



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

GEF ID:	9579		
Country/Region:	Nicaragua		
Project Title:	Resilient Landscapes Management Project		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	160688 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1; BD-4 Program 9;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$136,986	Project Grant:	\$4,389,261
Co-financing:	\$21,946,305	Total Project Cost:	\$26,335,566
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>July 25, 2016:</p> <p>Climate change: Not quite. The project is generally aligned with CCM Objective 2, Program 4: Promote conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks in forest, and other land-use, and support climate smart agriculture. Please refer to the Climate Change Focal Area Strategy and Results Framework to specifically align the project's planned</p>	

¹ 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)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>intervention to the options under Program 4.</p> <p>Biodiversity: Not quite. Please note that the project text notes that the project will improve financial sustainability of the protected areas in question. Please review the GEF-6 BD strategy, program one, which has a very specific focus on GEF support to improve financial sustainability. If the project wishes to maintain this focus, then the appropriate design elements must be included and this has to be reflected in the GEF data sheet and in Table B. Please clarify this element of the project design.</p> <p>Please note for BD projects we expect a discussion of the contribution of the project to the relevant Aichi Biodiversity Targets.</p> <p>24 Aug 2016 Alignment with the GEF-6 strategies on both CCM and BD are still unclear. Linkage to the Aichi Target is also not clarified. The PM suggests that the task team to prepare an annex that describes the project linkages to the identified GEF programs.</p> <p>April 3, 2017</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Adequate revisions, cleared.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>July 25, 2016:</p> <p>Climate change: Not quite. The project appears to be aligned with the Nicaragua's climate change national strategies and plans. However, how the project fits within the overall picture of Nicaragua's efforts on REDD+, the Emissions Reduction Program for the Caribbean Coast, and the 20x20 Initiative, remains unclear. Please clarify.</p> <p>Biodiversity: Yes.</p> <p>24 Aug 2016 Adequate information has been provided.</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>July 25, 2016:</p> <p>Please elaborate on the issue of land tenure and the description of the inhabitants living inside and outside of the protected areas targeted.</p> <p>24 Aug 2016 Description on the drivers are very general (p.7). Please further elaborate on the identified drivers and justify</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>relevance of the project approach.</p> <p>Some information has been provided on the issue of land tenure and inhabitants.</p> <p>Innovation on landscape management approach is well recognized. Issue on sustainability and scaling could be further elaborated. Particularly, sustainability and scaling up of livelihood activities are unclear. Please further clarify on these elements.</p> <p>April 3, 2017</p> <p>Adequate revision, cleared.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>July 25, 2016:</p> <p>Please strengthen the incremental reasoning provided, which is currently quite generic and does not provide the specific context (the geographic, temporal and thematic baseline) which this investment will complement.</p> <p>Please clarify the relationship of the project to the US\$40 million government program called National Program for Strengthening the Resilience of Protected Areas and Biological Corridors and how the</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>GEF investment will complement this project.</p> <p>Please clarify the relation of the project to the GAFSP particularly regarding the contributions that the GAFSP makes to the baseline which the project will build upon and complement.</p> <p>The project fails to provide any economic justification or rationale for pursuing a sustainable livelihood strategy nor any analysis of why the approaches proposed such as bee-keeping or eco-tourism would succeed under these conditions when it has had very limited success in conservation historically. The project does not describe what the project strategy is for ensuring that what the project will offer will replace current destructive practices and not simply provide an additional resource management activity, in addition to the current suite of destructive practices that are currently being implemented. Finally, the project assumes markets exist for all these new products or services, with little evidence that, for example, the 11 protected areas would make suitable ecotourism destinations.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Under the GEF alternative, the resilient landscapes approach under component one seems to reach too far, including strengthening linkages between urban and rural development and strengthening linkages between small cities and the surrounding landscapes. Please clarify what is meant by this emphasis.</p> <p>Climate change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please clarify how the project will coordinate with the REDD+ Readiness work and build upon Nicaragua's previous experience using an incentives program. - Please clarify what forest, land and agriculture practices will be promoted through the project for climate change mitigation. - Given that success of this project depends on the success and sustainability of diversified livelihoods, please elaborate on this component -- what lessons learned from previous experiences in Nicaragua and elsewhere in Latin America can be applied? How will the project implement a permanent and sustainable model? - Please elaborate on the realistic scale up potential for ER investments and ER payments to be made in this area of Nicaragua after the project. 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>What resources will be available then or how will the project catalyze those future investments?</p> <p>24 Aug 2016</p> <p>Information on the baseline (i.e. current status and what has been done to date) and remaining gaps are still very limited. Brief information on baseline and gaps under each component will further strengthen relevance and justification for the suggested GEF alternative. Please provide necessary information.</p> <p>Brief information on the 3 selected regions and reasons for selection requires further elaboration. The PM suggests to prepare a brief annex on the biodiversity status of the 3 regions.</p> <p>It seems that not much change has been made on component 3 since the above comments on the issue of sustainable livelihood activities. Further clarification is required.</p> <p>Linkage and coordination with the REDD+ and the Emissions Reduction Program with the FCPF are going in the right direction in terms of analyzing the drivers of deforestation</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>and reference emissions levels and moving towards results-based payments. It would be useful if this project could pilot some of the groundwork needed for those initiatives. Please further clarify how the project initiative links to the larger REDD+ and ERP initiatives.</p> <p>April 3, 2017</p> <p>Adequate revision, cleared.