



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

GEF ID:	9180		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Reducing Deforestation for Commodity Production		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5664 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IAP-Commodities; BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4; SFM-1; SFM-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$300,000	Project Grant:	\$14,584,403
Co-financing:	\$164,700,268	Total Project Cost:	\$179,584,671
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Paul Hartman	Agency Contact Person:	Andrew Bovarnick

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		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,		

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)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?		
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?		
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?		
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? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 			
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	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?	<p>August 15, 2016</p> <p>This is a child project under the Commodity IAP program, for which no PIF stage was required. The project is in line with the supply chain of the program, and focuses on "production" of beef in Paraguay and oil palm in Indonesia and Liberia. We note that following request from the Government, soy production in Brazil will be addressed through a separate child project designed with a supply chain lens. However, we do not see the logic of having a separate project for Paraguay (see para 18 of Prodoc), and therefore request that the submission be revised accordingly to fully integrate Paraguay (including description of target landscapes - Table 1 and Annex in Prodoc). While revising the documents, please address the following:</p> <p>i) include a list of stakeholders to be engaged under component 1 based on typology in para 29 of prodoc and para 86 of Endorsement doc; it would seem that a comprehensive list for each commodity is possible given the extensive consultations done during project preparation;</p> <p>ii) in para 21, please provide</p>	<p>Paraguay elements have been fully integrated into the project document, including all relevant outputs, tables, annexes, etc.</p> <p>(i) Country-specific lists of stakeholders to be engaged under Component 1 are presented in Annex E of the CEO ED. Additional details regarding many of these stakeholders are provided in Annex G of the project document.</p> <p>(ii) Reference could not be located; this sentence has been deleted.</p> <p>(iii) Liberia policy priorities, which had been identified in para 70 of the prodoc, have now been incorporated into Table 7 of the CEO doc (following para 48). They are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and adopt a national definition and policy on HCS/HCV forest • Strengthen the Environmental and Social Impact Analysis (ESIA) process as it relates to oil palm investments • Ensure that grievance mechanisms for conflict resolution are adequately developed and implemented • Support the definition of a Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) process in the Liberian context in line with Liberian cultures and traditions • Complete the national interpretation of RSPO principles and criteria, which, among other benefits, will create opportunities for smallholders to become RSPO certified.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>reference for "...recent exhortations by the Indonesian President";</p> <p>iii) clarify why Liberia policies are not yet determined (para 47, Table 7 of Endorsement) and when they will be;</p> <p>iv) south-south cooperation (para 172 of prodoc) is welcome, but framework for how this will happen with what resources needs to be clarified; and</p> <p>v) Institutional arrangement for implementation needs to clarify role of National Project Managers relative to other child projects in the target countries; how will coordination be achieved to ensure coherence and consistency?</p> <p>PH October 19, 2016 The CEO Endorsement and prodoc now include additional details on stakeholders to be engaged. Liberia oil palm policy priorities have been clarified, as has the discussion of south-south priorities with regards to frameworks and resources that will be employed. The role of the National Project Manager has been clarified and the discussion on coordination across countries has been strengthened. Cleared</p>	<p>(iv) The discussion of south-south co-operation has been expanded, with reference, inter alia, to relevant frameworks and resources (see UNDP prodoc, paras. 229-232). Key elements of south-south co-operation discussed there include:.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CoP, to be established under the Adaptive Management and Learning project, will support South-South learning, cooperation, and networking among a broad array of practitioners. The CoP will bring together practitioners and producers from the South, with a focus on Brazil, Paraguay, Indonesia and Liberia and will thus serve as a strong platform to facilitate South-South cooperation and technology transfer. The Production project will provide funding for pilot country participation in the COPs. • numerous opportunities for sharing lessons learned by the production and Brazil projects, both among the pilot countries themselves and with other countries facing similar challenges, particularly at the regional level will create significant opportunities for south-south co-operation; • opportunities will be identified and pursued for exchanges with countries involved in UN-REDD, GCP and GEF commodity projects in order to optimize institutional learning and dissemination in key technical areas related to the commodity production: deforestation nexus. • the production project team, working in close co-operation with the AM&L team,

