



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

GEF ID:	5516		
Country/Region:	Mozambique		
Project Title:	Payment for Ecosystem Services to Support Forest Conservation and Sustainable Livelihoods		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; CCM-5; SFM/REDD+-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$136,986	Project Grant:	\$3,637,748
Co-financing:	\$11,503,840	Total Project Cost:	\$15,278,574
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Adrian Whiteman

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 <b>country eligible</b> ?	8-20-13 Yes. Mozambique is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared  FJ/CCM “ 21 Aug 2013: Yes. Mozambique ratified the UNFCCC on 25 Aug 1995.  CLEARED	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	8-20-13 Yes. There is LoE from the OFP for \$4.1M dated June 7th, 2013 Cleared  CLEARED	

\*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>8-20-13 No. The requests for BD, and CC funding are above the allocation after the decisions of the June Council meeting. Mozambique currently has BD \$1,860,637, and CCM \$530,000. If FAO and Mozambique want to pursue this project under this new scenario, please adjust the budget accordingly.</p> <p>1-21-14  From a SFM perspective, the project is using more than \$2 million of STAR allocation from at least two focal areas (\$2,748 ,859) and can trigger a SFM incentive up to \$916,268 (only 876,712 were requested. Please review \$ figure in Tables A, B and C. if additional resources are sought).</p> <p>CHANGES NEEDED HERE</p> <p>1-30-14 Properly addressed in revised PIF Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>8-20-13 No. The requests for BD, and CC funding are above the allocation after the decisions of the June Council meeting. Mozambique currently has BD \$1,860,637, and CCM \$530,000. If FAO and Mozambique want to pursue this project under this new scenario, please</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>adjust the budget accordingly.</p> <p>1-21-14</p> <p>From a SFM perspective, the project is using more than \$2 million of STAR allocation from at least two focal areas (\$2,748 ,859) and can trigger a SFM incentive up to \$916,268 (only 876,712 were requested. Please review \$ figure in Tables A, B and C.</p> <p>For a \$3.625 million, it is an unnecessary burden to report on three focal areas and the SFM program. We would suggest transferring the LD resources (\$ 164,384) to CC to develop a more balanced project between BD, CC, and SFM. The indicative grant amount for CC would then be \$776,256. This "marginal adjustment" will be reflected in PMIS.</p> <p>CHANGES NEEDED HERE</p> <p>1-30-14 Properly addressed in revised PIF Cleared</p>	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
<b>Strategic Alignment</b>	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic</b>	<p>8-20-13</p> <p>Yes. BD-2 (and Aichi Targets 5, 7 and 14), CC-5, LD-2, SFM-1.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p><b>objectives?</b>  <i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>FJ/CCM “ 21 Aug 2013:  Yes. CCM-5.</p> <p>LD  From a LD perspective, the project is fully eligible under the LD2 objective. The LD resources are blended with other focal areas in three components. The use of LD resources is welcome to design a PES mechanism, reinforce institutions and capacities, and implement the approach on 400,000 ha of miombos forests ecosystems.</p> <p>SFM  The project is compatible with the SFM1 objective with the enhancement of the enabling environment linked to forest management, the reinforcement of capacities in sustainable financing mechanisms for SFM, the establishment of a PES mechanism.</p> <p>CLEARED</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>8-20-12  From the BD point of view, Ministerial Diploma of 2005 establishing mechanisms for channeling of 20% of the rate of harvesting of forest and wildlife for the benefit of local communities living in areas where the exploitation of these resources occurs is a central piece of legislation supporting this project. According to a report of the Government of Mozambique "NATIONAL REPORT TO THE TENTH SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS FORUM ON FORESTS", the result of the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>implementation of this diploma, 1189 beneficiary communities where identified, of which 896 communities were organized into committees for natural resource management. From this total, 861 had benefited with around \$3.7 million). Similar figures were provided in the PIF for the period 2005-2012. In addition, the Ministerial Diploma will allocate 50% of the values from the fines paid by the laws breakers to the law enforcement agents and all those who participated in this process was prepared and is being implemented allowing a better collaboration of the people involved on the patrol chain.</p> <p>FJ/CCM “ 21 Aug 2013: Yes.</p> <p>JMS/LD - 21 January 2014 Please, check the compatibility with the UNCCD National Action Program (NAP).</p> <p>CHANGES NEEDED HERE</p> <p>1-30-14 Properly addressed in revised PIF Cleared</p>	
