

Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) in the Productive, Natural and Forested Landscape of Northern Region of Cambodia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9781

Countries

Cambodia

Project Name

Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) in the Productive, Natural and Forested Landscape of Northern Region of Cambodia

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

5/24/2019

Review completed by PM

5/8/2020

Program Manager

Hannah Fairbank

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

June 27, 2019 HF: 1.) The new language for Component 2 contained in Annex G is not consistent with what is in the ProDoc. The Component 2 language in the ProDoc is logical and much preferred. Please revise accordingly; 2.) The previous Output 1.3 in the PIF put special emphasis on Indigenous People (IPs) in target areas, but the newly reworked Outputs 2.3 and 2.4 to contain capacity development don't share this same emphasis on IPs. Given the request in the PIF review to

ensure the CEO endorsement request explicitly includes/focuses on Indigenous People please either restore this focus to current capacity building efforts and/or provide further justification for this change; 3.) The move of sustainable financing mechanisms from Output 2.2 to Output 1.4 makes good sense, but there are two issues to address with this: a.) It is unclear why the "rationale" for this change on page 47 of the CEO endorsement request references "As a separate Component 3 relating to KM, gender and M&E etc...." when the change is related to Outputs 2.2 and 1.4 related to sustainable PA financing. Please clarify/correct; and b.) Please further articulate plans under this component for a national-level policy or planning effort on Sustainable Financing for PAs given this project has significant support from BD1-P1 that states the importance of PA-level sustainable financing actions be embedded within-or directly contributing to a national-level framework/plan for sustainable PA financing.

October 7, 2019 HF:

#1, 2, 3(a) Cleared.

3 (b) Thank you for these updates. Outcome 1.4.5 now reads: "Based of the results of pilot testing in the PAs, and assessment reports, propose new and revised policy to strengthen existing legislation related to revenue generation and use for conservation and community benefit, and recommendations for successful management of the most appropriate financial instruments for sustainable financing of PAs in Cambodia." Based on this, what is the plan/assumption about whom/how the recommendations to come out of this report will be adopted and implemented at the national level to improve sustainable financing of PAs?

December 4, 2019 HF: Comment cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Response, 12 September 2019

Thank you for the comments:

- (1) The language for Component 2 has been made consistent with the language in the ProDoc.
- (2) The emphasis on IP has been revised accordingly in capacity building efforts and throughout the documents.
- (3) (a) This has been changed to reflect to correct language

(b) The development/improvement of national policy, legislation and management arrangements are now reflected under Output 1.4

(1) Refer Annex G of GEF CEO ER including PRF (p.45)

(2) Refer Output 1.3, 2.3 in UNDP ProDoc (pp. 23-24 & 29) and GEFCEO ER Table B (p.1-2)

(3) (a) Refer GEFCEO ER (P.47)

(3) (b) Refer Output 1.4 paragraphs 44 and 45 of UNDP ProDoc (pp.24-25)

UNDP Response October 7, 2019

Thank you for the comments.

The project will document experiences related to financing mechanism for PAs that are tested via the project for wider consultation. Based on these results, GSSD/NCSD will prepare a policy brief for policy makers across relevant line ministries such as Ministry of Economic and Finance (MoEF); and Ministry of Environment (MoE) recommending the adoption and application of suitable mechanism for Cambodia from a suite of financial mechanisms. Based on consultation process as described above, the project will support GSSD/NCSD to draft guidelines on Protected Areas Financing for Government endorsement and application. By its mandate, GSSD/NCSD will play the leading role in coordination with stakeholders on the drafting and endorsement process for the proposed guidelines and will oversee its subsequent implementation

Please refer to Output 1.4 Paragraph 45 of UNDP Project Document (p.24-25).

2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

June 27, 2019 HF: Yes, although this is a very ambitious project working at many scales and it isn't clear how the project will target and narrow activities/priorities during implementation since the ProDoc only speaks in general terms about "indicative activities." For example, will each of the site-level activities in the ProDoc be implemented at each of the PA sites? Please revise the Prodoc and CER to clearly indicate at least at the project **Output level**, the scope of who/where will be involved in implementation (at one of the or all of the PAs? national Ministries etc).

October 7, 2019 HF:

Cleared.

In the conceptualization and implementation of the conservation enterprise and agricultural activities, ensuring there is a strong theory-of-change linking the activity to the intended biodiversity conservation impact is critical. Please see this recent document based on a review of what works/what doesn't from over 20 years of USAID experience in conservation enterprise. See the checklist on page 21: https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pa00n41k.pdf

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Response, 12 September 2019

Thank you for the comments.