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>will engage regularly with external partners, will participate at key events and will disseminate information through media coverage, publications and presentations, all of which will facilitate South-South learning, and;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • key stakeholders will participate in study tours to learn more about the relationship between advances on the demand and production sides of the supply chain. <p>(v) The discussion of the challenge of in-country co-ordination and the role of NPMs has been expanded (see para. 256 of the UNDP project document).</p> <p>To summarize, in Indonesia and in Paraguay, the National Project Manager (NPM) will act as National Focal Point (NFP) for the project (in Liberia, this role will be undertaken by CI). As described in the AM&L prodoc, the NFP role will be designated for each of the four IAP target countries: Brazil, Paraguay, Liberia and Indonesia (total of 4 national focal points). Each NFP will gather information on the main planned deliverables each year from the Implementing Agencies (IAs) working in the countries in order to prepare national workplans that are well sequenced and coordinated, that outline major milestones/ main planned deliverables and that will be agreed upon by the IAs. The development of well sequenced and coordinated workplans will facilitate technical synchronization of key deliverables across the individual child projects and four IAP target countries. In the event of shifts in the timing of these deliverables, these</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			workplans will be reviewed and adjusted as necessary. The focal points will facilitate communication among the Implementing agencies working in each country to enable this to happen.
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>August 15, 2016</p> <p>The project structure includes 4 components and 11 outcomes, but it is not clear how the design will actually deliver on the targets proposed for GEBs. Please clarify and address the following:</p> <p>i) ensure consistency in outcomes presented in para 35 of endorsement doc and para 13 of Prodoc with those in Table A of endorsement</p> <p>ii) include SFM1 (not SFM3) in Table A of endorsement to be consistent with TT; and provide clear description of how project will support each of the focal areas in section 5 of endorsement doc;</p> <p>iii) clarify how the outcomes for farmer beneficiaries under component 2 will translate into actual hectares of land under sustainable production;</p> <p>iv) clarify what specific actions will be taken to support scaling-up of key production principles and practices beyond the target geographies; how will the project draw on others under the program, especially the AM&L project?</p> <p>v) gender mainstreaming is discussed</p>	<p>(i) Outcomes have been checked and consistency ensured throughout the CEO Endorsement and UNDP project documents.</p> <p>(ii) Table A already referred to SFM-1 ("Maintained forest resources")</p> <p>Table 9 has been added to the CEO ED (see p.34) to describe global benefits by GEF focal area</p> <p>(iii) The following text has been added to Table 9, p. 34, row for SFM-1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project will support good agricultural practices and sustainable intensification on 200,000 ha. through farmer trainings <p>The project will establish or strengthen at least 7 national and sub-national commodity platforms, bringing together a wide range of public and private sector stakeholders to develop national and sub-national commodity action plans covering policy, planning and other aspects of sectoral management.</p> <p>(iv) See revised CEO document, paras. 75-77, which now includes the following discussion: The project will support the identification of opportunities, and implementation of approaches, to scaling up principles, policies and practices related to production of a given commodity, particularly those based on lessons learned by the project itself. The specific</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>in the Prodoc, but it is not clear where and how women and men are specifically engaged in production of each commodity to warrant a gender-differentiated approach; correct para 170 sentence stating "(women and women)";</p> <p>PH October 19, 2016 The child project structure has been revised. Regarding actions proposed to scale policies and practices across districts, provinces and globally, while the dissemination mechanisms have been clearly identified to share lessons and experiences drawn from the project, the types of products and activities through which these will be captured and communicated in order to facilitate uptake is unclear. Please provide examples of these as a means of clarifying.</p>	<p>approach taken will vary according to the locations of analogous commodity-driven deforestation processes, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given that the project's on-the-ground work will take place mainly in specific districts, scaling up will begin within the larger-scale jurisdictions within which these districts are situated, e.g. demonstrate in districts and scale up to provinces, in the case of Indonesia. Here, provincial platforms will serve as the means of dissemination for landscape-level findings and encouragement of uptake by other districts within the province where similar processes of commodity-driven deforestation are taking place. • At the next level, scaling up will branch out to other provinces; again in the case of Indonesia, landscape-level lessons will be disseminated via the country's national palm oil platform (InPOP), as well as through an associated UNDP-GEF project operating in three provinces of Kalimantan. Special attention may be paid to provinces such as West Papua, where palm oil expansion is in a relatively early but rapid stage. Given Indonesia's global leadership in palm oil production, a significant percentage of global palm oil production may thereby be 'touched' by the project simply via this national uptake process. • Global-level scaling up will take place in several ways. First, the Community of Practice (CoP) being set up under the Adaptive Management and Learning (AM&L) project,

