

## Indo-Malaya Critical Forest Biome Integrated Program

GEF Secretariat Review for Program Framework Document (PFD) entry – GEF - 8

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

11102

**Countries**

Regional (Lao PDR, Papua New Guinea, Thailand)

**Project Title**

Indo-Malaya Critical Forest Biome Integrated Program

**GEF Agency(ies)**

IUCN, FAO, UNDP

**Agency ID**

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Multi Focal Area

**Program Manager**

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

# GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

## General Program Information

a) Is the Program Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?


### Secretariat's Comments

May 10, 2023

Addressed. See last item.

April 20, 2023

- In General Program Information table there is no content on Anticipated Program Executing Entity neither on Program Commitment Deadline – please ask the Lead Agency to fill out this information.

Anticipated Program Executing Entity(s):	[Redacted]	Anticipated Program Executing Partner Type(s):	
Sector (only for Programs on CC): 		Program Duration (Months):	72
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area	Program Commitment Deadline:	[Redacted]

### Agency's Comments

IUCN, 6 May 2023

The anticipated program executing entities have been added in the relevant section in the portal and the program commitment deadline has been entered as a date calculated 18 months from the date of June 2023 Council meeting.

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments Addressed.

## Agency's Comments

### Program Summary

- a) Does the program summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the program objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?
- b) Is the program's geographical coverage explicit, as well as the covered sectors? Does the summary explain how the program is transformative or innovative?

## Secretariat's Comments

**May 10, 2023**

Addressed.

**April 20, 2023**

Addressed at PFD level.

However, we suggest describing for each of the participating countries so far, the aspect of transformational change that is expected from participating in this IP (e.g. PNG via: governance/IPLC capacity/rights for managing IFLs, VN this aspect is missing entirely etc.).

## Agency's Comments

**IUCN, 6 May 2023**

Lao PDR Child Project Concept:

To address the comment the following new text has been added in the Child Project Concept Note in section Project Overview and Approach point a) on page 6 last paragraph.

Furthermore, the levers of transformation to address the drivers and threats are three-fold.

First and foremost, this is a governance and management strengthening project designed to support and accelerate existing and planned governmental initiatives. Second, GEF financing for this project is not in isolation but a contributory part to leverage private sector investment, donor and government funding. Third, the IFL-focused intervention is following the first Forest National Strategy allowing the leveraging of decades of lessons learned and working with agriculture and forest sectors. To that end, the project will facilitate the requisite collaboration across sectors and among multiple stakeholders.

#### Thailand Child Project Concept:

Transformational change will be achieved primarily by i) identifying and removing perverse incentives, ii) creating a fully enabling environment for the participation and equitable benefit sharing of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities in the conservation of primary forests and the sustainable management of surrounding buffers, iii) by achieving cross-sectoral and cross-institutional integration to deliver synergistic conservation outcomes, iv) by unlocking private sector financing, including by accessing the domestic carbon market for primary forest conservation, v) by building capacities to integrate the targeted use of tailored remote sensing tools with field-based conservation for improved monitoring and enhanced enforcement, and vi) by enabling transboundary PA management with Lao PDR.

#### **Indicative Program Overview**

- a) Is the program objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- b) Are the components and outcomes sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the program objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the program components and appropriately funded?
- d) Are the GEF program Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 5%? If above 5%, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat's Comments

May 10, 2023

Addressed.

April 20, 2023

- We would like to remind that you need to make the demonstration in which way the use of a tool X or a method Y will help in generating or maximizing Global Environment Benefits Tools: interest and demonstration in supporting GEB to be demonstrate during the PPG. For instance, we are not convinced with the use of GEF resources to finance the IUCN Green List (not found in this PFD, but found in other PFD under the CFB IP. To be demonstrated during the PPG of concerned projects, if needed.

- The PMC portion funded by co-financing is not proportionate to the GEF-funded PMC. It is not an issue at this stage, but please anticipate that we will review the PMC allocation more closely at child project CEO endorsement submission. To be revised during PPG.

- Knowledge Management: While an overall approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been described in the Program Description and communications activities are mentioned, there is no reference to an overall communications strategy/plan. Thus, the agency is requested to include a brief description of a coherent communications strategy/plan for awareness raising and dissemination of program outputs/results, including outreach & dissemination to/from child projects. Please, clarify and correct.

## **Agency's Comments**

**IUCN, 6 May 2023**

### Application of tools and methods leading to GEBs

As advised, the component descriptions have been reviewed and reference was found to the following defined tools and methods listed: i) FPIC ii) OECMs, iii) METT4, iv) Community Conservation Agreements, v) Community Conservation Areas, vi) Sustainability Linked Bonds, xi) Social Behaviour Change Communications. Of these, FPIC, OECMs, METT4 are listed as key methods and tools in the GEF-8 Programming Direction and therefore their appropriateness in generating GEBs is defined. We have improved the demonstration of the contribution of the remaining tools to GEBs where necessary.

### PFD document:

Added clarification on how CCAs will contribute to the delivery of GEBs under Section 2, page 21 of the PFD word document and Part II in the portal.

### Lao PDR Child Project Concept:

To address the comment the following new text has been added in the Child Project Concept Note in section Project Overview and Approach point d) on page 9 last paragraph.

*In this connection, the identification of the site-specific and country-relevant tools and methodologies towards generating or maximizing Global Environment Benefits of the project's interventions will be fully investigated during the PPG phase where an intervention matrix will be developed along with an initial guide document that outlines the available methodologies and tools.*

### Thailand Child Project Concept:

Key tools to be applied by the Thai child project relate to enhanced forest governance. FLEGT Timber Legality Assurance System and the e-Tree traceability platform will help addressing illegal timber trade as a driver of deforestation, whereas the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure will help to address insecure land tenure by IP&LCs as a key driver. Land cover monitoring (SEPAL) and carbon calculations tools (FAO ExAct) will address the barrier of lack of information on primary forests.

### PMC

We acknowledge the comment and as advised will address this during the PPG phase

### Knowledge Management

Thank you for this comment. Kindly note that we have added a communication strategy in the project overview section of the word document as well as in the portal. We have also included text in the overall summary of what is in the different components (for component 5) that comes just before the detailed presentation of each component. We have also expanded outputs 5.7 for RCP as well as country child project and updated in Annex 2: Draft results framework for consistency. In addition, we have added the development of a clear and coherent communication strategy and plan that aligns with the program's objectives and contributes to its overall impact. This plan will ensure that the program's outputs and results are effectively disseminated and that stakeholders are engaged and informed throughout the project lifecycle. We have included the details of what the communication strategy would comprise (tools and methods) of in both cases.