The activities are now reflected in the ProDoc, along with potential list of activities. However, the activities in each PA will vary depending on:

(i) management plan priorities; (ii) nature and potential for SLM and LD activities in each PA that would be defined in consultation with the communities, agricultural staff and PA managers; and (iii) potential livelihood and value chain activities will be based on opportunities available in each area and defined in agreement with local communities during the planning phase of the project.

Overall, the project will be coordinated by GSSD/NCSD of Ministry of Environment as the Implementing Partner and will be responsible and accountable for managing the project and achieving the outcomes. To deliver specific project outputs, agreements will be signed between GSSD and number of responsible partners which includes both government and NGOs. For instance, to promote CFs, CPAs, soil conservation and pilot sustainable land management practices with small holder farmers, Ministry of Agriculture, Fishery and Forestry (MAFF) will be engaged by NCSD to deliver the outputs. This is reflected in the TBWP (budget note 12 & 21).

Refer Paragraphs 50, 55, 56 (activity 2.2.5), 58 (activities 2.3.2 and 2.3.5), 60 and 62 (activity 2.4.8) of UNDP ProDoc (*pp.26-31*)

Please refer to TBWP - budget note 12 & 21 (*pp.76-77*).

UNDP Response, October 7, 2019:

Thank you for a very good suggestion and providing reference to the review of experiences from USAID experience in conservation enterprise. This reference has now been included in the prodoc for IP to ensure that the checklist is used to help plan conservation enterprise approach during the project implementation.

Please refer to output 2.3 of the UNDP Prodoc (*p.29*).

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

2.) June 27, 2019 HF: 1.) Given the large-scale of the project retaining and potentially increasing the co-finance (via the private sector?) throughout the course of the project will be essential. Please also refer to the previous question/comment which is related to scale of project activities; 2.) The letter from the OFP requests a total of \$44,000 in direct project services whereas the budget note #29 under “Project Management” in the ProDoc has \$75,000 budgeted for these same direct project services. Please explain, justify or correct this inconsistency.

October 7, 2019 HF:

1.) Cleared.

2.) Please withdraw all references to execution functions retained by UNDP (the \$44,000 in direct project services and any other activities that would be considered project execution) and propose an alternative.

December 2019 HF: 2.) Comment cleared.

February 13, 2020:

1.) The budget in the ProDoc includes the purchase of a vehicle for \$55,000 under component 1 of the project. As per guidelines, “The use of GEF funds to purchase vehicles is strongly discouraged as such costs are normally expected to be borne by co-finance. Any request to use GEF funding to purchase project vehicles must be justified. The Secretariat assesses such requests and decides whether to approve them.” (footnote 136 page 42). Please provide justification for the proposed vehicle purchase.

2.) The budget also charges in each component project staff, that has to be charged to PMC – Additionally, there is a position namely “Technical support”, which is only clarified in Component 3 as “To support documentation, gender etc.” This is inconsistent with the positions presented in the ProDoc – Pages 70 – 71. Please amend.

3.) Instead of using the PMC to pay the project staff, we see a budget line including \$200,000 to pay “UNDP co-financing in terms DPC and M & E support (5 years x \$40,000 = \$200,000)”. Please eliminate this budget line and instead, using the PMC to pay the project staff.

April 22, 2020:

- 1.) The proposed budget revision to charge the same amount (\$55,000) to the GEFTF budget for vehicle rental doesn't address the issue as the funds will still allocated to vehicle-related expenses. As previously requested, if the purchase of a vehicle with GEF resources for project purposes is warranted and the most economically efficient option, **please submit a justification for this for approval by GEFSEC Program Manager.** Switching rental for purchase doesn't address the fundamental issue of use of GEF resources for a vehicle which is expected to be borne by co-finance.
- 2.) Comment cleared.
- 3.) Comment cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Response, 12 September 2019

(1) The project design reflects considered the most cost effective approach to implement the project and various activities that were included in the project, including the project area has been reduced to ensure that the project design is manageable within the resources available. Efforts will be made during the implementation of the project to involve the private sector in various activities, including ecotourism and crafts related support, small scale enterprise development as a means to provide incentives for local communities to conserve resources, private sector involvement to promote agricultural and non-agricultural value chains to improve local incomes, and the development of a financial sustainability plan that will look at various options for private sector engagement and support to conservation and development of sustainable local livelihoods

(2) It was a mistake and has now been corrected to reflect the correct amount of direct project support services that is US\$ 44,915.

