



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

GEF ID:	9777		
Country/Region:	Haiti		
Project Title:	Sustainable Management of Wooded Production Landscapes for Biodiversity Conservation		
GEF Agency:	UNDP and FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	5765 (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:	\$180,000	Project Grant:	\$6,186,964
Co-financing:	\$36,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$42,186,964
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2017
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Cyrille Barnerias	Agency Contact Person:	Lyes Ferroukhi

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	03/07/2017 - No. Please make sure the Gender mainstreaming, KM and M&E strategies are prepared during PPG. They should be implemented during project. - Yes, the project articulates the Aichi targets it will help achieve (3,4,5,7,12 on page 17). At CEO Endorsement, please provide the SMART indicators.	

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>04/05/2017 - comments addressed. For gender mainstreaming, please see below in the item regarding table B.</p> <p>04/17/17 - Comments addressed</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>03/07/2017 - Yes, it is aligned with the various national plans and draft NBSAP.</p> <p>04/17/17 - Cleared. Haiti launched in January 2017 its process for the definition of a strategy for Land Degradation Neutrality. At CEO endorsement, and depending on the progress made on the LDN strategy, please ensure that the project contribute to the targets.</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>03/13/2017 - Shouldn't the question of aging population of farmers be also addressed in the sustainability section?</p> <p>- Ok for the Innovation.</p> <p>- Regarding scaling-up, could you please specify the scope and</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>modalities of possible scaling-up?</p> <p>- market could be transformed mainly by Output 1.3.</p> <p>04/05/2017</p> <p>- comments addressed</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>03/13/2017</p> <p>- We appreciate the effort of co-financing presented in table C. Could you please clarify the level of discussion with the various sources to ensure the co-financing will still be available at CEO Endorsement in Grants?</p> <p>- Will all the species listed under paragraph 41 or in Annex 2, in particular Marine turtles and Trees, benefit directly from the project?</p> <p>- The maps in Annex 1 are very welcome. They do not seem to show all existing KBAs in the area. If that is the case, could you please update the maps.</p> <p>04/05/2017</p> <p>- No. Previous comments have been well addressed but in table C, the total doesn't correspond to the addition of the amounts in the above lines.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		04/17/2017 - Yes. Addressed.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	03/13/2017 - No. As previously stated, the strategies (Gender mainstreaming, KM and M&E) should be prepared during the PPG to be implemented during the project. The amount could be used for other concrete actions. - Could you please clarify the relation between the surface of the project's landscape (485,434ha) and the project targets in terms of GEB (20,000ha) and why all the Landscape areas will not be improved by the project? Similarly, 500ha of potential new PA could seem low compared to the total area of the project and to the Aichi target. - Some outputs should be more precise: "eligibility criteria ...", "BD-related branding ...", "systems for technical assistance provision ..." - Farmer field school can be a good tool to promote new methods. Could you precise how many farmer-schools the project intends to create and how many farmers these model-farms could reached?	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>- Will output 1.3 be directed mainly towards "big" or "small" farmers? For the same amount of ha targeted, that can make an important difference in terms of the number of farmers impacted.</p> <p>04/05/2017</p> <p>- No, even though most of comments are well addressed.</p> <p>- We would expect Gender to be mainstreamed in particular in the work of a UN agency. Hence, having it identified in table B seems redundant and we would expect the component 3 could be substantially reduced. The funds could be used to finance more grounds actions.</p> <p>- Please provide at CEO Endorsement the estimated number of Farmers Field Schools.</p> <p>04/17/2017</p> <p>- yes. Comments addressed.</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>03/13/2017</p> <p>- Yes, and we expect complete elements on CSO inclusion and gender consideration at CEO Endorsement.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
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? 	03/13/2017 - Yes.	
	<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?	03/13/2017 - No, please address the remaining comments. - Please also note that World bank has proposed a project on Productive Landscapes in another part of Haiti under LDCF. It could be good to add it to the list of project with which links could be done (experience and knowledge sharing, dissemination, scaling-up ...).	
		04/05/2017 - No, please address the remaining comment on reducing the importance of component 3 and mainstreaming gender. Please also fix table C.	
		04/17/2017	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		- Yes the PIF is recommended for clearance. Some comments will be addressed at CEO Endorsement (such as contribution to LDN strategy, complete elements on CSO inclusion and gender consideration, estimated number of Farmers Field Schools).	
Review Date	Review	March 13, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 05, 2017	April 13, 2017
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 17, 2017	

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?		
	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?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		

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
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council • Convention Secretariat 		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		