



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

GEF ID:	<b>5352</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Madagascar</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Conservation of Key Threatened, Endemic and Economically Valuable Species in Madagascar</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Biodiversity</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-1; BD-2;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$91,324</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$5,650,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$14,010,103</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$19,751,427</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jaime Cavalier</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Adamou Bouhari</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	4-1-13 Yes. Madagascar is eligible for funding. Cleared	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	4-1-13 Yes. There is LoE for \$6,286,650 dated February 7, 2013. The project is for \$6,186,750 including Agency fee. When adding PPG (+agency fee) for \$100,000, the total comes to \$6,286,750. Please \$100 from LoE, PIF or PPG.  5-28-13 The LoE is, indeed, for \$6,286,750 enough to cover PIF and PPG Cleared  Cleared	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the		

	all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	4-1-13 Yes. As of today, the BD balance for Madagascar is \$23,312,021. Cleared	
	• the focal area allocation?	4-1-13 Yes. As of today, the BD balance for Madagascar is \$23,312,021. Cleared	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
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>4-1-13 BD-1 and BD-2 Aichi Targets 12 &amp; 13</p> <p>Question: Why is there a suggested investment of \$2,741,324 in Protected Areas, when there is no reference to PAs in the description of the components?</p> <p>5-28-13</p> <p>1. The names of 9 Protected Areas were provided in the revised PIF. In order to understand how this species-based project is going to improve the sustainability of the PA system, please provide a table where the PAs relate to the target species once properly identified (see GEF Comment on item 8 first). Please also include the status of the target species (i.e. threaten, endemic) and the</p>	

		<p>GEF cannot provide funding to a species-base conservation project aiming at delivering Global Environmental Benefits without knowing the target species. It will be like providing funding for a PA project without knowing the name of target PAs.</p> <p>2. Please clarify how "community forestry approaches" increase representation of terrestrial PAs (as described in the Response to GEF Comments).</p> <p>3. The description of how "community forestry approaches" will indirectly strengthen PA management are vague at best. Please elaborate making reference to actual activities that have resulted in improved management (not the hypothetical).</p> <p>4. The examples of successful fundraising campaigns for key species in Madagascar were not provided. Please do so. This is different than fundraising for PAs</p> <p>7-30-13 Outstanding issues properly addressed in revised PIF dated July 3, and the Response to GEF Comments. Cleared</p>	
	<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>4-1-13 According to the PIF, the Project contributes to the implementation of: 1. Madagascar Action Plan 2007 "2012 (MAP), 2. National Environmental Action Plan and the 3rd Phase of the National Environmental Program</p>	

		<p>2012);</p> <p>4. The Madagascar National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (2000);</p> <p>5. The 4th National Report to the Convention on Biodiversity (2011) which identifies the importance of conserving key flora and fauna species;</p> <p>6. National Forestry Policy (1997), which has a strong focus on conservation ;</p> <p>7. The National Strategy for Forest Genetic Resources (2007) and the National Report on Forest Genetic Resources (2012) which both place a strong emphasis on the conservation of key endemic tree species;</p> <p>8. The National Action Plan for the Madagascar Pond Heron (<i>Aredola idae</i>) (2012);</p> <p>9. The Madagascar National African Eurasian Water-bird Agreement (AEWA) Plan, and the related National Reports (I et II) on implementation of the AEWA (2008, 2011).</p> <p>Question: Is there specific reference to species conservation strategies in these documents? Please clarify and enter only those docs where this is the case.</p> <p>5-28-13 Cleared</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>4-1-13</p> <p>Please separate the "baseline" (as in background) from the true "baseline projects" (as in what projects or activities will be carried out whether or not there is a GEF project). In the "baseline" (as in background) please describe the conservation efforts on single species, with especial emphasis on the target species. The "baseline projects" are those</p>	

Project Design

and contribute with the incremental costs. The funding for the upcoming projects or activities in the baseline projects, could be used as co-financing. At the moment, Table C appears to have a mix of "baseline projects" and co-financiers (i.e. the mining company?).

5-28-13

The background projects do not become the baseline projects.

The baseline projects are those that will be executed, whether or not the GEF funding becomes available. In other words, the baseline projects are those on which the GEF project is building on and paying for the incremental costs.

In order to clarify the issue of baseline projects, please address the following questions regarding co-financing:

Co-financing: Please provide the names of the co-financiers that have been contacted for the purpose of co-financing this project and are aware they are listed as co-financiers in this project with associated co-financing (in cash or in-kind).

