



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

GEF ID:	4605		
Country/Region:	Belize		
Project Title:	Management and Protection of Key Biodiversity Areas		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2; BD-2; CCM-5; CCM-5; CCM-5; SFM/REDD+-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$6,085,600
Co-financing:	\$16,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$22,085,600
PIF Approval:	September 21, 2011	Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ian Gray	Agency Contact Person:	Jo Albert

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?	September 6, 2011 Yes, CBD 1993, CCD 1998, FCCC 1995.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	September 6, 2011 Yes there is a letter from Mr Alegria dated August 11, 2011. However the overall levels of funding identified are in excess of Belize's STAR allocation and should be amended.  September 15, 2011 The endorsement letter should be revised downward to be in line with the STAR allocation.  September 20, 2011 Revised letter of endorsement submitted.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	September 6, 2011 Yes, the WB has known capacity for investment interventions within SFM related projects.	

	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	September 6, 2011 There is no non-grant instrument.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	September 6, 2011 The project is aligned with the CPS of July 2011 in terms of GoB plans to develop a natural resources based economic model and strengthen natural resources management. As the World Bank is re-engaging with GoB after a prolonged period of inactivity and there is no WB office in Belize please provide additional detail of the WB's arrangements for managing the project.  September 15, 2011 Sufficient information provided.	
Resource Availability	6. 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>September 6, 2011 The total STAR allocation for Belize is \$5.12 million, and the country is flexible. The project management costs and agency fees associated with BD and CC should be included in the \$5.12 million. Thus the funding being requested exceeds the STAR allocation, please revise. The project mgmt costs and agency fee associated with SFM are outside of the allocation.</p> <p>September 15, 2011 The BD and CC Totals in Table D are now within the STAR allocation, totaling \$5,021,000. This leaves a STAR allocation balance of \$99,000. However this equates to a grant amount requested of BD \$2,776,400 + CC\$1,788,200 = \$4,564,600 which would allow access to 1:3 SME/REDD+ Grant Amount = \$1 521 533</p>	

		include the remaining \$99,000 STAR allocation.  September 20, 2011 Cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>September 6, 2011 In Table D, the funding should be allocated to the focal area in which it is being applied. In this case, BD, CC, and SFM/REDD+ would be listed, with the appropriate funding amounts allocated to each. LD would not be listed.</p> <p>September 15, 2011 Please check the numbers in Table D again. The funding is flexible for the objectives, but the project management costs should reflect the focal area objective needs.</p> <p>September 20, 2011 Cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	<p>September 6, 2011 N/A</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	<p>September 6, 2011 N/A</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	<p>September 6, 2011 N/A</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>September 6, 2011 N/A</p>	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>September 6, 2011 Yes basically the project is aligned with the FA framework.</p>	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>September 6, 2011 a) BD Output 3 and SFM/REDD Output 1.1 do not appear to be reflected in the project framework. Also Section A1.1. contains reference to objectives from the Cross-Cutting Development Strategy. b) Component 3,#4 and some of the discussion (IIA.2) relates to adaptation activities which is</p>	

		<p>mitigation. See response to question 14 for more information on this issue.) Please revise.</p> <p>September 15, 2011 a) Sufficient information provided</p> <p>b) Sufficient at the PIF stage. During project design please focus on climate change mitigation, so that the CEO endorsement document focuses on CC mitigation.</p>	
	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>September 6, 2011 a) The project is generally aligned with the NPAPSP of 2004 and also the 3rd report to the CBD. b) Consistency between the First National Communication to UNFCCC and identified GEF-funded objectives should be improved.</p> <p>September 15, 2011 Modified sufficiently.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>September 6, 2011 Details of capacity building is limited in the project framework to fire management and monitoring however the text describes a wider array. Please describe clearly the proposed capacity building activities, in particular given the limited staff levels within the FD and NEAC.</p> <p>September 15, 2011 Sufficient information provided.</p>	
	<p>11. 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>September 6, 2011 a) There is little detail of ongoing efforts management by the FD and other agencies. Please provide additional information on ongoing MNRE and MAF activities to protect natural resources in the identified KBAs. b) Please provide information about any baseline forest carbon climate mitigation MRV activities</p>	