## **Program Outline**

### **. Program Rationale**

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the program design?**
- b) Has the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other program outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**
- c) Is the baseline situation and baseline projects and initiatives well laid out and how the program will build on these?**

d) Have lessons learned from previous efforts been considered in the program design?

e) For NGI, is there a brief description of the financial barriers and how the program – and the proposed financial structure- responds to these financial barriers.

#### Secretariat's Comments

**May 10, 2023**

Addressed.

**April 20, 2023**

- Worth considering whether engagement of the private sector via forest legality/traceability (timber and timber product/content) could contribute positively to the objective of the IP-which goes beyond investment in bankable projects and biodiversity friendly value chain development.

- Suggest including MEA context for IFL conservation/management early on in the program rationale to provide a stronger context for investment. Including the relevance of IFL conservation under UNFCCC (KMGBF and SDGs are there, but climate is left out).

- For PPG please consider current GEF global investments that will have direct relevance to the countries and assessment/planning needed for this IP in the context of GBF T3, policy coherence and NBSAP revision. Please review to maximize complementarity and avoid duplicative funding or activities in regional program or country projects:

- GEFID 10916 “National Planning for an Inclusive and Effective Conservation Approach to Reaching Global Biodiversity Framework Target 3” WWF-US that is developing a Guide to National Planning for inclusively and effectively meeting GBF Target 3 (in cooperation with WCPA) and working with six countries on analysis, consultation, and national planning. The Guide, and experience from these countries should be directly relevant and used as a basis to support GBF target 3 planning under this IP and to avoid duplication.

- GEFID 10920 “Policy Coherence for Global Environmental Benefits” UNEP/ICCF is working on a Guide for legislators to policy coherence for nature positive development and supporting the conservation caucuses in three countries on increasing policy coherence for nature/climate.

- GEFID 11036 “Technical Support for the Global Biodiversity Framework Early Action Support project”

- GEF-7 (and previous) GEF support to BIOFIN

- Please, during PPG, take lessons and best practice from past or on-going projects in the region.

#### Agency's Comments

**IUCN, 6 May 2023**

### Engagement of private sector vis-a-vis forest legality/traceability.

Kindly note that we have added information on this in Section A Project Rationale, page 9 of the PFD word document and the relevant section in the portal, as follows:

“Although voluntary partnership agreements such as FLEGT and certification schemes are mostly relevant to plantations, engaging the private sector, particularly in the timber and timber product/content sector, in the development and implementation of forest legality and traceability systems could still play a critical role in achieving the objectives of this project by not only contributing to investment in bankable projects and biodiversity-friendly value chain development, but also by enhancing law enforcement and curbing illegal logging.”.

For example, in Thailand e-Tree (traceability platform and forest management system) will be utilized as due diligence system on responsible sourcing to prevent encroachment and illegal logging into legal supply, to be specified during PPG.

### MEAs

Please note that we have added We added the following sentence to the first paragraph of Section A Project Rationale, page 7 of the PFD word document as well as the relevant section in the portal: “ Several Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs), such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) have emphasized the importance of conserving primary forests and Intact Forest Landscapes (IFLs) for global biodiversity and climate change mitigation and adaptation. In addition, primary forest conservation is essential to meet targets under the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), including the achievement of Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN).”

### Current Global GEF Investments

Thank you very much for providing the detailed existing GEF investments/project that we need to consider in developing synergies with during the PPG stage.

### Lao PDR Child Project Concept:

To address the comment the following new text has been added in the Child Project Concept Note in section Project Overview and Approach point b) on page 7 last paragraph.

*Furthermore, UNDP Lao PDR is working on NBSAP revisions, GEFID 11036 and GEF-7 support to BIOFIN. Therefore, during PPG phase and implementation phase, the project will ensure effective coordination so that these projects are well-complemented. In addition, during the PPG phase, The project will review Government and donor baseline initiatives including GCF and GEF projects to ensure avoidance of*



*overlap and the creation of collaboration to maximize the global environmental benefits. In addition, the project will take into account of lessons learned and best practices from the success of GEF 6 project that UNDP in Lao PDR implemented to enhance the impacts of this project and also other initiatives being implemented in the country.*

#### Thailand Child Project Concept:

The concept phase of the Thailand child project development already took stock of relevant baseline investments, including those funded by the GEF. These are however, not shown in the concept for lack of space, but will instead be specified during the PPG.

## 5 Program Description

.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the program logic, including how the program design elements are contributing to the objective, a set of identified key causal pathways, the thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences?

c) Are the program components described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the program approach has been selected over other potential options?

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Have the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline programs been described? Is the program incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)?

e) Are the relevant levers of transformation identified and described?

f) Is there an adequate description on how relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) will contribute to the design and implementation of the program and its components?

g) Gender: Does the description on gender issues identify any differences, gaps or opportunities linked to program objectives and have these been taken up in component description/s?

h) Are the proposed elements to capture, exchange and disseminate knowledge and lessons learned adequate in order to benefit future programs? Are efforts for strategic communication adequately described?

**i) Policy Coherence: How will the program support participating countries to improve, develop and align policies, regulations or subsidies to not counteract the intended program outcomes?**

**Secretariat's Comments**

**May 10, 2023**

Addressed.

**April 20, 2023**

item a: - Theory of Change: the notion of “intermediary impacts” is interesting and helps to figure out where the programmatic approach is going to. However, from a methodological point of view (see the OECD Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management), the word “impact” may be disputable. We suggest “intermediary effects” to reflect the intermediary changes due to the CFB IP in the Indo-Malay region (impacts should be kept for consequences of the PFD on the long-term).

