



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5784		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Management in Priority Socio Ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes (SEPLS)		
GEF Agency:	CI	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,909,000
Co-financing:	\$6,350,000	Total Project Cost:	\$8,259,000
PIF Approval:	May 08, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Yoko Watanabe	Agency Contact Person:	Orissa Samaroo

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	<p>This is a global project. The country that may participate in the project will be selected from GEF BD eligible countries. Please clarify this point in the PIF.</p> <p>14 April 2014 yes, this is now clearly noted as key criteria for selection of the on-the-ground projects under component 1.</p>	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	This is a global project so do not require OFP endorsement letter. However, before investing in any on-the-ground project under the small grants facility of this project, the proponent of the small grant project should obtain an	The project now identifies the Indo-Burma, Tropical Andes, and Madagascar hotspots as targeted geographical areas. This transboundary hotspot approach maybe more effective and efficient, rather than narrowing to

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>endorsement letter from the OFP. Please clarify this point in the PIF.</p> <p>14 April 2014 Yes, coordination with the GEF OFP is noted. Detail mechanism for the coordination needs to be clarified by the time of CEO approval of the MSP.</p>	<p>specific countries at this point. Let's discuss and revise as necessary.</p>
Resource Availability	3. 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? 	n/a as this is a global project from GEF BD set-aside.	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	Yes, the project requests funding from the GEF-5 BD global and regional set aside funding.	Yes, as noted above.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	Yes, as already noted above.	Yes.
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>Yes, the project conform well with BD2 on mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes.</p> <p>In B.2. please further clarify how this project could contribute to the mainstreaming agenda at the GEF, as well as larger forum such as CBD, IUCN, etc.</p> <p>14 April 2014 Adequate information provided at this stage.</p>	<p>Yes, the conformity with BD2 is recognized. However, it is rather unclear how the SEPLS approach is different or similar to what the GEF has been financing for years under the BD2 window. There seem to be overemphasis and artificial isolation of the SEPLS approach from the larger international efforts on mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes.</p> <p>The PM suggest the proponent to further</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>clarify the conformity of the approach to BD2, and the value added of this project (e.g. innovation, focus on traditional knowledge for mainstreaming, platform for knowledge sharing, etc) to the mainstreaming initiatives that the GEF and other partners are engaged in.</p> <p>Further, section H also notes the platform being strengthened by the project will enable the sharing and dissemination of lessons from other BD2 projects. This is an important element of the project, however, it is not clear how this will be done through the project components. Please clarify.</p>
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>The project's consistency with the CBD Strategy and Aichi Target is clearly noted. The link with UNESCO could be deleted.</p> <p>The project's consistency with NBSAPs of the potential participating developing countries could be clarified in general terms, as most countries have articulated mainstreaming biodiversity as key focus of their NBSAPs. Please further clarify under section B.1.</p> <p>14 April 2014 Appropriate information provided.</p>	<p>In addition to the specific linkage of the project to the relevant Aichi Targets, it is important to clarify and provide necessary information that the participating hotspots/countries have identified mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and seascapes as an priority under the NBSAP and other policies/strategies, and this project will contribute in meeting that focus/target. Please further review section I, and revise as necessary.</p> <p>Please also provide necessary brief information on the country ownership and drivenness (section J) as this is an important element for GEF support. The current description of the section is not sufficient.</p>
	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to</p>	<p>The section on baseline (page 8-10) should be substantially improved.</p>	<p>Information on the baseline projects are rather fragmented and difficult to capture, and requires substantial</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	<p>address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>As a general suggestion, please delete all bullet points of the PIF as it is difficult to read and follow.</p> <p>This section should focus on: 1) the significance of the Satoyama Initiative, 2) its history and achievements, and 3) most importantly what it plans to do in the future, and 4) how this GEF projects could be instrumental in bringing the initiative to scale and fill some of the gaps.</p> <p>Please revise the section accordingly.</p> <p>14 April 2014 Adequate revision has been made.</p>	<p>improvement.</p> <p>First, it is recommended that section C and G to be consolidated and combined, and follow the comments made at the time of PIF review on baseline projects.</p> <p>Second, it is also important to explain that in addition to SDM and COMDEKS, there are many mainstreaming works ongoing by GEF and others, but this project will try to fill in some of the gaps: including fostering innovation, utilizing traditional knowledge, knowledge management platform, etc for mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes/seascapes.</p> <p>Third, please update section A.4 and A.5 of the CEO approval request form as required.</p>