Project Design		<p>September 15, 2011</p> <p>a) Sufficient information provided.</p> <p>b) Please add text to the section specifically saying something like this. That is "Little information is currently easily available for baseline forest carbon climate mitigation MRV activities or other LULUCF baseline activities. The start-up activities will help gather this data". This information is expected at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>September 20, 2011 Cleared.</p>	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>September 6, 2011</p> <p>Please expand on the incremental reasoning - for example in B.2 notes globally significant species and ecosystems being eroded and encroachment into Chiquibul NP, but does not quantify or qualify these with any additional detail.</p> <p>September 15, 2011</p> <p>Thank you for the additional information. It is accepted that during project preparation further clarity will be developed in terms of specific benefits “ and these will be expected in full at CEO Endorsement. However it is necessary to have some basic understanding at a coarse level of the expected return on GEF funding “ for example the PIF still gives no indication of the scale of KBAs to be involved out of Belize's 1million ha total. Information on the PAs</p>	

		<p>(e.g. <a href="http://www.biodiversity.bz/find/protected_area/">http://www.biodiversity.bz/find/protected_area/</a>) and should be included in the PIF. At this stage a minimum information would at least identify the expected scale of NP, FR, WS etc. included in the project even if exact areas were not yet identified.</p> <p>September 20, 2011 Thank you for the additional information which now identifies approx. 300k ha of PAs, to be further refined during project preparation. Cleared.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>September 6, 2011 In section IIA.2, the information presented from the First National Communication to the UNFCCC relates to adaptation. The STAR allocation funds are for mitigation activities, although climate resilient activities (such as forest fire prevention activities, for instance) can be appropriate but for mitigation reasons. The First National Communication to the UNFCCC lists a number of activities under Land Use Change and Forestry that would be appropriate and potentially fit into this proposal. The list includes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) restoring abandoned agricultural lands,</li> <li>2) establishing tree plantations, and</li> <li>3) developing national forest fire management plans.</li> </ol> <p>In Table B, the outcomes and outputs are not clearly identified as belonging to a CCM-5 objective. We are looking for core outputs including carbon stock monitoring systems established and forests and nonforests under good management practices. The activities on enhanced sustainable forest management practices, reducing deforestation, reducing forest fires, and reducing illegal logging and</p>	

practices if carbon benefits can be expected and reasonably assigned to the activities. The output in component 3 on monitoring tools and capacities may qualify if they relate to carbon sequestration or reduction in carbon emissions for forests and land use. CO2 benefits of the activities should be estimated, at least using a Tier-1 type approach. Carbon inventory systems are encouraged too, however including activities that show improvement the accuracy of the carbon estimates could be acceptable.

The issues of Minsiterial fiat and the requirement for leased land "improvement" have been earmarked for change for many years - please explain the conditions that allow the project able to resolve these issues now.

Please explain how the project is involving the private sector in improved management of KBAs.

Please provide additional information on plans for critical area rehabilitation.

September 14, 2011

a) Thank you for the modifications. Acceptable at this stage.

b) In component 3 please insert the word "mitigation" in outcome 4, as in "Climate change mitigation considerations mainstreamed into theâ€ IF climate change mitigation funds are being used for this activity. If BD funds are being used to mainstream climate adaptation or climate resilience into the NPASP then clearly state that in Table B.

c) The process identified in risk mitigation B4 is acceptable at PIF stage with full details of how

