



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

GEF ID:	9796		
Country/Region:	Belize		
Project Title:	Integrated Management of Production Landscapes to Deliver Multiple Global Environmental Benefits		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	6015 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4 Program 9; LD-1 Program 1; LD-3 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$132,420	Project Grant:	\$5,108,933
Co-financing:	\$15,076,600	Total Project Cost:	\$20,185,533
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Sarah Wyatt	Agency Contact Person:	Santiago Carrizosa

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>	<p>March 14, 2017</p> <p>No. This project is currently framed as a biodiversity project with some land degradation components. However, the justification for how the project's proposed activities would yield significant benefits for globally significant biodiversity is quite weak. The project needs major revisions to focus on biodiversity benefits, particularly in the on-the-ground</p>	

<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)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>activities for biodiversity.</p> <p>However, it may make more sense to recast this project as principally a land degradation project and meet the objectives of that focal area with some resources coming from biodiversity. As a fully flexible country, no explanation is needed to move resources among focal areas.</p> <p>June 2, 2017</p> <p>Cleared. Thank you.</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>March 14, 2017</p> <p>If the project changes, then this area would need to be reexamined. The link to the NBSAP or NAP for UNCCD are not strong.</p> <p>June 2, 2017</p> <p>Cleared. Thank you.</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>March 14, 2017</p> <p>No. Please address the issues of innovation, scaling and sustainability more thoroughly.</p> <p>June 2, 2017</p>	

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

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Cleared, please ensure that these issues are taken into account throughout PPG.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>March 14, 2017</p> <p>No. This PIF describes a number of initiatives that have worked or are working in this space without providing a good justification for why these additional resources will yield different results.</p> <p>June 2, 2017</p> <p>Cleared. Please continue to develop this during PPG.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>March 14, 2017</p> <p>No, if this project undergoes some of the changes described above, this question would need to be reexamined. Overall, this project seems to be taking on many different activities in many different lines of work that may result in fragmentation and lack of real impact. Fundamentally, it also raises the question of whether all these activities are feasible together. At the same time, the lack of detail on the activities makes it difficult to assess their feasibility and likelihood of success.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>At this stage, please address the following issues:</p> <p>Component 1.2 and 2.4 - A STAP assessment of GEF projects on payments for ecosystem services found that projects will often propose using PES at the PIF stage with little detail as a funding strategy, but that component will not be included at CEO endorsement leaving the area of work weak. The STAP advisory document provides specific guidance for what is needed at the PIF stage. While we understand that we are in a concept stage, we need more information about who will provide financial resources and the mechanism for the program. Using CDM resources seems unlikely given current low prices for carbon. This component needs to be more concrete. In addition, to state that the project will implement two as yet undefined systems seems unlikely.</p> <p>1.3 - Please clarify if this is creating a new database or creating the protocols for using an old database. Also, 1) Where will this be housed? 2) Who will be responsible for maintenance? 3) How will this be maintained after the life of the project? 4) How will this project ensure changes in existing practices?</p> <p>1.5 - Please clarify what is meant by</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>this component.                      2.6 - This seems to be disconnected from the activities of the rest of the project.                      2.8 and 2.9 - These activities can be challenging to implement. Please provide more detail about how they will be undertaken.</p> <p>June 2, 2017</p> <p>Cleared. Thank you for the revisions.</p> <p>During PPG, it will remain important that as a primarily biodiversity project - the results, activities and justification keeps global biodiversity benefits in mind. For example, a payments for ecosystem services program should provide benefits for activities with biodiversity impact not simply groundwater recharge. This could take place through the location of farms in corridors or PA buffer zones, types of activities supported, etc.</p> <p>Please also include a map of the project areas and KBAs (as there are a number in the region).</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>March 14, 2017</p> <p>No. While this project mentions indigenous peoples, no special</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>attention has been given to ensuring their full participation in the project.</p> <p>June 2, 2017</p> <p>Cleared. Thank you.</p>	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>March 14, 2017</p> <p>Yes. This project matches Belize's total STAR allocation exactly.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>March 14, 2017</p> <p>Yes. Belize is a fully flexible country, so resources can moved between focal areas.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>March 14, 2017</p> <p>No, this project is not being recommended at this time. Please follow up with the GEF Secretariat informally to discuss the comments with questions.</p> <p>June 2, 2017</p>	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		The program manager recommends this project for CEO clearance.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 14, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 02, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<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>
<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		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
<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		
	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

<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.

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Recommendation</b>			
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		