

Additional Financing for the Cambodia Sustainable Landscape and Ecotourism Project

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10483

Countries

Cambodia

Project Name

Additional Financing for the Cambodia Sustainable Landscape and Ecotourism Project

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

1/23/2020

Review completed by PM

3/4/2020

Program Manager

Hannah Fairbank

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

CEO Approval Request

Part I – Project Information

1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: Yes.

Agency Response

2. Project description summary. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF:

1. Please provide a detailed project budget which will greatly aid us in understanding how GEF resources will be used and the extent to which the project will achieve expected outcomes and outputs.
2. On a related note, Please describe how the project will focus and concentrate efforts (GEF portion) to ensure in order to realize priority outcomes and GEBs. This could be done thematically (prioritize activities etc) and/or geographically (just focus on two sites) depending on interests and priorities of government and project proponents.

The scope of what is being proposed in the project document for GEF financing seems beyond what can actually be realized with the funds and time allocated. Many of the (sub) activities could take up a good portion of the GEF resources [for instance: the project will expand to a total of 16 PAs over a 5 year period. (Pg 15) How many CPAs? Scope of CPA work? (Pg 15) how is it possible to do biodiversity assessments over a 2 million hectare area with available resources?]

3. The second outcome under Project Component 1 in Table B ("Increase in the number of visitors in selected community-based ecotourism sites") seems more aligned with Component 2. Please correct or clarify.
4. Component 2: If any of the activities proposed in Component 2 improve the management of land outside the formal Protected Areas per GEF core indicator 4 (sub-indicators 4.1, 4.3, 4.4) definition/criteria) that outcome should be included and indicator target should be set.

Feb 7, 2020 HF:

1 & 2.) Thank you for the helpful details below. Comment remains-particularly without having reviewed the budget.

3.) I thought I read somewhere in the documentation that Tonle Sap is no longer a focus of this project, that the project is focused on Cardamoms only, is this not the case?

Feb 21, 2020 HF:

All comments cleared.

Agency Response

WB Responses Feb18 2020

(1 +2) Based on the recommendations provided, the budget has been adjusted to indicate GEF support at the Sub-component level (see budget table in Annex J of the GEF datasheet) and activities with GEF support are better clarified within the components. The updated project documents reflect priorities for the GEF financing and incremental activities compared to the Parent Project in the component descriptions. Following up on GEF recommendation, during appraisal Government agree to a stronger focus on sub-component 1.2 PA Landscape Planning, Management & Enforcement with 65% of GEF funding being allocated to these activities.

(3). Thank you very much for your comment. Please also see para 22 of the Project Paper on incremental benefits.

- The suggested target for CPA Management Plans is 25 over the lifetime of the project.

- The biodiversity assessment will build on multi year work prepared by NGO partners in the region. In the first year existing data and assessments will be gathered and gaps identified. The overall budget is limited but we will support key interventions in partnership with ongoing work done by NGO partners.

- With the Additional Finance, the Government will be able to expand critical activities to additional PAs in the Cardamom Mountains and Tonle Sap (CMTS) Landscape (Project Area), benefiting a number of smaller PAs neighboring the original seven priority PAs (additional 356,632 ha compared to the parent project).

The project area covers the Cardamom Mountains and the Tonle Sap

(4) Noted and revisions have been made to include it under component 2 in Table B in the GEF datasheet.

(5) areas outside the PA are not targeted as of now, but if project activities are developed, we will measure the outcomes.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: Please include the entire parent project funding under co-finance (currently it looks like only \$26. million is included)-if the resources align with the GEF co-financing requirements. Among others, co-financing for Component 3 is missing.

February 21, 2020 HF:

Comment cleared.

February 28, 2020 PPO comment:

Please provide evidence of co-financing from the Government of Cambodia.

March 4, 2020 HF: A one-time exception has been granted due to time constraints of project team to permit the submission of the evidence of co-financing after the CEO endorsement request has been approved. Please submit co-finance documentation to project PM subsequent to March 30 negotiations as requested by Agency. Comment cleared.

April 8, 2020: Given we have not yet received the co-financing letter from the Government of Cambodia, the Agency has decided to take out the co-financing from the project. Please make this change to table C (and adjust as needed throughout datasheet). How does the removal of the \$2.5 million in Government Of Cambodia co-financing affect the project, its deliverables, GEBS, etc.? Please address and revise project documentation as necessary.