- (a) Cost effectiveness (Section V paragraphs 122- 129);
- (b) Sustainability plan: Output 1.4, Paragraph 44
- (c) Private sector engagement in enterprise development (Paragraphs 50 and 58) and value chain development for SLM and agricultural products and services (Paragraphs 61-62)

(2) Please refer to TBWP, budget note # 29 (p.74)

UNDP Response, October 7, 2019:

We have removed all references to execution functions of UNDP from the prodoc. These are highlighted in the prodoc (please see section VIII & IX, *from p.67*).

US\$ 44,000 has been re-allocated to training and workshops (Budget note 22) and travel cost of project staff (Budget note 28). Please refer to TBWP (*pp. 74-79*).

UNDP Response, 3 March 2020

1. Purchase of vehicle has been removed, instead a cost has been built into the budget to hire vehicle for project-related work (*Please refer to budget note 6 of TBWP of UNDP prodoc*).

2. Position for ‘Technical support’ has been removed from the budget table. Budget for key staff management positions such as Technical Coordinator has been moved to PMC. Part of the Technical Coordinator costs will be met through the project (under PMC) and the balance cost from other donor funded projects. Similarly, the Financial and Administrative positions will not be financed through the INRM project. These costs will be met from another donor funded project, so the Administrative and Financial staff will work on both projects as the INRM project does not justify full time positions.

(Please refer to Section VIII – Governance and management of UNDP prodoc, p. 70; TBWP table and budget note 23; Institutional arrangement and coordination in the CEO ER, p. 20).

3. Comments on UNDP’s co-financing has been resolved.

UNDP Response, 4 May 2020:

The GSSD/Government of Cambodia has confirmed that the cost associated with rental/procurement of vehicle will be met from the co-financing commitment. The budget (\$55k) allocated for rental of vehicle has been re-allocated for workshops and travel under Components 2 and 3 and adjustments have been accordingly made in the budget table and corresponding budget notes (*please refer to budget note 10, 11, 18, 19 & 21*) in Section X of the UNDP Project Document (*pp.74-79*) as well as in Table B in the CEO ER document.

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

HF July 3, 2019: Please include/analyze the proposed cultivation of Orchids as a livelihood strategy under Risk 6 as this could certainly have unintended consequences to wild or already threatened/endangered species and safeguards would have to be put in place to prevent this.

HF October 20, 2019: Thank you for response regarding risk-mitigation. A follow-up: Given that the time from initiating cultivation to sale of orchids can be 6 years or more, which is longer than the project period, how is it envisioned that the proposed risk mitigation measures be effective? And further, that this, and other biodiversity-friendly agri-enterprises, are having the positive intended impact on biodiversity conservation and land degradation?

December 11, 2019, HF: Comment cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Response, 12 September 2019

The comment is well accepted.

The unintended consequence of cultivation of orchids on endangered wild species is now addressed in the Risk matrix (Table 1) of UNDP ProDoc.

In terms of the promotion of orchid cultivation for livelihoods that might have negative impacts on wild harvesting, the project will institute the following measures:

(i) identification of habitats within PAs for priority conservation and ecological restoration; (ii) concerted monitoring and enforcement, concurrently with strengthening pathways for sustainable legal trade; (iii) propagation and cultivation by small community enterprises to ensure wild populations are not negatively impacted; (iv) licensing orchid cultivation through certification procedures to minimize risk of wild extractions; (v) improved training and awareness; etc.

Table 1 of UNDP ProDoc (Risk Matrix) *p. 39*

UNDP Response, October 20, 2019:

Thank you for the comments. Cambodia has been carrying out orchid farming through tissue culture on a number of orchid species for commercial and research purposes. To further support this effort, a Centre for Orchid Research and Conservation (CORC) was established in Kulen National Park in 2018 to support research, education, tourism and conservation. Among others, tissue culture is a key focus of the CORC. Given that orchid propagation has been rather advanced for some of the specie, the CORC will also work with orchid growers to provide access to propagation materials for orchid and relevant species that are already in production.

Consequently, it is anticipated that within a short period of time, the CORC can expand the production of propagation materials for cultivation by farmers and provide communities with financial benefit within the project lifetime. Other activities associated with the CORC to complement the propagation and cultivation, would include promotion of orchid-based tourism (within the Centre itself and within Kulen National Park as part of community managed trekking expeditions) will also generate community income in the short to medium term. Through investment under this project for further expansion of propagation materials, cultivation of orchids

by farmers with technical support from the CORC, it is expected to also have long term impact on orchid conservation and other species, as well as improve community incomes and support for conservation.

