



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

GEF ID:	9330		
Country/Region:	Madagascar		
Project Title:	Sustainable Agriculture Landscape Project		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	157909 (World Bank)
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; BD-1 Program 1; CCM-3 Program 5; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$13,699,083
Co-financing:	\$100,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$113,699,083
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	

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>10-27-15</p> <p>Yes. BD-1, BD-4, LD-3 and SFM.</p> <p>The GEF received two documents: Sustainable Agriculture Landscape Project (P154698) with IDA \$50M, and Sustainable Agriculture Landscape Project (P154698/P157909) IDA \$50M and GEF \$ 13.69M. Please clarify why</p>	<p>10-30-15</p> <p>The Operation Portal is full of glitches and we have been obliged to work on two parallel versions of the document: the portal version (which generates a word document) and the word version. The final GEF amount was known with certainty on the last day and the team failed to update the portal version. In the end, both documents got mistakenly submitted while it should have just been</p>

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
		there are two documents and two PI numbers in one of them. 11-3-15 Both documents will be uploaded to PMIS unless instructed otherwise. Cleared	just the one with the correct GEF contribution. As for the PI numbers, P154698 is the PI for IDA and P157909 is related to the GEF, since both financing sources have different agreements and trust funds.
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	10-30-15 Yes Cleared	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	10-30-15 Yes Cleared	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	11-3-15 No. Please elaborate on the Incremental Reasoning in and state the Aichi Targets.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	10-27-15 The GEFSEC is generally supportive of the MFA approach and of the proposed use of the SFM incentive. However the justification of the SFM incentive in the PCN is weak and there is limited information on what the SFM elements would encompass. The drivers of forest degradation and how these drivers will be targeted by the project are not clear. The GEF	11-1-15 The proposed project emphasizes an integrated approach across the landscape: more concretely, it addresses the increasing soil erosion problems upstream and upslope, causing siltation (sand deposit) in rice fields by tackling degradation in the upper watershed and/or even the entire river basin, not only in the immediate watershed and degradation and biodiversity loss issues in the nearby PAs