	6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b> , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>8-20-13 Ministerial Diploma of 2005 establishing mechanisms for channeling of 20% of the rate of harvesting of forest and wildlife for the benefit of local communities living in areas where the exploitation of these resources occurs, and the allocation of 50% of the values from the fines paid</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>by the laws breakers to the law enforcement agents and all those who participated in this process, conform the financial baseline of the project.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <p>1. In the PIF there is reference to payments of \$3.3M to communities in the period 2005-2012, and to \$7.7M available under the 20% decree, for making the payments under the PES schemes (This amount is similar to the \$7M figure presented in the PIF submitted in 2007 (PMIS 3436), as co-financing form the central government.</p> <p>The GEF requires clarification regarding the flow and use of funds collected under the Ministerial Diploma.</p> <p>1. Are the ca. \$7M mentioned in the PIF submitted in 2007 (PMIS 3436), the same as in this new PIF (PMIS513)?</p> <p>2. What was the impact of the \$3.3M disbursed to the communities for natural resource management between 2005 and 2012?</p> <p>3. Why \$7.7M has not been disbursed?</p> <p>4. How much has been collected thanks to the allocation of 50% of the values from the fines paid by the laws breakers to the law enforcement agents and all those who participated in this process?</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>FJ/CCM “ 21 Aug 2013:</p> <p>a) The project list a number of on-going and planned initiatives for forest carbon monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV), but does not identify what is lacking in those initiatives and why additional work on forest carbon MRV would be necessary. Please clarify or adjust the proposal.</p> <p>b) The project also identifies a World Bank project at PIF stage with similar goals. Although the World Bank project and the proposed project will target different areas, the proposed PIF does not clarify why the approach of the GEF project #5225 could not be extended at the national level and why a different approach would be needed. Please clarify or adjust.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Jan 10 2014: The previous comments from CCM have not been addressed.</p> <p>CHANGES ARE NEEDED HERE</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Jan 27 2014:</p> <p>a) Comment cleared. It is understood that GEF funding will not be used for forest carbon monitoring, reporting and verification since other initiatives (JICA) are covering this aspect.</p> <p>b) The response does not address previous comment b). GEF finance is supposed to support innovative initiatives that may later be replicated and scaled</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>up. Proposing a project with a similar approach than project #5225, at a similar scale, only in a different location does not provide a strong justification for the project. One would expect a project additional to the existing ones to propose activities enabling the country to act at a larger scale.</p> <p>CHANGES ARE NEEDED HERE</p> <p>FJ/CCM - 7 Mar 2014: Comment cleared.</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>8-20-13 This project is basically the same as the project presented by FAO and Mozambique in 2007.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <p>1. In this new PIF (5516) there is no reference to the PIF submitted in 2007 (PMIS 3436). What has happened and changed over the last 5 years to merit the resubmission of the project?</p> <p>2. Why Mozambique wants to put in place a PES scheme to use the funds collected thanks to the 20% decree, if funds have been allocated to the communities working on natural resource management? Is there an independent report describing the process that has been put in place and requesting changes that merit the developing of new schemes like the PES suggested in this project?</p> <p>FJ/CCM “ 21 Aug 2013:</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>a) The PIF intends to develop a PES mechanism but does not explain how this mechanism will be designed to ensure it will target carbon sequestration and carbon depletion avoidance.</p> <p>b) For the PES mechanism to work, the payment procured by the mechanism would have to provide stakeholders with at least the same amount of income currently provided by unsustainable practices (illegal logging, charcoal productionâ€). The PIF does not explain how it would ensure this. Please provide an estimation of the income currently provided by unsustainable practices and explain how the PES may be able to shift the focus of stakeholders activities to more sustainable ones.</p> <p>c) Having a PES system work properly supposes a strong monitoring and verification systems with the necessary means to implement it. The PIF does not explain how the means for monitoring and verification activities will be sustained beyond the project implementation. Please clarify.</p> <p>REVIEW OF 21ST JANUARY 2014</p> <p>Below is a complete list of the outstanding questions. Some of the questions were put forward in the previous review and some are new. Please address these issues in a revised PIF and provide an answer to the GEF comments in a separate document. As this project is at the PIF stage, please answer the questions to the extent</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>possible and suggest activities to fulfil the information gaps during project preparation. Thanks.</p> <p>1) The PIF intends to develop a PES mechanism but does not explain how this mechanism will be designed to ensure it will target carbon sequestration and carbon depletion avoidance.</p> <p>2) For the PES mechanism to work, the payment procured by the mechanism would have to provide stakeholders with at least the same amount of income currently provided by unsustainable practices (illegal logging, charcoal production). The PIF does not explain how it would ensure this. Please provide an estimation of the income currently provided by unsustainable practices and explain how the PES may be able to shift the focus or stakeholders activities to more sustainable ones.