In terms of biodiversity agri-enterprises, the intent is to ensure that any such agri-enterprises will be identified based on a thorough feasibility assessment and seeks to support the following activities to ensure success: (i) capacity building of stakeholders in the agri-enterprise development, training and skill development to producers and service providers to help understand customer requirements, increase productivity, learn necessary business skills and other specific needs as per the value chain, including developing new products and services. Systems and processes will be developed to capture adequate data and monitor the functioning of the value chain; (ii) support community based producer organization and management; (iii) collaborate with national, sub-national and private sector institutions to provide producers and service providers with both technical and infrastructure (small processing, storage and marketing facilities); (iv) seek opportunities for branding and marketing that will allow producers and service providers to gain maximum value for their goods and services; (v) assess the feasibility and commercialization of specific species (e.g. including assessment of species of orchids for propagation, commercial production and marketing) and other products as they relate to the application of modern and appropriate technologies and (vi) Geographical indications (GI) registration to the extent relevant.

In addition, as suggested above, the IP and practitioners, while planning and implementing the conservation enterprise and agricultural activities must ensure a strong theory-of-change linking the activity to the intended biodiversity conservation impact. The checklist for planning conservation enterprise, prepared by USAID has been referred in the prodoc as reference (*under output 2.3 of UNDP Prodoc, p. 29*).

Please refer to Table 1 (Risk 6, Project Risk matrix, *pp.39-41*)

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

HF July 3, 2019: 1.) Although co-financing letters are provided they do not contain sufficient detail regarding the co-financing. Please provide evidence of co-financing that includes the expected amounts, sources, timeframe and types of co-financing (grant vs in-kind). Also, please be aware that per the July 2018 Co-financing Policy project reporting documents and reviews that are submitted subsequent this CEO endorsement request are required to contain co-financing broken down by "investment mobilized" (vs "recurrent expenditures"); 2.) Please provide further explanation/justification for the drop in co-financing between the PIF and CER stage.

October 7, 2019:

1.) Thank you for the co-financing letter, but please be aware that per: GEF co-financing guidelines we require the co-financing letter to include the expected amounts, sources, timeframe and types of co-financing (grant vs in kind). Please revise/resubmit with this information included in the CER and co-financing letter (amount, sources, timeframe and types of co-financing) Guidelines found here (pg 4): https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf 2.) Cleared.

December 11, 2019 HF: Final PM recommendation for this CER will be issued once the updated co-financing letter is submitted by the IA. All other technical comments have been cleared.

February 10, 2020 HF: Revised co-financing letter received. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Response, 12 September 2019

The government has issued a revised co-financing letter for US\$ 10 million specifying sources of co-financing from the various agencies of the government.

The indicated co-financing will be fully accounted for and tracked during the implementation and reported in the MTR and TE.

(2) The government has retained the same co-financing amount at the level of PIF.

Please refer to the revised co-financing letter issued by the Government.

UNDP Response, October 7, 2019:

-

Implementing Partner is discussing with the OFP for further guidance on revising the co-financing letter. UNDP as the IA has requested to issue a revised co-financing letter indicating the types of co-financing as per the guidelines.

UNDP Response, 22 Jan 2020:

Co-financing letter has been revised and obtained from the Royal Government of Cambodia.

(The sources of co-financing and revised figure has been also included in Table C of CEO endorsement request).

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

July 3, 2019, HF: Yes, with the following questions:

1.) BD tracking tool Objective 1 Section II: Kulen NP line 38 in the table references the hectares cleared with a baseline, mid-term and end target. Why is the mid-term target much lower (2445 hectares) than the end target (4890)? Shouldn't the directionality of these targets be a downward trajectory from the baseline (8480 hectares) as the refer to hectares of forest cleared for farming? 2.) Same question as previous except for as it relates to Indicator 2 for the Kulen Promtep site. 3.) Indicator two for Kulen Promtep also states: "Assuming 1% of the land is confiscated and returned to state land for forest restoration, 2,000 hectares of land," please clarify what confiscations are being referenced and how this relates to the indicator/targets.

October 20, 2019 HF:

1.) Cleared;

2.) Cleared;

3.) What would be the mechanism through which "the taking away of encroached land and removal of encroachers" would occur? Please include or indicate in the risk table how potential social risks from this activity would be identified mitigated.

