



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

GEF ID:	<b>9300</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Madagascar</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Strengthening National Capacities to Meet Global Environmental Obligations with the Framework of Sustainable Development Priorities</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5582 (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>CCCD-1; CCCD-2; CCCD-3; CCCD-4;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$50,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,950,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$2,000,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$3,950,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Susan Waithaka</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Mr. Tom Twining-Ward,</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>The project is consistent with the Cross Cutting Capacity Development (CCCD) objectives for GEF 6. However the project is attempting to address CCCD 1-4 which appears to be very ambitious for a project of this size. The budget available is only \$500,000 - unless a justification can be provided for more than that.</p> <p>The number of objectives should be</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>streamlined, overlapping addressed which should in turn reduce the budget which is high for projects of this nature.</p> <p>Further work requested.</p> <p>09/03/2015 SW</p> <p>Done. See note (NO 7) on budget agreement).</p> <p>It is noted that the CCCD objectives mentioned in table A - are not referred to in the main document and no linkage is made to these objectives within the narrative. Please make these linkages.</p> <p>11/11/2015</p> <p>There are still too many outputs for this project and this had made it extremely complicated to follow. It would be good tighten the outputs and simplify it. As requested below - a numbering system will also assist in the follow up.</p> <p>More information requested. SW 2/29/2016</p> <p>Done. Cleared</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>SW 4/9/2016</p> <p>Partially. The project mentions that it is consistent with the NCSA but no specifics are given. There is mention of a Capacity Development Strategy and this is not clear if this is separate from the NCSA process or was indeed from the NCSA process. Please clarify and provide more information on the gaps to be addressed.</p> <p>The baseline information provided is not specific. Please provide more clarification. (Note: On page 8 there is use of an acronym that is not elaborated upon. Please correct this.)</p> <p>Additional Information requested</p> <p>9/3/2015 SW</p> <p>Information provided - and to be firmed up during project development. However the acronym MMD is still not clear which institution this is. Please provide full name.</p> <p>11/02/2015 SW</p> <p>Cleared</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		SW 2/29/2016	
<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>Yes - the project has outlines the causes of environmental degradation citing habitat loss resulting from heavy deforestation along with over - exploitation and hunting. It also cites increase mining activity along with population pressure encroaching on natural habitats.</p> <p>Cleared 09/17/2015</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>Please explain this sentence - "The incremental costs of this project is determined on the basis of the main criterion that the co-financing achieved an equal share of the GEF increment will be negotiated with potential donors." The rest of this paragraph explains the incremental reasoning - please rephrase the first sentence.</p> <p>Further information requested. 09/16/2015 SW</p> <p>The first sentence was rephrased and this is now much clearer. The reworded sentences is ;The expected leveraged co-financing for this project will be at least 1:1 of GEF grant to non-GEF contribution on the basis of</p>	