Agency Response

Responses Feb 28, 2020:

It may be clarified that as per WB procedures, government contribution will be evidenced in the Minutes of negotiations or a letter at the time of completion of Negotiations. Signed minutes will be provided after negotiations as has been done for other GEF projects.

Project now includes the entire parent project funding under co-financing in the GEF data sheet for incremental reasoning purposes in support of both BD objectives. It may be clarified however that GEF is lending no support to Component 3.

Response April 14:

Evidence of Government of Cambodia co-financing has now been provided in the form of the signed minutes of negotiations. Therefore no changes have been made to the project.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 01/31/20 HF: Yes, the Agency fee comes in at 8.9%, below the 9% limit.

Agency Response N/A

STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: Yes, this project will use \$4.82 million of Cambodia's \$6.42 million in STAR. Cambodia has full flexibility.

Agency Response Noted.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: Cambodia has full flexibility and the project contributes to BD-1-2b and BD-2-7.

Agency Response Noted.

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF:

1. According to Annex C there was a \$104,000.00 PPG and \$1.00 has been spent to date. Is this accurate?

2. If so, please identify the activities and specify that these activities are future proposed uses of PPG grant and please ensure they are in line with eligible expenditures for PPG funds (annex 2 - Tables 1 and 2 - page 13 of the Guidelines).

02/21/20 HF:

Comments cleared.

Agency Response

PPG funds were not requested for the project. Annex C has been corrected for the error in the numbers presented.

7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF:

1. Please ensure the entire area of each of the target Protected Areas is included in this target.
2. Please see question 2, #2 above: If there will be "area of landscapes under improved practices" outside of protected areas, these should be captured under Indicator 4, sub-indicators 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, if they meet indicator definition/guidance.
3. This comment is not in reference to a GEF core indicator, but rather to the "Index of Natural Resources value addition"-How is the conservation, sustainable management and use of the natural resources (NTFPs) considered/included in this index? Or isn't it? (pg 45).

02/21/20 HF:

Comments 1, 3 cleared.

2.) Just to confirm, the GEF AF is expected to produce an additional 356,632 hectares compared to the parent project? If it is indeed the case that there are no additional hectares expected under Indicator 1 or 4 please describe the reasons for this relatively high investment/hectare.

4.) Annex A: (i) states: "The end target of this indicator is 2,125,602 ha, an increase by 72,732 ha compared to the parent project" whereas the GEF-7 Core Indicator worksheet seems to have different numbers (Indic 1 target 2,385,831 with 300k increase over parent project). Please reconcile and ensure consistency.

5.) Annex F: Why are the GHG emissions reduction target calculated based on 2,029,199 hectares rather than 2,385,831 hectares which I think is the total target for indicator 1? GHG should be calculated for total hectarage target.

02/24/20 HF: All comments cleared.

02/28/20 PPO comment: Please include WDPA ID and METT-score baseline for each of the protected area under Sub-indicator 1.2. Also, the estimated GHG emission reduction should be reported under sub-indicator 6.1 and not 6.2. Please revise.

March 4, 2020 HF: A one-time exception has been granted due to time constraints of project team to permit the submission of the METT baseline after the CEO endorsement request has been approved. Please submit METT baseline documentation to project PM subsequent to March 30 negotiations as requested by Agency. Comment cleared.

1.

Agency Response

Responses Feb 28, 2020:

Noted. The baseline BD METT will be confirmed only at negotiations and will be provided after completion of negotiations. GHG reporting is revised as suggested and revised core indicator sheet provided.

Responses Feb 24, 2020:

2.) Only indicator 1 would increase its target area. Regarding indicator 4, we are not targeting any areas outside the PAs and hence no target will be reported under. Team would like to reiterate, that the GEF activities were originally appraised along with the rest of the IDA financed operation last year, and as such are part of the bigger whole. However, in the discussion with the Government over the last few months during preparation, team was able to assess the opportunities for a potential

expansion of activities to other PA within the existing Project Area. GEF AF will now allow the project to expand its activities benefitting an additional 7 smaller Protected Areas covering an additional 356,632 ha. However, the Government did not want to commit to any specific targets in those areas, except for the expansion of PA Management Plans in Kirirom PA (which is now reflected under indicator 1).

The other areas would also benefit from ecotourism, sustainable economic activities, law enforcement and zoning activities financed by the project and hence considered under biodiversity conservation. Thus, all targeted protected areas, covering a total of 2,385,831 ha, have been included under indicator 1, and non under indicator 4.

