



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

GEF ID:	9434		
Country/Region:	Timor Leste		
Project Title:	Securing the Long-term Conservation of Timor Leste Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services through the Establishment of a Functioning National Protected Area Network and the Improvement of Natural Resource Management in Priority Catchment Corridors		
GEF Agency:	CI	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):	SFM-1; SFM-2; BD-1 Program 1; LD-1 Program 1; LD-1 Program 2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$3,340,367
Co-financing:	\$12,292,000	Total Project Cost:	\$15,732,367
PIF Approval:	May 04, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	June 09, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Cyrille Barnerias	Agency Contact Person:	Ian Kissoon

PIF Review			
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>	Yes	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	The following still needs to be	

<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>drivers<sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is no mention nor assessment of the attempt by Gvt, accompanied by the Gvt of Australia &amp; Birdlife, to establish a protected area network (PAN). Please provide lessons learned and how the failures will be addressed</li> <li>2. The 2007 Ninos Konis Santana NP benefited from CTI/USAID funding. Please provide assessment including of the CB NOAA training &amp; follow-up implementation.</li> <li>3. In para. 29 please summarize NEGA issues &amp; recommendations and explain how the proposed project will succeed and previous failures avoided.</li> <li>4. Please add the following High Risks in Table 4:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.1 how will the capacity hurdle which up to today has not been solved be solved through the project</li> <li>4.2 How will the current lack of enforcement of current laws be remedy for current and new laws? should regulations be envisaged versus new laws?</li> <li>4.3 Sustainability</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. In the light of past results, please change the ratings of the first 2 risks from low to medium.</li> </ol>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound</p>	<p>The sustainability section needs to</p>	

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

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	incremental reasoning?	clearly factor in the barriers and how they will be removed to achieve sustainability	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>Please quantify the GEBs (# of has covered by PAN/forest cover/sucos etc; #parks/, etc.) in Tables B&amp;F and in text under each component's outcome.</p> <p>For example, the previous work on the PAN estimated the PAN to cover 3,200km<sup>2</sup> inclusive of terrestrial and marine PAs</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	yes	
<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>	Timor Leste benefits from the flexible option. This proposed project and PPG amount to \$2.5M of STAR resources	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	The proposed project uses the flexibility option through a \$2.5M STAR allocation for BD & Land Degradation.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	SFM incentive is currently available. However it will need to be re-checked	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		at work program stage	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	Please address above comments 4/5/2016. All above comments have been addressed satisfactorily. PIF is recommended for clearance.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	<p>2017-12-19</p> <p>- Changes from the PIF version are presented and some justifications are provided.</p> <p>- In PIF, the project proposed 100 unemployed youth trained and graduate per year and 100 adults participate in NRM training. The project now targets 100 youth trained in NRM management under outcome</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>2.2. We saw that you initially thought of 100 youth per year, making it 400 total, which is now said to be too optimistic. Could you please first relate that to the population concerned? Is there a reason for not keeping the 100 adults also trained in NRM? Could you please confirm that you will target unemployed youth and bring them to graduation?</p> <p>- regarding the measure of the social benefits, we agree that the sustainable livelihoods framework appears more comprehensive than just the households income. Is there a methodology for gathering the various elements that constitute the sustainable livelihoods framework and for calculating it? If yes, could you please provide it or make a reference?</p> <p>- For output 3.1.2, could you please detail what the suco NRM plans implementation initiation will cover as initiation can cover a wide range of reality?</p> <p>- Targets in the new version reflect the move of Output 2.1.3 to Outcome 2.2, but could you also please add the equivalent Output under Outcome 2.2 in table B?</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>- We noted the important diminution of targets concerning the CO2 mitigated from 2,7 million metric tons to 7561124 metric tons.</p> <p>2018-02-02</p> <p>- Yes. comments addressed. We noted the changes in the targets.</p>	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>2017-12-19</p> <p>- Please provide an objective in table B.</p> <p>- Please quantify the GEBs (# of has covered by PAN/forest cover/sucos etc; #parks/, etc.) in Table B.</p> <p>2018-02-02</p> <p>- yes. comments addressed</p>	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	<p>2017-12-21</p> <p>- Cost effectiveness is mainly based on Strengthening community based management capacities which can indeed be cost-effective in the long term if they are well adopted by the targeted population.</p>	
	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	<p>2017-12-21</p> <p>- Please detail how the project will deal with the climate change impact on the reforestation or afforestation (resistant species, increase water</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	enhance climate resilience)	reserves, plantation techniques ...).  2018-02-02 - Comments addressed.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	2017-12-19  - Co-financing is confirmed and evidence provided.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	2017-12-21  - Could you please explain how the project target 1 in table F relates to the number in the tracking tool?  - Please add reference to the methodology used for your carbon benefits calculations, for further information on recommended methodologies please check the GEF Guidelines for Greenhouse Gas Emissions Accounting and reporting for GEF Projects, Annex 5.  2018-02-12  - Thank you for providing some information on the GHG emission accounting.  - Could you please complete the information missing regarding the reduction of deforestation thanks to the soft interventions to be implemented by the project.	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>- All mentioned planned activities that will deliver carbon benefits such as agroforestry, reforestation of degraded lands and riparian buffers can be better reported if the EX-ACT tool is used.</p> <p>- For a complete and valid reporting of GHG emissions reductions the GEF recommends the use of the EX-ACT tool (FAO).</p> <p>2018-03-29</p> <p>- We look forward to seeing the use of the EX-ACT tool and completion of the reporting with that tool.</p>	
	<p>7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?</p>		
	<p>8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>2017-12-21</p> <p>- The ProDoc provides a good list of projects. Apart from GEF project 4930 for which a specific entry point is provided, most other refer to potential synergies and opportunities. Could you please give details on if contacts have already been made with the projects listed and how the project will coordinate with them?</p> <p>2018-02-12</p> <p>- Comments addressed</p>	