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>The project framework under table B requires further revision, while the project components provide comprehensive approach to the project.</p> <p>The outcomes and outputs should be further clarified, with indicators and targets.</p> <p>Further emphasis on traditional knowledge and indigenous peoples approach as well as promoting private sector involvement are recommended and built clearly in the project design.</p> <p>The PM has also provided upstream</p>	<p>The project framework requires further review and revision. Specifically, please revise and provide further information based on the following comments:</p> <p>1) Components: The description on component 3 under table 3 and text (page 27 of the project document) does not match. The focus of component 3 could go beyond traditional workshops and training, but strengthen the international platform (e.g. IPSI) to share and exchange knowledge.</p> <p>2) Outcomes, indicators, and key</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>feedback on the issue of project framework. Please revise the section accordingly.</p> <p>14 April 2014 Adequate revision has been made, reflecting on GEF review comments.</p>	<p>activities:</p> <p>Component 1</p> <p>- Outcome 1.3. The aim of this outcome itself is unclear. The end result is to develop 3 IPSI Collaborative Activities? Rather than having such outcome which the results are beyond the control of this project, it is recommended that tangible activities and outcome are achieved through demonstrative/pilot subgrant projects under this project.</p> <p>- The key activities under this component is missing. It is unclear how the grant making mechanism will be coordinated, including involvement of SDM and CEPF. The justification/relevant of the funding range (\$50000-100000) needs to be further clarified. Moreover, the criteria for subgrant project selection needs to be further reviewed to ensure that important elements such as globally environmental benefits, innovation, TK, private sector involvement, policy linkage, etc are taken into consideration.</p> <p>Component 2</p> <p>- The relevance of the indicators, particularly the one on downloads and citations of the knowledge products is rather weak. Could we come up with more comprehensive communication and dissemination strategies of the knowledge products (beyond IPSI website etc) and more results oriented indicators?</p> <p>Component 3</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>- Again, the indicator/target of having additional IPSI Collaborative Activities do not seem relevant. It would be important to identify indicators that could measure the capacity development of the institutions and individuals that are involved. Number of participants is also not a strong outcome level indicator, but rather suitable for output.</p> <p>- The outputs on women's participation is welcome, however, 30-40% seems still limited, and encourage to aim for more.</p> <p>- On the workshops and trainings, it is unclear what the project will be targeting on (e.g. specific themes, for example on TK, indicators, governance, etc for mainstreaming biodiversity). it would be important to at least identify and clarify 2-3 targeted themes for capacity development, based on identified gaps to ensure a focused approach.</p> <p>In addition, on the institutional arrangement, the role of the GEFSEC as active member of the IPSI steering committee and the potential advisory role with other relevant institutions needs to be clarified.</p>
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>No, it is unclear. A set of clear and tangible global biodiversity benefits, including coverage, species, ecosystem indicators are required.</p> <p>Please provide further information, in the table B as well as section 5 of page 15.</p>	<p>The two GEBs identified (page 30) is relevant and tangible.</p> <p>The description on incremental reasoning is still weak and require further information and revision (section F. in particular). As noted above, baseline projects/activities need to be</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>14 April 2014 Adequate revision has been amde.</p>	<p>further clarified and existing gaps are to be articulated to further justify the incremental reasoning.</p> <p>The financial figures in section F do not match with the rest of the project document (i.e. finance allocated to component 1, baseline/cofinancing figures under para 63, etc). As noted in this section, can't we mobilize COMDEKS as cofinancing to this project?</p>
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		<p>No, while the linkage to socio-economic and gender issues are noted, there is lack of information on the tangible benefits that this project will be generating on these issues. Please further clarify.</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>No, the role of CSOs and particularly Indigenous Peoples should be further clarified under section A.2. This section does not require detail explanation on the existing institutional structure, but more on different category of stakeholders (i.e. not necessary the name of institutions), how they will be involved (i.e. approach and strategy), and their roles in the project.</p> <p>14 April 2014 The role of CSO and IPs, including their traditional knowledge is clarified throughout the PIF. Further clarification on their involvement, roles and responsibilities for project implementation should be made by CEO</p>	<p>The approach on this issue is still vague and weak. Please refer to the comments made at the time of PIF approval and provide necessary information. In particular, considering the projec's strong linkage to TK, please clarify special consideration and approach to ensure strong Indigneous Peoples involvemnt.</p> <p>On the stakeholder analysis (section G), please also clarify the role of private sector in this project. To foster innovation, could we consider further involvement of private sector partners in the activities?</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		approval.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	<p>Many of the mitigation measures are not articulated in the project design (i.e. outcomes, outputs, and activities). Please make sure that these elements are well integrated in the project design.</p> <p>Risks such as lack of interest among the participating governments, sectors, or private sectors in mainstreaming biodiversity activities also needs to be factored in.</p> <p>14 April 2014 Adequate revision has been made.</p>	There has been changes in the risk analysis and mitigation description between the PIF and Project Document. Please update and provide necessary information under A.6 of the CEO approval request form.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>Rather than listing up many different activities, it is suggested that concrete lessons learned (and how this project build on their work) and coordination mechanism with key relevant initiatives to be clarified: including GEF small grants programme, COMDEKS, CEPF, Eco-Agriculture, etc.</p> <p>Please revise the section A.4 accordingly.</p> <p>14 April 2014 Adequate information provided. Coordination mechanism and details, particularly with SGP, COMDEKS, and CEPF should be clarified by the time of CEO approval.</p>	Coordination with COMDEKS, CEPF and LPFN are well noted. Please also clarify coordination and synergy with GEF SGP (in addition to COMDEKS, they are active on mainstreaming in the targeted regions) and other GEF mainstreaming projects in the regions.
