



Protecting biodiversity and recovering degraded ecosystems - RECOVER Honduras

Basic Information

GEF ID

10220

Countries

Honduras

Project Title

Protecting biodiversity and recovering degraded ecosystems - RECOVER Honduras

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP, FAO

Agency ID

UNDP: 6295

GEF Focal Area(s)

Multi Focal Area

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

No, as the PIF provides no detailed elaboration of this alignment but simply lists the programs in the BD and LD focal area strategy with little explanation of the relationship between the project design and the FA strategies. In fact, the logic of the design seems not to be at all geared towards the BD strategy of the GEF but only the LD strategy of the GEF, as well as the FOLUR IP.

As currently designed, this PIF is geared towards the FOLUR IP. The elements of the PIF that are presented are most closely aligned with the LD FA strategy. As currently presented there is a minimal orientation towards the BD FA strategy and the generation of global BD benefits.

May 3, 2019

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response

3/5/19

A strategy has been designed in which biodiversity conservation through protected areas (PAs) and biological corridors, biodiversity-friendly agricultural production, and sustainable land management (SLM) are linked together for the delivery of related global environment benefits (GEBs). Accordingly, Biodiversity Focal Area (BD FA) Objective 2-7 (BD-2-7: Address direct drivers to protect habitats and species and improve financial sustainability, effective management, and ecosystem coverage of the global protected area estate) has been included as

part of this project. More specifically, the project will contribute to enhancing the management effectiveness and financial sustainability of six PAs covering 299,634 hectares (ha) (PAs: Nombre de Dios National Park [NP], Pico Bonito NP, Texiguat Wildlife Refuge [WR], Cuero y Salado WR, Lancetilla Botanical Garden, and Janett Kawas NP) and consolidating biological corridors covering 256,527 ha between these areas by mainstreaming biodiversity in the production lands within them.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

No the project design and component structure is neither sound or appropriate with regards to the biodiversity focal area. The elements of the components that are most viable are related to the land degradation focal area and the FOLUR IP.

Component One will cost about \$10 million to produce policy, institutional and financial frameworks, action plans, roundtables, and platforms with no measurable global environmental outcomes on the ground. Most of these activities are part of the sustainable development baseline and necessary for sustainable agriculture but it is hard to see why the GEF increment is necessary for these activities particularly given the large benefit that the private sector will realize through these activities. We do not see this component as a viable entry point for the amount of GEF resources requested, particularly from the biodiversity focal area where the request for this component is about 50% of the GEF total.

Component two will cost more than \$20 million with extremely small amounts of GEBs particularly with regards to biodiversity benefits and covering a very small amount of territory. The justification for the use of BD resources for this component is very weak as this is basically a land degradation focused component that seeks to improve agricultural production with an assumption that these will result in co-benefits for biodiversity, with no supporting evidence that this has much of a chance of occurring.

Component three will cost more than \$31 million and again is focused on agricultural and commodity production systems with very limited biodiversity benefits or focus provided even though more than half of the GEF increment is coming from the BD focal area.

Component four seeks funding to support platforms and communities of practice already supported by GEF through previous investments. In addition, we do not believe that the GEF should be paying for the production of a manual on mainstreaming gender in sustainable production systems given the plethora of manuals on gender mainstreaming in the marketplace.

In sum, the components of Table B are geared mainly toward sustainable commodity and agriculture production, and land restoration, and thus are more aligned with the FOLUR IP and the LD FA strategy with very little relationship to the BD FA strategy. Finally, the GEBs produced by this almost \$60 million investment are negligible in total, particularly from a BD FA perspective.

May 3, 2019

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response

/5/19

The project design and component structure has been adjusted in line with objective BD-2-7 and to better reflect mainstreaming of biodiversity (BD-1-1). The project objective has been updated in line with this change as follows: Promoting the conservation of biodiversity through improved connectivity, reduction of threats, and effective management of PAs and biological corridors in Northern Honduras.

Similarly, the project components have been adjusted as follows. It should be noted that the distribution of GEF resources has been also changed accordingly, particularly the contribution from the BD FA:

Enabling a territorial governance framework for the conservation of biodiversity and improved connectivity.

