



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

GEF ID:	5486		
Country/Region:	Madagascar		
Project Title:	A Landscape Approach to Conserving and Managing Threatened Biodiversity in Madagascar with a Focus on the Atsimo-Andrefana Spiny and Dry Forest Landscape		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5263 (UNDP)
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:	\$5,329,452
Co-financing:	\$26,050,000	Total Project Cost:	\$31,379,452
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Fabiana Issler

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 ?	8-06-13 Yes. Madagascar is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	8-06-13 Yes. There is a LoE for \$6M signed by the GEF OFP on July 25, 2013. The PIF+PPG+ Agency fees are \$6M. Cleared	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	8-6-13 Yes. Madagascar has a BD balance of	

*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)
		\$9.5M as of today. Sufficient to cover this \$6M project. Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	8-6-13 Yes. Madagascar has a BD allocation of \$95M as of today. Sufficient to cover this \$6M project. Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	NA	
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>	8-6-13 Yes. The project will contribute to Objective 2 of the GEF5 Focal Area Strategy (BD2), "Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors". The project will contribute to Madagascar's achievement of the Aichi Targets No. 5, 11, 12, 14 & 15. Cleared	
	<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>	8-6-13 Yes. As stated in the project, this project "...is supportive of the 1990 National Environment Charter (PNAE), the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (from 1997 and currently being update/revised to incorporate the Aichi Targets), and the principles of the Environment Programme III (2005). Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	6. 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?	8-7-13 Yes. See details on p. 7. Cleared	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	8-7-13 Questions: Component 1 (Effective Landscape-level Conservation Mainstreaming). According to the PIF (p.9), "The project will develop a multi-sectoral land use management framework, including a compliance monitoring and enforcement system, to ensure that development in production sectors such as agriculture, forestry, extractive industries, energy production and transport, is congruent with biodiversity conservation needs". i) While all this sounds good on paper, and very appropriate, is it realistic? This proposition runs the risk of overpromising an under-delivering. Is there a role model in Madagascar or in the region that this project is following? ii) What are the chances that this "multi-sectoral land use management framework" is adopted and follow through by the agriculture, forestry, extractive industries, energy production and transport sectors?	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>iii) This plan appears to be too ambitious, even for a country that has all the necessary capacity for its development, monitoring and enforcement. Is there an alternative and less ambitious proposition to make that would still make a difference on the ground?</p> <p>Component 2. (Community-based Conservation and Sustainable Use operationalized. "Work under this Component will ensure the incorporation of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into local communities' production activities and land and resource management practices"</p> <p>i) As in Component 1, this sounds perfectly reasonable. But, is its realistic? Are there actual, economically viable and tested ways for incorporating conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into local communities' production activities?</p> <p>ii) Although "CCAs represent a globally tested model for achieving conservation results" what is the experience so far with the "Community Conservation Areas (CCA) in Madagascar, and with the AFO MIHAavo network of locally based CSOs, in particular?</p> <p>iii) Are there actual, and economically viable "Livelihood activities" that can be "managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity and its use within sustainability thresholds, but</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>equally the generation of socio-economic benefits". If these activities exist, why have they not been tested before? In the Terminal Evaluation of the Madagascar Environment Programme III (PIMS 2762), one of the determinants of 'success' for achieving lasting conservation results is the Capacity of resource users to achieve tangible improvements in their income or well-being on the basis of conservation-compatible". Did this happen? What were the activities that resulted in improving "tangible improvements in their income or well-being"?</p> <p>8-20-13 Properly addressed in the Response to GEF Comments and revised PIF. 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>8-7-13 Yes. See details on page 3 and 4. Cleared</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>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>8-7-13 Yes. As stated in the PIF, Fondation TANY MEVA and SAGE are the project proponents, and the role of these two CSOs in implementing the project will be</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>confirmed following an in-depth capacity assessment that will be carried out during further project preparation.</p> <p>8-20-13 Properly addressed in the Response to GEF Comments and revised PIF. Cleared</p>	
	<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>	<p>8-7-13 Please elaborate on the risk of private sector in the agriculture, forestry, extractive industries, energy production and transport sectors, not buying into the proposed "Multi-sector land use management framework". This framework may go against their short term interests. Could they derail the process or not comply with the decisions? What is the capacity of the Central and Local governments to enforce decisions agreed in the framework?</p> <p>8-20-13 Properly addressed in the Response to GEF Comments and revised PIF. Cleared</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>8-7-13 Yes. See page 12 for details. Cleared</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <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 	<p>8-6-13 Yes. As stated in the project, "The sustainability elements of the project derive from two aspects. First, the concerted landscape governance approach, involving public, private and CSO actors in biodiversity mainstreaming. Second, the socio-</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>economic benefits that the project is expected to generate through livelihoods activities. On the later, Fondation TANY MEVA's revolving Fund is a key instrument in securing financial sustainably and encouraging communities to establish community funds". Specific elements of capacity building for achieving sustainability are embedded in the results framework: First, output 1.1 (Spatial Planning) will focus on building the capacity of Ministry of Environment and Forests (MEF) and other partners at the national regional, district and commune levels to undertake biodiversity spatial planning. Second, outputs 1.2 and 1.3 (Threat Management and Landscape Governance) will develop the capacity to apply the mitigation hierarchy to safeguard biodiversity with respect to road development, oil & mining developments, and large scale agricultural projects. Third, output 2.3 (Local Capacity for BD Management) will focus on capacity development activities including: (i) PA planning and ecological monitoring; (ii) resource use governance; (iii) enforcement and conflict resolution; (iv) management of bush-fire and other hazards; and (v) inclusive benefit sharing.</p> <p>Innovation is embedded in the novelty of the project's landscape approach and the move away from site based work to addressing diffuse and indirect threats to biodiversity from both the economically emerging sectors in Madagascar and from</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>communities' subsistence activities. Another innovation aspect pertains to the PA approach to community conservation and its link to the internationally recognised ICCAs. This is also not sufficiently tried in Madagascar. The BD LUP use of technology and the PAG terroir approach also bring innovation in terms of how they intertwine the spatial, socio-economic and ecological dimensions, while fostering participation, both remotely and on the ground</p> <p>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 approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
Project Financing	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>8-7-13 Yes. Assuming all the co-funding (cash and in-kind) becomes effective during project execution. Cleared</p>	
	<p>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?</p>	<p>8-7-13 Yes. There is co-financing in the amount of \$26.5M from The National and Local Governments, a CSO and the GEF Agency. Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	8-7-13 Yes. It is 4.5% and the co-financing ratio for PM is 1:5 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?	8-7-13 There is a request for \$150,000 for PPG and that is within the norm (\$150K for projects up to \$6M). Cleared	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan 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. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	8-7-13 No. Please address outstanding issues. When resubmitting the PIF, please provide a response to comments (as has	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>been the practice so far) and highlight in the PIF the new text addressing the issues brought up during the review process. That will expedite the second review. Thanks.</p> <p>8-20-13 Yes. PIF is recommended for clearance. Cleared</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	August 07, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 20, 2013	
	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.**