



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

GEF ID:	5355		
Country/Region:	Moldova		
Project Title:	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into Territorial Planning Policies and Land-Use Practices		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5259 (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:	\$958,904
Co-financing:	\$4,850,000	Total Project Cost:	\$5,808,904
PIF Approval:	August 28, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Yoko Watanabe	Agency Contact Person:	Maxim Vergeichik

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 ?	Yes, Moldova has ratified the CBD and eligible for GEF BD finance.	Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, an endorsement dated 19 Feb 2013 signed by the GEF OFP is attached.	Yes.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, the GEF-5 BD allocation is \$1.5 million, and the remaining BD allocation to Moldova is \$1100000. The project will use 100% of the GEF-5 BD allocation.	Yes, no change since PIF approval.
	• the focal area allocation?	Refer above.	Yes, no change since PIF approval.
	• the LDCF under the principle of	n/a	n/a

*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)
	equitable access		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	n/a	n/a
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>	<p>Yes, it is in line with BD2. On the linkage with the Aichi targets, please also clarify the number of the target (e.g. target 1 on....) that the project will contribute to.</p>	<p>The project is generally in line with BD2, however, please note comments provided below and revise the approaches as appropriate. Please also provide the planned target figure (i.e. number of policies and plans) in table A.</p> <p>6 Jan 2014 Revised adequately.</p>
	<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>	<p>Yes, the project is in line with the priority identified under the NBSAP and other relevant national policies and programs.</p> <p>Moldova has not worked on the NPFE.</p>	<p>The project is found to be in line with the NBSAP and other key strategies and plans. The development of the updated NBSAP is noted in the relevant section, however it is unclear whether the proposed project is in line with this updated NBSAP. Please confirm.</p> <p>6 Jan 2014 Revised and necessary information provided.</p>
	<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>While number of related activities by the government ministries and agencies are noted in the relevant section, it is hard to understand how the proposed project and the baseline activities would coordinate and work together. Please further clarify how they are interlinked and coordinated.</p> <p>26 Aug 2013 UA:</p>	<p>While additional information has been provided on related activities, it is hard to understand how the proposed project would coordinate and work together with these initiatives. Please clarify further details on the coordination mechanism.</p> <p>6 Jan 2014</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		Further details are expected at the time of CEO endorsement.	Revised and necessary information provided.
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>The project design is largely in line with the PIF that was submitted by the country during GEF-4. The project framework is sufficiently robust but could be improved by considering the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include all the key GEBs, including mainstreaming coverage target in the framework. 2. Develop activities to ensure financial sustainability of the initiatives. 3. Further clarify the incentive mechanism for the farmers and other stakeholders to promote BD friendly land use. 	<p>The project framework and description are rather confusing and requires further clarity and revision. Some of the terminologies that are used are not commonly used and sometimes confusing, and require further explanation or revision. In general, the project design provides strong approaches for land management (LD benefits) rather than biodiversity (BD), which needs to be reviewed and revised:</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is unclear what it means to monitor "acceptable limits of change in biodiversity important areas." How is "acceptable" defined and what would be the criteria? - It is also unclear what the "Passport" approach is. Please clarify. - Baseline information for indicators are required at the time of CEO approval. Please provide the necessary information. - On the third outcome (i.e, increased knowledge and skills..), the PM assume that this is to increase capacity on "concrete tools and approaches" to mitigate/prevent/offset impacts, not to "apply criteria" as it is stated at this point. Please clarify.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>- Role of private sector is briefly noted, but unclear with their roles and involvement. Please further specify what roles are expected and how they are going to be involved in this project.</p> <p>Component 2:</p> <p>- Please clarify what "decision support system" means in this context.</p> <p>- Indicator: Population of grass species: would it be coverage or density? Again, baseline information is required at this stage.</p> <p>- Removal of invasive species is a very costly and in most cases, inefficient methods for land rehabilitation. The areas that are covered through this project is also very limited. It also unclear why 25% of invasive species can be left. Learning from experiences from other projects, the PM has major concern on this activity and requests to review/revise the approach.</p> <p>- Other activities, including erosion control, hay production, rotational grazing, should also be viewed and approached from the effectiveness of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, rather than productivity and land management. Please review and revise.</p> <p>- GEF does not finance afforestation activities. The entire initiative to</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>develop corridors through afforestation can not be supported by GEF finance.