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>together with project outreach at various global fora, will stimulate uptake beyond the borders of the three target countries. Second, multinational companies involved in the national commodity platforms can be expected to bring their lessons to other countries where they are operating. Multinationals, national companies and platforms will be stimulated to expand their commitments to other commodities and to other geographies, specifically those geographies which are new frontiers of deforestation. The project builds on a strong baseline of public and private sector commitment to changing production towards reduced-deforestation commodities, and project activities will further empower these key stakeholders to implement such commitments. Third, close co-operation with UN-REDD will help to encourage dissemination to, and scaling up by, countries engaged in REDD+ processes. Finally, the project's initial target commodities and target countries can ultimately be expanded. Replication will come from applying the approach and proven model to other commodities and countries with similar issues (v) "women and women" has been corrected to read "men and women" (see CEO document, para. 93)</p> <p>A Program Gender Mainstreaming Strategy and Action Plan was developed during the PPG to guide actions taken across the components of the IAP Program to ensure that gender mainstreaming is adequately addressed</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>throughout implementation. The plan is annexed to the coordination project "Adaptive Management and Learning for the Commodities IAP". The plan assesses gender issues in the oil palm, soy and beef supply chains, and describes the gender mainstreaming strategies of each child project. In addition, specific country level action plans will be developed during the inception phase. The gender section in the CEO doc (section A.4. p.40-41) has been strengthened with the following text:</p> <p>Gender differentiation in production of agricultural commodities has a wide range of economic and social impacts. The problem has been noted in studies covering Indonesia's palm oil sector as well as in Paraguay's livestock sector. For example, gender-related social issues facing Indonesia's palm oil sector include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women's participation in the oil palm sector, while significant, is barely addressed in studies and statistics. • Women are often excluded from formal plot ownership. Plots are generally registered in men's names, which means that mainly men are eligible to become members of co-operatives; • In the plantation sector, a gendered division of labor put in place by plantation managers often relegates women to lower paid casual jobs • Women may not be paid directly for fruit collection in cases where their

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>contribution is used to help meet their spouses' production quotas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women and children often bear the brunt of health hazards in the palm oil sector, including those associated with application of pesticides. <p>In economic terms, a number of studies have identified a significant "gender gap" in agricultural productivity"ranging from 4 to 25 percent, depending on the country and the crop"within various agricultural sectors in developing countries. According to one report, "this gap exists because women frequently have unequal access to key agricultural inputs such as land, labor, knowledge, fertilizer, and improved seeds." The report goes on to estimate that the gender gap amounts to \$100 million in Malawi, \$105 million in Tanzania, and \$67 million in Uganda per year.</p> <p>An important element of the project's logic is support for sustainable intensification"improving agricultural productivity on a per ha basis"as part of a strategy for reducing commodity-driven deforestation. A key reason for this and other projects to undertake a gender-differentiated approach, therefore, in addition to equity issues, is the opportunity to achieve productivity gains through such an approach. The magnitude of this opportunity is, in general terms, proportional to the gender gap in agricultural productivity.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	<p>August 15, 2016 The breakdown of GEF grant and co-financing by component is adequate and cost-effective, and the focus on farmer support systems for bulk of the co-financing is particular welcome given the need to influence this important group of stakeholders in the supply chain. There are however inconsistencies in the numbers between the tables. Please double check total amounts to ensure they are adding up correctly.</p> <p>PH October 19, 2016 The tables showing GEF financing and co-financing are consistent. Financing is adequate and demonstrates cost-effective approach to meet the project objective. Cleared</p>	Tables showing GEF financing and co-financing have been revised to ensure internal consistency
	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)	<p>August 15, 2016 Important risks are considered, but no reference is made to climate change and potential effects; please clarify and describe appropriately in accordance with any existing projected climate change scenarios for both the commodities and targeted geographies.</p> <p>The issue of resilience in broader sense is also an important priority for the program that seem to have been overlooked despite guidance provided</p>	<p>The project team greatly appreciates the earlier support provided by STAP on this topic. A proposed approach to the issue during the full project is described in paras. 95-101 of the CEO Endorsement document. This includes, inter alia, the following discussion:</p> <p>Climate change has been added to Table 13 (p. 43-44). A resilience section has been added in this document (p44-46) to clarify how resilience was taken into consideration during the project design for implementation. The following is</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>with support from STAP. Please clarify how resilience was taken into consideration during project design, and carefully considered during implementation.</p> <p>PH October 19, 2016 Adequate consideration of resilience has been incorporated into the CEO Endorsement document. We recommend that during the project's inception and implementation phases climate scenarios covering the target landscapes are assessed to determine the medium-long term viability of the commodities targeted in these areas vis-a-vis projected temperature, rainfall and drought impacts. This will be necessary to ensure that interventions with farmers in component two do not run the risk of being mal-adaptive in the future.</p>	<p>an excerpt from the section.</p> <p>The fundamental question facing the IAP may be characterized as follows: how can dynamic change within productive landscapesâ€”including sometimes rapid increases in the production of important commoditiesâ€”be made more resilient and sustainable , particularly in ways that help to sustain forest cover and associated ecosystem services such as biodiversity and climate services, as well as equity, green growth and socio-economic benefits?</p> <p>As a first step in addressing the above question, the PPG team began the process of creating an IAP perspective, or lens, through which to view and monitor landscape-level dynamics. This lens is reflected in the project's theory of change and in its definition of 'elements of sustainability and resilience'. Importantly, it is also visible in the project's structure of components, outcomes and outputs. The simple idea here is that the project can strengthen landscape-level systems by bolstering these constituent elementsâ€”which are seen a common but differentiated across landscapes. Thus, while every such landscape is unique and its evolution through time to some extent unpredictable, the project design is based on the assumption that there is sufficient similarity among landscapes and among the factors controlling their sustainability, that principles and actionable lessons can emerge from a multi-landscape comparative and learning approachâ€”.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>Given the above characterization, the project's strategy for building landscape-level resilience and sustainability during the full project includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To further iterate the elements of sustainability and resilience concept, based on lessons learned during the project, and to develop a landscape scorecard for same. • To apply the scorecard to multiple landscapes, including both project and control landscapes. • To develop a systems-level approach to understanding the interactions among elements and between them and exogenous factors. Thus, the elements-based approach may be taken one step further here as it comes to serve as a model describing the dynamic evolution of the system over time. Here, different approaches, e.g. to a given policy dilemma, will push the system in a particular direction. In this sense, the system can be compared to the ecological system of which it is a fundamental component, albeit one with a heavily anthropogenic, and externally-influenced overlay. • Within the above framework of analysis, to ensure ongoing monitoring of unexpected and hard-to-predict shocks and stresses, and using this analysis to adaptively manage the project and, more importantly, to recommend corresponding course of action to policy makers. Table 13 below presents one possible typology for describing specific options and alternatives for adapting