Regarding the investment/benefit ratio, please note that the investment/hectare over the lifetime of the project lies at less than 12.9 USD considering the entire project area and IDA and GEF funding for components 1 and 2 (around 30.8 million including Project Management cost), and at 12.4 USD strictly only looking at GEF resources and the additional 356,632 ha. We don't consider this a high investment per hectare, particularly taking into account the high level of risk exposure of the area and its extensive work proposed for protected area management and law enforcement, ecotourism development and other economic activities, to address those particular challenges. We actually consider this amount rather modest if PA should be effectively created and secured.

4.) Please note that the latest submitted version now includes an updated Annex A in the GEF datasheet - which now reads 2,064,431 ha, an increase by 35,232 ha compared to the parent project. This is to ensure alignment and consistency with the changes in the targets of the indicators as per the results framework of the World Bank PAD and Project Paper. The two figures referenced (increase by 35,323 ha and increase by 356,632 ha) are referring to two different aspects of additional activities.

The parent project's target are seven Protected Areas (2,029,199 hectares), which will benefit a.) from the development of PA Management Plans, and b.) from other activities, such as capacity building, zoning and law enforcement, ecotourism, connectivity and livelihood activities, etc.

- Through GEF AF, the project will be able to develop one additional PA Management Plan, namely for the Kirirom PA covering 35,232 ha (this is what is stated as a change in the result indicator as per WB results framework).
- However, the AF will also allow the project to expand all other activities to additional seven smaller PAs (including Kirirom) for which the project will not develop PA management plans), but which will nevertheless benefit significantly from the other activities. These additional seven PAs which will benefit from project activities sum up to 356,632 ha, which increased the total area to 2,385,831 ha stated as target.

5.) The original analysis and calculation of the GHG emission reduction has been based on the target project area of the parent project under implementation. The analysis and calculation of the GHG emissions reduction target for AF is based on the original target areas of PA that benefit from the parent project. With the increase of funding from GEF AF, targeted PAs will increase by around 18% (precisely 17.58%) from 2,029,199 to 2,385,831 ha. The GHG emission reduction target will therefore increase proportionally (by 17.58%) from 1,702,747 tCO₂eq to 2,002,005 tCO₂eq, which is the figure included under the indicator in the GEF datasheet and Annex F Core Indicators. Specific calculation and methodology for GHG emission reduction targets is included in Annex H of the Data Sheet.

-
1. Noted. Team has included the entire area of each of the target Protected Areas in the target in the Core Indicator table in Annex F of the GEF datasheet.
 2. Noted. The project now plans to expand the coverage of services (law enforcement, conservation-compatible economic activities, monitoring technology, ecotourism, CPA development) to more PAs within the Project Area, covering an additional 356,632 ha of PA. These are also Protected Areas and have thus been included in indicator 1.2 in the GEF datasheet Annex F, as mentioned above.
 3. The value addition indicator is becoming a very important way to measure benefits for communities. NTFPs are harvested and cultivated based on management plans and within certain zones (development zones), which guarantees sustainability. This is also further explained in the Theory of Change section in the project paper (35). The index will thus specifically include sustainability relevant aspects. The Monitoring Framework and baseline data work will start over the next few months.

9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: Yes. Please select Climate Change Mitigation Rio Marker.

02/21/20 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response Noted. Revision made to select the Climate Change Mitigation Rio Marker in the taxonomy table in the datasheet.

Part II – Project Justification

1. Project Description. Is there sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/ adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: Yes.

Agency Response Noted. Thank you

2. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: No. Please include/describe the baseline scenario and baseline projects (or make reference to this for reviewers).

02/21/20 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you. We have highlighted in the the project paper para 28, and in the Stakeholder Engagement section in the GEF datasheet, that during project preparation there was extensive consultation with Government and Development Partners including consolidating existing analysis and data on the project target area, as well as conducting field visits to validate and build on this knowledge base.

Through this, the project has coordinated with four Development Partners (FFI, CI, WA, UNDP) to create synergies with existing activities and projects in the CMTS landscape.

The project team also has engaged with USAID and Tetrtech which are carrying out a project with very similar components to this GEF-7 proposal (Greening Prey Lang) in a different landscape in Cambodia.

