



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

GEF ID:	9437		
Country/Region:	Nepal		
Project Title:	Integrated Landscape Management to Secure Nepal's Protected Areas and Critical Corridors		
GEF Agency:	WWF-US	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-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$183,486	Project Grant:	\$6,697,248
Co-financing:	\$42,622,653	Total Project Cost:	\$49,319,901
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2017
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Pascal Martinez	Agency Contact Person:	Renae Stenhouse

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>25 March 2016: Yes. The project is well aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework.</p> <p>1 April 2016: After providing more details, it appears that some activities are not aligned with some GEF focal areas funding windows used for this project. Please see below comments in box 3 (biogas units) and 5 (SFM</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
		components). 6 August 2016 Addressed	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	25 March 2016: Please take into account the Nepal's NDC submitted to the UNFCCC on 11 February 2016, which is coherent with the project and present the alignment of the project with the NDC. 1 April 2016: Addressed.	Noted. Additional text has been added under 'Consistency with National Priorities' to note that the project aligns with the goals of the NDC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • through utilization of the landscape approach for resource conservation and management in forest areas; • reducing dependency on biomass through the use of alternative energy; • maintaining forest cover and enhancing carbon sequestration through sustainable management of forests and improved forest governance to control drivers of deforestation and forest degradation; and • institutional strengthening at various levels of governance and contributing to policies including the Forest Policy, National REDD+ Strategy and the Low Carbon Economic Development Strategy.
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental	25 March 2016: The drivers of the environmental	Regarding alternative energy systems (likely biogas, but to be determined

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>degradation are sufficiently and clearly presented. Regarding the sustainability, the project relies, among other, on technology to reduce dependency on natural resources. Please consider the importance of the proposed alternative energy systems to be financed by the co financing part (as requested in cel 5 below). Regarding the potential for scaling up, it remains unclear how the demonstration sites that are a part of Component 3 will allow for other communities and district staff to see the outcomes and uptake the same technologies and what is additional governmental support that will be a condition for up scaling. Please provide more information accordingly.</p> <p>1 April 2016: Thank your for the additional information provided on the up-scaling. Addressed. Nevertheless, the purchase, installation, monitoring and training for self-maintenance of 6000 biogas units are not eligible under LD-2 Program 3. This program includes indeed practices for sustainable supply of wood and biomass energy, but these practices does not</p>	<p>based on analysis during ProDoc stage); it is proposed to fund alternative energy systems under LD-2 Program 3, which includes practices for sustainable supply of biomass energy, and by co-financing (under a government program run by AEPC under Ministry of Population and Environment). This is noted in the revised PIF.</p> <p>The value of such systems is in reduction of off-take of trees for firewood by reducing household consumption of fuel wood. Reducing demand for fuel wood in communities adjacent to critical forests in the short term helps to sustain the supply of fuel wood in the long term. The installation and use of biogas units promotes stall feeding of livestock, rather than open grazing, as a consistent supply of manure is needed to produce the gas for cooking. The gas is pure methane, clean and odorless, and burns more effectively than wood, increasing the efficiency of cooking. There are multiple benefits from biogas units: reduced GHG emissions, reduced impact to local species, reduced forest degradation from tree removal and overgrazing of cattle, and livelihood co-benefits. This is now noted in the Component 3 text.</p> <p>There is high sustainability for ongoing</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>corresponds to biogas unit, even if it logically alleviate the pressure on forest resources. This activity should be funded by the co-financing part. Please adjust the PIF accordingly.</p> <p>6 August 2016 Addressed</p>	<p>use of the alternative energy systems as they have a long life span, monitoring is undertaken by AEPC, and the project will ensure training of recipients so there can be self-maintenance. There are long term benefits beyond the project period in terms of reducing fuel wood collection and the associated carbon emission reduction benefits. This is now included in the section on sustainability.</p> <p>Regarding scaling up, the team has revised the PIF to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • include an activity for community-based learning and exchange of lessons on interventions in the demonstration sites, both among recipients and also communities more broadly in the landscape's buffer zones and corridors • provide more information on government support to facilitate scaling up across the landscape successful project interventions. This scale up will be supported by ongoing government programs on: community and leasehold forest development; national forest development and management; and soil conservation programs.
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	25 March 2016: Yes.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the	25 March 2016: Please address the following	1- Outcome 1.2 wording has been adjusted to better reflect the outputs, and now reads as:

