has been revised and clearly does not attempt to address the threats of monoculture nor the issue of under utilization directly but proposes the use of GIAHs as a response similar to the development of PA networks.</p> <p>b) Please provide analysis that the proposed approach of GIAHs in terms of scale, extent and distribution actually matches the needs and</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------------|
| | | <p>demands of the species identified in terms of their habit, range etc. c/d) Please provide analysis from examples of GIAHs analysis of successful replication and bring these lessons learned into the project design. e)The barriers and links to interventions has been provided in P23.</p> <p>September 24, 2015</p> <p>Cleared.</p> | |
| | <p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p> | <p>March 26, 2015</p> <p>The problem statement and threat analysis, as noted above in section 3, and the project's response are not adequately articulated, thus preventing a clear incremental reasoning to be provided.</p> <p>A number of inconsistencies are also evident in the presentation.</p> <p>First, on the one hand the project identifies 10 species of global importance that will be conserved and an area of 40,000 hectares as the target for the intervention based on their global importance and also provides a strategy for ensuring their conservation. However, at the same</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|-----------|---|-----------------|
| | | <p>time in Component One it requests GEF support to identify important areas for prioritization and the development of strategies and models for conservation.</p> <p>Please note that the literature already documents the globally important agro-biodiversity of Chile to the degree necessary for a GEF intervention to be prioritized so we do not believe there is a need for further mapping paid for by GEF funds. Furthermore, the platform for agrobiodiversity research, as well as the rich literature on this topic produced by FAO and others, provides ample models and strategies for analysis and valuation of biodiversity.</p> <p>Component Two and three have the potential to be designed with incremental reasoning, but the rationale for the responses in component two and three have to better justified vis a vis the threats to the conservation and sustainable use of agrobiodiversity in the particular geographic locations and to the 10 species targeted.</p> <p>08/20/2015 a-c) Baselines are still not adequately</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|--|---|-----------------|
| | | <p>developed in relation to the actions contained in the proposal. Please provide information that allow consideration of the alternative scenario and then the incremental reasoning of the interventions.</p> <p>d) Cleared</p> <p>e) This relates to the need to explain the baseline condition and the proposed interventions and their ecological viability. See review comment in Q4b.</p> <p>September 24, 2015</p> <p>Cleared.</p> | |
| | <p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p> | <p>March 26, 2015</p> <p>NIAHS and GIAHS is presented a solution to the fact that agricultural biodiversity is threatened by monoculture farming systems and underutilization. The project notes that a "lack of strategies to assess and conserve agricultural diversity" as a key barrier. This does not make sense.</p> <p>In Component One, the proposal seeks support many elements listed are not eligible for GEF-funding as they are not incremental (database development, inventories, etc), hence, please allocate some of the funding</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | | <p>from that component to other elements of the project that will actually be focused on improving agrobiodiversity management as described in components two and three.</p> <p>Components Two and Three need entirely revised, once the project's intervention strategy reflects that changes requested in questions 3 and 4.</p> <p>As currently presented, Table B is not adequate overall, and must be revised to empahsize elements that are GEF-eligible, but equally important, that are composed of outputs and outcomes more clearly linked to the threat assessment and underpinned by a theory of change, that reflects the real economic viability of the response.</p> <p>08/20/2015 a) Cleared as PIF no longer claims to directly address under utilization. b/c) These have been removed in the revision. d) See comments on Table B in Q1.</p> <p>September 24, 2015 Cleared.</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| | 6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered? | <p>March 26, 2015</p> <p>These elements need to be more specific to the actual regions where the project will intervene, at present they are too generic and could be applied to any rural area.</p> <p>08/20/2015</p> <p>Information has been amended, but there is still insufficient consideration of socio-economic elements considering the interventions have the potential to affect local communities' management and husbandry practices of the species and sites and the marketing of products from these.</p> <p>September 24, 2015</p> <p>Cleared.</p> | |
| Availability of Resources | 7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? | <p>March 26, 2015</p> <p>Yes.</p> | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? | <p>March 26, 2015</p> <p>Yes.</p> | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access | <p>March 26, 2015</p> <p>NA.</p> | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or | <p>March 26, 2015</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| | Technology Transfer)? | NA. | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? | March 26, 2015 NA. | |
| Recommendations | 8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified? | <p>March 26, 2015</p> <p>No. Please note issues listed above and revise the PIF significantly.</p> <p>08/20/2015 Not at this stage please address comments above.</p> <p>September 24, 2015</p> <p>The PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.</p> | |
| Review Date | Review | February 26, 2015 | |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | August 20, 2015 | |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | September 28, 2015 | |

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. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> 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? | | |
| | 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? | | |

CEO endorsement Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
|-------------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| 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.