The project is planning to continue collaborating with the above-mentioned actors formally and informally: the project is planning several learning and knowledge exchange events with the above mentioned partners, such as workshops and study tours, and will aim at formally collaborating with them for the implementation of activities under Component 1.

3. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there more clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

02/03/20 HF:

GEFSEC notes that 2/3 of the GEF resources are currently allocated to Component 2 (\$2.7 million) vs Component 1 (\$1.5 million). Given the scope of what needs to be done under Component 1, the significant allocation of IDA resources towards Component 2 (\$16.75 million) and our interest in the generation of Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) for biodiversity, we would like to see a re-balancing of a majority of the GEF resources into Component 1. We are open to discussing

this further with the project team once we have reviewed a detailed project budget and have a better idea of the design and approach under Component 2 (see following related questions).

Questions in regard to 47. Component 2 design and implementation:

1. What are examples of 'other economic activities' are envisioned for GEF support (if it isn't NTFPs and ecotourism) under this component?
2. Beyond the Theory Of Change (TOC) please describe how the economic activities (aside from ecotourism) under Component 2 will support and result in GEBs for globally significant biodiversity/wildlife (target wildlife)? Including examples of how Component two will **link investment in NTPF/other economic activities to resulting global biodiversity benefits** (Components 1 & 2) would be really helpful in better understanding the intended approach and design elements (e.g. what measures will be in place).

Further technical input on this point: Components 1 and 2 currently seem like they are parallel Components (aside from potential ecotourism contributions to PA finance) rather than substantively linked and inter-dependent. Noting that a recent analysis of World Bank projects that included both biodiversity conservation and livelihood/economic activities found: *"no association between success in the provision of economic benefits and the achievement of biodiversity conservation goals. This finding may be because the projects included in the analysis did not always consider the livelihood and conservation strategic approaches as conceptually linked, and most often these approaches were implemented simultaneously, meaning that impacts in one strategic approach could rarely be a necessary precursor or result in another. This analysis also compiled a set of recommendations gleaned from the World Bank's experience implementing integrated biodiversity conservation and livelihood projects."* Please see the root study here: <https://rmportal.net/biodiversityconservation-gateway/learning-groups/conservation-enterprises/ce-documents/integrating-conservation-livelihood-goals/view> and Lessons Learned Conservation Enterprises <https://rmportal.net/biodiversityconservation-gateway/learning-groups/conservation-enterprises/ce-documents/conservation-enterprises-using-a-theory-of-change-approach-to-synthesize-lessons-from-usaid-biodiversity-projects/view>

02/21/20 HF

All comments cleared.

1.

Agency Response

1. **I.** Noted. We see your point and during appraisal Government as agreed to make the adjustments to the budget allocation (see Annex J of the GEF datasheet). The project has now allocated \$2.89 million of the GEF funding to sub-component 1.2 PA Landscape Planning, Management & Enforcement, and \$1.3 million to sub-component 2.2 Promoting NTFP Value Chains. This shift has been made to provide even stronger support to the generation of GEBs.

Both community-based economic activities and forest governance are key to reduce IWT, illegal logging and degradation of habitat. There is a strategic approach in

this project that links through all of its components, both under GEF and the IDA-financed parent project. This is elaborated in the theory of change and the Theory of Change section and Figure in the project paper. We have clarified in the datasheet in the Private Sector Engagement section, and in the project paper under component 2, that are alternatives to unsustainable livelihoods (see more details below). These activities will be carried out in close coordination with other project activities focused on law enforcement and CPA management.

2. Conservation compatible economic activities: We have included more detailed information in Annex 2 of the project paper. Possible conservation compatible economic activities/relevant value chains identified and analysed include bamboo, rattan and resin. In addition, several agricultural products have the potential to provide communities with conservation-compatible alternatives to unsustainable extractive livelihoods, thereby reducing pressure on biodiversity and illegal wildlife trade. Examples of these include, for instance, cardamom, ginger, turmeric, galangal, lemongrass, moringa, agarwood cultivation, and teak. These crops can be integrated into an agroforestry system and processed into value-added products such as essential oils, teas, incense sticks, or herbal medicines.
3. Project Paper includes clarification in the theory of change section of the project paper: By creating conservation-compatible economic opportunities (ecotourism, NTFP, and other conservation-compatible economic value chains), increasing tenure security, and increasing female participation and entrepreneurship, illegal pressure on wildlife habitats and encroachment on PAs will be reduced. In addition, ecotourism and other revenues will increase the financial sustainability of PAs. The AF will, therefore, provide technical assistance to communities for developing and strengthening conservation-compatible economic alternatives to illegal wildlife trade and logging activities. There is a direct link between PA management, valuation of PA with ecotourism, CPA management plans for communities and economic activities based on conservation. these links are clearly established and are in line with best practice mentioned in the guidance provided by GEFSEC.

4. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: Yes, but please note that: Ecosystem/forest restoration **not included in GEF-7 biodiversity strategy** outside of Impact Programs (and given the unclear benefits for globally significant biodiversity), thus restoration activities included in the GEF Additional Financing portion of the project are not eligible for GEF-7 BD resources.

02/21/20 HF: Okay, thank you but please see Annex A of the GEF CER as restoration and reforestation are still included in the "summary of GEF supporting activities" (iii) which needs to be corrected. Fine to note in the Project Paper that these activities will be IDA or government funded (other resources).

02/24/20 HF: Comment cleared. I saw that the taxonomy included forest restoration, but I thought it was fine to leave it in as the parent project is investing in this area and it might be good to have it searchable by that, but either way is okay.

Agency Response

Response Feb 24, 2020:

Thank you and noted. As an oversight the older version of the annex A remained at submission. Updated Annex A now included and aligns with overall RF and core indicator table. It may be clarified that it does not include any further reference to restoration and reforestation. In addition, the taxonomy sheet is also slightly updated to remove alignment with “Forest Restoration”.

Well noted, we have removed restoration from the activities carried out under GEF and adjusted the budget accordingly, allocated more resources to forest law enforcement as discussed above

5. Project Description. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: Please see comments on co-financing in Part I #4.

1. Please describe the incremental reasoning of this project visa vis the expected Global Environmental Benefits from this project. In other words: what is the specific value-added by the GEF financing in terms of Global Environmental Benefits (presumably for wildlife) against the baseline scenario?
2. Please explain para 28 (page 10 of 63) starting 'As envisaged...' visa vis the GEF increment for globally significant biodiversity.

02/21/20 HF: All comments cleared.

Agency Response

We have outlined the incremental benefits in the project paper (see highlighted in Para 22 in the Rationale for Additional Financing Section of the project paper). The project will also prepare a baseline assessment during the first year of implementation.

1. Incremental benefits measured, by monitoring framework, include but are not limited to:

- Development of PA management plan for one additional PA in the CMTS, covering additional 35,232 ha (parent project: 2,029,199 ha, with AF: 2,064,431 ha);
- The AF would expand the coverage of services (law enforcement, conservation-compatible economic activities, monitoring technology, ecotourism, CPA development) to more PAs within the Project Area, covering an additional 356,632 ha of PA (parent project: 2,029,199 ha, with AF: 2,385,831 ha);
- Doubling of targeted NTFP and other conservation-compatible value chains (parent project: three value chains, with AF: six value chains); and
- Adding more biodiversity and wildlife-trade-specific activities within the Project Area.

2. During the revision of the document, this paragraph has been removed from the text

6. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: Please describe the Global Environmental Benefits expected from this project in the project paper and GEF CER document. As this is a Global Wildlife Program Child Project please include a description of the expected contribution to the conservation of globally significant wildlife. For example, please describe under **#2 in the A. Context section** of the Project Paper for the AF as well as somewhere in the **II. Description of Additional Financing Section**.

Please note that pg 8, para 11. references "ecosystem service benefits such as water provision, slope protection, freshwater/nutrients" as resulting global environmental benefits, but these are local and national-level benefits, whereas GEF biodiversity resources are to produce GEBs for globally significant biodiversity.

02/21/20 HF: All comments cleared.

Agency Response

We agree that global biodiversity protection is of vital importance. GEF resources provide incremental global benefits through improving management of protected areas, contributing to the Aichi Targets, preserving and its endangered wildlife, preserving ecosystem services, reduce degradation of landscapes and aquatic resources, reducing disaster risks and reducing carbon emissions. These are reflected under para 2 and 11 (context) and paras 36 and 40.

7. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: Yes. A full treatment of sustainability is contained in the World Bank PAD document on page 32.