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	GEBs?	<p>comments:</p> <p>1- the outcome 1.2 refers more to capacity building and training than to landscape planning and management. The wording should be adjusted for a better coherence with the outputs.</p> <p>2- The project will support biodiversity and socio-economic surveys and stakeholder consultations for Bramadav, Karnali and Kamdi corridors to analyze the feasibility for proposal for Protection Forest status. It is unclear how such surveys can achieve an improved protection status and planning for this corridors, especially if the Protection Forest Status is not doable.</p> <p>3- To demonstrate integrated landscape management in key field sites in the project buffer zones and corridors, the project will undertake interventions to reduce threats to forests and wildlife. This interventions are only quoted (Climate Smart Agriculture and community gardens, integrated livestock management etc...). As it is by far the most important component of the project in terms of resources allocated (half of the total project amount), more information on these</p>	<p>Outcome 1.2: Capacity increased for multi-stakeholder and cross-sector landscape planning and management</p> <p>2- Under the UNDP-GEF WTLP, seven forest stretches were identified as corridors because of having critical biodiversity and connectivity value, and a Corridor Management Guideline was developed and endorsed by MoFSC. The WTLCP catalyzed MoFSC to declare three of the corridors as Protection Forest and to develop management plans for these three corridors (WTLCP Terminal Evaluation). One further corridor was designated after the WTLCP closed.</p> <p>The first step in the government's process towards Protection Forest designation is to conduct surveys for assessing the status of biodiversity. If the area is justified with respect to biodiversity values, a socio-economic survey is conducted to understand the human element, then a series of stakeholder consultations are undertaken to determine whether the local communities agree on the proposed designation and what conditions are required to achieve consensus. Protection Forest status ensures government staffing and funding, which</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>interventions will be welcome (scope, numbers, species...). In particular, as it is an SFM supported project, the forest intervention has to be highlighted.</p> <p>4- One of the intervention of the output 3.1.1 if the provision of alternative energy systems (e.g. biogas, solar). If this is indeed a way to reduce fuel wood collection, please note that the such activity is not included in the project focal area objectives. The project should thus explicitly mention that this intervention will be founded by the co-financing part.</p> <p>5- To improved the response on wildlife crimes, the project proposes basically the support for community-based approaches to human wildlife conflict mitigation, as well as training and equipment for a wide range of stakeholders (Community Based Anti Poaching Units, Protection Forest Councils and district staff). Nevertheless, the lack of law enforcement capacity is also presented to be the result of a lack of staff in the DPAWC. Please explain further how the proposed activities will be efficient and how the success of the related outcome (3.2) will be</p>	<p>assists long-term protection and management.</p> <p>The proposed project will fund the required surveys for three remaining undeclared corridors in TAL. The cost for undertaking the surveys for the 3 corridors does not exist under government budget and has been requested under this project to move forward towards an outcome of official designation of all seven TAL corridors.</p> <p>If the surveys and consultation find that Protection Forest status is feasible, MoFSC will finalize the process for declaration, develop management plans, and dedicate staff (Protected Forest Manager and rangers). The alternative would be designation as Integrated Community Conservation Area. In this second option, integrated community conservation area, all forest patches would be under the community based management and requiring a management plan with provision of conservation of biodiversity.</p> <p>The PIF has been revised to better reflect this.</p> <p>3- More information on the project interventions, including species and scope, has been provided in the revised</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>evaluated in the targeted areas.</p> <p>6-The increasing demand for wildlife is presented as an important threat. How the project is facing this issue to ensure that this threat will not undermine the results of the project?</p> <p>1 April 2016:</p> <p>1- Addressed.</p> <p>2- Thank you for your complement which is very clear. Please briefly specify the conditions and feasibility of the establishment of such Integrated Community Conservation Areas. The importance of this point is to ensure that with GEF support, the protection status will be effectively improved. Some elements regarding the results in terms of protection in the already established Protection Forest will also be welcome to enhance the relevance of this outcome in the project strategy.</p> <p>3-The SFM activities of the proposal are now presented in the PIF, thank you. Nevertheless, the activites proposed does not appear clearly aligned with SFM-2 Program 5, whose objective is the capacity development for SFM within local</p>	<p>PIF under Component 3 in the section on proposed alternative scenario. The forest interventions have been highlighted also further detailed under Component 3. Interventions have been more clearly identified as SFM or LD related under two outputs in Component 3, in the Table B and in the proposed alternative scenario.</p> <p>The details of this work will be elaborated and defined with partners during prodoc development.