February 13, 2020:

1.) Indicator 1.2 – Please provide WDPA ID and METT score also through the portal – they are currently mentioned only in the project's results framework (Annex A) but not in the portal. Please add.

2.) Indicator 4.3 - Area of landscapes under SLM in production systems is included in the results framework (target 1,000 ha) but not recorded on the portal. Please add.

April 22, 2020:

All comments cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Response, 12 September 2019

Thank you for the comments:

- 1) In terms of Section II Kulen NP line 38, this was an error that is now corrected with mid-term target (4890 ha) and project completion target of (2245 ha).

In terms of Kulen Promtep site, the indicator is being changed to “Areas of land removed of encroachments and restored to natural conditions”. “Confiscation” means the taking away of encroached land and removal of encroachers and the subsequent restoration of these lands.

Refer BD TT Annex 13 of UNDP ProDoc .

UNDP Response, October 20, 2019:

Thank you for the comment. We have re-visited the issue of encroachment and confirm that the intent of the project is not to support any actions that might cause harm to communities, but rather to support communities who are already occupying encroached lands to improve cropping systems (e.g. introduction of agro-forestry and multi-cropping systems) that will enhance biodiversity and support biodiversity friendly agricultural systems) rather than actively supporting removal of encroachments because this is not a viable and socially acceptable solution to the problem. This is now reflected in the revised METT. While, the project will try to ensure that there is no displacement of people or their livelihoods, where this is not possible, the project will ensure that FPIC procedures are applied before any action is taken that would affect people’s livelihood or displacement. If livelihoods are displaced that the project will ensure to support alternative livelihood options. A livelihood action plan would be prepared early during the project, if displacement of incomes is inevitable

In addition, through the PA management, the project will mitigate future encroachments within the PAs.

Please refer changes in UNDP ProDoc: Output 2.2, para 56 (*pp.28-29*); METT (Annex 13) & Table 1 - Project Risk matrix (*pp.39-41*).

UNDP Response, 3 March 2020

The comments are well noted and will be added to the portal.

Indicator 1.2:

1. Kulen Promtep WS: WDPA ID – 61943; METT score - 33
2. Phnom Kulen NP: WDPA ID – 68861; METT score - 32
3. Angkor Wat Protected Landscape: WDPA ID – 2351; METT score - 59

Indicator 4.3: 1000 hectares

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement NA

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement July 3, 2019, HF: Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

July 3, 2019, HF: Yes.

February 13, 2020:

The NIM audit is included under the M&E budget. However, in the project budget of the ProDoc, audits are included under PMC. Please remove Audit from the M&E Plan.

April 22, 2020:

Comment cleared.

May 15, 2020:

Note that while NIM audit was removed from the M&E Plan in the ProDoc, it still is included in the M&E Plan in Portal. Please remove it and adjust the final figure to \$139,000 (which is the total in ProDoc), so both versions of the M&E Plan will match.

May 19, 2020: Comment cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Response, 3 March 2020

NIM audit is removed from the M & E table.

UNDP Response, 18 May 2020

M&E plan in CEO ER revised.

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement July 3, 2019, HF: Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

July 3, 2019, HF: No. The GEF SEC flagged the engagement/inclusion of Indigenous People and women to be addressed in the CER. Despite the response in the CER document and reference to Annex 5 and 6 the Stakeholder Engagement plan does not detail how/why/where Indigenous People will be engaged and the final row

in the table on "local communities" is a cursory treatment of a critically important, yet extremely diverse set of actors (individuals, groups etc). Please further elaborate on the context and how this project will engage with IPs with inclusion in the ProDoc, CER and Stakeholder engagement plan. Even if detailed information isn't available as it will be undertaken during implementation, intention to do so (and preferably plans for) engaging IPs need to be explicitly included in the Stakeholder Engagement plan as they are currently lacking.

October 20, 2019 HF: Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Response, 12 September 2019

Thank you for the useful comment.

The participation of the IPs (particularly the 10 IP communes in KPWS) is central to the project. IP participation will be governed by application of principles of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) principles. In particular efforts would be made to: (i) improve IP participation and decision making; (ii) empower and gender sensitize tribal leaders and men so that to ensure that women have a voice in decision making; (iii) support efforts at improving land security; (iv) improve quality of life, food security and sustainable livelihoods; (v) facilitate strengthening of local governance; (vi) improve IP capacity and skills, etc.