Agency Response

Noted. Thank you. In addition, the project is considered a model approach by the Ministry of Economy and Finance. And if financial sustainability can be demonstrated, it is willing to expand this project to all other PA of the country. Kindly also see the section on the sustainability framework in Annex I of the GEF datasheet

8. Project Map and Coordinates. Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: Please include a map(s) depicting the target Protected Areas (PAs) including, to the extent possible, the target communities/areas for Component 2.

02/21/20 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response A map of the project area, which highlights the PAs and ecotourism hubs, is included in the project paper and the datasheet. The specific communities and CPAs to be targeted will be identified during project implementation.

9. Child Project. If this is a child project, an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: Yes.

Agency Response Noted. Thank you

10. Stakeholders. Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: Please provide the project's stakeholder engagement plan/equivalent documentation and information about what stakeholder engagement took place during the design phase. Thank you for the stakeholder list.

02/21/20 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Project preparation documents have been provided to demonstrate the broad consultation effort during preparation. The project has held national and sub-national stakeholder consultation workshops with members of the relevant government ministries, relevant provincial departments, community protected areas with ecotourism potential, local authorities, community-based ecotourism operators, and civil society groups. Frequent field visits with and without World Bank participation ensure the continuous involvement of the communities and community groups. Additional information on stakeholder engagement is provided in the datasheet.

11. Gender equality and women's empowerment. Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: Yes. Gender analysis included in the PAD pg 95. Design includes corresponding measures.

Agency Response Noted and thank you.

12. Private sector engagement. If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: Yes. Private sector engagement is one of the key elements of the project to develop and sustain enterprise/economic activities under Component 2 and to support PA management in Component 1 via ecotourism concessions etc.

Agency Response Noted. Additional clarifications have been added for specific links to components.

13. Risk. Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: The IDA project has an Environmental and Social Management Framework which has been reviewed. There are several Environmental and Social risks that don't seem to have been included and therefore unlikely to be addressed in the project's Environmental Management Plan. Please describe (in the GEF CER at minimum) how the project is approaching the following risks for Component 2 (currently includes GEF resources):

1. This component will increase the access and promote high-biodiversity areas (PAs etc) to tourists. Although the project intends to promote an ecotourism model that will provide financing for conservation and PA management, there is certainly a risk/unintended consequence that tourism becomes a new and increasing threat to biodiversity in the area, if not properly managed, particularly given the focus of Component 3 on road building for market connectivity.
2. Improving and increasing NTFP extraction and value chains could have an adverse impact on ecosystems without providing a conservation benefit.

Realizing that Component 3 is 100% IDA-financed and loan is already approved, noting that indirect/induced negative impacts of road upgrading/increasing access to high-biodiversity areas (deforestation and land degradation, new/illegal settlement and incursion, increased hunting and facilitation of wildlife trafficking, road kill and increased Human Wildlife Conflict etc). The ESMF addressed hunting of construction crews-but not these longer term risks.

02/21/20 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

1. 1. Noted. Our safeguards specialists will accompany the project to strengthen the clarity of the biodiversity and wildlife risks and mitigation measures in the preparation of the safeguards TA TORs, which is currently under development. Ecotourism activities will not take place in the core zones and conservation zones of the PAs. Zoning and regional ecotourism activities are taking place now which will guide the location of activities (ecotourism and others) in the PA which will be reflected in the management plans.
2. Agreed – increased NTFP might have negative impacts. Mitigation action are identified during the safeguard screening at NTFP subproject approval prior to financing. NTFP specific risks and mitigation strategies will also be reflected in each CPA and PA management plan which will be developed as part of the project.

The Government, World Bank and stakeholders are fully aware of exposure to illegal trade risks from roads. The project will not create new roads, but only upgrade them. By doing so, we will have the unique opportunity to upgrade law enforcement activities, blockages, control mechanisms, technology that would control the area and better enforce the law. Sufficient resources are allocated under IDA to help mitigate the current threats for IWT.

14. Coordination. Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF:

1. Who is planned to be the Executing Agency (EA) for Component 2?
2. **G. Implementing Arrangements** Paras: 56-57 of the Project Paper. How will work/resources be allocated between 4 potential IO/CSO partners? Are all four critical? How will the transaction and financial costs of engaging/involving so many different organizations/partners be minimized?

02/21/20 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

MoE, which is the lead EA for the entire parent project, is also the EA for Component 2. MoE has a livelihoods department and members of this department are also part of the project team. In addition, the project will engage consultants for capacity strengthening including on NTFP value chains and PPPs.

