



## 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		
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:	\$65,000	Project Grant:	\$1,909,000
Co-financing:	\$5,800,000	Total Project Cost:	\$7,774,000
PIF Approval:		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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	<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>	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	<p>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</p>	

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

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	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>	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	n/a as this is a global project from GEF BD set-aside.	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes, the project requests funding from the GEF-5 BD global and regional set aside funding.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	
	• focal area set-aside?	Yes, as already noted above.	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</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 further 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>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> 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>Project Design</p>	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>The section on baseline (page 8-10) should be substantially improved.</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>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (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 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>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>14 April 2014 Adequate revision has been amde.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<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 approval.</p>	
	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>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<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>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>While key elements are noted, please build on these information and provide a strong case on innovation, sustainability, and scaling up.</p> <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</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		sustainability of the initiative and the components implemented by the project.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Cofinance about 1 to 3 is indicated with 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.	
	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.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	The project management cost is over 10%. Following standard norm, please try to make it within 10%.  14 April 2014	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Revision made and considered adequate.	
	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.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council? • Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. <b>Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	No, please revise the PIF based on the comments made above and resubmit.  14 April 2014 Yes, the GEFSEC received a revised PIF	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Appropriate procedures on coordination with GEF OFP to be clarified by learning lessons from other similar GEF projects.</li> <li>- Further clarify and determine tangible indicators and targets of the project.</li> <li>- Further strengthen and clarify incremental reasoning with solid baseline data and identified targets.</li> <li>- Further clarification on their involvement, roles and responsibilities for project implementation should be made by CEO approval.</li> <li>- Coordination mechanism and details, particularly with SGP, COMDEKS, and CEPF should be clarified by the time of CEO approval.</li> <li>- Further details to be provided before CEO approval, particularly on the sustainability of the initiative and the components implemented by the project.</li> </ul>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	April 02, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 14, 2014	
	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.