Promoting the conservation of biodiversity and improving connectivity between PAs and production landscapes

Mainstreaming biodiversity and SLM practices into production landscapes

Knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation (M&E)

Specific updates in term of outputs, the number of GEBs to be delivered, and budget distribution are included in Table B of the updated PIF. In summary, the project is now mostly aligned with the BD FA strategy and not with the FOLUR IP strategy; the alignment with the LD FA strategy has not been modified. In addition, the number of GEBs to be produced have been increased and are now in line with the total investment.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

NA.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

NA.

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

NA.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

NA.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

No. There is nothing in the document that indicates that the forests in question are HCVF. In addition, there is no indication from the PIF that this qualifies as a forestry biodiversity mainstreaming project either. Please eliminate all check boxes associated with mainstreaming as this is predominantly an investment that seeks to support sustainable commodity production, with some assumed minor co-benefits to biodiversity.

May 3, 2019

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response

3/5/19

Upon further review, it was found that the forests in question are not HCVF. Therefore the HCVF box was unchecked. The box associated with mainstreaming of biodiversity was kept checked, as project Component 3 will address mainstreaming biodiversity into production landscapes in biological corridors between six PAs. In addition, the box associated with Protected Areas and Landscapes was also checked

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

The project describes the drivers of environmental degradation, but it assumes a much more significant reduction in biodiversity loss from the investment than is justified by the project design. In fact, there is as much chance that if producers gain increased market share they may remove more forest for commodity production if premiums are available for the certified products.

The PIF fails to discuss previous and ongoing GEF investments with very similar kinds of interventions to address very similar root cause analyses of the policy and institutional frameworks and what has happened with their implementation and what has been learned – particularly regarding the impacts of policy change in the Honduran context– and how that is factored into the root cause and barrier analysis and proposed solutions of this investment.

May 3, 2019

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response

3/5/19

The project's description of the global environmental problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed, has been updated to include threats to the six prioritized PAs and the related barriers that need to be overcome to enhance their management effectiveness and financial sustainability.

In addition, previous and ongoing GEF investments with very similar kinds of interventions in the country include: a) GEF5 - Delivering Multiple Global Environment Benefits through Sustainable Management of Production Landscapes (GEF Project ID 4590); b) GEF5 - Strengthening the sub-system of coastal and marine protected areas (GEF Project ID 4708); and c) GEF6 - Agroforestry Landscapes and Sustainable Forest Management that Generate Environmental and Economic Benefits Globally and Locally (GEF Project ID 9262). Reference to these previous and ongoing GEF investments is made in the description of root causes, barrier analysis, and proposed solution as suggested.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

April 19, 2019

The baseline description of external support is robust, but it is unclear what the Government of Honduras is currently investing in the target areas and in the thematic areas of palm oil and cattle production. Please clarify.

May 3, 2019

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response

3/5/19

As part of the baseline, the Government of Honduras (GoH), through the National Service of Agrifood Health and Safety (SENASA), provides technical support and monitoring to the cattle production sector to guarantee the health of herds and the quality of dairy products for their commercialization in national and international markets. This is done in cooperation with the Association of Milk Processors (APROLECHE) and the Honduran Chamber of Milk (CAHLE). In addition, through the National Agricultural and Livestock Extension Program implemented by Ministry of Economic Development, and in cooperation with the University of El Zamorano, the GoH will support the implementation of an agribusiness model for the production and marketing of milk by establishing technical and financial cooperation relations between stakeholders along the milk value chain to enhance productivity and add value to dairy products. This initiative will provide training to 2,500 producers around best management practices, including producers within the prioritized biological corridors and production landscapes. It should be noted that the GoH relies heavily on external support when it comes to investing in agricultural production, including palm oil and cattle production. During the PPG, a more detailed analysis of the baseline will be conducted to identify additional investments from the government to support palm oil and cattle production.

Regarding investment in PAs in the target areas, the GoH invests in the implementation of their management plans primarily through the national Fund for Protected Areas and to a lesser extent reinvestment from tourism fees. In addition, it also relies on multiple sources of external support, including international NGOs (e.g., WWF, MARFUND, Darwin Initiative, and Panthera), bilateral and multilateral cooperation (e.g., GEF, USAID, World Bank DANIDA, Canada Fund for Honduras, and the European Union), and the private sector (e.g., tourism and palm oil sectors), among other donors. During the PPG a detailed assessment will be conducted to identify all funding sources for PA management and to validate the financial gap of the six prioritized PAs, which is estimated at 50% on average.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

Yes. But as noted previously, the alternative scenario responds to the FOLUR IP and its vision, and to a lesser degree the land degradation FA strategy. However, given that 83% of the GEF resources are coming from the BD FA, the alternative scenario produces few measurable biodiversity benefits, and the ones that are identified, are based on implicit assumptions not supported by any evidence.