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>July 25, 2016:</p> <p>Considering the funds available from the GEF and the project's co-financing, we urge the Agency to reflect on the appropriate scope and reach of the project, with special consideration to the challenges of strengthening "sustainable livelihoods inside and outside of the protected areas."</p> <p>Climate change: - Please provide an estimate for GHG emissions expected to be reduced by the whole project, as well as a description of the assumptions and methodology.</p> <p>24 Aug 2016</p> <p>BD coverage information and</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>considered adequate.</p> <p>GEF funding allocation to component 3 is still the largest and require further review, particularly considering that the approach that has been described is still rather weak with traditional approach that has not necessary proven efficient and effective.</p> <p>Thank you for providing the information on the GHG benefits estimate. It appears there is a typo in the document on p.21 where it states, "Consequently, the 5-year balance between emissions and removals during said period was 2,000 million tons of CO2e." I believe the amount should be 2 million tCO2e as explained further in the Annex. With regards to the estimate itself, we note that the estimate refers to the 5-year implementation period of the project. Our guidance is to report on lifetime emissions avoided, and for LULUCF projects lifetime length is defined to be 20 years, unless a different number of years is deemed appropriate. Please consider extending the number of years depending on the project itself and what can reasonably be ensured in terms of the longevity of the avoided deforestation impacts.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>April 3, 2017</p> <p>The analysis in Annex 4 is acceptable, however, it doesn't match the number in the project document under the Key Results listed in page 17. Please correct the discrepancy by CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>July 25, 2016: Please elaborate how the project incorporates relevant gender elements, will consult with CSOs, and will ensure the proper inclusion and involvement of indigenous peoples.</p> <p>Please note that the GEF STAP will shortly produce a guidance document with tools and methods for analyzing and measuring economic impacts of protected areas on communities and for identifying potential economic opportunities during project design. Please refer to this guidance during the project design phase.</p> <p>Please note that the project focus on providing support for the development of sustainable livelihood activities lends itself to implementing this project using experimental designs and randomized control groups. If the project team wishes to add this to the design of the project, small amounts of funds are available</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>from the biodiversity focal area set aside for this purpose. Please also refer to the STAP publication for guidance: "Experimental Project Designs in the Global Environment Facility".</p> <p>24 Aug 2016</p> <p>Gender - general information has been provided. Concrete measures to promote gender equality is expected at the time of CEO endorsement.</p> <p>Indigenous Peoples - IPs safeguard is triggered and linkage is clarified. FPIC and close consultation is expected during PPG, and have a concrete plan by the time of CEO endorsement.</p> <p>CSOs - please clarify.</p> <p>Experimental project design - is it correct to understand that the task team has opted out for the possibility?</p> <p>April 3, 2017</p> <p>Adequate revisions. Experimental project design would have to be incorporated at this stage in the project design with any additional funds required for the design and</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		implementation of such an approach provided from the biodiversity focal area set aside. This can not be added at a later date, therefore, we assume that the project has decided not to pursue this opportunity.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	<p>July 25, 2016: Yes. Nicaragua has a total STAR allocation of \$7,319,900. With this project, Nicaragua would leave a total of \$310 of its STAR allocation leftover.</p> <p>April 3, 2017</p> <p>The proposed request is within the amount of STAR Nicaragua has remaining.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	<p>July 25, 2016: Yes. Nicaragua's STAR allocation by focal area is \$4,472,142 for BD, \$2,000,000 for CC, and \$847,758 for LD. The project plans to use \$4,472,089 from BD, \$2,001,880 from CC, and \$845,621 from LD. The slight differences are within the flexibility norm.</p> <p>April 3, 2017</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	<p>July 25, 2016</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	July 25, 2016 NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	July 25, 2016 NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>July 25, 2016: Not at this time. Please address all comments raised above in a revised document.</p> <p>Please re-submit Letter of Endorsement with the correct amounts.</p> <p>Please address the following comments on the datasheet:</p> <p>1) The project agency fee on the first box should match the total on Table D. (\$622,707).</p> <p>2) Please ensure that the co-financing listed in Table C has been discussed with the co-financiers listed, specifically regarding the EU's and Switzerland's contributions.</p> <p>3) The total PPG amount requested in Table E should match the total grant amount only, not including agency fee (\$129,750).</p> <p>4) Please fill out GHG emissions estimated to be reduced in Table F.</p> <p>24 Aug 2016 The GEFSEC could technically clear</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the project, pending receipt of revised PCN and GEF datasheet that adequately reflects our comments. Please address all comments raised above and below, and provide a revised PCN and GEF Datasheet with revised/additional information.</p> <p>On the comments on the datasheet that was provided on 25 July:</p> <p>1) Not revised. Please revise the amount in the first box.</p> <p>2) It is recognized all cofinancing is in-kind. Please kindly review this situation. Some cash cofinance is expected (even though it does not go through the Bank, i.e. parallel cofinance).</p> <p>3) Not revised. In Table E, PPG amount requested should be \$128,750 not \$142,076. There is a number at the top of Table E that says "Project Preparation Grant amount requested: \$142,076" and then "PPG Agency Fee: 12,326," so the first number should be 129,750, the total for the grant itself rather than the total with the agency fee.</p> <p>4) GHG emission estimate is now included. Biodiversity targets between table B and F are inconsistent. Please review and revise to ensure consistency.</p> <p>5) Project management cost (PMC)</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>should not be a different project component, but added at the end of Table B, Monitoring and evaluation can be kept under a separate project component.</p> <p>6) Please revise Table D. There is mistake on the amount under Biodiversity (missing two zeros)</p> <p>April 3, 2017</p> <p>Yes. The PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	July 25, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 24, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 03, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ 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.