



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

GEF ID:	<b>4590</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Honduras</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Delivering Multiple Global Environment Benefits through Sustainable Management of Production Landscapes</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>4741 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-2; BD-2; LD-3; LD-3; LD-3; SFM/REDD+-1; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$3,045,445</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$9,050,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$12,095,445</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>November 01, 2011</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ian Gray</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Santiago Carrizosa</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	August 18, 2011 Yes - CBD 1995, CCD 1997.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	August 18, 2011 OFP letter has been attached.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	August 18, 2011 Yes. UNDP's background in deforestation and efforts against degradation is well developed. UNDP is also already involved in SFM, in particular the components of sustainable livelihoods.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency	August 18, 2011 There is no non-grant instrument.	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	capable of managing it?		
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	August 18, 2011 Yes, the proposed project fits into UNDP's role as outlined in the draft country programme document for Honduras (2012-2016).	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	August 18, 2011 Yes, STAR allocations are BD \$7.270 million and LD \$0.780 million - with 100% of both FAs remaining to be allocated.	
	• the focal area allocation?	August 18, 2011 Yes, see above.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	August 18, 2011 N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	August 18, 2011 N/A	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?	August 18, 2011 The request for SFM/REDD incentive funds is within the 3:1 ratio.	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	August 18, 2011 Yes the project is generally well aligned with the outcomes and outputs of the FA results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	August 18, 2011 Yes the project identifies the objectives of BD-2, LD-3 and SFM/REDD-1.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and	August 18, 2011 Yes. The project is particularly aligned with Goal 3 of the National Plan.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?		
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	August 18, 2011 Capacity development is evident in two levels - through the creation of permanent multi-stakeholder processes and the development of field-level capacity in biodiversity and carbon-positive management practices.	
Project Design	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?	August 18, 2011 Yes, the PIF describes national activities such as SAG's Sustainable Ranching Program and regional activities such as PROCORREDOR on the Caribbean coast and MARENA in the south.	
	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?	August 18, 2011 Yes, clear enough for PIF stage	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	August 18, 2011 Yes, generally clearly explained, however please address the following: 1. As certification is a central part of the project please describe more fully the existing/projected market demand and how this will really be capable of driving the necessary uptake of certification. 2. Experience from other certification processes has highlighted the difficulties	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>in 'creating' demand for certified products - please justify how the level of resource matches the task of developing favourable market conditions.</p> <p>3. Certification of small-scale operations is often prohibitively costly - please explain how certification is going to be maintained without requiring on-going support to cover certification fees.</p> <p>September 06, 2011 Addressed.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	August 18, 2011 Yes clear enough at PIF stage.	
	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?	August 18, 2011 Social benefits accrue through the proposed improvements in land management resulting in livelihood gains for rural families. This is enough for PIF stage but at CEO endorsement please provide a fuller description of expected socio-economic benefits. Additionally, gender issues are modestly covered and greater detail will be required at CEO endorsement.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	August 18, 2011 The proposal includes CSO involvement at through the national and regional multi-stakeholder fora and through field-level implementation of improved management techniques. At CEO endorsement further details of the mechanisms and organisations involved will be necessary.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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)	August 18, 2011 Yes - key risks and mitigation measures included.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	August 18, 2011 Yes - links to GoH and ODA activities are included together with links to existing GEF projects in Honduras and elsewhere in LAC.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	August 18, 2011 Yes, sufficient detail at PIF stage as mentioned in Q17 additional details of how CSOs are integrated into project execution will be necessary at CEO endorsement.	
	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?	August 18, 2011 Project management costs are at 5%.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	August 18, 2011 Generally yes, but see point 2 in Q14.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	August 18, 2011 Cofinance is at a ratio of 3:1, of which 82% is cash cofinance.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	August 18, 2011 Yes, UNDP is providing \$1 million cash co-finance.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	August 18, 2011 Not at this stage please address the issues above.  September 06, 2011 Yes, PIF recommended.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
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*	August 18, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 06, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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**

<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Decision Points</b>	<b>Program Manager Comments</b>
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.