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>agricultural systems which, to the extent possible, may be considered from a broader landscape resilience perspective, rather than in isolation. This approach will be dynamic in nature, acknowledging the complex systemic nature of the problems and solutions and external variables.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finally, to arrive at an enhanced understanding of the characteristics that make policy, project and programme interventionsâ€”including actions at landscape, provincial, national and global levelsâ€”successful in supporting landscape-level sustainability and resilience.
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>August 15, 2015 The total co-financing amounts to just under \$165 million, most of it contributed as in-kind by Governments of the participating countries. This reflects strong ownership for the project, which is critical for anchoring the entire IAP program. However, some of the co-financing letters from Paraguay are missing.</p> <p>PH October 19, 2016 Please provide English language translations of co-financing support letters previously submitted in Spanish. Additionally, the \$158 million in-kind co-financing commitment from the Government of Indonesia is significant, but it is unclear how this will be realized. We</p>	<p>October 14, 2016 One additional co-financing letter has been received since the first submission and included in the package. A second referenced letter is not forthcoming and has been removed from the list and calculations. The total co-financing now amounts to \$ 164,700,268.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		request clarification on the types of activities, actions, etc. that this in-kind commitment will cover. Note that the letter from the Indonesian government does not need to be revised.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>August 15, 2016</p> <p>The TT is included, but cover page wrongly refers to another child project; please correct and address the following:</p> <p>i) under CCM, if land under "low GHG" is 400 ha, then where what land uses will be associated with the life time estimates of emission reductions?</p> <p>ii) also under CCM, please specify number of farmers to be associated with the land use practices that will generate GHG benefits.</p> <p>Please note also that incremental reasoning and estimates of GEBs should be made consistent across all the documents and in the tracking tool; Table E and Table 8 in the Endorsement doc, and Project Results Framework in Prodoc all show very different estimates, and are inconsistent with those in description of outcomes and outputs in the documents.</p> <p>Finally, please clarify methodology used to derive GEB estimates (land area and GHG) and how they will be</p>	<p>A new tracking tool is being submitted, with correct references and some revised calculations based on new data received regarding the landscapes. Additional information is also provided in the section on global environmental benefits (p.33).</p> <p>As indicated in the tracking tool, an estimated 6,000 farmers will receive training in good agricultural practices under the project. Given that only a percentage of the trained farmers will adopt these practices, leading to an estimate of 200,000 ha where enhanced and more sustainable agricultural practices will be in place. However, no direct calculations have been made of the carbon benefits associated with 'low-GHG commodity production' on existing agricultural lands.</p> <p>Instead, the project's estimated carbon benefits of 65.6 million tons CO₂e are derived from estimates of avoided deforestation, over a 10-year timeframe, of 128,898 ha. This would represent a modest reduction in annual deforestation rates across the total project landscape areas of 7.95 million ha which include an estimated 3.89 million ha of forest from a BAU estimate of 1.65% per year to a GEF project alternative of 1.31%. This avoided deforestation benefit would come in two parts:</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>monitored during project implementation.</p> <p>PH October 19, 2016 The new tracking tool has been revised. Incremental reasoning and estimates of GEBs have been made consistent across all the documents and in the tracking tool, and Tables have been fixed. The question of methodology used to derive GEB estimates and how they will be monitored during project implementation has been addressed by the agency in the CEO endorsement request through a footnote indicating that they will be using FAO EX-ACT during project implementation.</p> <p>There is a discrepancy between what is represented in indicator 1 of the Climate Change Mitigation tracking tool of Total Lifetime Direct and Indirect GHG Emissions Avoided (Tons CO₂eq), which equals 62,100,000 tons, and the emissions reductions total in the detailed calculations table of 65,637,508. Please reconcile this difference and ensure consistency of TT indicator estimates across CEO endorsement and Prodoc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a projected 35% reduction in deforestation, compared with BAU, across one million ha where the project is supporting the establishment or strengthening of set asides, both on private and public lands; • a projected 15% reduction in deforestation rates across the remaining three million ha, linked to broader policy changes, together with the benefits of improved productivity (‘sustainable intensification’).
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been	N/a	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>August 15, 2016 The baseline includes reference to existing platforms for coordination, but no specific link to other GEF projects (existing and planned) for coordination. Please provided a summary of all relevant GEF projects and clarify how this production project will harness opportunities for link during implementation.</p> <p>PH October 19, 2016 Yes, the project is coordinated with other related initiatives and plans. Cleared</p>	<p>October 14, 2016 A description of projects and co-ordination plans is provided in paras. 111-12</p>
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	<p>August 15, 2016 Yes the budgeted M&E plan is included and appropriate. Cleared</p>	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	<p>August 15, 2016 The knowledge management plan is adequately presented and described, but no reference is made to how this will be aligned with other child projects under the program. Please clarify.</p> <p>PH October 19, 2016 The description of the knowledge management plan and how it will be aligned to other child projects under the project is sufficient.</p>	<p>October 14, 2016 Key mechanisms for enabling knowledge-related connections and synergies to emerge from the production and other IAP projects are now described in para. 114 of the CEO Endorsement document. This includes, inter alia, the following Key mechanisms for enabling knowledge-related connections and synergies to emerge from the production and other IAP projects will include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A dedicated Global Knowledge Lead will foster a culture of knowledge creation and