- Item c: 1.) Component 1: Suggest engaging directly with ICCF/CCN regarding policy coherence work and legislative/conservation caucus engagement in Thailand and robust private sector interest in investment in PAs in Lao PDR.
- Item c: 2.) Component 2: Per the GEF-8 strategy, engagement with protected areas must include clear emphasis on systems-level to support sustainable financing and effective management to be sustained versus a park-by-park approach. This is consistent as well with the transformational change that is intended through this IP, please revise accordingly and take into account in PPG.
- Item c: 3.) Outcome 4.2: Suggest ensuring that analytic work build on current GEF investments in assessment/guidance on policy coherence and 30X30 as noted elsewhere with GEFIDs.
- Item c: 4.) Output 5.1: Please redact/revise reference of the RCP supporting reporting of participating countries under the post-2020 GBF. Reporting to the MEAs (including the CBD-GBF) is supported and financed through focal area Enabling Activities. Further, suggest referring to the “post-2020 GBF” as the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (or GBF) throughout for consistency-sake.
- Item c: 5.) Output 5.7: Please reconsider/revise this output in the PFD (and during activity design during PPG) *global best practice regarding behavior change* communications including recent STAP documents/guidance/advisory documents. Communication Advocacy and Awareness activities should be strategically designed to serve the intended impacts of the IP (maintenance of the integrity of IFLs in the region). Therefore, investment in this Output should focus specifically on changing behaviors (stopping negative ones, starting positive ones, campaigning for change etc.) as opposed to, for instance, “raising the profile of the IP and primary forests” and “promoting the IP.” In addition, may want to consider whether the ‘rumble in the jungle’ event is culturally relevant/appropriate in the regional context, and whether there might be another more regionally relevant or context specific name for an event. Suggest leaving this out and considering event design/naming further with participating countries during PPG.
- Item c: 6.) Suggest combining/integrating the activities/outputs listed for the country projects in the PFD document into the overview of the outputs that come just prior. The current separation is confusing/redundant.

item f: - On Stakeholder engagement: It seems that the project has not answered yes to the question in the portal “ We confirm that key stakeholders were consulted during PFD development as required per GEF policy, their relevant roles to program outcomes and plan to develop a Stakeholder Engagement Plan in the Coordination Child Project before CEO endorsement has been clearly articulated in the

Program Description (Section B).” It does however indicate that it has consulted civil society. The description, however, does not include any further details on with who and when. Please ask agency to confirm that it has consulted key stakeholders were consulted during PFD development as required per GEF policy and also outline which civil society stakeholder were consulted in PFD preparation stage.

- Alongside references to Indigenous People and Local Communities (IPLC), please include women/women’s groups, in particular, with reference to land tenure, stakeholder engagements, collaboration, beneficiaries, livelihoods, etc. There are many references to these in the description of components, outputs, activities.

item g: - Use of gender-sensitive vs. gender-responsive: It is preferable to refer to gender-responsive when the reference is something that requires action or concrete outcome. Gender-sensitive is applicable mostly to data or awareness-raising, sensitization efforts. Please, review the use of gender-sensitive in the project and replace with gender-responsive when there is an action or concrete outcome expected (e.g., gender-responsive capacity-building; gender-responsive management plan). Some suggestions are suggested to the PFD components below: in red font

Component 1: Suggested changes to the last sentence of the component description:

Consideration of gender perspectives addressing inequality, **women’s equal** participation in governance **and decision-making, their** access **to natural resources**, and **equal** distribution of benefits, as well as of climate change perspectives will be cross-cutting themes throughout the Component.

Component 3: Suggested changes to this section:

All resource management and livelihood strategies will be identified with the full participation of IP&LCs **and women ...** The design of livelihood, value chain and community enterprise development interventions will additionally engage private sector actors and be subject to analysis of their technical and economic feasibility, capacity requirements, **gender-responsiveness** and scientific soundness ... Outputs that influence land rights will integrate strong conflict resolution mechanisms and **gender perspectives. Gender-responsive** capacity development for IP&LCs, smallholder producers, SMEs and producer organization groups...

3.3 Integrated and gender-sensitive [Replace with gender-responsive] participatory land use plans including conflict resolution mechanisms put in place:

3.4 Gender-sensitive [Replace with gender-responsive] and climate-responsive community forestry strengthened: Building on governance and institutional arrangements for community forestry built through Output 1.1.3, community forest management plans will be developed in targeted landscapes for areas with customary and/or legal tenure held by IP&LCs and **women**.

3.6 Gender-sensitive [Replace with gender-responsive] and resilient biodiversity-friendly IP&LC livelihoods supported and community enterprises built:

.....“Support will be provided to IP&LCs **and women** to develop business plans that underpin value chain development,...

Component 4 Innovative finance, investment and scale-up

**How does the project address access to these innovative finance schemes by IPLCs and women? Please, reflect this in this project component.**

## Agency's Comments

IUCN, 6 May 2023

### Item a:

The ToC graphical presentation and the narrative as suggested has been rephrased in the PFD word version Section B, p. 14 and 17 and in the relevant section of the portal.

### Item c.1:

#### Lao PDR Child Project Concept:

To address the comment the following new text has been added in the Child Project Concept Note in section Project Overview and Approach point b) on page 7 first paragraph.

*In addition, the project will during the PPG phase be engaging directly with ICCF/CCN regarding how to best further policy coherence work and ensure a robust private sector interest in investment in PAs in Lao PDR. It is expected that this collaboration will be continued through the implementation of the full project.*

Action taken on the Thailand Child Project Concept: In the Thailand Child Project Concept (Section 2.b), we have reflected Thailand's Senate Conservation Caucus (affiliate of the ICCF) to be engaged for increased policy coherence particularly on landscape conservation in protected areas.

### Item c.2)

Thank you very much for this comment and as advised this will be revised and taken into account in the PPG phase

### Item c.3)

Thank you very much for the suggestion on the analytical work building on current GEF investments. We will ensure that this is incorporated during the ProDoc development in the PPG phase

### Item c: 4)

Kindly note that we have rephrased the description of Output 1.2 (Section B, page 18) related to supporting any reporting under MEAs. The project will merely support the preparation of specific chapters on primary forests and not the preparation of entire reports, which are to be funded through GEF Enabling Activities.

In the RCP child project concept, we have removed the final sentence of the second paragraph of Section 3 in the document that was referring to support reporting under MEAs.

Item c:5)

SBCC approaches have been included in a revision of Output 5.7, as these are very important - but the communications strategy has to be broader than just SBCC focusing on behaviour change - we still believe that raising the profile of primary forests is important - e.g. amongst the donor community to encourage increased interest and support for primary forests; and e.g. amongst higher levels of government to appreciate the importance of primary forests and consider them more in decision-making, and that the communication strategy also includes two-way communication between the country child projects and the RCP in line with the comment above:

*the agency is requested to include a brief description of a coherent communications strategy/plan for awareness raising and dissemination of program outputs/results, including outreach & dissemination to/from child projects.*

Item c6)

Thank you for the suggestion, which we carefully deliberated. We came to the conclusion that the overview followed by separate detailed descriptions of Outputs for the RCP and for country child projects increases the clarity of guidance the PFD should contain for the PPG phases of these projects. Removing the overview would remove the context at the Outcome level and would require the same contents to be repeated for RCP and for corresponding country child project outputs. We therefore prefer retaining the current structure and hope you find it agreeable.

Item f:

We have changed the responses for IPLCs and CSO, since consultations with these stakeholder categories have taken place in the meantime as specified in the corresponding section of the PFD (Section D Policy requirements – Stakeholder engagement). As advised, references to women have been added.