May 3, 2019

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response

3/5/19

The alternative scenario has been adjusted so that it more visibly responds to and is more aligned with the BD FA strategy (BD-1-1 and BD-2-7), emphasizing related measurable biodiversity benefits.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

April 19, 2019

The PIF is aligned with the FOLUR IP strategy, to a lesser degree the LD FA strategy, but not at all with the biodiversity focal area strategy.

May 3, 2019

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response

3/5/19

The project design and component structure has been adjusted to be more in line with objective BD-2-7 and to better reflect mainstreaming of biodiversity (BD-1-1). Alignment with the FOLUR IP strategy has been removed.

5. Is the incremental / additional cost recovery properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C 31 /122

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.51/12?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

April 19, 2019

The incremental reasoning is described per the guidelines, but it is not viable from a BD perspective as the amount of resources being spent from the BD FA can not be justified vis a vis the GEBs generated.

Please also note that in para 20 the document notes that \$103 million of cofinance will be leveraged for this project, whereas all the tables present \$50 million as the cofinancing number.

May 3, 2019

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response

3/5/19

The incremental reasoning was updated to make it viable from a BD perspective and to justify the amount of resources being spent from the BD FA and the related GEBs, including: 299,634 ha of PAs under improved management effectiveness, 256,527 ha of biological corridors gazetted, and the confirmed presence of the endangered Central American tapir (*Tapirus bairdii*), factors which were not previously considered.

Reference to the total cofinancing in paragraph 20 (now paragraph 23) was changed to \$56.2 million in line with Table C - Indicative sources of co-financing for the project by name and by type, note that there was an increase in the co-financing

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

The project's contribution to GEBs is reasonable and achievable but very modest, particularly given the overall investment of \$60 million. In addition, the GEBs for biodiversity are extremely limited as well.

May 3, 2019

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response

3/5/19

The project's contribution to GEBs has been revised and expanded, including GEBs for biodiversity associated with improve the management and financial sustainability of six PAs and the gazetting of biological corridors, which are part of Honduras' strategy to conserve biodiversity, reduce habitat fragmentation, improve connectivity between ecosystems, and promote sustainable production processes that improve the quality of life for local populations who use, manage, and conserve biodiversity (Regulation of the Biological Corridors of Honduras 632-2015).

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

April 19, 2019

There is nothing particularly innovative about this project design as it has been supported by GEF and other donors in the past, and most recently in the GEF-6 IAP on commodities and now in the GEF-7 FOLUR IP. The design is largely silent on what has been learned and incorporated into this new project based on decades of experience in promoting sustainable commodity production.

May 3, 2019

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

By the time of CEO endorsement, please provide a budgeted and detailed plan for replication with measurable targets.

Agency Response

3/5/19

The description of on the potential for innovation has been adjusted as suggested and highlights biodiversity conservation and ecosystem connectivity, which is now emphasized more in the strategy of the PIF. This section now reads as follows:

Although Honduras is already implementing a strategy for the effective management of protected and interconnected areas within biological corridors in southwestern Honduras through the GEF6 project Agroforestry Landscapes and Sustainable Forest Management that Generate Environmental and Economic Benefits Globally and Locally (GEF Project ID 9262), this new project is innovative as this strategy will be implemented for the first time in Northern Honduras, enhancing the connectivity between interior mountain PAs and coastal PAs and working closely for the first time with the palm oil and cattle ranching sectors that are key to the country's economy. An intervention will be achieved through this project, in which biodiversity conservation through PAs and biological corridors, biodiversity-friendly agricultural production, and sustainable land management are linked together to delivery GEBs. The project will build upon past experiences supported by the GEF for mainstreaming biodiversity into production sectors (e.g., Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Sustainable Cattle Ranching [GEF Project ID 3574]) and using LMTs to promote ecosystem connectivity working with the private sector (e.g., Mainstreaming Biodiversity in the Coffee Sector in Colombia [GEF Project ID 3590]). In addition, it will build upon lessons learned and experiences under the Good Growth Partnership regarding the development of business models to manage sustainable commodity production (e.g., palm oil and beef/milk) while conserving forests and ecosystem services

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19 2019

April 19, 2019

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

Please clarify whether any of these stakeholders have been part of the discussion about this project to date, particularly the private sector.