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		Cleared	<p>management and uptake of learnings among the team and will regularly exchange information with, and brief the child project KM leads, as well as the Program Steering Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KM at the level of each child projects will include specific emphasis on creating and sharing knowledge on the learnings emerging from its interventions with the child project partners. • The AM&L project will commission a study to examine the effects of increased demand and financing on sustainable production and vice versa”by definition a multi-project result. • KM will include learning and information sharing about the experience of implementing an integrated approach pilot itself. • A key step in building towards each Community of Practice (CoP) will consist of an effort to weave together Programme-level lessons from project-level experiences, for sharing with partners. • Learning exchanges/ study tours will be carried out both by the production child project and the demand project. The A&L project will help ensure coordination between the two child projects for these study tours and will also glean learnings from the study tours to contribute to the overall KM agenda of the IAP. • The Global Communications lead will liaise with the child projects to ensure

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			consistency among child projects in publications and communications documents in terms of messaging and use of the IAP logo and art files, in order to maintain IAP cohesion.
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEFSEC • STAP 	<p>August 15, 2016 Please address relevant STAP comments from PFD stage.</p> <p>PH October 19, 2016 STAP comments have been addressed. Cleared</p>	<p>October 14, 2016 See Annex B, Part 1 of CEO document. The table includes responses to those project reviews from the PFD stage that relate directly to the Production project. The complete set of responses to PFD reviews is included in Annex B of the AM&L document.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council 	<p>August 15, 2016 Please address relevant Council comments from PFD approval stage.</p> <p>PH October 19, 2016 GEF Council comments have been addressed. Cleared</p>	<p>October 14, 2016 See Annex B, Part 1 of CEO document. The table includes responses to those project reviews from the PFD stage that relate directly to the Production project. The complete set of responses to PFD reviews is included in Annex B of the AM&L document.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat 		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>August 15, 2016 No, child project is not yet recommended. Please address all comments highlighted.</p> <p>PH October 19, 2016</p>	

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.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		No, child project is not yet recommended. Please address all comments highlighted.	
Review Date	Review	August 15, 2016	October 07, 2016
	Additional Review (as necessary)	October 19, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		