Item g)

Thank you very much for the excellent suggestion on strengthening the gender responsiveness aspects of the PFD, kindly note that all the changes have been made throughout, including women and correcting the phrasing as advised in terms of the specific wording for outputs and description of narrative sections.

Component 4 Innovative finance, investment and scale-up

The project addresses access to innovative finance schemes by IPLCs and women by:

- Strengthening institutional and technical capacities of IPLCs and women to access and utilize innovative finance schemes (for instance training on financial management, business planning, and proposal writing under component 5).
- Facilitating partnerships between IPLCs and women and financial institutions or other relevant stakeholders to access innovative finance schemes (developing a regional platform for primary forests that bring IPLCs and women together with potential financiers to be established under Component 5).
- Promoting awareness and advocacy: The project can engage in awareness-raising and advocacy activities to promote the benefits of innovative finance schemes for IPLCs and women. This can include developing communication materials, organizing workshops or seminars, and engaging with policymakers and other stakeholders to advocate for more inclusive finance policies (under Component 5).
- Providing financial incentives: The project can provide financial incentives, such as grants or seed capital, to IPLCs and women to support their participation in innovative finance schemes. This can help to overcome some of the financial barriers that IPLCs and women may face when seeking access to finance (for instance a community development grants scheme in Papua New Guinea).

Component 5 of the project focuses on activities aimed at improving access to these innovative finance schemes specifically for IPLCs and women.

### **Program coherence and consistency**

- a) How will the program design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and allow for adaptive management needs and options?**
- b) Is the potential for achieving transformative change through the integrated approach adequately described? How is the program going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?**
- c) Are the countries or themes selected as child projects under the program appropriate for achieving the overall program objective?**
- d) Are the descriptions of child projects adequately reflective of the program objective and priorities as described in the ToC?**
- e) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate to meet the program objectives?**

Secretariat's Comments

May 10, 2023

Addressed.

**April 20, 2023**

- Item C: - The participation to the CFB IP in the Indo-Malay region is dependent on the willingness and prioritization from countries. For the time being, the Indo-Malay CFB IP should work with four countries (if Vietnam confirms). We hope that the regional platform will create the enabling conditions to get the interest from other countries, as Malaysia (national dialogue to come) and Indonesia (out of the CFB IP, but potentially interested in forest issues). To be confirmed.

- Item C and D: Please, accept that some comments may be sent in parallel of this review during the PPG, if the PFD is approved. Thanks.

- Item d) 1.) The results framework in annex 2a is very instructive and nicely shows the components/outcomes of the program and how country projects align with each. It gives a helpful picture of how the pieces add up to the whole for the region thus far. Component 1 (policy enabling environment/coherence) and Component 4 (sustainable financing/resource mobilization) are the two components that seem most aligned with the system transformation that the IP is seeking and given that participating countries should be investing in one or both for true system transformation. Otherwise, components 2 and 3 alone are just site-based activities that are not well aligned with the intent of the IP, nor the GEF-8 BD FA strategy. Therefore, it is notable that the results framework indicates that the Viet Nam country concept does not have activities/investments in either component 1 nor component 4. This gap should be addressed in the framework for the country concept to provide a basis for PPG as the current proposed design needs to clearly contribute to transformative system change for IFLs in the country or region, beyond site-based work.

- Item d) 2.) The interventions for the RCP in the table in the child project concept includes interventions like “new PAs created” and “OECMs”. Please review this table and update with clearer indicative interventions that are aligned with the role of the RCP.

- Item d) 3.) Please ensure all child project concepts include a results framework as is required per the template. Some include these while others don't.

- Item d) 4.) Child projects should directly address how they propose to tackle systemic challenges per section 2 c in the *Project overview and approach*

- Item d) 5.) PNG: please include incremental reasoning, results framework in concept, and redact reference to “support an updated NBSAP” as GEF NBSAP support is funded separately per corresponding comment.

- Item d) 6.) Viet Nam CP: This country concept seems entirely focused on site-based interventions whereas the transformation this IP is seeking will require systemic change on both a national and local level. Please rework country concept results framework and design to include clear investment in Components 1 (policy coherence/enabling environment and/or 4 (financing/resource mobilization at systems level) of the PFD and further develop this design in PPG. Incremental reasoning, results framework and components for this country concept are absent. 108,000 hectares for \$23 million (\$4 M GEF) is a challenging return on investment to understand, particularly given site-based focus of the proposed design. Please consider in project design and financing scenario.

## **Agency's Comments**

**IUCN, 6 May 2023**

### Item C

Thank you very much for your observation

### Item C and D

We look forward to receiving further comments during the PPG phase

Item d) 1.)

Thank you for the feedback on the results framework and for the comments on how they are (not) aligned with the GEF-8 Programming Directions, including the GEF-8 BD FA strategy. The IP intends to deliver impactful piloting of best practice approaches at the landscape level through Components 2 and 3. While we agree that Components 2 and 3 are “just site based activities”, we have to highlight that it was our intention to cluster site-based activities into distinct components for logical and practical implementation reasons. Investments intrinsically linked to investments under Components 2 and 3 that upscale the achievements of landscape pilots and lead to transformational change are placed in Components 1, 4, and 5. As an example, investments that target the improvement of PA management effectiveness at the level of individual PAs are in Component 2, whereas the review of enabling policies required for upscaling this at the country level is placed in Component 1, and the associated capacity development, development of remote-sensing based tools, communication, advocacy, etc. required to achieve transformational change based on these best practice pilots delivered by Component 2 are placed in Component 5. We request you to have a second look at the results framework in light of this explanation.

Item d)2).

Thank you for the comment. We have reviewed the table and updated with clearer indicative interventions are aligned with the role of the RCP.

Item d) 3):

Lao PDR: Please refer to Annex 3 for the indicative results framework. The projects Theory of Change has also been added – please see annex 2 Specific project indicators will be determined during PPG.

Item d) 4): The proposed approach for how the Lao PDR CFB Child Project will tackle the systemic challenges has been outlined in section 2 c of the Lao PDR CFB Child Project Concept Note. However new text additions on the project’s “Levers of transformation” has been added in the Child Project Concept Note’s Project Overview and Approach point a) on page 6 last paragraph, and the project’s Theory of Change diagram has been included as Annex 2, further illustrating the pathways through which the project will address the systemic challenges.

Item d) 4):

Thailand Child Project Concept: was amended in Section 2.c to more clearly reflect how the project will achieve transformational change to tackle systemic challenges.

Item d)5).