May 3, 2019

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response

3/5/19

Private sector stakeholders consulted during the development of the PIF included the Honduran Association of Banking Institutions (AHIBA) and the Honduran Bank for Production and Housing (BANHPROVI). In addition, the Association of Honduran Cocoa Producers (APROCAHO), the Honduran National Federation of Ranchers and Farmers (FENAGH), and the RSPO Oil Palm Committee wer consulted.

Other private sector stakeholders such as the Industrial Association of Oil Producers of Honduras (AIPAH), the National Association of Foresters of Honduras (ANASILH), the Federation of Agroforestry Producers of Honduras (FEPROAH), and Honduran Federation of Savings and Loans Cooperatives (FACACH) will be consulted during the PPG phase of the project.

Non-private sector stakeholders consulted included the Secretariat of Natural Resources and Environment (MiAmbiente+), the Agriculture and Cattle Farming Secretariat (SAG), the National Institute of Forest Conservation and Development, Protected Areas and Wildlife (ICF), and the Panthera Foundation Honduras.

During the PPG, a stakeholder analysis will be conducted, and a comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan will be developed that includes consultations with additional stakeholders such as CSOs and NGOs, research institutions, and local communities and community organizations, including organizations of indigenous and Afro-Honduran peoples (e.g., Garífuna and Pech). An Indigenous Peoples Plan will be developed to ensure their participation in the project

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

April 19, 2019

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response**Risks**

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

Yes. But many of the mitigation strategies are based on limited evidence of success. For example, the project proposes that making beef and palm producers aware of the importance of BD will somehow mitigate the risk that they will have limited interest in sustainable production has no basis in experiential evidence.

Please review the mitigation strategies in their entirety and apply more realistic assessments of the risk level and propose more creative and honest mitigation strategies.

May 3, 2019

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response

3/5/19

Thank you for your comments, the mitigation strategies were revised and updated in the PIF. Also, please note that additional risks were identified based on UNDP's Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) for project concepts (pre-screening).

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

First of all, UNDP and FAO are listed as co-implementing agencies. Please provide a rationale as to why both GEF agencies are needed and what their specific added value will be.

Second, UNDP and FAO are also both listed as project executing entities. Given that Honduras has an existing portfolio where UNDP is the GEF agency and not the executing entity we see no reason why both FAO and UNDP have to function as project executing agencies. Please revise accordingly

A list of initiatives underway and largely funded by GEF are listed, however, there is no evidence the current design takes any lessons from these previous experiences.

May 3, 2019

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response

3/5/19

UNDP's comparative advantage relies on its breadth of experience in implementing GEF projects related to biodiversity conservation and for improving the management effectiveness and financial sustainability of PAs. FAO's Comparative advantage relies on its breadth of experience in sustainable production and agriculture, as well as land degradation. In addition, FAO has developed a number of tools (e.g., Livestock Environmental Assessment Model [GLEAM], Ex-Ante Carbon-balance Tool [EX-ACT]), which will be used to quantify some of the GEBs to be delivered by the project. When selecting UNDP and FAO as co-implementing agencies, the GoH considered these considerations, as well as the long experience of both agencies in Honduras.

Reference to UNDP and FAO as project executing entities was removed; these agencies will act only as implementing agencies. The list of projects executing entities was modified as follows: Secretariat of Natural Resources and Environment (MiAmbiente+), International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), UN Environment, Secretariat of Agriculture and Livestock (SAG), and National Institute of Forest Conservation and Development, Protected Areas and Wildlife (ICF).