		<p>to be developed at CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>d) Additional information acceptable.</p> <p>e) The requirement for information on critical area rehabilitation remains.</p> <p>September 20, 2011</p> <p>b) Cleared.</p> <p>e) Cleared.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>September 6, 2011</p> <p>a) GEBs are not entirely clear and needs additional detail - for example, as the two large KBAs are already identified, the specific GEBs that are expected from the project interventions in these areas would need to be developed.</p> <p>b) Please provide preliminary estimates of CO2 benefits and description of methodology. Are any activities planned in the project to improve the accuracy of these estimates?</p> <p>September 15, 2011</p> <p>a) Thank you for the additional information. The results of the additional work will be expected to be incorporated at CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>b) It is accepted that the project preparation phase will develop specific figures, however at PIF stage some basic estimates of the return on GEF investment is required, and data sets are available to make these initial calculations. For example Cherrington et al's "Forest Cover and Deforestation in Belize: 1980-2010" provides estimates of PA and non-PA deforestation rates over a 30 year period. These figures could easily be combined with Reference Values from the LULUCF Good Practice Guide to give a fast and simple Tier 1-type estimate.</p> <p>September 20, 2011</p>	



		analysis will be expected at CEO Endorsement.	
	16. 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>September 6, 2011 B3 includes reference to examples such as Sarstoon/Temash - full description of expected socio-economic benefits and incorporation of gender issues will be required at CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>September 15, 2011 Thank you for the additional information. The results of the additional work will be expected to be incorporated at CEO Endorsement.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>September 6, 2011 Many of the issues identified such as fires, encroachment are related to local communities and land users - there is limited information however on how these stakeholders are going to be involved and additional information is required.</p> <p>September 20, 2011 Cleared.</p>	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	<p>September 6, 2011 Risks and mitigation measures are very generic - please provide project-specific information.</p> <p>September 15, 2011 Thank you for the additional information. The risks identified are still somewhat generic, but are acceptable at PIF stage. Please ensure full analysis is included at CEO Endorsement.</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>September 6, 2011 Please explain how the project links to and builds on earlier GEF projects "Strengthening National Capacities for the Consolidation, Operationalisation and Sustainability of Belize's Protected Area System" and "Strengthening</p>	

		<p>Sectoral Environmental Policies and Programmes" and UNDP's "Mainstreaming and Capacity Building for SLM in Belize".</p> <p>September 15, 2011 Additional information acceptable.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>September 6, 2011 Yes enough information for PIF stage, additional detail will be required at CEO Endorsement.</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>September 6, 2011 Current GEF policy is that PMC should not exceed 5% of the total GEF grant for projects requesting grants of \$2 million and above, when another agency or agencies is involved as the executing agency. Please ensure PMC is in line with this.</p> <p>September 14, 2011 PMC now at 5%.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>September 6, 2011 Not clear at the moment - need to revisit in light of responses to questions above on Project Design.</p> <p>September 20, 2011 PM recommends PIF for work program inclusion.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided	<p>September 6, 2011 \$15 million hard loan from WB \$1 million in-kind from GoB</p>	

	the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes, see above.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>September 6, 2011 Not at this stage - please address issues identified above.</p> <p>September 20, 2011 PM recommends PIF for WPI</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>16 Sept 2011/LH: a) Solid information is expected on baseline forest carbon mitigation MRV activities or other LULUCF baseline activities (such as related to FCPF). b) Climate Change funded outputs and outcomes are for mitigation not adaptation. The wording should also be clear this is mitigation. c) Solid carbon benefit estimates are expected. d) CCM funds and related outputs and outcomes will be compared to ensure the activities are cost-effective.</p> <p>September 19, 2011 Ensure biological status indicators including proxies for the PAs that would complement the</p>	

		<p>Ensure clear description of socio-economic elements of the project, including involvement of indigenous communities.</p> <p>Ensure full assessment of project-specific risks and mitigation measures.</p> <p>Ensure clear arrangements for project execution in particular involvement of KBAs in private protected areas.</p> <p>Ensure costed description of coordination activities with other ongoing GEF projects.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 06, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 15, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 20, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.