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>fails to see the strong links to forest management that would justify the use of the proposed SFM incentive in the order of \$5M+. The PCN therefore requires strengthening in terms of the approaches, methodologies and outcomes expected to result from the use of the SFM incentive</p> <p>The project is mainly an agriculture and irrigation project. Please elaborate on the use of mostly BD resources with comparable few LD resources. Not clear why the SFM incentive was maxed in the project. It is very difficult to consider the use of CCM and the project is very light on carbon benefits (i.e. storage, avoided emissions).</p> <p>The GEF fails to see a strong justification for the use of \$7.0+ M of BD resources. Not clear what Protected Areas in the three zones will be targeted and what activities will be carried out with these funds; Boeny (4 PAs), Sava (3 PAs), Analanjirofo (3 PAs). Please provide a table with the 10 PAs indicating the previous GEF investments if any, and the most likely interventions with the proposed GEF project discussed in the PCN. Please indicate if the</p>	<p>and forests, through efforts in integrated landscape management (ILM). The project would therefore encompass the full scale of the agriculture-environment and development-conservation nexus, and designing corresponding solutions for connectivity across the landscape. All interventions happening upstream and upslope from the irrigated perimeters are related to the following activities: i) for largely intact habitats: continuing to protect the already established PA and support sustainable management of non PA forests; ii) for slightly degraded habitat, promoting sustainable management of forests that are outside the PA and that are still productive enough essentially via supporting the existing CBNRM structures, promoting the creation/development of timber and non-timber products value chains, etc., promoting agroforestry techniques (including agro-silvopastoralism to renew the traditional pasture renewal through bush fire), etc.; iii) for more degraded forests, restoration activities to connect fragmented patches of forests, afforestation for address (at least partly) the needs in fuelwood, and using agroforestry techniques for protecting the slopes from erosion.</p> <p>FAPBM (the Foundation) has increased the co-financing using revenues from the</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Foundation for Biodiversity and Protected Areas (FAPBM) will work in this new GEF Project and what is going to be its role, as appropriate. Please also clarify the value added of ecotourism in the context of this project.</p> <p>We welcome the World Bank to program GEF CCM STAR allocation in the proposed agriculture project in Madagascar. We expect that the World Bank develops a component in the project that is align with smart agriculture as indicated in GEF 6 CCM Program 2 under Objective 2. The smart agriculture component should generate benefits of greenhouse gas emission reductions.</p> <p>A minimum of risks and mitigation/monitoring measures should be mentioned (land tenure issues, timber value chains, reputational risks).</p> <p>Under the Component 1, they should include a Land Degradation Neutrality target setting framework in the list of tools, as a decision was taken at the UNCD COP12. This project may be an illustration of what can be done to "protect", "restore" lands, and improve productivity on</p>	<p>combined IDA/GEF contributions from 4 PAs (484,000 ha) in 2012, to 8 PAs (813,000 ha) in 2013 and 10 PAs (1,050,000 ha) in 2014 (Masoala, Andoahela, Tsaratanana, Ankarana, Zahamena, Ambatovaky, Ranomafana, Midongy Sud, Baie de Baly, Bemaraha). At this early PCN stage the team is still unable to say with certainty which protected areas will be included in the final PAD of the proposed project. In general, FAPBM covers about 50% of the total budget for each of the PAs, including contribution to salaries and running costs of MNP, conservation, provision for technical and financial support to the PA management units and development activities. As preparation proceeds the selection of PAs will be finalized. However it is important to mention that the three proposed target areas for the project intervention were prioritized based on extensive consultative deliberations between the three sectoral ministries to ensure maximum synergies on the ground.</p> <p>The data sheet in error indicated linkage to CCM3- Program 5. The project as designed contributes to CCM2- Program 4 (Promote conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks in forest, and other land use, and support climate smart agriculture). This has been revised.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>agro-ecosystems: potentially an interesting pilot case of Land degradation neutrality. It will be very complementary of a landscape approach.</p> <p>Please clarify the use of GEF resources (if any) in the proposed "Emergency Contingency Fund"</p> <p>11-3-15 Please check the requirements for CEO Endorsement under item 8. Cleared</p>	<p>The project design will certainly promote climate-smart agricultural practices through sustainable agricultural intensification and the rehabilitation of irrigation schemes that can increase productivity and support resilience and adaptation to climate change. As indicated above the SFM related activities are integrated to ensure the linkage between upstream and downstream activities. Relevant indicators to track progress will be included in the results framework. Related to mitigation, at least two (the Analanjirofo landscapes) of the 4 zones of the project are overlapping with the Emissions Reduction programme, that is expected to generate Verified Emissions Reduction and financed by the carbon fund. The first payment is expected to take place 5 years after the beginning of the project</p> <p>Well noted by the team and will be taken into consideration as the project document preparation proceeds. Indeed, i) land tenure is a non-negligible issue that represents risks, especially for the interventions related to the watershed management. Also, ii) ensuring proper timber value chains implies dealing with issues related to illicit/illegal timber products that can represent more than 50% of the timber products on the local market</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>Recommendation well noted by the team. Land degradation neutrality target setting framework will be included in the list of tools under component 1.</p> <p>The GEF resources will not be used in the proposed Emergency contingency fund.</p>
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	10-30-15 Yes Cleared	
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>10-27-15</p> <p>On page 10 of Document P154698/P157909, it says: "The proposed project, and program, involves blending various sources of finance. With respect to the proposed project finance will include IDA (US\$50 million), Global Environment Facility (US\$17 million from the country STAR-6 allocation plus resources from the Sustainable Forest Management window), carbon finance such as that originating from Emission Reduction Purchase Agreements with the Carbon Fund (up to US\$50 million), if Madagascar's program meets the necessary quality requirements". Why</p>	<p>10-30-15</p> <p>The contribution of the GEF is US \$13.69 million (excluding agency fees); the US \$17 million figure on page 10 is a mistake. Error will be corrected. For the US \$50 million from Carbon Fund, Madagascar recently submitted a proposal for Emission Reduction Program and the idea note got accepted recently, which means that Madagascar is now officially entitled to compete against other countries already in the pipeline to get the funding. If Madagascar signs an Emission Reduction Purchase Agreement with the Carbon Fund of FCPF, there will be no upfront payment; payment will only take place after delivering verified emissions reduction (VER) results. In other terms,</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>is the GEF amount different here? Please also clarify the status of the request of the \$50M from the Carbon Fund</p> <p>11-3-15 The Agency fee is different on front page of the GEF Data Sheet (\$1,250,917) than on Table D (\$1,232,917). Please check values in LoE and recalculate Data Sheet as needed.</p>	the FCPF funding would not be available before at least 5-years after the starting date of the project implementation (which is expected to be by end of 2017).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	<p>10-27-15 Yes. A LoE was provided by the OFP Cleared</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? 	NA	
Recommendations	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>11-3-15</p> <p>Not at this stage.</p> <p>Please take care of issue under item 7 (Agency fee) and confirm that the following items will be delivered by the WB at PID and/or CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>PID Please elaborate on the Incremental Reasoning and indicate the Aichi</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Targets.</p> <p>CEO ENDORSEMENT</p> <p>1. A map of the watershed(s) where upstream and downstream activities will take place, including the location of the target Protected Areas, forest areas subject to the interventions indicated in the Response Matrix for Large Intact habitats, for slightly degraded habitat, and for more degraded forests. Please also indicate the location of areas to go under climate smart agriculture.</p> <p>2. Indicate the activities to be carried out in the target Protected Areas, and how they relate to the ongoing investments by FAPBM, as appropriate. Of the 10 PAs of the 3 target zones (Annex 7), only Masoala and Tsaratanana are being supported by FAPBM, as stated in the Response.</p> <p>3. Indicate the activities to support sustainable management of non-PA forests in large intact habitats and slightly degraded habitat, and the interventions in more degraded forests. Please link them to the forested areas in the map under The GEF does not finance afforestation to address the needs of fuel wood.</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>4. The Agency needs to provide detailed data, assumptions, methodologies, and calculation steps that are used to estimate the amount of carbon emission reductions.</p> <p>11-9-15 The Program Manager Recommends CEO PIF Clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	November 04, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	November 09, 2015	
	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 PIF ³ stage from:		

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