



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

GEF ID:	5354		
Country/Region:	Madagascar		
Project Title:	Participatory Sustainable Land Management in the Grassland Plateaus of Western Madagascar		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$1,584,931
Co-financing:	\$5,345,800	Total Project Cost:	\$7,130,731
PIF Approval:	June 10, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Adamou Bouhari

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Date of UNCCD Signature: October 14, 1994 Date of Ratification: June 25, 1997 Effective Date: September 23 1997	Addressed at PIF level.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Addressed.	Addressed.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	The GEF grant (\$1,642,500) is within the LD resources available for Madagascar. We invite the GEF agency to check with the OFP if the project amount cannot be optimized. Actually, Madagascar has a LD allocation of \$2.88 million;	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>\$1,035,000 have been programmed for the GEF Small Grants Program. \$202,500 are still available.</p> <p>If it is possible to increase the project amount, we suggest to use this additional resources to increase the investments on the ground (component 2) close to \$1 million - and more if possible.</p> <p>May 21, 2013 Addressed.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	Addressed.	Addressed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	NA	NA
<b>Strategic Alignment</b>	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</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. the project is fully compatible with the LD1 objective related to agriculture.</p>	<p>Addressed.</p>
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE,</p>	<p>The project contributes to the implementation of the NAP developed under UNCCD.</p> <p>Bongolava is one of the regions in need of support that is identified in the 5th</p>	<p>Since the PIF, the NAP has been aligned with the 10 year Strategy. The project still fits with the NAP priorities, as well as the new National Development Plan (2015).</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	national report (2011). The project fits also with the Bongolava Regional Rural Development Plan.  Addressed.	Addressed.
Project Design	6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b> , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	A brief analysis of the situation is proposed, describing the problems.  However, the contents of the baseline activities (notably from cofinancing) need to be developed and clarified. We have to understand better how the GEF will be used on the top of these existing initiatives.  Moreover, we would like to see a brief description of the kind of conservation agriculture that is promoted through the GSDM. Some references might be added to reinforce the scientific robustness of the PIF idea.  May 21, 2013 Addressed.	The project focused on 1) the weak local institutional and individual capacities, 2) unsustainable practices on NR, 3) the lack of knowledge management and dissemination approaches.  Addressed.
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	- General comment on the project framework: We do not have any objection on a project with three components, plus management costs. We invite the agency to focus on results on the ground, and give a more important part to the component two.  - Output 1.1.1: Effective participatory land management committee in 7 communes: Please confirm the sustainability of this output. What will happen once the project will have closed.	- Please use some metrics to include in the result framework. We would like to see the number of ha at last, the number of beneficiaries (with disaggregated data per gender), a number of SLM technologies.  2.1.1. Implementation of agreed measures: the formulation is not an output. Please be more accurate about the nature of activities and a way to quantify it.  2.1.2. Interim support to socio-economic