The list of initiatives underway was revised and updated as follows:

a) Actions will be coordinated with the GEF6/UNDP project (2018-2025) Agroforestry Landscapes and Sustainable Forest Management that Generate Environmental and Economic Benefits Globally and Locally (GEF Project ID 9262), which aims to strengthen the connectivity between PAs and production landscapes to generate environmental, social, and economic benefits in the dry-humid biological corridor of southwestern Honduras. Lessons learned and experiences will be exchanged regarding the implementation of sustainable production systems, biodiversity conservation and ecosystem connectivity, and restoration strategies. Similarly, information will be exchanged regarding the process for gazettement biological corridors and stakeholder engagement, including indigenous peoples and women's groups. When considered appropriate, complementarity between the two projects will be sought, which will contribute to the cost-effectiveness of the two interventions.

b) Lessons learned and best practices for the GEF5/UNDP project Strengthening the sub-system of coastal and marine protected areas (GEF Project ID 4708) will be considered. This project is aimed at promoting the conservation of biodiversity through the expansion of the effective coverage of marine and coastal PAs in Honduras. In particular, lessons learned regarding the improvement of the management effectiveness of PAs will be relevant, including the development of management plans for the Cuero y Salado WR and the Jeannette Kawas NP, which are also part of this new project. Also, experiences regarding the piloting/demonstration of tourism as a tool for supporting financial sustainability in PAs will be considered.

c) Actions will also be coordinated with the GEF5/UNDP project (2018-2025) Delivering Multiple Global Environment Benefits through Sustainable Management of Production Landscapes (GEF Project ID 4590), which aims to mainstream biodiversity conservation, SLM, and carbon sequestration objectives into production landscapes and sectors in humid broadleaved and dry zone agroecosystems. Best practices and lesson learned working with platforms of producers, establishing agreements between purchasers and farmers and marketing of sustainable products (e.g., beef dairy products) generating GEBs in production landscapes, and providing technical assistance

and training to farmers will be considered.

d) The project will also consider lessons learned from the implementation of the GEF/World Bank project Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Sustainable Cattle Ranching (GEF Project ID 3574) regarding the use of agro-silvopastoral systems that combine trees, shrubs, and various herbaceous plant species to improve the sustainability and productivity of farms combining agriculture and cattle production, while creating an environment that is vastly more hospitable to biodiversity and is carbon-friendly. In particular, best practices and lesson learned regarding agro-sylvopastoral systems would be used in the implementation of intensive silvopastoral combined with agroforestry (Output 3.5).

e) The project will also make use of lessons learned and best practices resulting from the implementation of the GEF Small Grants Program (SGP) in Honduras. These will include experiences in biodiversity conservation on cattle farms, diversification of production, biodiversity habitat conservation, and restoration of degraded lands, among other related topics. Through Output 2.2, the project will make use of the SGP long experience in Honduras in biodiversity conservation and sustainable production working with CBOs, including women's groups and organizations of indigenous and Afro-Honduran peoples.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

The KM section is so generic it is meaningless. It could be applied to any project in any sector. Please revise.

May 3, 2019

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response

3/5/19

The Knowledge Management section was revised as follows:

Knowledge management activities will be part of Component 4 and will include the systematization of the knowledge generated and the sharing of lessons learned, including women’s experiences. Knowledge products/publications will be developed. The results from the project will be shared within and beyond the project intervention area through a number of existing information-sharing networks and forums, such as the Conference of the Parties of the CBD, the Panorama Portal “Solutions for a Healthy Planet”, and Good Growth Community of Practice. The project may participate in UNDP-FAO-GEF-sponsored networks that are organized for senior staff working on similar projects (e.g., GEF Project ID 9059, Guatemala; GEF Project ID 9262, Honduras; and GEF Project ID 10081, Uruguay) and in scientific and/or other networks that may be of benefit to project implementation. Identifying and analyzing lessons learned is an ongoing process, and the need to communicate lessons, as one of the project’s central contributions is a requirement to be delivered at least every 12 months

OTHER: The project strategy has been revised so that the project is better aligned with the GEF-7 BD FA. This new strategy will allow biodiversity conservation in six PAs through their effective management and financial sustainability, and the consolidation of three biological corridors by promoting ecosystem connectivity using LMTs, biodiversity-friendly agricultural production, and SLM in northern Honduras. These elements are closely linked together for the delivery of GEBs.

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 19, 2019

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

May 3, 2019

Adequate revisions have been provided to all previous comments and the project has been adjusted sufficiently. The PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/19/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/4/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		