



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

GEF ID:	5351		
Country/Region:	Madagascar		
Project Title:	Strengthening the Network of New Protected Areas in Madagascar including New Protected Areas with Mangrove Ecosystems		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	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-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$113,000	Project Grant:	\$3,905,265
Co-financing:	\$12,200,000	Total Project Cost:	\$16,218,265
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Edoardo Zandri

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 ?	4-9-13 Yes. Madagascar is eligible for funding. Cleared	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	4-9-13 Yes. There is a LoE signed by the GEF OFP for the amount of \$4,400,000. That is the amount needed to cover the project, including Agency Fees and PPG. Cleared	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	4-9-13 Yes. There is enough STAR allocation to support this project.	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	4-9-13 Yes. The balance in BD STAR (\$23,312,000) is enough to cover this project (\$4,000,000). 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	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <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>	4-9-13 Yes. BD-1, and Aichi Targets 5,6,11 and 14. Cleared	
	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?	4-3-13 The list of National Strategies, plans and reports is pretty comprehensive. Thanks. Please list only those where there is explicit reference to the "New Protected Areas" (NPAs), which are at the core of this project. Links or page numbers on these documents would be ideal but not necessary. This information would facilitate the presentation of the project to the CEO and GEF Council as appropriate. Thanks. 4-12-13 Please see reponse from UNEP and partners.	

Project Design	<p>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?</p>	<p>4-9-13 Thanks for providing detailed information on the baseline for the 9 NPAs. Some observations and requests: 1. Although all the 9 NPAs have a "promoter", not all have funding available as baseline. GEF SEC assumes that the amounts under "Current Annual Investments from actor" in Annex 1, are the investments/year, and will be used as co-financing. The sum of investments over the next 4 years in the 9 NPs is \$1,224,000 when adding all investments over the next 4 years. The co-financing in Table C (excluding the National Government) is far greater (\$11.3M). Please clarify the difference. 2. In the baseline at the national Level, there is only reference to the work on updating the Protected Area Code. There is no reference to the baseline investments on the activities to strengthen the National Protected Area System. But there is co-financing in the amount of \$3,000,000. Please clarify.</p> <p>4-12-13 Please see reponse from UNEP and partners. Cleared</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>4-9-13 General Component 1. 1) It is not clear how the National Protected Area System will be strengthening with the proposed activities. Will training in PA management suffice for this purpose?</p> <p>Component 2. 1) It is not clear how the \$2.7m from</p>	

	<p>addition to work on obtaining definitive protected area status. One of the proposed activities is to "help develop alternative livelihoods by promoting investments in compatible socio-economic activities". Please clearly articulate what this means. What are these "alternative livelihoods"? If there were alternatives, why the local people have not taken advantage? How this project aims at securing the biodiversity conservation inside of these NPAs is the weakest part of the project. Please elaborate on the actual activities to be carried out and HOW they relate to conservation of BD.</p> <p>2) Not clear how NPAs can increase management effectiveness when all the funds allocated to the Component (GEF \$2.7M + Co-financing \$7M) are for Technical Assistance). Are there no needs for Investments in these NPAs? What is the level of protection and enforcement on these NPAs?</p> <p>3) Please add the IUCN category of the NPAs in Annex 1.</p> <p>Component 3</p> <p>Not sure the proposed activities can secure sustainability. What does really require for a PA to have a chance at supporting itself in the socio-economic environment of Madagascar? Please translate those needs into activities, as appropriate.</p> <p>4-12-13</p> <p>Please see response from UNEP and partners.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
--	---	--

	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>4-9-13 GEBs are identified for each of the NPAs in Annex 1. Would be possible to provide a map with the location of the NPAs and a bibliographic reference where the 93 NPAs were listed?</p> <p>4-12-13 Please see reponse from UNEP and partners. Cleared</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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>4-9-13 Public participation is mentioned under the Activities to be funded by the GEF (Annex 1). Do the communities inside and around the target NPAs know this project is being considered for funding?</p> <p>4-12-13 Please see reponse from UNEP and partners. 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>4-9-13 The risks and proposed measures listed on p. 9 could apply to any project in Madagascar or other developing country. Please provide country- and NPA-specific information on the risks and mitigation measures. What is the risk that these NPAs do not get formal legal status? Once they do, what is the risk that these areas, due to their nature (IUCN IV,</p>	

		<p>communities unsustainably, simply because natural resources become limited Do these NPAs really have a chance at protecting biodiversity?</p> <p>4-12-13 Please see reponse from UNEP and partners. Cleared</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>4-9-13 There is a long list of projects in Madagascar. Was there any attempt to coordinate the preparation of this PIF with any of the projects listed on p. 10.? What projects are worth coordinating with because of geographic and/or thematic overlaps?</p> <p>4-12-13 Please see reponse from UNEP and partners. 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 for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>4-9-13 Innovation: Not much global innovation. Perhaps some innovation at the national level with the use of NPAs. Sustainability: Not clear how the sustainability of these NPAs will be secured by means of i) financial strategies, ii) implementation Decree for the new PA management code. What other activities were considered and worth mentioning again in this context? Scaling up: If successful, this project has the potential to be replicated in the other 84 NPAs.</p> <p>4-12-13 Please see reponse from UNEP and partners. Cleared</p>	

	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?	<p>4-9-13 Yes. Assuming co-financing becomes readily available during project implementation. Do the co-financiers know they have been included in this PIF with the co-financing amounts listed in Table C? Please see comment under item 6 on co-financing when summing amounts in Annex 1 and comparing ot with Table C.</p> <p>4-12-13 Please see reponse from UNEP and partners. Cleared</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>4-9-13 UNEP brings \$200K in co-financing. Cleared</p>	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>4-9-13 It is 4.5 of the Total Project cost. Cleared</p>	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification	<p>4-9-13 No. Cleared</p>	

	with project design needs? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	4-9-13 No. Cleared	
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?	4-9-13 No. Please address outstanding issues under 5-13. Thanks. 4-12-12 Yes. This PIF is technically cleared.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	April 09, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 12, 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.**