PNG Child Project Concept: Results Framework added as annex 2 and Reference to NBSAP redacted

Item d) 6).

Viet Nam Child Project Concept:

The three components covering forest conservation (1) inside Yok Don National Park, (2) inside the adjacent State Forest Company, and (3) across broader dry forest landscape include several national level policy outputs that contribute to component 1 in PFD. Component 2 includes plan to convert the SFC into a carbon offset. Extensive consultations indicate that this is the best way to delivery carbon offsetting at a scale to be commercially viable. This contributes to component 4 in PFD.

Concept note includes a simple results framework with goal, components/outcomes, and outputs.

The area of forest inside and outside protected areas has increased to 192,000 hectares, including 4 new protected areas. This is modest relative to other forest biomes but significant in Viet Nam and for the dry forest regionally.

#### **Program Governance, Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Programs**

- a) Are the program level institutional arrangements for governance and coordination, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has a program level organogram / diagram been included, with description of roles and responsibilities, and decision-making processes?**
- b) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed initiatives, projects/programs (such as government, private sector and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the program area, e.g.).**

#### **Secretariat's Comments**

**May 10, 2023**

Addressed.

**April 20, 2023**

- In addition to the mention of the Positive Conservation Partnership, biodiversity credits, Project Finance for Permanence, and the Libreville agenda, please include the mention of Forest Climate Investments Package (notion under definition).
- Please, confirm that the coordination project will explore opportunities related to this agenda.

## Agency's Comments

IUCN, 6 May 2023

### Mention of Forest Climate Investment Package

As advised, this is now included in the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point in Output 4.2 of the word version of the PFD as well as the relevant section in the portal

### Opportunities related to Libreville Agenda

We confirm that the coordination project will explore opportunities related to this agenda. Reference to Forest Climate Investments Package was added to the description of Component 4 on page 16 of the word version of the PFD and the relevant section in the portal.

### **Program-level Results, Monitoring and Reporting**

- a) Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified? Does the PFD describe how it will support the generation of multiple environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF program?**
- b) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01 GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?**
- c) Are the program's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) / adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?**
- d) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the program at the global, national and local levels sufficiently described?**
- e) Is the described approach to program level M&E aiming to achieve coherence across child projects and to allow for adaptive management?**

## Secretariat's Comments

May 13, 2023

Addressed.

May 10, 2023

Partially Addressed. Please, see the remaining comments in green:

2. On the comments provided by M&E:

- Program Objective:
  - o The Agency may consider writing the Program Objective statement as a forward looking goal, rather than as a result. This means instead of indicating “is maintained”, the Program Objective could read: “To maintain the integrity of...”. Please also reflect on whether the Program Objective, if achieved, can be attributed to the Program itself and its co-financing as it comes with a high level goal/impact for which a causal link between the program’s activities and that goal may not be strong enough to occur by program completion. As appropriate the Agency may wish to revise the Program objective to focus on what can be attribute directly to its activities by program completion. **This comment is for now left unaddressed. Please consider addressing this time around. This matters as the Program will eventually be evaluated against its Objective statement, as is indicated in the Evaluation Policy and the Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines. Kindly ensure that progress against this statement can be measured by adequate outcome indicators. Given the high objective and likely limited attribution of the program to “maintaining the integrity of forests”, the Agency may for example consider using a wording that is more measurable such as around ‘protecting’ or enhancing institutional mechanisms.**
  - o The wording seems to imply that “human well-being” is a “global environmental benefits”. Kindly edit as appropriate. **No indicator measuring “Human well-being” is provided. Kindly consider adding a dedicated outcome indicator or removing this reference, as progress against this will not be measured and the program will risk being evaluated unsatisfactorily against this part of the objective statement.**
- The program rationale and description of objectives refers to the fact that OECMs may be supported. Please consider including the estimated hectares of OECMs to be supported and related WDPA-IDs as available, under the sub-indicator 4.5. Kindly note this indicator is contextual, which means the same hectare can be for example captured under both 4.1 and 4.5. **Please consider addressing as appropriate and available.**
- Monitoring and Evaluation section.
  - o Indicators tracked under the Program objective do not include any indicator tracking improvement in “human well-being”, making the Program Objective not fully measurable. Please consider either including an indicator tracking this aspect of the Program objective or further limiting references to this aspect in the Program objective statement. **Same comment as above. Please consider addressing.**

- o The Program description makes ample references to OECMs but this aspect is not tracked in the indicators listed. Please consider adding. Kindly note that OECM indicator 4.5 is contextual and does not feed into Core indicator 4. This means the same hectares can be captured under 4.1 for example and 4.5. *Same comment as above. Please consider addressing.*

#### April 20, 2023

- item c) 1.) Indicator 1.1 on terrestrial PA newly created: PA table splits the PAs into “unnamed” and “unnamed KBAs”. Please revise table for clarity and explain in the core indicator narrative. Also, please note the requirements in the GEF-8 biodiversity focal area strategy regarding PA establishment needing to be a KBA, meet KBA criteria or other containing scientifically sound determination of globally significant biodiversity.
- item c) 2.) Please include country names after names of PAs for comprehension.
- item c) 3.) Please explain the “methodological approach and underlying logic to justify target levels for Core and Sub-indicators)” as requested in the template in the space below the Core Indicator table.
- item c) 4.) Please review this indicator: *Indicator 1.1: Number of countries controlling CFBs that adopt coherent policy frameworks supporting inclusive forest conservation and management (number)*. Suggest rethinking use of “CFBs”-would IFLs be a better fit and more easily understood/monitor?
- item c) 5.) The Core Indicator 11 target for the RCP child project is surprisingly low for the level of expected financing and level of engagement of this project (600 beneficiaries with \$10 million). Suggest revising target given expected engagement over life of RCP through events, outreach, country engagement, public events etc to a more reasonable ROI. Please include explanation for target setting below Core Indicator table and include update in PFD targets.

#### Core Indicators

- The ambition of the Integrated Approach is to maximize the Global Environment Benefits. Please, explain how the coordination project succeeds in increasing the global environment environment from child projects. If not, please discuss with the GEF agencies involved in child projects and see how to increase the targets under the Core Indicators.
- Based on the language in the PFD, and especially the expected results under the component 3, please provide a target for the core indicator 4.5 on OECM
- Selecting the OECM indicator 4.5 is not exclusive of selecting sub-indicators 4.1 and 4.2 related to landscapes under improved practices, with or without the reference to a certification system. Both sub-indicators should be selected where relevant. This will not lead to double counting as the OECM indicator is a contextual indicator which does not feed into the main Core Indicator 4.
- In the link below, you will find the guidelines for the core indicators for GEF-8. On pages 13 and 14 you will find instructions on the application of core indicator 4.5 for Terrestrial OECMs. The definition of OECM is also provided.