Please include in Table C only those institutions that fit the criteria described above [The reading of the mandate/role of Stakeholders (p.13) suggest that many of these institutions have not been contacted]. Please remove the International and National NGOs for which there is no name (each with \$500K) and "other" (to be confirmed)

		<p>justify the \$2M from local communities or remove. Increase UNEP to \$200K as indicated in the Response to Comments from GEF.</p> <p>PLEASE remember that the project will need to get signed Letters of Co-financing (LoC) at CEO Endorsement. If co-financiers are included at PIF stage without their consent, it is going to be harder to get their formal LoC later in project development.</p> <p>7-30-13 Outstanding issues properly addressed in revised PIF dated July 3, and the Response to GEF Comments. Cleared</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>4-1-13 Overall: This project is difficult to evaluate without knowing the target tree species.</p> <p>Component 1. A) The species that will be the focus of a "species-based approach" need to be selected upfront. B) Not clear how the combination of a review of lessons learned + biological- and Socio-economic analysis, are sufficient to derive a "Species Conservation Strategy" for the 21 target species. C) A clear baseline (as in background information) is needed for the target species for the development and implementation of a "Species Conservation Strategy", D) Why a species-based approach for tree conservation was selected over the conservation of the same species inside protected areas? What is the cost-effectiveness of this approach compared to increase the coverage of PAs or</p>	

the existing PAs?, E) Are the proposed outputs under 2.2, the same as suggested in the "National Action Plan for the Madagascar Pond Heron"? F) Is it really possible to reduce the level of habitat destruction (to 20% of baseline levels) of the Heron, by "training of staff in the local government and technical services in the management and conservation ...", "a participatory monitoring and evaluation system", "awareness raising and changing attitudes of local people", and "conservation agreements developed and implemented in support of local development in exchange for habitat conservation actions"? How does this work? Are the conservation agreements direct payments to local people in exchange of changing land use practices in favor of the Heron population? If so, who is going to provide payments after the closure of the project?

Component 2. A) If the "Species Conservation Strategies" are the objective of Component 1, how can planting of 240,000 seedlings in natural forests and of 56,000 seedlings plants in home gardens and village agro-forestry sites can be prescribed? B) How are the seed-banks and nurseries going to sustain themselves after the closure of the project? C) Please provide a few examples of participatory monitoring and evaluation of target species in Madagascar that is up and running. D) The "eco-labels, certificates and conservation friendly marketing plans" are very hard to obtain. On what bases is this project suggesting to use these "Sustainable harvesting Tools" when the

have been made in this line of work with tree species in Madagascar? E) The indicators "100 hectares of restored forest rich in the 20 species" and "20 hectares of agro-forestry and home-gardens based on the 20 species", suggest that the target tree species and pilot sites have already been determined. Otherwise, how can you determine that the 100 hs. are rich in 20 species? The same for the agro-forestry and home-garden.

Component 3. A) While capturing lessons learned is in principle a good, how are these materials going to be used? B) What specific actions will be taken to "lobby government and non-government actors to channel funds toward conservation of key species..."? This is very hard work, and unless a clear window has been identify, this outcome will most likely overpromise and under deliver. Please provide examples of role models being used to guide investments. C) How is the implementation of the 21+1 "Species Conservation Strategies" is going to take place with this level of investment? Compare budget of this component with component 1 + 2 (\$4,600,000) where only paper products are being produced. Action of the ground will require higher investments, D) How can the project is proposing to do the Species Conservation Strategies for another 10 unknown species, when in this proposal is expecting to use the funding of Component 1 + 2 totaling \$4,600,000 for the same output for 21 species?

5-28-13



A) See comments on Target species under item 4 and 8. Basically, provide a table where the PAs relate to the target species, including their conservation status (i.e. threaten, endemic) and the economic reasons for their selection. The project needs to provide a clear view of what is being proposed. This cannot be postponed to PPG or project implementation.

Component 2.

A) This project reads more like an agro-forestry and plantation project on species of commercial importance (with significant local benefits), than one on conservation of biodiversity and Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs). This can be clarified by providing the names of the species and associated places (PAs). See items 4, 8.

B) Please elaborate on these "conservation agreements" providing working examples in Madagascar. No clear reasons why local communities will maintain or renew these commitments after project closure (when there are no incentives for them to do it).

Component 2. A) Please elaborate and provide examples of nurseries and seed-banks in Madagascar that have remained open and functional beyond the time and budget for the project. Please state how is interested in the plant material and who pays for the recurrent costs of these initiatives. B) The issue of "eco-labels, certificates and conservation friendly

		<p>fuzzy. Without the name of the species (that do matter for GEBs) it is not clear what these labels mean&gt;</p> <p>Component 3. A) Does the Madagascar Foundation for Parks have successful stories of species-based fundraising that are applicable to this project?</p> <p>7-30-13 Outstanding issues properly addressed in revised PIF dated July 3, and the Response to GEF Comments. Cleared</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>4-1-13 In the absence of a list of target species (except the Pond Heron) it is not possible to determine the GEB associated with this project.</p> <p>5-28-13 Of the 20 plant species listed on page 9 of the revised PIF, only four (<i>Dalbergia baroni</i>, <i>D. chapelieri</i>, <i>D. madagascariensis</i> and <i>D. maritima</i>) are listed in the IUNC Red List of Threaten species (<a href="http://www.iucnredlist.org/search">http://www.iucnredlist.org/search</a>). Please clarify the reasons to include the other 11 species in this project with the objective of conserving key threaten, endemic and economically viable species in Madagascar. The Global Environmental Benefits that this project is going to deliver are directly related to the selection of species. As indicated under item 4 as well.</p> <p>7-30-13 Outstanding issues properly addressed in revised PIF dated July 3, and the</p>	