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>- Please clarify the output 1.1.2 "participative understanding of the baseline". It is expected that the baseline will be defined during the project preparation (PPG).</p> <p>- It is not clear if the component 2 will deliver concrete results on the ground beyond training. Please include an indicator in area (number of ha under SLM or conservation agriculture) as well as an indicator in terms of beneficiaries (Number of persons trained for instance). Some social monitoring might be proposed, if possible (income increase for instance).</p> <p>May 21, 2013 We suggest to maintain the three indicators for the component 2: Nb of ha under SLM, Nb of persons trained, and change in household revenues in the 7 communes.</p> <p>All other points are cleared.</p>	<p>activities (whilst waiting for benefits of SLM interventions): We do not understand the output. Please explain what the cofinancing finances and what the GEF finances. Please, refer to activities mentioned in the GEF5 strategies under the LD Program 1.</p> <p>2.1.3. Please explain the linkages with SLM (training for business development?).</p> <p>2.1.4. We would hope more technical and quantitative details on this output (results from the PPG and the TT?).</p> <p>June 16, 2016 Most of the points have been addressed, but the changes have not consistently been reported in the different documents. Maybe it would be better to produce a consolidated project document rather than sending 31 files (!). Please, check the request for CEO endorsement, the formulation of the outputs 2.1.1, 2.1.2, and 2.1.3, and 2.1.4 have not been updated; We did not find quantitative and technical information for the output 2.1.4. We did not find more information in the section 5 on the activities financed by the cofinancing.</p> <p>September 16, 2016 Addressed. But at inception workshop and in the future project reports, please provide carbon information in tons of CO2 to allow comparison, and detail the technical information (assumptions, soil</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			management techniques, for instance).
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>No. The text is too general. Please provide a better description of GEB at PIF stage.</p> <p>At CEO endorsement, we expect some metrics, baseline values, and targets (Number of hectares under conservation agriculture, Nb of beneficiaries, carbon measurements, soil fertility, income increase, for instance).</p> <p>May 21, 2013</p> <p>The section has been slightly completed. At CEO endorsement, we expect some metrics, baseline values, and targets (Number of hectares under conservation agriculture, Nb of beneficiaries, carbon measurements, soil fertility, income increase, for instance).</p>	<p>Please check the comments above made at PIF level. The PIF was very light in terms of quantitative information. We specifically asked for more quantitative information to collect during the PPG. We need a baseline, and measurable targets: number of hectares under different SLM practices, eventually the equivalent in carbon if feasible, the change in land productivity, the improved farmer income, etc.</p> <p>September 19, 2016 Addressed.</p>
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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?		September 19, 2016 Addressed.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	The GDSM is of course mentioned, but this group is not included in the executing partners (see table p1 in the part 1 "project information"). We invite the GEF agency to explore during the PPG different options for implementation and work, as far as possible, with local partners on the ground.	Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>At PIF stage, please confirm that operational partnerships will be elaborated to increase the chances of success.</p> <p>May 21, 2013 addressed.</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>Some risks are mentioned. A comprehensive risk assessment is expected at CEO endorsement.</p>	<p>The risk assessment stays rudimentary. Please identify better the risks and the mitigation measures. Also include the environmental/ecological risks.</p> <p>June 16, 2016 Addressed.</p>
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>See section A4 coordination. At CEO endorsement, please detail the mode of coordination with other related initiatives.</p>	<p>Addressed.</p>
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>The project will replicate existing experiences and will intervene in a very poor area identified in the NAP as a region in need of support. There is indeed a strong potential for scaling up the project's intervention strategy.</p>	<p>Please include some sections to describe the innovative aspects of the project, sustainability (include financing aspects), and the potential for scaling up.</p> <p>June 16, 2016 Addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		<p>The project is close to the PIF. The slight changes are explained.</p> <p>However, at PIF level, it was proposed to include new resource management systems and conflict management systems at commune level, as well as the farmer plot level. We are not seeing this interesting aspect anymore. Please clarify.</p> <p>June 16, 2016 The Annex related to the logframe has been updated and conflict management systems are now included. However, these changes are not reported in the request for CEO endorsement. Please check also the other elements of the project package make the different pieces a coherent package. Thanks.</p> <p>September 19, 2016 Addressed.</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>In the section on cost-effectiveness, include a demonstration that the project design is appropriate (cost-effective) in comparison with alternative approaches.</p>
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>- Following comments made in the cell. 7, we would like to better understand the justification of \$300,000 for the component 1 and \$195,000 for the component 2 (KM). It seems that the GEF should focus on the component 2 with more concrete activities on the ground.</p>	<p>Please explain what activities are financed by the cofinancing and the partners.</p> <p>June 16, 2016 Not addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>- We are not sure to understand what is financed by the cofinancing. That will help to figure out the justification of outputs and outcomes financed by the GEF.</p> <p>May 21, 2013 Addressed.</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>UNEP brings \$250,000 in cofinancing. Please complete the information if it is in cash or in kind (table C, p3).</p> <p>At CEO endorsement, confirm UNEP cofinancing.</p> <p>May 21, 2013 Addressed.</p>	<p>The letters of cofinancing are included. Please, remind that an non-official translation should be included with the letters in French.</p> <p>September 19, 2016 Not addressed. We did not find the non-official translation of the letters of cofinancing. However, the letters in French are included and the information is right (name of the partner and amount). Be ready to provide a translation if the quality control is asking for it.</p>
	<p>18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?</p>	<p>The management costs are under 10 percent (9.8%). We expect a detailed budget at CEO endorsement.</p>	<p>September 19, 2016 Acceptable.</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>A PPG of \$100,000 is requested (\$109,500 with fees). The amount is in the norm for a project under \$3 million.</p>	<p>Please, provide PPG report. We are interested to know the list of studies that were produced at PPG.</p> <p>June 16, 2016 Addressed.</p>



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes.
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		There is indeed a M&E Plan, but there are no baseline data or description (maps, number of ha per biome, etc).  June 16, 2016 Please, confirm that the changes in the monitoring programme in annex are also reported in the table B of the request for CEO endorsement.  September 19, 2016 Addressed.
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?	Not yet. Please address the comments above.  May 21, 2013 The PM has technically cleared the PIF (and the PPG amount). However, the PIF will be processed for CEO approval only once the status of resources in the GEF Trust Fund is clarified.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO	- Confirm cofinancing at CEO	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	endorsement/approval.	endorsement; - Detail implementation arrangements and develop operational partnerships; - Provide a comprehensive risk analysis; - Provide a Monitoring Plan, with indicators, metrics, baseline values, and targets.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		April 15, 2016 The project cannot be recommended yet. Please address the comments above.  June 16, 2016 All the points have not been addressed. The project cannot be recommended yet.  September 19, 2016 The project is recommended for clearance.
	First review*	April 04, 2013	April 15, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	May 21, 2013	June 16, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		September 19, 2016

\* **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.**