</p> <p>4- In the GEF-6 Programming Directions for LD 2: generate sustainable flows of ecosystem services from forests, Program 3: landscape management and restoration, examples of GEF support for land management options with multiple environmental benefits includes point (c) SLM approaches to avoid deforestation and forest degradation in production landscapes, including practices for sustainable supply of wood and biomass energy. As such, LD-2 Program 3 supports practices that promote the sustainable supply of wood and biomass energy, which is interpreted to include alternative energy such as biogas, which reduces household consumption of fuel wood collected from forests. This has been noted in the section on proposed alternative scenario, in the paragraphs on</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>communities: the livestock management refers to LD focal area and the invasive species are addressed by the BD focal areas.</p> <p>As regard to the invasive species in particular, our experience has been that this kind of activities are quite expensive with limited results. We therefore suggest that the project spend its resources and energy on other proposed activities to achieve a stronger impact. For the same reason, we invite the agency to remove the "study tours" of the outcome 1.2.</p> <p>In general, as SFM funding is important in the project (\$2,5 million, 1/3 of the GEF grant), please provide a stronger and clearer strategy on forests and SFM, based on the GEF programming Directions.</p> <p>4- Not addressed, see comment above.</p> <p>5- Addressed.</p> <p>6- Addressed.</p> <p>6 August 2016 All comments are addressed</p>	<p>alignment with GEF focal area strategies.</p> <p>The alternative energy systems in selected communities will be funded under LD-2 Program 3 and also under co-financing from the AEPC (under Ministry of Population and Environment).</p> <p>5- As noted in the PIF baseline section, there is a very strong baseline for law enforcement in the protected areas, by DNPWC, DoF, the Nepal Army, and Nepal Police (Central Investigation Bureau), and organised and overseen by national government. There is less law enforcement in the buffer zones and the corridors, and these areas are under the management of Community Forest User Groups and District government. As such, the project proposes support to this level for the buffer zones and corridors. The project's GEF funds will provide appropriate training and equipment for enforcement. This has been noted in the revised PIF.</p> <p>The government is adding 900 staff to DNPWC over the next two years, to work as game scouts, to do ground level surveillance. The project will use GEF funds to provide training, including on law enforcement, for these staff. This</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>will assist to close the gap in law enforcement capacity in DNPWC. This training has been included under Component 1 in the text and in Table B.</p> <p>The project will coordinate with the Global Partnership on Wildlife Conservation and Crime Prevention to access agreed best practice indicators to evaluate 'improved response on wildlife crime' in the target areas, and the baseline for the indicator will be measured during project preparation, and targets will be set.</p> <p>6- Nepal is globally recognized as a leader in wildlife protection, for example, the country has again achieved zero poaching for rhino. However, the demand for tiger products in south and south-east Asia is leading to poaching of tigers in Nepal, and particularly in Bardia National Park. There have been four cases of tiger poaching in Bardia NP in the past year, linked to professional poachers recruited by networks from neighbouring countries. This has been added to the narrative on threats and root causes.</p> <p>Project support will be provided for training and equipment for anti-poaching units in the Bardia NP buffer zone, and to anti-poaching in the core zone,</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			towards ensuring that the demand for tigers in trade does not undermine the efforts of the project to better manage and restore tiger habitat in the project sites. This has been added to the PIF under Component 3 text.
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	25 March 2016: Yes.	
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? 	25 March 2016: Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	<p>25 March 2016: The resources requested in BD (\$2,433,333) and LD (\$2,433,333) are above the remainder in BD (\$1,844,899) and LD (\$1,962,551). The remaining resources of NEPAL allow these adjustments using the marginal flexibility as stated in GEF procedures. Nevertheless, the letter of endorsement from the Nepal's Ministry of Finance doesn't mention the use of the marginal flexibility in the STAR Focal Area allocations. Please, adjust the letter of endorsement accordingly, providing details on the amount of resources moved from which focal area to which other.</p> <p>1 April 2016:</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Not addressed yet.</p> <p>6 August 2016 Addressed. Nevertheless, be aware that the SFM resources are not guaranteed at this stage and will depend on the actual availability of the SFM resources when the project will be included in the work program.</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>25 March 2016: Not yet. Some few comments need to be addressed and the letter of endorsement need to be adjusted mentioning the use of the marginal flexibility.</p> <p>1 April 2016: Some adjustments are still required.</p> <p>Generally speaking, Nepal has already done similar activities, i.e. landscape planning with community level activities, in many places and by different donors. We encourage the agency to build on decades of these experiences and strengthen the proposal on focusing more on less targeted activities in line with the focal area objectives, showing a</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>difference from other past experiences, in order to achieve lasting, stronger and replicable impacts.</p> <p>Finally, please use the CO2 t unit in the PIF and recalculate, as relevant, taking into account a stronger SFM objective.</p> <p>6 August 2016 Yes, all the comments have been addressed and the PIF (including the PPG) is now recommended for clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

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

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?		
	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?		

CEO endorsement Review

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