



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

GEF ID:	9429		
Country/Region:	Cuba		
Project Title:	Incorporating Multiple Environmental Considerations and their Economic Implications into the Management of landscapes Forests and Production Sectors in Cuba		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5760 (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-4 Program 5; SFM-1; SFM-1; BD-4 Program 10;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$9,580,365
Co-financing:	\$37,800,000	Total Project Cost:	\$47,380,365
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Sarah Wyatt	Agency Contact Person:	Lyes Ferroukhi, RTA, EBD

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>March 14, 2016</p> <p>Overall, this is a strong project, but there are a few issues to be addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allocating funding by objective - In Table A, please differentiate funding by each program within biodiversity and SFM. - Target areas for component 3 - 	

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>please provide more information about why the target areas were selected and their ability to provide GEBs, particularly unique biodiversity values. Also, how will the pilot sites within those areas be selected (including GEBs)?</p> <p>- Please provide SMART indicators for this project in relation to the Aichi Targets.</p> <p>March 31, 2016</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for these changes.</p> <p>However, please understand that this MFA project makes sense from a LD point of view, only if the agriculture sector is considered. We will check this point in the CEO endorsement.</p> <p>The project is developed under the LD4/Program 5: we will expect in the CEO endorsement a logical set of activities to integrate ecosystem services into the agriculture sector (assessments, multi-stakeholder planning, investment, incentive mechanisms for SLM, monitoring). We are very interested to see the strategy and the methods to improve valuation of natural resource assets and ecosystem services from production landscapes to inform</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		decision-making on investments. Different options should be evaluated during the PPG to set up participatory mechanisms to scale up best SLM practices and restore productive landscapes.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>March 14, 2016</p> <p>No, while this project is likely consistent with Cuba's NBSAP, it is not discussed in the PIF.</p> <p>March 31, 2016</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for these changes.</p> <p>During PPG, please also include information about how this project relates to the UNCCD NAP.</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>March 17, 2016</p> <p>Yes. If successful, this project will directly target drivers of biodiversity loss and unsustainable land use.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>No, please explain the role of co-financing relative to the project activities. One potential way to address this is to clarify which specific activities through the project will be supported by co-financing.</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is very good that the CPP projects are mentioned. - Beyond coordination, it is recommended to take the lessons and best practices from the previous CPP projects. - Beyond the CPP, it will be recommended to take the lessons from other projects and partners. <p>March 31, 2016</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for these changes.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>No. Please address the comments below when resubmitting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outputs and outcomes - Please revise the formulation of the outputs and outcomes. Sometimes the outputs sound like outputs and vice versa. Outputs, as far as possible in a concept, should be specific and quantified outputs, well reflecting the results of activities. - Under Component 2, Output 1 - Please clarify that the project's role in relation to those knowledge products as they are baseline activities. - Component 2, Output 3 - Will economic valuations for decision-making not be undertaken in regards 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>to agriculture and forestry? Maybe the challenge is the language used to describe these valuations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Component 3.1 - The GEF doesn't finance EIAs. Please clarify how this project will be working with EIAs in Table B. - The Indicators are confusing when it comes to numbers of hectares. What is the relationship between the indicators for 3.1 and 3.3? - Component 3.2 - How will the financial sustainability of this mechanism be ensured? The GEF STAP developed good guidelines for the development of PES with GEF projects. If this is a PES-like system, please use those guidelines. If not, please address how this will be different from PES. - If the LD resources are mainly used for the component 3 (1,885 ha of agriculture land under SM), the project should reconsider the Focal Area Objectives/Programs. - Lessons learned and coordination from non-UNDP projects - How will this project coordinate with and learn from other major initiatives that are not part of UNDP? - Please provide an annex with a list of acronyms defined as the number of institutions involved can make it hard to follow. 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>During PPG, please include a more comprehensive risk assessment and results in the project document. Also, as this project is particularly innovative in working on bringing ecosystem values into mainline decision making, please spend extra attention on the question of knowledge management and how this project will document and share lessons learn.</p> <p>March 31, 2016</p> <p>Yes. These issues have been addressed.</p> <p>During PPG, make sure that the role of the GEF is clear for component 3.2.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>No. The gender component is strong, but there is more discussion of CSOs needed.</p> <p>March 31, 2016</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for the additions in this area.</p>	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	<p>March 14, 2016</p> <p>Yes. The resources are available for Biodiversity and Land Degradation.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	<p>March 14, 2016</p> <p>Yes. The resources are available for Biodiversity and Land Degradation.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>This project is requesting a total of \$3,463,844 from the SFM focal area.</p> <p>The SFM set aside has specific requirements and objectives that have to be met. Innovation in policy could be a justification. However, the project mentions improved protection of over 470,000 HCVF without much explanation. Please elaborate on this. Also, please include forests in the title of the project.</p> <p>March 31, 2016</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for making the requested changes.</p>	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>No. The project needs some revisions</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>before being recommended for clearance.</p> <p>Please also ensure that the most up-to-date project template is being used as there was a revised template posted in September 2015.</p> <p>March 31, 2016</p> <p>Yes. The PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	March 17, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 31, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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.