		Cleared	
	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 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>4-1-13 Mentioned in the context of species selection and in some of the activities under Component 2. Because neither the sites nor the tree species are defined, participation of the local communities is not clearly stated.</p> <p>5-28-13 Once species and sites have been determined, the role of local communities should be clarified.</p> <p>7-30-13 Outstanding issues properly addressed in revised PIF dated July 3, and the Response to GEF Comments. Cleared</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>4-1-13 Risks and mitigation measures need to be project-specific. Information on Table A.3 could apply to a myriad of other projects and countries.</p> <p>5-28-13 The risks and mitigation sessions needs to be rework. The GEF Secretariat expects to see real project-specific risks and mitigations measures address. No</p>	

		<p>conservation strategies develop but never used, ii. The co-funding in-kind not becoming available during project implementation so activities on the ground not carried out, iii. No interest in replication of the project, etc.</p> <p>7-30-13 Outstanding issues properly addressed in revised PIF dated July 3, and the Response to GEF Comments. Cleared</p>	
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>4-2-13 Although there is reference to ongoing and upcoming GEF funded projects, there is not a single reference to other conservation efforts in Madagascar funded by domestic and international NGOs and Bilateral Agencies. It appears as if nobody else - except GEF funded projects, is working on tree species conservation. Is that the case?</p> <p>5-28-13 Information was provided of related initiatives with the Heron, Uapaca bojeri and the species of the genus Dalbegia. Not clear if there are other ongoing activities for the rest of the species and PAs.</p> <p>7-30-13 Outstanding issues properly addressed in revised PIF dated July 3, and the Response to GEF Comments. Cleared</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</li> </ul>	<p>4-1-13 Innovation: There are no elements of innovation. Sustainability: It is not clear how the seed banks and nurseries will sustain</p>	

	<p>and if not, why not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>going to pay for the recurrent costs and who is going to purchase the seeds?  Replication: It is unrealistic to think that the project can deliver the Species Conservation Strategies for another 10 species, when it is aiming at doing this work for 21 species by using significant financial resources (Component 1+2+ part of 3).</p> <p>5-28-13  On sustainability: While the package of interventions proposed by this project, will provide "motivation for the local communities to manage/sustain their nurseries/seed-banks", it is most likely that these will close after the completion of the project because it is not clear who would pay for the recurrent costs of these activities and why would they do so. Thoughts? Examples to the contrary?</p> <p>On replication: While replication can be obtained, no reason to have another 10 species under this component. Move them to Component 1.</p> <p>7-30-13  Outstanding issues properly addressed in revised PIF dated July 3, and the Response to GEF Comments.  Cleared</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</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</p>		

	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?	<p>4-1-13 Without specifics on the target species, it is very difficult to determine if funding and co-funding is appropriate. Nonetheless: For component 1 + 2, the project is very expensive for what is offered (i.e Species Conservation Strategies for 21 unknown species of trees + planting of a total of 296,000 seedlings + seed banks and nurseries). On the contrary, for component 3, there are not enough funds to produce the 4 outputs, specially the implementation of the strategies.</p> <p>5-28-13 Component 2. A) In the response to the GEF Comments, there is reference to "...site level activities in 16 sites, and in-depth work in 10". Please clearly determine the number and name of the places to be targeted by this project (i.e. the name of 9 PAs were provided in the Response to GEF Comments) B) Change TA for INV under component 2.</p> <p>Component 3. A) Why is the project proposing to develop the Conservation Strategies of another 10 species under a different component? Why not simply add 10 to the 21 species under Component 1 for a total of 31?</p> <p>7-30-13 Outstanding issues properly addressed in revised PIF dated July 3, and the</p>	

		Cleared	
	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?	4-1-13 UNEP is bringing \$100,000 of co-financing (or 0.6%). UNEP needs to increase its co-financing.  5-28-13 Please increase UNEP contribution to \$200K as indicated in the Response to GEF Comments.  7-30-13 Outstanding issues properly addressed in revised PIF dated July 3, and the Response to GEF Comments. Cleared	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	4-1-13 It is 4.7% Cleared	
	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?	5-28-13 PPG is requested in the amount of \$100K which is within the norm for projects up to \$3M. Cleared	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	4-1-13 No. Cleared	
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?		

	responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
<b>Recommendation at PIF Stage</b>	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>4-2-13 No. Please address outstanding issues. THE COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS STATED IN THIS REVIEW REQUIRE SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES AND CAN NOT BE ADDRESS WITH SIMPLE CHANGE IN LANGUAJE. Thanks for your cooperation in the thorough review of this PIF</p> <p>5-28-13 No. Please address outstainging issues throughtout.</p> <p>7-30-13 Yes. This PIF is recommened for clearance.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Provide DETAIL list of activities per species and protected area. Use Annex 1 as template and include information on activities in a new colum. Please also include EXECUTING PARTNER in charge of the activities.	
<b>Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval</b>	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	April 02, 2013	
<b>Review Date (s)</b>	Additional review (as necessary)	May 28, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	July 30, 2013	

\* **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.**