13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.	While key elements are noted, please build on these information and provide a strong case on innovation, sustainability, and scaling up.	On sustainability, in addition to the subgrant projects' sustainability, it would be important to clarify the sustainability of the grant making	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>On sustainability, please provide brief business plan of the IPSI and Satoyama Initiative in a longer term with plan and indication on how financial and institutional sustainability will be ensured.</p> <p>On scaling up, please indicate coordination with key international forum, mechanism, and institutions, including CBD, GEF, IUCN, CI etc.</p> <p>14 April 2014 Adequate information provided. Further details to be provided before CEO approval, particularly on the sustainability of the initiative and the components implemented by the project.</p>	<p>facility of this project under component 1. As relevant, it maybe useful to clarify the project's intention to have a boost and catalytic effect on the topic for the duration of this project, while ensuring linkage with the IPSI, SDM, CEPF, and other mechanisms for long term support towards the related work. Please review and revise the section as required.</p> <p>On the scaling up and replication, some of the activities noted in the section (linkage with CBD, IUCN, etc) could be further integrated in the project framework (i.e. activities, outputs, etc). Please review and revise the project framework.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>As noted above, there are several updates and changes made since the PIF approval, and they should be clearly noted and explained in the CEO Approval form (e.g. changes in project framework, section A.4,5, and 6, etc). Please provide necessary revision.</p> <p>Further, cofinancing amount has been reduced. Please explain and try to bring to the same level or more.</p>
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		<p>To further strengthen the argument, please provide additional information on the project's cost effectiveness compared to alternative approaches in achieving similar benefits.</p>
	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-</p>	<p>Cofinance about 1 to 3 is indicated with</p>	<p>Cofinancing amount has slightly</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	finance from UNU, government of japan, and CI. What about cofinance from IGES? 14 April 2014 Adequate revision made and cofinancing from IGES has also been identified.	decreased from the PIF. Please review and try to ensure same level of cofinance.
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	Cofinancing of \$300k is noted from CI. Considering the role of CI as a new GEF Agency, further cofinance is expected. Please consider increasing CI's cofinance amount while reflecting on the resource mobilization/fundraising that maybe conducted during the PPG phase. 14 April 2014 CI cofinancing increased to 1.6 million, considered adequate.	Ci 's cofinance has decreased significantly to \$970k. Please review and try to bring back to the similar level.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The project management cost is over 10%. Following standard norm, please try to make it within 10%. 14 April 2014 Revision made and considered adequate.	The PMC is within 10%. However, "Other direct costs" are charged under each of the components (section 8). Please clarify what this budget line is, and revise as necessary.
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	The PPG amount of \$91000 is requested. Considering this is a MSP, the amount is rather excessive. Please to keep it around \$60000 to 70000. 14 April 2014 PPG has now been revised to \$65000, and considered appropriate.	Adequate report has been provided.
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of	n/a	n/a

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	reflows included?		
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		No. The TT on BD2 lack necessary information (only section 1 is filled). Please submit a duly completed TT.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes adequate information has been provided.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		n/a
	• Convention Secretariat?		n/a
	• The Council?		n/a
	• Other GEF Agencies?		n/a
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	No, please revise the PIF based on the comments made above and resubmit. 14 April 2014 Yes, the GEFSEC received a revised PIF that adequate responds and revised based on earlier comments. The PM recommends the PIF for CEO approval.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	- Appropriate procedures on coordination with GEF OFP to be clarified by learning lessons from other similar GEF projects. - Further clarify and determine tangible indicators and targets of the project. - Further strengthen and clarify incremental reasoning with solid baseline data and identified targets.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Further clarification on their involvement, roles and responsibilities for project implementation should be made by CEO approval. - Coordination mechanism and details, particularly with SGP, COMDEKS, and CEPF should be clarified by the time of CEO approval. - Further details to be provided before CEO approval, particularly on the sustainability of the initiative and the components implemented by the project. 	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>No. Please provide necessary information and revision to the documents based on the comments and resubmit. The PM is available to explain and discuss in person/phone as needed.</p> <p>24 July 2015 Yes. The resubmitted CEO approval documents adequately address the comments made earlier. The PM recommends the project for CEO approval.</p>
	First review*	April 02, 2014	June 10, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 14, 2014	July 24, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**