[https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2022-09/Results\\_Framework\\_Guidelines\\_2022\\_06\\_30.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2022-09/Results_Framework_Guidelines_2022_06_30.pdf)

- Target 3 of the recently agreed Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework reads as follows: Ensure and enable that by 2030 at least 30 per cent of terrestrial, inland water, and of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services, are effectively conserved and managed through ecologically representative, well-connected and equitably governed systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, recognizing indigenous and

traditional territories, where applicable, and integrated into wider landscapes, seascapes and the ocean, while ensuring that any sustainable use, where appropriate in such areas, is fully consistent with conservation outcomes, recognizing and respecting the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities including over their traditional territories.

- It is imperative that OECMs be part of the entire spectrum of conserved areas. We expect the core indicator to be used within the CFB IP, especially the component 3 of the Indo-Malay CFB IP.

- Please note that the cost per beneficiary of \$6451 is very high: Why so few people are benefitting from an investment of \$220 million? Please, correct and/or justify.

- On Monitoring aspects including Core Indicators, objective, (comments provided by PPO):

- Program Objective:

- o The Agency may consider writing the Program Objective statement as a forward looking goal, rather than as a result. This means instead of indicating "is maintained", the Program Objective could read: "To maintain the integrity of...". Please also reflect on whether the Program Objective, if achieved, can be attributed to the Program itself and its co-financing as it comes with a high level goal/impact for which a causal link between the program's activities and that goal may not be strong enough to occur by program completion. As appropriate the Agency may wish to revise the Program objective to focus on what can be attribute directly to its activities by program completion.

- o The wording seems to imply that "human well-being" is a "global environmental benefits". Kindly edit as appropriate.

- The program rationale and description of objectives refers to the fact that OECMs may be supported. Please consider including the estimated hectares of OECMs to be supported and related WDPA-IDs as available, under the sub-indicator 4.5. Kindly note this indicator is contextual, which means the same hectare can be for example captured under both 4.1 and 4.5.

- Core Indicator 6 on GHG emission mitigated. Please indicate the Anticipated start year of accounting and Duration of accounting (per guidelines, carbon gains should be calculated on a 20 period).

- No methodological explanation is provided under the Core Indicators section. Please consider adding elements and cross-references as appropriate.

- Monitoring and Evaluation section.

- o Indicators tracked under the Program objective do not include any indicator tracking improvement in "human well-being", making the Program Objective not fully measurable. Please consider either including an indicator tracking this aspect of the Program objective or further limiting references to this aspect in the Program objective statement.

- o The Program description makes ample references to OECMs but this aspect is not tracked in the indicators listed. Please consider adding. Kindly note that OECM indicator 4.5 is contextual and does not feed into Core indicator 4. This means the same hectares can be captured under 4.1 for example and 4.5.

## Agency's Comments

IUCN, 11 May 2023

The program objective was rewritten as a forward-looking goal, following the earlier comment repeated this time. Additionally, in the current revision we have down-scaled the ambition of the objective in line with the limited attribution as "to contribute to maintaining the integrity of globally important primary forests of Indo-Malaya for maximizing multiple global environment benefits related to carbon and biodiversity".

Reference to human well-being in the objective statement was removed based on the earlier set of comments. We had missed to remove it from the ToC graphical presentation and corrected this in the current submission.

Based on your comment, we have provided an estimate for the target under GEF Core Indicator 4.5 on terrestrial OECMs. Given that the countries are at very early stages of understanding and defining OECMs at the national level, identifying which government agency is responsible for recognizing OECMs, conducting national assessments of potential for OECMs, the target set now is speculative. We will conduct more analytical work in the PPG phase and subsequently refine targets thereafter."

Monitoring & Evaluation: Regarding the comment made on monitoring human well-being, please refer to the point above. Reference to human well-being was removed from the objective statement and therefore is not a target of monitoring any more.

As far as monitoring of OECMs is concerned, we would also like to direct you to our response made on the OECM comment above.

IUCN, 6 May 2023

Item c)1).

PNG Child Project Concept: Unnamed revised to specific "proposed TPA in GP and WP", unnamed KBA to "KBAs in GP and WP" and text improved.

Item c)2).

Kindly note that the child project core indicators within the overall PFD include all the names of the PAs. However, as requested the suffix of the country names has been added against all the PAs included in the core indicators section of the PFD in the portal. This in our view is a repetition as the information is already entered against each of the specific country child projects

Item c)3).

Kindly note that this has been addressed and all the methodological approach and underlying logic has been copied from the child project indicator sections and pasted in this section. As you are aware, this repetition of the description in the PFD core indicators section leads to exceeding the word limit of 250 words

Item c)4).

Thank you for noting this. We have rephrased this indicator changing “CFB” to “primary forests”.

Item c)5).

As advised, RCP beneficiaries revised to 1,400, - cost/beneficiary is now around \$7,000/person which includes for e.g. costs of travel and participation in one regional training/workshop/event per person/year

Core Indicators

*Maximise GEBs*

Thank you for the comment. Kindly note that we have added a brief explanation on how the RCP will further increase the delivery of GEBs as compared to the sum of country child projects in RCP Section 2.c of the PFD word document as well as relevant section in the portal.

Core Indicator 4.5).

Thank you for the comment. Even though understanding this is an important indicator, in our view it is too early to provide a target for OECMs. Given that the countries are at very early stages of understanding and defining OECMs at the national level, identifying which government agency is responsible for recognising OECMs, conducting national assessments of potential for OECMs, etc. any target set now would be speculative. We would appreciate if you would agree for us to conduct more analytical work in the PPG phase and subsequently set targets thereafter.

*CI6*

As advised, this has been included in the PFD portal version, with duration of accounting indicated as 20 years and start date as 2024The methodological explanation is provided in a tabular format.

*Monitoring of program objective:*

We have rephrased the objective as proposed. We have reduced the scope of the project objective and therefore human well-being improvements are not further targeted.

In an effort to streamline the monitoring effort under the IP, we intended not to duplicate mandatory GEF Core Indicators with additional customized indicators. Given that indicator GEF CI 4.5 tracks OECMs, we suggest not to include additional partially redundant indicators.

#### **Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes**

**a) Are climate and other main risks relevant to the program identified and adequately described? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?**

**b) Are the key risks and mitigation measures that might affect implementation and the achievement of outcomes adequately rated?**

**c) Are environmental and social risks and impacts adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat's Comments Addressed.