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

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>negotiations with potential donors.</p> <p>Cleared SW 11/02/2015</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>Not quite. The components in table B should be numbered to correspond with what is in the text under 1.3. in the document (page 10) which is numbered for ease of reference.</p> <p>On Component 1 - Much more work would need to be done to develop a national sustainable development strategy and this is beyond the scope of this project. Please revise this to developing elements that can be used towards a national sustainable development strategy. Make it more specific and realistic. It may be very difficult to update key legislative texts (how many), pilot updated and mainstreamed sector development plans, pilot mainstreaming Rio Conventions in regional and sector plans for the amount of money mentioned \$(250,000).</p> <p>Further more - there is a lot of overlap between component 1 and component 4. Look to see how you can make this one component and reduce the overlaps.</p> <p>Component 2: Please explain what the</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>project outcome means- and what will be achieved with the budget of 130,000. This appears very ambitious.</p> <p>For Component 3, this could be the basis for the whole project. A little more information on how this will be done, its scope and the final EMIS will be necessary if you decide to continue with this project given the amount of funds available.</p> <p>Component 4 - some elements seem to overlap with those in Component 1. As with all the objectives it is also very ambitious and not specific. Component 1 talks of comprehensive policy and legislative analysis of environmental governance. Component 4 looks at institutional analysis of environmental governance. Component 1 refers to integrated Rio Conventions into Sustainable development strategy,. while component 4 refers Rio convention mainstreaming best practices (into what?) and what is the difference between these two. Component 1 has as an output; Pilot mainstreaming Rio Convention in regional and sector development plans and Component 4 refers to piloting regional mainstreaming best practices. I think there is need to look</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>closely at both these components and their outputs and outcomes and revise them.</p> <p>Component 5 “ while welcome - is also very wide and generic and would need to be much more specific. A bit more focus or information on which directorates and services will be involved. In GEF 6 - the GEF would like to see more involvement of other Ministries such as Agriculture, Finance and Budget, industry etc. that have an impact on the environment and could benefit from these trainings.</p> <p>It is also unclear what types of training would be provided. We require more specific information on exactly what will be done under this component - which institutions are involved, what curricula and how many training are planned.</p> <p>Additional information requested 09/16/2015 SW</p> <p>Information on how many legislative texts to be identified during project formulation and outlined for CEO endorsement.</p> <p>Under Component 2: The outcome as</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>stated in table B - at the end of the project there will be sustainable financial resources mobilised for global environmental benefits. Please explain how this will be achieved. Where will the finances be mobilized from?</p> <p>Component 3: Please reword the outputs to clearly reflect what will be achieved. As they are currently worded this is not entirely clear - For instance please qualify what will happen with the sustainable development indicators - are they to be refined or identified or developed? Also for the standardized data collection methodologies - will they be developed or improved. Where possible please quantify them. What will be done with the best practices for conducting environment impact and strategic environmental assessments?</p> <p>Component 4: The outputs are vague - despite the explanation that this is a mainstreaming exercise. How do you arrive at the budget of \$550,000 for this component - especially as it is not at this point stated in a measurable way?</p> <p>Component 5: Can you provide an</p>	



## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>outline of the budget breakdown for this activity? You are dealing with a large group of Ministries and as you are not able to quantify this activity at this point, please explain the budget of \$900,000.</p> <p>More information and clarification requested.</p> <p>11/02/2015 SW</p> <p>Provided somewhat. However a more tightened wording for the outcomes and outputs - avoid the mix ups, they should be clear and identifiable deliverables. Also as requested earlier - the numbering the outputs would assist in following up on them. Please number them - so for Component 1 - you will have 1.2 - 1.6. etc. Please consider reducing the outputs and make it sharper and more focused.</p> <p>The concern still remains that as the outputs are so general - it is hard to justify the budget that has been given. Given that the NCSA just took place, it should be easier to have more quantifiable outputs e.g the number of legislative texts, etc. For Component 3 - the outputs as they are stated are</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>extremely vague - - Baseline assessment of current database - what is proposed with this? Will it be revised, updated, does it exist or it will be developed anew? - the EMIS - is it being developed or updated or disseminated - as it reads it is hard to know what work will go into this output and therefore what the budget will be. The same applies to most of the outputs as they are currently written.</p> <p>For Component 5 - the first output is a project activity and not to be funded by GEF. Also the outputs should be reduced they are too many.</p> <p>Please revise SW 2/29/2016</p> <p>Provided. Cleared. SW 4/0/2016</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes Cleared. 09/09/2015 SW	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	N/A	
	• The focal area allocation?	N/A	
	• The LDCF under the principle of	N/A	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	equitable access		
	<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>	<p>The funds will come from the CCCD. However this budget is beyond the \$500,000 limit for CCCD project and will need to be revised.</p> <p>More information requested 09/16/2015 SW</p> <p>Further to discussions between UNDP HQ and the GEF Sec, the project budget remains the same. This project is strategically important for a large African LDC, and has the potential to leverage at least US\$ 2 million in co-financing and more than justifies the GEF request within the parameters of GEF Medium-Size Projects.</p> <p>This is correct and this is further to a programming process (the NPFE) that the country is going through in prioritizing their projects for GEF 6 in the main focal areas for which this project will be supportive. It will be important for this project to take note of other processes on going even as the prioritization is ongoing.</p> <p>Cleared 11/02/2015 SW</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>Not yet. Please address the comments raised above.</p> <p>09/16/2015</p> <p>The PPG amount is within the norm.</p> <p>More clarifications requested before recommendation for PIF clearance.</p> <p>11/10/2015</p> <p>More information requested.</p> <p>SW 2/29/2016</p> <p>Recommended for Clearance and PPG.</p> <p>SW 4/29/2016</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	September 17, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	November 11, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 29, 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 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?		

## CEO endorsement Review

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