



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

GEF ID:	<b>9372</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Sri Lanka</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Managing Together: Integrating Community-centered, Ecosystem-based Approaches into Forestry, Agriculture and Tourism Sectors</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5804 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-4 Program 9; LD-2 Program 3; SFM-1; SFM-3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$100,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$2,725,622</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$28,450,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$31,175,622</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ulrich Apel</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Doley Tshering</b>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	<p>Yes, alignment to BD Program9, LD Programe 3, SFM Program 2 and 8 are noted. However, it is not clear if all the components are related to SFM and require review. Please refer below comment.</p> <p>Information on alignment to Aichi targets is also not provided. Please clarify.</p>	

<sup>1</sup> 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>15 June 2016 SFM finance still requires review (see below). Adequate information on linkage to Aichi targets provided.</p> <p>12 July 2016 UA: SFM request has been reduced to \$1.2 million. The justification for SFM has been strengthened and concept aligns with SFM-1 and SFM-3.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>Project alignment to NBSAP, NAP and relevant national forest policies is not clear. Please provide necessary information.</p> <p>15 June 2016 Linkage to NBSAP is noted. No information on the linkage to NAP. Please provide necessary information.</p> <p>12 July 2016 UA: Information has been provided.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>No, not sufficient.</p> <p>The key driver for forest loss is recognized as agriculture but it is not sufficiently clear how the pressure from agriculture will be addressed</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>through the project. Land use planning etc could be tools but please further clarify approaches on how the project will be working with agriculture sector.</p> <p>On tourism, it is unclear how this project will enable market transformation towards "biodiversity-friendly tourism." Private sector involvement in the suggested activities are not specified, wider national scale policy interventions are also unclear, and the definition of biodiversity-friendly tourism is unclear. Substantial review on component 3 is required.</p> <p>15 June 2016 Adequate additional information provided at this stage. Additional detail information is expected at the CEO endorsement stage on the drivers.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>While the incrementality of component 1 and 2 are recognized, SLM and SFM linkage on component 3 is very weak. Please refer also to above comments and review the relevance and activities of component 3. If this component has minimum linkages to SLM and SFM, the PM</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>recommends not to pursue SFM finance and perhaps focus on BD benefits for the tourism component.</p> <p>15 June 2016 Further information has been provided. Component 3 is not linked to SFM and SLM, and part of component 1 is also not linked to SFM. The project would not qualify for requesting full amount of SFM incentive. The PM, in consultation with the SFM and SLM team at the GEFSEC suggests to drop or reduce the SFM incentive request.</p> <p>12 July 2016 UA: Linkages among the components have been improved and SFM request has been reduced to \$1.2 million.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>GEBs for component 1 and 2 are sufficiently clear, however again, outcome/outputs identified under component 3 requires review and revision to strengthen GEBs.</p> <p>The biodiversity-friendly tourism activities that are identified look more like an old integrated conservation and development activities without much market analysis and private sector involvement. Please review</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the component in view of lessons learned from many other countries on similar initiatives.</p> <p>It is commendable that UNDP and IUCN have come together to work together on a mainstreaming MFA project, however, please clarify further on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) how this project relates to the GEF-5 ESA project;</li> <li>2) how the two GEF agencies will work together (i.e. institutional structure) of the project.</li> </ol> <p>15 June 2016</p> <p>Substantial revision has been made on the components. However, further clarification is required on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) how the project will ensure private sector involvement in the project activities? How would it incentivize private sector involvement to biodiversity-friendly certification etc? Any financial incentive, tax system to be considered? Noting that project will engage private sector "as much as possible" is not sufficient for this type of project. Concrete policy and financial measures to ensure engagement of private sector would be required. Please further clarify.</li> <li>2) On table F, target for COs mitigation is way too high than the</li> </ol>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>norm for the area that is targeted. 57 million sounds like an entire carbon stock of these forest. Should calculate benefits over a baseline/reference level. Please kindly review this carefully and revise the target.</p> <p>12 July 2016 UA:                      (i) Further clarification on private sector involvement has been provided.                      (ii) CO2 mitigation target has been revised down to 4.5 million tons of CO2eq.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>Gender consideration is very general and not specific to the country/thematic topic. Please review and provide tangible information.</p> <p>Please clarify involvement of indigenous peoples in the project.</p> <p>15 June 2016                      Adequate information has been provided. Appropriate implementation plan for both gender and IPs are required at the time of CEO endorsement.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	12 July 2016 UA: SFM request has been reduced to \$1.2 million. Please note that the SFM program is over-subscribed. The amount of \$1.2 million for this project is currently available, however, it will need to be re-checked at the time of work program inclusion.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>No. Please review the above comments and address the issues.</p> <p>15 June 2016 No. Additional information has been provided but some elements require further information. GEBs and SFM incentive requires careful review and revision. Please address the comments and resubmit the revised PIF. PM is also available to clarify any issue upstream.</p> <p>12 July 2016 UA: Please clarify if this project is jointly IMPLEMENTED by UNDP and</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>IUCN or if IUCN is only an executing agency. If IUCN is IA, please provide exact breakdown of requested resources by Agency in Table D and also provide us with the new agency ceiling certification. Please resubmit the PIF in a clean version.</p> <p>After that, PIF can be recommended for CEO clearance.</p> <p>3 Aug 2016 The GEFSEC received a revised PIF that clarifies joint implementation of UNDP and IUCN, and breakdown in finance. The PIF is recommended for CEO clearance.</p> <p>17 August 2017 UA: The revised PIF with adjusted figures submitted on 8/17/2017 does not make full use of the available resources for Sri Lanka, which are: \$2,674,146 STAR \$1,100,000 SFM including agency fees and PPG.</p> <p>Please consider adjusting figures accordingly.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 10, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 15, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 12, 2016	



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	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		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> 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.