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	<p>2017-12-21</p> <p>- yes, and M&amp;E plan is presented.</p> <p>- Regarding indicator 2 (demarcation), could you please precise what kind of demarcation the project aims at and what would mark its success?</p> <p>2018-02-12 Yes. Comment addressed.</p>	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	<p>2017-12-21</p> <p>- The project has elements of knowledge management strategy.</p> <p>- Are there plans that could allow to keep the most substantive elements of the website after the four years implementation (like synthesis, lessons learned on CI website)? That would be a good element of the KM sustainability.</p> <p>2018-02-12 Yes. Comment addressed.</p>	
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEFSEC</li> </ul>	2017-12-21	

<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.

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>- Please see above comments such as adding Global Environmental Benefits to table B.</p> <p>- Could you also please change the rating of the first risk from low to medium as it was in the PIF?</p> <p>2018-02-12</p> <p>- Comments addressed.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEF Council</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>2017-12-21</p> <p>- No, please address above comments.</p> <p>2018-02-12</p> <p>- No, please see the remaining comments.</p> <p>- Could you also please make sure to indicate "SFM" in the "Multi-focal areas" line in the column "programming of funds" of table D?</p> <p>- Could you please indicate if/how you addressed comments from Council member Germany? For simplicity, the comments are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The final proposal should elaborate</li> </ul>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>in more detail on how the envisaged project will cooperate and take into account the work of other actors working on similar issues in Timor-Leste, these include among others the EU-Global Climate Change Alliance implementation in Timor Leste.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcome 2.1. The outputs related to this outcome need to be based on a solid analysis of drivers of land degradation. The final proposal should either state what data already exists or include an analysis of drivers of land degradation in Timor-Leste.</li> <li>• Output 2.1.1. elaborates on the process to adopt NRM plans in the traditional system. However, information is lacking on how this process is envisaged in the national system, and where the links are between the two systems and potential challenges for the project's success. Including this information in the full proposal would be of great use.</li> <li>• Section Environmental problems and root causes: Paragraph 24 should be strengthened. The upland erosion also contributes considerably to the availability of water (quantity) since it affects the water recharge capacity of the upper catchment areas. Thus, upland erosion control is critical for</li> </ul>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>upper catchment management. The problem analysis should also consider impacts on water quantity.</p> <p>In Timor Leste a great number of donors are active in closely related areas of activities; therefore Germany recommends exchanging experiences / lessons learned and close coordination with these donors.</p> <p>2018-03-29 yes, comments addressed.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	December 19, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 12, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		