Agency's Comments

#### **6 Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities**

**.1 a) Is the program adequately aligned with Focal Area and IP Elements, and/or LDCF/SCCF strategy?**

**\*For IPs: is the program adequately aligned with the Integrated Program goals and objectives as outlined in the GEF 8 programming directions?**

Secretariat's Comments Addressed.



**Agency's Comments**

**b) Child project selection criteria: Are the criteria for child project selection sound and transparently laid out?**

**Secretariat's Comments** Cleared through the Expression of Interest Process (and discussed at the IP Design Workshop).

**Agency's Comments**

**Is the program alignment/coherent with country / regional / global priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)?**

**Secretariat's Comments**

**May 10, 2023**

Addressed.

**April 20, 2023**

- Great work on annex 2b. Many thanks.

- In the PFD document Annex 2b under the component related to enabling policies, delete Target 13 as the PFD does not indicate any specific contribution to the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and ABS.

- Please, explain the monitoring strategy and methodology that will be used to track outputs 1.2, 1.3, 4.3 and 4.4. These will be critical for the assessment of the IP to the GBF targets.

**Agency's Comments**

**IUCN, 6 May 2023**

As advised, Target 13 has been deleted in the PFD.

In terms of monitoring, kindly note that the monitoring framework does not foresee Output level monitoring, but focuses instead on impact monitoring by capturing Outcomes. At the same time, the PPG phases of individual child projects will specify project-level output and outcome indicators. We have added a new section on the methodology of monitoring indicators in the Monitoring and Evaluation Section. At the PFD level, Outputs 1.2 and 1.3 will be tracked through Indicator 1.1 "Number of countries controlling primary forests that improve governance frameworks supporting inclusive forest conservation and management (relative improvement on a customized index to be developed during PPG)", whereas Outputs 4.3 and 4.4 will be monitored through Indicator 4.1 "Cumulative additional investments into primary forest conservation and sustainable management and use across participating countries (US\$)" and Indicator 4.2 Cumulative value of carbon and biodiversity credits validated for primary forest conservation directly resulting from the IP (US\$)."

## **7 Policy Requirements**

### **.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?**

**Secretariat's Comments** Yes

**Agency's Comments**

#### **Environmental and Social Safeguards**

**Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal? (annex D)**

**Secretariat's Comments**

Addressed.

## Agency's Comments

### 8.1 Knowledge Management Requirements

#### Knowledge Management

8.1 Has the agency confirmed that a project level approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been included in the PFD?

#### Secretariat's Comments

May 10, 2023

Addressed.

April 20, 2023

See the comment on the result framework:

Knowledge Management: While an overall approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been described in the Program Description and communications activities are mentioned, there is no reference to an overall communications strategy/plan. Thus, the agency is requested to include a brief description of a coherent communications strategy/plan for awareness raising and dissemination of program outputs/results, including outreach & dissemination to/from child projects. Please, clarify and correct.

#### Agency's Comments

IUCN, 6 May 2023

Please refer to the response above in which we have mentioned of adding a description of a coherent communications strategy in Output 5.7. In addition, as requested we have added SBCC elements.

## Annexes

Financing Tables (Annex A and Annex H)

**9.1 GEF Financing Table:**

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

**Country STAR allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

**Non-STAR Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

IP Set Aside

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

## IP Contribution

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

For Child Project Financing information (Annex H)

- b) Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas' allocated amounts? Are the IP contributions aligned with the Program? The allocated amounts (including Agency Fee) match those in LoE?
- c) Project Preparation Grant Table: Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas' allocated amounts? The allocated amounts (including PPG Fee) match those in LoE? Is the requested PPG within the authorized limits set in Guidelines? (pop up information?) If above the limits, has an exception been sufficiently substantiated?
- d) Sources of Funds Table: Are the allocated sources of funds for each and every one of the three STAR Focal Areas within the Country's STAR envelope by the time of the last review?
- e) Indicative Focal Area Elements Table: (For IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area element corresponds to the respective IP?
- f) (For non-IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area Elements are aligned with the respective Program?
- g) Co-financing Table: Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing provided and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

May 13, 2023

Addressed.

May 10, 2023

The comments made on April 20, 2023 are addressed. However, the level of cofinancing of the regional coordination project stays very low. It does not reflect a good level of partnership and dialogue with development partners, CSOs, and other initiatives. Please, see how to increase this cofinancing (indicative at PFD level).

### April 20, 2023

Co-financing:

- Please during PPG, explore with Conservation International the possibility to include the Positive Conservation Partnerships as a cofinancing partner. Some Indo-Malay countries may be eligible to this \$100 million fund launched at the Libreville Meeting.
- Public investment is normally classified as investment mobilized. Please request the agency to revise the below which are classified as 'recurrent expenditures', and change them to 'investment mobilized'.

Recipient Country Government	Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP)	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	16,700,000.00
Recipient Country Government	National Science & Technology Development Agency (NSTDA)	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	30,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Office of the National Land Policy Board (ONLB)	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	13,800,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Royal Forest Department	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	11,500,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Rubber Authority of Thailand (RAOT)	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	10,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Conservation and Environment Protection Authority (CEPA)	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	2,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	PNG Forest Authority (PNGFA)	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	2,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Department of Lands and Physical Planning (DLPP)	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	1,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Department of Agriculture and Livestock (DAL)	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	1,500,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Climate Change and Development Authority (CCDA)	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	1,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Western Provincial Administration	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	500,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Gulf Provincial Administration	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	500,000.00

### Agency's Comments

IUCN, 10 May 2023

Thank you very much for the comment on cofinancing. We have increased the level of cofinancing considerably for the RCP to around USD 28mn from various sources including donor agencies, partners, GEF agencies, CEPF, Foundations etc. The details are provided in the portal RCP child concept note, word version of the consolidated child concept notes and also in the word version of the PFD

**IUCN, 6 May 2023**

Thank you for the comment. As mentioned earlier, we will proactively explore opportunities of tapping the concerned fund  
As advised, public investment is now reclassified correctly for both the PNG and Thailand child projects

**9.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG): if PPG for child projects has been requested: has the PPG table been included and properly filled out adding up to the correct PPG and PPG fee totals as per the sum of the child projects?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

**Sources of Funds for Country STAR Allocation**

**Does the table represent the sum of STAR allocations sources utilized for this program?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments



#### **9.4 Indicative Focal Area Elements**

**For non-IP Programs**

**Does the table contain the sum of focal area elements and amounts as per the sum of the child projects?**

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

#### **9.5 Indicative Co-financing**

**Are the indicative amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequate and reflect the ambition of the program? Has the subset of co-finance which are expected to be investment mobilized been identified and defined (FI/GN/01)?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

#### **Annex B: Endorsements**

**9.6 Has the program and its respective child project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?**

Secretariat's Comments

May 13, 2023

We are taking note on the absence of LoE from Vietnam.

