



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

GEF ID:	9793		
Country/Region:	Madagascar		
Project Title:	Conservation and improvement of ecosystem services for the Atsinanana region through agroecology and the promotion of sustainable energy production		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
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-2 Program 3; CCM-1 Program 1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$136,986	Project Grant:	\$3,789,955
Co-financing:	\$20,075,000	Total Project Cost:	\$23,864,955
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Adamour Bouhari

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	Yes.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please, confirm the level of dialogue you have developed with the cofinancing partners (CSO, IFAD, JICA, WB). - Which of these projects are directly connected with the current proposal in terms of geography (in the region of 	

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>Atsinanana) and themes (SLM, forest restoration, bamboo, energy).</p> <p>September 20, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
Project Design	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>On page 11, for Component 3, please do the following:</p> <p>1. Undertake literature review and market research on the use of energy efficient cook stoves and bamboo gasification generators in the Atsinanana region and in the whole country of Madagascar. The results should justify why this project needs to spend GEF funds in energy efficient cook stoves and bamboo gasification generators. This will also justify innovation of the project, since promotion of energy efficient cook stoves has been taking place already in the country.</p> <p>2. Clearly indicate who are the owners of the manufacturing facility of cook stoves, who are the owners of the 300 ha of lands, and who are the owners of the 25 kW bamboo gasification generator. Who will benefit from GEF resources?</p> <p>3. Please justify cost-effectiveness of</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the GEF investment in wood cook stoves and bamboo gasification generators. Scenarios on investing GEF grants in solar PV, solar cook stoves, mini-hydro power, and wind power should be designed and analyzed against efficient wood cook stoves and bamboo gasification generators.</p> <p>September 20, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>- The metrics in the table F seem relatively low, with a weak value for money. Please, explain, justify, and/or change.</p> <p>Section 5 on the GEB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please mention the area of interests (PA, KBA...) that will be indirectly better protected by the proposed mainstreaming activities. - The GEB 1. and 2 seem low. - GEB 4: include the coverage under SLM and/or SFM, - Provide metrics or remove the GEB #5; - The GEB 6 is not a GEB. However, you can describe the development benefits that will be generated in addition to the GEB (livelihoods, food security...). <p>September 20, 2017</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>Addressed.</p> <p>Please, revise the formulation of the project objective: "to contribute" is not a verb to use for a specific, measurable and accessible objective. We would also like to see the beneficiaries reflected in the objectives.</p> <p>Outcome 1.2: improved management of 878,885 ha of forest and agricultural lands seem a little optimistic. Please, justify or reduce.</p> <p>Output 1.1: We are supportive of the establishment of platforms at landscape level (in accordance with local authorities and administrations). However, a new mechanism at national level does not seem justified. Please, refer to existing platforms.</p> <p>Output 1.2: This output has a pretty vague formulation and is either too ambitious or the anchorage/justification of these strategies and policy recommendations is not clear.</p> <p>Outputs 1.3, 1.4, 2.4, 3.1: Revise the formulation, they are not formulated as outputs (specific, quantifiable, realistic, defined in the time).</p> <p>Outputs 1.5, 3.1, 3.2: explain the institutional and legal anchorage of these plans, assessments, and</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>strategies (which should already exist);</p> <p>The risk section is very restrictive: what about the risks related to the lack of capacities, lack of institutional continuity, difficulties of project implementation, financing management, monitoring, ...</p> <p>September 20, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include a gender study in the PPG to better figure out the inequalities. - Explain at CEO endorsement how this study would have influenced the result framework. <p>September 20, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
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? 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>However, slight adjustments may be needed for the LD allocation (LD allocation: \$1,497,930; project request+PPG+fees: \$1,500,000).</p> <p>September 20, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of 	NA	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	equitable access		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	NA	
Recommendations	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Table E (PPG): Please check the values in the tables; the PPG total (136,986) does not match with the sum of the precedent lines (136,886). - Please, check the breakdown of cofinancing and the sums in the different tables (red alert in the PMIS). <p>September 20, 2017 The PIF is recommended for clearance.</p> <p>During the PPG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confirm the coverage of lands under conservation, restoration, and plantation/management (include baseline maps). - Confirm the metrics and the methodologies to calculate the GEB. - Provide a clear definition of each land use: conservation, restoration, plantation, management. Include the safeguards, if any. - Provide an updated rural energy assessment to adjust the strategy and the interventions. 	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include CSO, scientific organizations, and local communities in the implementation phase. - Develop a gender strategy. - Develop a coordination mechanism with similar approaches, notably related to the Bonn Challenge, REDD+, and integrated approaches (GEF/WB/AFD PADAP for instance). 	
Review Date	Review	March 24, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 20, 2017	
	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?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		

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?		
	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		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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.