



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

GEF ID:	4743		
Country/Region:	India		
Project Title:	Developing an Effective Multiple Use Management Framework for Conserving Biodiversity in the Mountain Landscapes of the High Ranges, Western Ghats		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4651 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2; BD-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$88,600	Project Grant:	\$6,275,000
Co-financing:	\$30,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$36,363,600
PIF Approval:	January 11, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	February 29, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Yoko Watanabe	Agency Contact Person:	Doley Tshering

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes, India has ratified the CBD and eligible for GEF BD finance.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, an adequate letter from the OFP dated 29 Nov 2011 is attached.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	UNDP's comparative advantage for working on PA and landscape level conservation initiatives are well recognized.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	n/a
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, the initiative is in line with UNDAF and other strategy in the country. UNDP also has sufficient experiences and staff capacity to work on the issue in India	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources		

Resource Availability			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	Yes, India has so far utilized \$1.62M from the GEF-5 BD STAR allocation and there is sufficient remaining resources.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	Yes, pls refer to the above comment.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	n/a	n/a
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes, the project is well aligned with BD1 and BD2, and the project outputs are clearly contributes to the BD FA results framework.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes, please note above comment.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Yes, the project is consistent with NBSAP and other key national policies and strategies.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, the capacity building initiatives are focused both at the institution/system and site levels, which are aimed to enable long term sustainability of the project activities and outcomes.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.  In relation to the capacity, please clarify key differences between the Direct Implementation Modality and National Execution Modality, and why this project would adapt the former. Some explanation has been provided through the letter provided by the

			clear why DIM is required for this project in a country like India. Please provide further information.
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	The project framework is well developed with clear information on the significant baseline projects, supported by the national and state governments and local communities.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		Yes, sufficiently explained.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	Yes, the incremental reasoning of the project activities are well articulated under page 8-10, including a table that clearly articulates the incremental benefits.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	The project design is well articulated with good situation analysis, information on baseline projects, remaining gaps, and possible comprehensive solutions through the suggested project. Based on this analysis, the project framework is well developed with measurable outcomes and outputs.	Although the project is very ambitious, the project design and framework are comprehensive and clearly articulated.
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes, the incremental benefits of addressing biodiversity conservation and sustainable use at the mountain landscape level rather than only in	Yes, as also noted at the time of PIF approval.

		ecological and socio-economic contexts and they are well articulated in the proposal.	
	16. 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?	Yes, clear description is provided at this stage. Further detail analysis is expected during further project preparation.	While the gender dimension and approaches are clearly articulated in the text, including targeting women as more than 50% of the target beneficiaries, it is recognized that there is no gender-disaggregated indicator included in the project results framework. Please clarify and include relevant indicators.  The text also includes 15% income increase of local communities (page 16 of CEO endorsement request document) However, this is also not included in the project results framework. Please clarify/explain and revise the results framework as necessary.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes, relevant information is provided. However, pls also refer to comments made below on linkage with CEPF.	Yes, sufficiently informed.
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Yes, adequate risks are addressed at this stage. Further detail analysis and information are expected by the time of CEO endorsement.	Yes, adequately addressed.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Linkages with several relevant GEF and UNDP funded projects are noted. The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF), a partnership program among the GEF and other donors, has also provided significant investment in the Western Ghats hotspot through various international and national NGOs and other CSOs. In addition, the Global	Since the PIF of this project was approved, another PIF was approved in Western Ghats, which is managed by the WB. Both projects take a landscape approach and strong coordination is expected. Please clarify linkage and coordination between the projects.

		GEF is also planning activities in India. Please also clarify linkages, lessons learned, and coordination with these key conservation initiatives.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes, adequate information is provided at this stage. Further details on the institutional arrangement and coordination are expected at the time of CEO endorsement.	Yes, adequate arrangement and information provided.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Yes, no significant change has been made.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		n/a
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	No, the project management cost is identified at over 5% of the project components budget. Under table B, there should be a line on sub-total for project components (before the project management cost line). The project management cost should be determined at less than 5% of this sub-total. Please kindly refer to the latest GEF PIF template and revise accordingly.	Yes, adequate.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The GEF funding and cofinancing per components are considered adequate. Overall cofinancing ratio is about 1 to 5 and considered adequate, however, considering substantial baseline projects that are ongoing, it would be encouraging to see further cofinancing if possible.	Yes, adequate.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Please refer above comment.	The cofinance letters from the MoEF and State Government of Kerela are missing (instead, endorsement letter was attached). Please provide separate letter from both MoEF and State of

	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UNDP is providing \$1m in cash and considered appropriate.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes, adequate TT on BD1 and BD2 provided.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes, adequate.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	Please provide adequate response once comments are provided.	Yes, adequate response has been provided.
	• Convention Secretariat?	Please provide adequate response once comments are provided.	n/a
	• Council comments?		Yes, adequate response has been provided.
	• Other GEF Agencies?	Please provide adequate response once comments are provided.	n/a
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>No. In general, this PIF is well prepared. However, please address the comments made above, including comments on coordination and project management cost. Upon receipt of a revised PIF that adequately addresses the comments, the PM will recommend the PIF for work program inclusion.</p> <p>3 Jan 2011 A revised PIF has been received that addresses the earlier comments, besides the one on the project management cost. The management cost should be less than 5% of the project components sub-total, i.e. less than \$298125. Please revise and resubmit. Upon receipt of the revised PIF the PM will recommend the</p>	

		<p>program inclusion.</p> <p>5 Jan 2011 The project management cost has been revised accordingly. The PM is recommending the PIF for CEO clearance for work program inclusion.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		Please provide a report with a breakdown by activities (i.e. the four activities that were included in the PPG).
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		<p>No, please respond to and address the comments made above, and resubmit a revised CEO endorsement package with additional information.</p> <p>25 Nov 2013 Yes, the GEFSEC received a revised CEO endorsement package and responses that adequately address the earlier comments. The PM recommends the project for CEO endorsement.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 13, 2011	October 21, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 03, 2012	November 25, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 05, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	The activities that are noted in the PPG are relevant and considered appropriate for the project development.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>The local consultant budget, as it is stated would be more than \$3000 per week. The person weeks should indicate for both GEF and cofinancing budget/amount. Please revise as required.</p> <p>The cofinancing ratio of the PPG is suggested to be consistent with the PIF, which is approx 1 to 5. Please revise as necessary.</p> <p>28 Feb 2012 Adequately revised. Local consultant cost is now revised to \$2000 average, most of them \$1500 per week. The cofinancing ratio has revised to 1 to 5.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	<p>N0. Please refer to the above comments and provide a revised PPG request that adequately respond to the comments.</p> <p>28 Feb 2012 Yes, the GEFSEC received a PPG request that adequately responds to the earlier comments. The PPG is recommended for CEO approval.</p>
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	February 07, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 27, 2012

\* 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.