</p> <p>3) Having a PES system work properly supposes a strong monitoring and verification systems with the necessary means to implement it. The PIF does not explain how the means for monitoring and verification activities will be sustained beyond the project implementation. Please clarify.</p> <p>4) Tax collection - with 90% of logging illegal that means 90% of tax is not being collected - what is being done to address this? How can this project link to that? If the tax collection does not increase this</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>fund will always be underachieving.</p> <p>5) What is the link between the PES recipients and their "authority" to collect the money? The Government owns the land - logging is done either by long term or short term license. What is the PES recipients' tenure or rights? What is the authority for the recipients to change forest management? What is the capacity to stop illegal activities by 3rd parties (assuming the PES is enough to make them change their own ways)?</p> <p>6). There needs to be some sort of MRV system built into this that connects to the system being developed within the FCPF. This will have to look at the system as a whole (that money is flowing i.e. it is accountable and transparent) but also show that the PES = benefits in terms of BD,CC etc. in the pilots.</p> <p>7) In Table B. please change 4 priority provinces for 1 priority province (Zambezia Province).</p> <p>CHANGES NEEDED HERE</p> <p>From SFM; For CEO Endorsement please address the following issues: 1) the involvement of local communities in identifying and preventing incidences of illegal logging through this project. That will aid in improved fine collection. 2) It is necessary to design a mechanism for monitoring how local communities would</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>participate in law enforcement activities, identify and report illegal activities to DNTF, so they receive a fair share of the fines collected. This is related to the MRV system being developed by JICA-DNTF to be linked up to the system developed within the FCPF.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Jan 27 2014:  a) The previous comment a) is not addressed yet. Please clarify how the payments provided through the PES would be linked to increases in carbon stocks or reduced carbon depletion.  b) Please see CCM comments of Q8 below.  c) Details are expected by CEO endorsement on the means available at the National Directorate of Land and Forests (considering their other duties) to adequately proceed with the monitoring and verification activities needed for the PES during and beyond project completion.</p> <p>CHANGES ARE NEEDED HERE</p> <p>FJ/CCM - 7 Mar 2014:  a) Cleared. Details on the exact way the PES reward will work based on carbon benefit are expected at CEO endorsement stage.  b) Cleared.</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>8-20-13</p> <p>From the BD point of view, the GEBs would be included in the ca. 12 million ha of Miombo forest ecosystems under sustainable management.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Question: What would be the approximate cash flow needed to incentive the local communities to do sustainable forest management in this area? In the 2007 PIF funds were accumulating at a rate of \$1.4M/year. If that is approx. the same as now, the financial incentives per ha for the 12 million ha would be \$0.1/ha per year. Please use these calculations as illustration of the figures the GEF would like to have to estimate the viability and sustainability of the proposed PES scheme. Thanks.</p> <p>FJ/CCM “ 21 Aug 2013:</p> <p>a) In situation where illegal logging and charcoal production are the main drivers of forest depletion, supporting changes of those unsustainable practices in targeted areas may protect the selected areas but may also lead to shifting the logging and charcoal production to other zones. Since the project does not include activities to reduce the demand for logging and charcoal, it will not be able to avoid such shift. In that case, there would not be any or only limited carbon benefits from the project. Please clarify and consider including activities in the project that would address the drivers of carbon depletion at a proper scale to avoid any risk of leakage.</p> <p>b) Please address Q6 a) and b)</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>c) Please clarify how Component 3, with an investment co-financing of \$12.5 million may manage to sequester 41.8 million tCO<sub>2</sub> eq. This seems very unlikely.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Jan 10 2014: The previous comments a) and b) have not been addressed. Regarding question a) Please clarify if the demand for charcoal production and illegal logging is local, national or international as this affects the capacity of the project to deliver net CCM benefits (no leakage). Please include activities in the project that would address the drivers of carbon depletion at a proper scale to avoid any risk of leakage.</p> <p>JMS/LD -January 21 2014</p> <p>1. The increase of forest cover would result in increased forest area of 20,000 ha (and not 200,000 ha). Please correct the figure on p. 9.</p> <p>2. We recommend including a list of other benefits (livelihoods, incomes, NTFP, etc), even if they are often difficult to measure at a project scale.