The GEF OFP was fully involved in the IP Design Workshop in Bangkok on March 22-23, 2023: we discussed about the EoI, its review, the concept note, the draft PFD, and the LoE template.

**May 10, 2023**

Comment not addressed. Please, confirm with Vietnam or withdraw Vietnam from the PFD.

**April 20, 2023**

- Please, provide a Letter of Endorsement for Vietnam, reflecting the last changes in term of focal area contributions.

### **Agency's Comments**

**IUCN 12 May, 2023**

Kindly note that the Letter of Endorsement could not be obtained for the Viet Nam project. As a result, as advised, the Viet Nam child project budget and other information has been deleted in the portal and also reference to Viet Nam has been removed/redacted from the PFD, ESS Annex and the consolidated child project concept note. The changes resulting from removal of Viet Nam have been highlighted in green, however the deletion of specific mention of Viet Nam is not shown. The references to Viet Nam have been removed from the implementation arrangement diagram, site location map, etc.

However, please note Viet Nam still appears once in the portal resubmission and this is due to lack of access rights to delete the child project tab

**Compilation of Letters of Endorsement Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?**

### **Secretariat's Comments**

**May 10, 2023**

Comment still valid.

**April 20, 2023**

Yes (see comments on Vietnam).

Agency's Comments

**Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

**Annex C: Program Locations**

**9.7 a) Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the program interventions will take place?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

**Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes\* (\*only for non IP programs)**

**9.9 a) Does the program provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.**

**b) Does the program provide a detailed reflow table to assess the program capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.**

**c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

**Secretariat's Comments**

NA

**Agency's Comments**

**Additional Annexes**

**10 GEFSEC Decision**

**0.1 GEFSEC Recommendation**

**Is the program recommended for clearance?**

**Secretariat's Comments**

**May 16, 2023**

The PFD is recommended for clearance.

**May 13, 2023**

Technically, all the points have been addressed and the PFD is recommended for clearance. However, one comment from the quality control has not been addressed.

The PNG LOE said:

**SUBJECT: ENDORSEMENT FOR THE PNG IM-CFB IP PROJECT “MAINTAINING THE INTEGRITY OF GLOBALLY SIGNIFICANT INTACT TROPICAL FOREST LANDSCAPES IN GULF PROVINCE AND WESTERN PROVINCE OF PAPUA NEW GUINEA”.**

In my capacity as GEF Operational Focal Point for Papua New Guinea (PNG), I confirm that the above project proposal (a) is in accordance with my government’s national priorities in PNG’s Vision 2050<sup>1</sup>, PNG’s Fourth National Goal and Directive Principle (NGDP), PNG’s Medium Term Development Plans, Strategy on Responsible Sustainable Development (StaRS) 2014, Forest Act, Environment Act, Policy on Protected Areas, Climate Change Management Act, and National Sustainable Land Use Policy and our commitment to the relevant global environmental conventions; and (b) was discussed with relevant stakeholders, including the global environmental convention focal points.

I am pleased to endorse the preparation of the above project proposal with the support of the GEF Implementing Agency(ies) listed below. If approved, the preparation of the proposal will be supported by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), and the project will be executed by an appropriate agency to be determined<sup>2</sup>. I request the GEF Implementing Agency to provide a copy of the project document before it is submitted to the GEF Secretariat for CEO endorsement / Approval.

The total financing from the GEFTF being requested for this project is US\$17,999,997 inclusive of project preparation grant (PPG), if any, and Agency fees for project cycle management services associated with the total GEF Project Financing. The financing requested for PNG is detailed in the table below.

While the Portal entry of the child project for PNG still include an executing entity namely “Conservation and Environment Protection Authority” – please ask this entity to be removed – it can be included during the preparation phase (now the requirement is the LoE info to match Portal):

**Child Project - GEF - 8**

**GENERAL CHILD PROJECT INFORMATION** 

Child Project Title:	Maintaining the integrity of globally significant intact tropical forest landscapes in the Gulf Province and Western Province of Papua New Guinea		
Region:	Papua New Guinea	GEF Child Project ID:	11105
Country(ies):	Papua New Guinea	Type of Child Project:	FSP
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO	GEF Agency Child Project ID:	
Anticipated Executing Entity(s):	Conservation and Environment Protection Authority	Anticipated Executing Type:	Government
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area	Submission Date :	
Type of Trust Fund:	GET	Child Project Duration (Months):	48
GEF Child Project Financing: (a)	16,213,762.00	PPG Amount: (c)	300,000.00
Agency Fee(s): (b)	1,459,237.00	PPG Agency Fee(s): (d)	26,998.00
Total GEF Program Financing: (a+b+c+d)	17,999,997.00	Total Co-financing:	32,500,000.00

Thanks for the improvements.

Please address the pending comments in the item 5.4 (result framework, M&E), the cofinancing ratio of the regional coordination project and the Letters of Endorsement:

- LOE from Viet Nam is still missing in Portal;

- LOEs from Thailand, PNG, and Laos are with different executing entities name from Portal's child project entries. Project title of Thailand child project differs slightly between LOE and Portal. Please request Lead Agency to make changes in Portal to match with LOEs.

**April 20, 2023**

The PFD cannot be recommended yet. Please address the comments above.

### **Agency's Comments**

**IUCN 15 May, 2023**

As advised, the executing partner for PNG has been removed to make it consistent with the Letter of Endorsement. However, kindly note that the anticipated executing entity can be deleted/removed, but the anticipated executing entity type cannot be deselected/removed. This is a GEF IT portal issue

**IUCN 12 May, 2023**

As clarified above, we were unable to obtain the LoE from Vietnam

The executing entities have all been changed in the portal's child project entries and are now consistent with the ones mentioned in the LoEs for Lao PDR, PNG and Thailand

## **10.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency(ies) during the child project development.**

**Secretariat's Comments**

- Confirm cofinancing
- Confirm the role of the private sector
- Confirm and if possible increase the targets under the core indicators.

- Confirm the institutional framework, especially to host the regional platform, and anticipate post-project sustainability issues.
- Confirm the pmc costs and the proportionality between the GEF resources and cofinancing.
- Provide lessons and best practices from past and on-going initiatives and projects.

### Agency's Comments

**IUCN, 6 May 2023**

These comments are duly noted by the agencies for the PPG phase

### 3 Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/20/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/10/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/13/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/16/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		