



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	<b>9606</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Madagascar</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Conservation and Sustainable used of biological diversity in the North-western Landscape (Boeny region) - Madagascar</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>CI</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Biodiversity</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-1 Program 1; BD-4 Program 9;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$100,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$6,817,431</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$10,816,936</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$17,634,367</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jaime Cavalier</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Orissa Samaroo</b>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	7-30-16 Yes. BD-1 P1 and BD-4 P9. Aichi Targets on page 12. Cleared	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	7-30-16 Yes. See page 26 of PIF. Cleared	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental	7-30-16 Yes. Page 11 and 22 of PIF.	

<sup>1</sup> 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Cleared	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>7-30-16 Although the information of the baseline projects (p.14-15), and co-financing (p.19-20) are in the PIF, the incremental reasoning is weak. The project needs to build a cleared and more robust argumentation as of how the GEF project will provide incremental funding for the activities in and outside of the PAs. The incremental reasoning for activities inside the PAs, should clearly show how the funds will improve the financials of the PAs and outside, how the proposed activities will improve the livelihoods of the communities living along the perimeters and/or insider the PAs.</p> <p>9-16-16 Addressed in the revised PIF dates 7-25-16 and the Response Matrix Cleared</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>7-30-16</p> <p>Although the objectives within and outside the Protected Areas, the project requires some clarifications and to elaborate on some technical aspects. While the combination of activities inside the protected areas</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>and in the wider landscape is the right one, the level of investment necessary to achieve the goals do not "add-up". The project does not sell well that the investments will be sufficient to achieve the goals. Although there is a baseline project and co-financing, a better case needs to be made to convince that the objectives of the two components can be achieved. This is particularly true for component 2, where it is difficult to visualize if the proposed activities and investments can really make a difference for the local communities in and around the PA and put a break into the degradation of the PAs. Addressing the needs of the local communities in such a large area is challenging. Unless the GEF investments are not incremental to a program well funded by Government on Agriculture and Forestry (baseline projects), the GEF investments will be spread out and become insufficient to deliver tangible and measurable results on the ground. The comments made about Outcomes and Outputs, need to be addressed in Table B to the extent possible, but MAINLY in the body of the PIF (p. 16-18).</p> <p>1. There is no Objective on Table A.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>2. The geographic and thematic scopes of the project are very wide for the level of GEF funding. As currently presented the project is overpromising and likely of under-delivering. Need to narrow down the proposed activities (or proposed geographic targets) to make this project viable. Unless the in-kind co-financing is not fully aligned with the objectives of the project (as in doing exactly as the project would do if the GEF could provide all necessary funding), this project is unlikely to deliver durable and tangible results on the ground.</p> <p>3. Budget for Component 1. It is not clear how the project will achieve outcomes 1 (management plans revised and implemented) and outcome 2 (improve financial sustainability) when \$4.5 million are going to the Trust Fund, out of the \$4.9 allocated to the component. Or is that the proceeds of the investment of the \$4.5 million (\$150K) will be used to achieve the other outputs in the component? If that is the case, only about \$30K/PA x year would be available for these outputs including the implementation of the management plans (these are INV not TA in Table B). When considering</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>that gap between the current funding (\$2.4M) and the needs (\$3.8M) to cover the recurrent cost of the management of these areas is (\$1.4M -Table 1 p. 13), the revenues of the \$4.5M will be make very little difference in the overall budget of the 5 PAs. In order to fully understand the financials of these PAs, the GEF Secretariat suggests providing a clearer view of the current funding, financial needs and sources of funding for the PAs. There is information scattered in Table 1 (p.13) and Co-financing (p.19-20). Although full financial sustainability is not expected at this moment, it is necessary to understand how this GEF project contributes to this effort.</p> <p>4. Outcome 1.3 Is it necessary to make separate investments in conservation plans for the 3 species, when investments will be made for the management plans of the 5 PAs? If these species management plants do not have funding for implementation, they are unlikely to be executed making the investment of producing the plans a waste.</p> <p>5. Component 2. Although it is about fostering sustainable agricultural and forest production in PA surrounding</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>areas as a pillar of the North-western management scheme, no interventions are proposed to achieve this objective. Can this be achieved with the proposed outputs (i.e. identification of habitats, communications and capacity building tools, M&amp;E, control and enforcement)? What co-financiers listed in Table C going to support agriculture and forestry with mostly in-kind contributions?</p> <p>6. Outcome 2.1. Not clear why the project wants to identify key habitats around the PAs for the regional management scheme. Why more studies? Aren't the entire perimeters of the PAs subject to pressure?</p> <p>7. There is a disconnect between paragraphs 43, 44 and 45. One does not follow the other.</p> <p>8. Outcome 2.1. The proceeds of the \$500K to set up a small credit mechanism may be inadequate to tackle the scale of the problem. If the proceeds are \$20K/year and this has to be divided by the 5 PAs, that means an average of \$4K/PA x year. If one were to calculate the investment along the perimeters of the PAs, the investment per KM appear small. For instance, for</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Ankarafantsika NP with an area of 1,305 Km<sup>2</sup> and assuming a circular shape (that gives the minimum perimeter), the perimeter would be 125 Km and the investment per year would be \$ 32/km x year. Is this investment likely to make a difference for the communities sitting around the PA? The GEF suggest making a realistic calculation of the potential investments along the perimeters of the PAs and set a fundraising target for the project to meet the demands.</p> <p>9. Table C. Co-financing. Disaggregate the co-financiers under "Other". Each co-financier needs to provide an indicative co-financing and a Letter of Co-financing at CEO Endorsement. If there is uncertainty, please do not include. And include only those co-financiers that have been contacted and are aware of the co-financing they are associated with the PIF.</p> <p>10. The co-financing for JICA is for 11 regions. Only include here the co-financing for the target region (Boeny)</p> <p>11. Paragraph 52. Please remove proposed or suggested activities for which there is no solid bases to</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>consider them viable (i.e. ecotourism, sustainable use of flora and fauna", "ecotourism"). That only reduces the credibility of the PIF.</p> <p>Please take time to consider these general and specific comments. The GEF remains available for consultation.</p> <p>9-16-16 Please review financials on Table B. Total Project Cost" (Subtotal + PMC) should be \$6,817,431. Nevertheless, when adding all values under GEF Project Financing in Table B, the total is \$7,142,070.</p> <p>Please also review the claim of the contribution of Madagascar to the global biodiversity (p. 5) and the number of municipalities in Table B (outputs of Component 2)</p> <p>1-11-17 While the components of the project are clearly and point in the right direction, the co-financing is unlikely to allow the project to deliver the proposed outputs and outcomes. The GEF request the Government of Madagascar and the Agency to explore additional sources of co-financing relevant to the proposed</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>interventions. Of particular concern is the co-financing for Component 2. Without sufficient funding, it is unlikely to deliver durable results on the ground. The needs of the local communities (which are numerous) are significant and a shortage of investments on the part of the GEF and others (local and regional governments) is unlikely to make a difference in the long run. If solutions are found for some others will continue with their practices threatening the gains obtained with the beneficiaries.</p> <p>3-13-17 Cleared</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>7-30-16 Cleared</p>	
	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>7-30-16 Yes. There are BD \$9.6M as of today to cover this \$6.8M project Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>7-301-6 No. Please address outstanding issues under items 4 and 5. Thanks.</p> <p>9-16-16 No. Please review outstanding issues under item 5.</p> <p>1-11-17 No. Please address issue of co-financing as described under item 5.</p> <p>3-13-17 Cleared</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	July 30, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 16, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 23, 2016	

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.