</p> <p>CHANGES ARE NEEDED HERE</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Jan 27 2014: The previous comments a) and b) have still not been addressed. Projects have to address carbon depletion drivers to be eligible to GEF CCM-5 funding. Based</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>on the response provided, it is understood that (i) the key drivers of carbon depletion are charcoal and illegal logging; (ii) these drivers are linked to urban demand/activities; (iii) the project does not currently include activities to curb these drivers. To justify GEF CCM-5 funding request, the project needs to demonstrate that it will reduce the charcoal and illegal logging demand and hence effectively reduce carbon depletion (instead of seeing carbon benefits in the targeted area being replaced by carbon depletion elsewhere). To justify GEF CCM-5 funding request, please consider (i) setting up and implementing a sustainable mechanism to replicate the proposed PES system at a national level (on all forests); and (ii) adding activities improving charcoal kiln efficiency to reduce charcoal demand. The latter would imply (i) understanding the barriers to the adoption of improved kilns and (ii) activities to support and replicate improved kilns use as replacement of current kilns.</p> <p>CHANGES ARE NEEDED HERE</p> <p>FJ/CCM - 7 Mar 2014:</p> <p>a) In the unforeseen event of the SNV project not following through activities on improved kilns, details are expected on how the GEF project will address and reduce fuel wood demand for charcoal and how the project will ensure the replicability and scaling up of the associated activities beyond project</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>completion.</p> <p>b) By CEO endorsement request, details are expected on how the project will ensure that the human and financial resources needed (to monitor and validate the carbon benefits on which the payments will be done) will be identified, put in place and secured for replication and scaling up beyond the proposed pilot.</p> <p>CLEARED: Comments included in CEO Endorsement Requests</p>	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>8-20-13 The Local Communities of the 4 priority provinces would be the beneficiaries of this program. Not clear what role CSOs (i.e. Centro Terra Viva) or NGOs (i.e. Livaningo and KULIMa) would play in the project.</p> <p>8-20-13 The Local Communities of the 4 priority provinces would be the beneficiaries of this program. Not clear what role CSOs (i.e. Centro Terra Viva) or NGOs (i.e. Livaningo and KULIMa) would play in the project.</p> <p>1-21-14</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>The project has narrowed down the geographical scope of the project. The specific communities and CSOs to be included in the project should be identified at CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>CLEARED</p>	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	<p>8-20-13 The risk analysis and mitigation measures are basically the same (in some cases identical) as in the 2007 project. One would have thought that the risks associated with a PES scheme at the National level would have changed in 5 years. The GEF expects a detailed account of the risks associated with the institutional capacity to properly structure and run a PES scheme.</p> <p>1-21-14</p> <p>1. Please address the mitigation measures for "likeage". That is really not addressed in the revised PIF. The issue of leakage was also mention in point 8.</p> <p>2. Please address the risks associated with the financial and institutional sustainability of the PES mechanism and mitigation factors.</p> <p>3. Identify the risk and the measures to maintain sustainable local governance mechanisms beyond the time and budget of the project.</p> <p>At CEO endorsement, please provide a detailed risk assessment.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>CHANGES NEEDED HERE</p> <p>1-30-14 Cleared</p>	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>8-20-13 There is no mention to the recent GEF projects in support of PES, like PMIS 2589 UNDP-Institutionalizing Payments for Ecosystem Services and PMIS 3807 UNEP-Project for Ecosystem Services (ProEcoServ). Have you consulted with these two agencies on their experiences in these two projects and the viability of the PES scheme in Mozambique in light of the experiences gained over the last 5 years? There is also the Katomba Group East and Southern Africa. These consultations need to be done prior to PIF approval.</p> <p>FJ/CCM “ 21 Aug 2013: Please address Q6 a) and b)</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Jan 10 2014: The previous comments have not been addressed.</p> <p>1-21-14 Consultations with the developers and implementers of the projects now listed under A.4 are expected at CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>CHANGES NEEDED HERE</p> <p>1-30-14 Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		FJ/CCM - 7 Mar 2014: Comments cleared.	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>8-20-13 Innovation: Although the GEF has only supported the development of two national PES scheme projects (Mexico and Costa Rica), with this in Mozambique being a potential third, this PIF has hardly changed since first submitted in 2007. Significant and serious work will be needed to update and beef-up this PIF for consideration by the GEF. If Mozambique wants to have a national PES scheme, it is necessary to carry out exploratory work and consultations with those that have done it before (Mexico and Costa Roca) and with those that have been exploring PES schemes in Africa over the last years (References in the Review Sheet).