</p> <p>6 Jan 2014 Additional information has been provided on all comments above. On afforestation, it is now clarified that it is in fact reforestation activity. While this was noted at the time of PIF approval, reforestation activities could include variety of approaches (not only planting), and includes regeneration and effective management practices. Planting trees are often costly and unsustainable and the GEF supports the activity only when strong justifications are provided and sustainability is ensured. From the perspective of biodiversity significance, most or all of the species that are currently recognized are not globally threatened, and it is hard to understand the need to do plantation for biodiversity benefits. Based on internal discussion, we are in the opinion to encourage revisiting the activity and see feasibility to introduce effective management practices with the communities for regeneration. While we recognize the importance of the overall project approach and management of the corridor to connect the two PAs are well recognized, we would encourage to review and revise this particular activity. The PM is available for further discussion as needed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>The GEB is sufficiently clear, including coverage and species conservation target.</p>	<p>Biodiversity benefits of this project is rather unclear. Table 1 includes more LD and CC benefits than BD. Please clearly articulate BD benefits, and LD and CC benefits should be considered/viewed as co-benefits rather than central focus of this project. Please make a major revision to clarify this point.</p> <p>As for site selection and description, it is also important to further clarify and provide summary on the BD importance of these areas.</p> <p>6 Jan 2014 Revised and necessary information provided.</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>Although this project should and could have a major benefit to the communities and land users that are involved in the project, the description provided both on socio-economic benefits and gender elements are very general and lack specificity. Please kindly provide further details.</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>The public participation section is rather general. Please further elaborate existing CSOs and farmers association that the project may collaborate.</p>	<p>As noted also at the time of PIF approval, please provide further information on this element.</p> <p>6 Jan 2014 Revised and necessary information provided.</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.,</p>	<p>Yes, it is sufficiently described at this stage. Further details are expected at the time of CEO endorsement.</p>	<p>The risk of involvement and participation of land users is not sufficiently covered. What are the incentives and activities that the project would implement to ensure active</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	measures to enhance climate resilience)		<p>participation of the local communities/land users and mitigate potential risk?</p> <p>6 Jan 2014 Revised and necessary information provided.</p>
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>As noted above, please further clarify how the project will build on the "baseline projects" and coordinated.</p> <p>The complementarity of the project with the ongoing GEF PA project is well noted.</p>	<p>As also noted above, please clarify the coordination mechanism.</p> <p>6 Jan 2014 Revised and necessary information provided.</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>The innovative element is well taken.</p> <p>The financial sustainability of the project initiative is expected to be further elaborated.</p> <p>On the scaling up/replication, the project could highlight the role of development of the legislation/policies at the national level.</p>	<p>As noted above, afforestation/reforestation elements can not be considered as innovation. Please further articulate and revise the section on innovation.</p>
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		<p>Details provided on the project approaches are rather questionable for GEF financing (including afforestation, reforestation, and eradication of invasive species on the ground). Please kindly revise the approach, and the PM would be pleased to provide further information and discuss as necessary.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		While the description under the concerned section is relevant and sufficient, as noted above, the cost effectiveness of some of the project approaches is questionable. Please kindly review.
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?	Cofinancing is identified at 1 to 5 and considered adequate.	Yes, cofinancing remains 1 to 5 and considered appropriate.
	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?	Yes, considered adequate. UNDP's cash cofinance is limited to \$40000. The cash cofinancing from the government is noted and welcome.	Cofinancing letters for all cofinance are provided.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	It is less than 10% and considered adequate.	It is exactly 10% and proportionate - considered appropriate.
	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?	Yes, it is within the norm. 26 Aug 2013 UA: PM recommends PPG for CEO approval.	Yes, adequate report has been provided. However, it is noted that spent amount to date is less than 10% and raises some concern. Please confirm all committed amounts will be paid soon.
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	n/a

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes, duly completed TT is provided.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes, adequate plan has been provided.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		n/a
	• Convention Secretariat?		n/a
	• The Council?		n/a
	• Other GEF Agencies?		n/a
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>No, please address the comments raised above, including the issue of baseline and incentives.</p> <p>10 May 2013 All issues were addressed in the revised PIF. The PM has technically cleared the PIF. However, this MSP PIF will be processed for CEO approval only once the GEF-5 financial status is clarified.</p> <p>26 August 2013 UA: Availability of STAR funds has been confirmed.</p> <p>The MSP and PPG are recommend for CEO clearance/approval.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		No, please address the comments raised above and resubmit a revised package.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>6 Jan 2014 No, please review under item 7 above and revise the CEO endorsement oackage as appropriate. The PM is available for further clarification and discussion as needed.</p> <p>13 Feb 2015 Yes, adequate revision has been made to the approach and necessary information has been provided. The PM recommends this project for CEO approval.</p>
	First review*	April 12, 2013	November 15, 2014
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	May 10, 2013	January 06, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 26, 2013	February 13, 2015

* **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.**