Refer Paragraphs 86 (*p.43*) and 107 (*p.46*) of UNDP ProDoc and Annex 5 (*pp.6-8*) and GEFCEO ER Section A.3 (Stakeholders)

STAP

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement July 3, 2019, HF: Yes. The STAP and Germany's comments on Stakeholder engagement seem to be sufficiently addressed and the approach (to include a detailed analysis in year 1 of implementation) seems sound.

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement July 3, 2019, HF: Yes. The STAP and Germany's comments on Stakeholder engagement seem to be sufficiently addressed and the approach (to include a detailed analysis in year 1 of implementation) seems sound.

Response to Secretariat comments

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement NA

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

July 3, 2019: No, not at this time. Please respond to the questions in the review sheet above.

October 21, 2019 HF: No, not at this time. Please respond to outstanding issues in the review sheet above.

December 11, 2019 HF: Final PM recommendation for this CER will be issued once the updated co-financing letter is submitted by the IA. All other technical comments have been cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The objective of this GEF-6 MFA (BD/LD) project is to promote integrated landscape management for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity natural resources and ecosystem services in the northern region of Cambodia. The GEF increment builds on the existing programs undertaken by the Government of Cambodia for biodiversity conservation, maintaining ecosystem services, sustainable land and forest management. In the alternative scenario enabled by the GEF, the project will work towards removal of systemic and institutional barriers for integrated natural resources planning through: (i) strengthened institutional, legal and regulatory frameworks that incorporate biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services considerations into sectoral, national and sub-national land use planning; (ii) strengthened national capacity for integrated natural resources management planning with protected area management and biodiversity mainstreamed; (iii) effective operationalization of an integrated planning and management approach in northern landscape in the country with community protected area and forest management,

biodiversity compatible SLM and improved agricultural land restoration in place; (iv) an effective integrated natural resources management supporting key ecosystem service (i.e. water) and biodiversity of global significance; (v) biodiversity conservation is mainstreamed into the agricultural, tourism and forestry sectors, supporting the reduction of key threats to globally and regionally threatened ecosystems and species; and (vi) knowledge management for biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services, SLM, and agricultural and livelihood productivity is captured and shared, encouraging ongoing and widespread implementation. The proposed project generates GEBs by contributing to Aichi Targets #5, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 19.

Innovativeness: The project design is innovative in several ways: First, it proposes to pilot the first programs in Cambodia for integrated planning and management in large landscapes and the project seeks to mainstream biodiversity and water conservation outcomes in sectoral and provincial economic planning among others.

The project addresses many dimensions of sustainability, including: *Financial sustainability* will be achieved by a number of means, including: (i) ensuring that through the integrated management planning exercise, develop new business models for landscape conservation, multi-stakeholder collaboration, support for establishment of Community level revolving funds and market linkages among others. *Institutional sustainability* will be ensured through systematic capacity development of existing public institutions, local communities and civil society organizations that operate in the northern landscape. By engaging these stakeholders in gender responsive conservation and livelihood investment planning, the project will help establish alliances for conservation and sustainable use of biological resources that is expected to continue beyond the project period. *Social sustainability* will be enhanced through the development/strengthening of stakeholder participation mechanisms for the target biological landscape. A Knowledge Management and Communication plan will be developed early during the project to facilitate awareness and enhance stakeholder participation. The project will ensure adequate consultation and participatory decision making to ensure that project activities are detailed in collaboration with local communities, so that extensive consultation including all affected groups is undertaken prior to delineation of areas to be set aside for conservation, so as to avoid excessive community resource use areas or to improve the management of such uses. Finally, *environmental sustainability* will be achieved through a coordinated approach involving improved protected area management approaches, sustainable natural resources, forest and land management, watershed and riparian area management, securing improved forest restoration and sustainable forest product use, improving incentives for conservation and community participation.

Potential for scaling up: The project is designed to provide demonstration models for up-scaling in Cambodia. In particular, the capacity building and the development of guidelines and regulations for each aspect of the project will strongly support up-scaling. Ensuring that activities, impacts and lessons learnt from the demonstration landscape are disseminated widely helps generate a bottom-up demand for similar activities throughout the country. The Project's investment component will seek to develop synergies among rural development actors and programs with an objective of raising additional investments that will fund and expand models of resource use and alternative livelihood activities within and outside of the targeted landscape.

The *global benefits* that will be delivered include improved management effectiveness of around 450,673 ha of existing protected areas, improved agricultural productivity in around 1,000 ha of degraded agricultural lands, community protected area and forest improvements in 1,500 ha of key biodiversity areas.