</p> <p>Sustainability. There are outstanding issues on sustainability under item 6 and 7 of the review.</p> <p>Scaling up. Not an important consideration as the PES scheme needs to be up and running for considering expanding beyond the 4 pilot provinces.</p> <p>1-21-14 Please address the issue of sustainability (Institutional and Financial).</p> <p>1-30-14 Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>8-20-13 Please address the co-financing questions under item 6 and item 8 c).</p> <p>1-21-14 The issue of whether or not the flow of funds per unit area (made under item 8 in the previous review) will be sufficient to make the PES system viable and sustainable is still to be resolved. A key question here is: Is the payment enough to discourage the current behavior of land-owners and move them in the direction of Sustainable Land Management so these investments render Biodiversity, Land and Climate Change benefits?</p> <p>CHANGES NEEDED HERE</p> <p>1-30-14 Cleared</p>	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line	<p>8-20-13 Please address the question on co-financing under item 6 and item 8 c).</p> <p>1-21-14</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	The co-financing brought up by FAO (\$200,000 in kind) is very limited. We would like to see a more significant contribution with cash (at least at CEO endorsement).  CLEARED	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	8-20-13 Yes. It is 4.7%. Cleared	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	8-20-13 The PPG request is within the agreed amount for this FSP. Cleared	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>8-20-13 No. Please address all outstanding issues. Because this PIF was very much the same as the PIF presented in 2007, the GEF will require SIGNIFICANT improvements in the project. PLEASE DO TAKE THE TIME TO EXPLORE THE ISSUES AND PROVIDE CONVINCING ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS PROPOSITION.</p> <p>1-21-14 No. While there are significant improvements in the PIF in response to BD comments, most of the questions raised by CCM are still unresolved. Some questions have emerged from SFM that require attention too. Please address them prior to resubmission.</p> <p>The GEFSEC will be happy to convene a conference call with FAO to discuss these questions as required.</p> <p>1-30-14 No. Please address outstanding issues under items 6,7 and 8. The GEF Secretariat would be available for consultation over email or teleconference.</p> <p>3-10-14 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO	1-21-14	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	endorsement/approval.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide detailed carbon calculation</li> <li>2. Develop the multiple benefits of SFM in addition to the GEB;</li> <li>3. Develop a comprehensive stakeholder analysis and mapping; explain how the project will work at local level and will help to develop sustainable mechanisms and capacities.</li> <li>4. Include gender issues.</li> <li>5. Provide a comprehensive risk assessment and what the mitigation measures are.</li> <li>6. Address in full the points raised in the PIF review on matters of leakage and sustainability of local governance mechanisms).</li> <li>7. Consult with the developers of the other GEF projects on PES.</li> <li>8. Develop sustainability aspects (PES, distribution mechanisms, local governance, monitoring).</li> <li>9. Address the issue of the involvement of local communities in identifying and preventing incidences of illegal logging through this project. That will aid in improved fine collection.</li> <li>9. Address the issue of the involvement of local communities in identifying and preventing incidences of illegal logging through this project. That will aid in improved fine collection.</li> <li>10. It is necessary to design a mechanism for monitoring how local communities would participate in law enforcement activities, identify and report illegal activities to DNTF, so they receive a fair share of the fines collected. This is related to the MRV system being</li> </ol>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>developed by JICA-DNTF to be linked up to the system developed within the FCPF.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - 7 Mar 2014:</p> <p>a) Details on how the PES will work based on carbon benefit are expected at CEO endorsement stage.</p> <p>b) Details are expected by CEO endorsement on the means available at the National Directorate of Land and Forests (considering their other duties) to adequately proceed with the monitoring and verification activities needed for the PES during and beyond project completion.</p> <p>c) In the unforeseen event of the SNV project not following through activities on improved kilns, details are expected on how the GEF project will address and reduce fuel wood demand for charcoal and how the project will ensure the replicability and scaling up of the associated activities beyond project completion.</p> <p>d) By CEO endorsement request, details are expected on how the project will ensure that the human and financial resources needed (to monitor and validate the carbon benefits on which the payments will be done) will be identified, put in place and secured for replication and scaling up beyond the proposed pilot.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	August 20, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	January 21, 2014	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 30, 2014	

\* **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.**