The project activities will build on existing coordination and synergies with relevant IOs/CSOs, including coordinating with and scaling up the successful interventions of UNDP, Conservation International, FFI, and Wildlife Alliance, all of whom are working in the targeted landscape on CPAs, NTFPs, and ecotourism, and each with their own comparative advantages and valuable experiences to bring to the table.

15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 01/31/20 HF: Yes.

Agency Response Noted. Thank you

16. Knowledge management. Is the proposed “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: Although the global project of the Global Wildlife Program provides engagement on knowledge management (KM), the project itself doesn't reference knowledge management in the GEF CER or in the Project Paper nor in the PAD. Please describe the project's approach to KM.

02/21/20 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Noted.

1. Under Component 4, The AF would allow the Project to further strengthen its knowledge management, which is building on the dialogue between the World Bank, RGC, UNDP, and NGOs, and can be clustered in three main areas:

- (i) Provision of good practices to the RGC on GWP-related topics such as biodiversity and ecotourism.
- (ii) Extraction of lessons learned and systematization of knowledge on the Project, which will feed into the World Bank's upcoming regional work on forest landscapes and serve as a basis for the RGC's engagement in international and regional networks.
- (iii) Capture and dissemination of information at the community level to produce user-friendly tools and guidelines in Khmer.

The AF would also include resources for project staff to participate in international and regional conferences on GWP related topics.

As part of project design, the team is going to engage a KM consultant to develop a detailed KM Approach and Work Plan elaborating on the above mentioned three main areas.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: Yes, the project has a monitoring plan with indicators and targets, but we are awaiting a detailed budget the project.

02/21/20 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response The project monitoring is done through the results framework which defines the indicators and targets. Monitoring as per usual procedure is budgeted for under Component 4. GEF AF will further strengthen the project's M&E and Knowledge Management, as described in para 52 of the project paper.

18. Benefits. Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: Presumably socioeconomic benefits will be accrued primarily via Component 2. Description of, (and indication of the measures in place) to ensure how the benefits from Component 2 'translate in supporting the achievement of GEBS" is needed. Please see and respond to Part II #3 regarding the substantive linkages/relationship between Component 2 and Global Environmental Benefits and how this will be realized during project implementation.

02/21/20 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response Noted. Yes, there will be socioeconomic benefits under Component 2, which will be measured under the monitoring framework. The links between socio economic benefits of communities and GEBS were further elaborated in the theory of change section of the project paper.

19. Annexes:

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: Yes, but please upload all the documents submitted to the GEF Secretariat (including the PAD, ESMF etc) in the documents section of the Portal. Thank you.

02/21/20 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

February 18, 2020

Revised CEO endorsement package has been submitted through the system as per the WB-GEF harmonized procedures. A map of the project area, which highlights the PAs and ecotourism hubs, is included in the project paper and the datasheet.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: Clear.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

02/03/20 HF: No comments directed at Cambodia child project at time of Council PFD/concept review.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

02/03/20 HF: No comments directed at Cambodia child project at time of STAP PFD/concept review.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

01/31/20 HF: See Part I #6.

02/21/20 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

02/03/20 HF: Please see previous question on maps.

02/21/20 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Part III – Country and Agency Endorsements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

02/03/20 HF: A current LOE was included at the time of work program inclusion. This LOE is still valid now at CER stage.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

1. RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/ approval recommended?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

02/03/20 HF: Not at this time. Please address the comments above.

02/21/20 HF: Not at this time. Please see remaining comments under Part I #8 and Part II #4.

02/24/20 HF: Yes, CEO endorsement is recommended by PM.

02/28/20 PPO comments, please address above in Part I #4 and #8:

1. Co-financing: Please provide evidence of co-financing from the Government of Cambodia.
2. Core Indicators: Please include WDPA ID and METT-score baseline for each of the protected area under Sub-indicator 1.2. Also, the estimated GHG emission reduction should be reported under sub-indicator 6.1 and not 6.2. Please revise.

Review Dates

1SMSP CEO Approval

Response to Secretariat comments

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

1SMSP CEO Approval

Response to Secretariat comments

Additional Review (as necessary)

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The objective of the Cambodia Sustainable Landscape and Ecotourism Project is “to improve protected areas management, and to promote ecotourism opportunities and non-timber forest product value chains in the Cardamom Mountains-Tonle Sap landscape.” This is a 65-month World Bank project under the Global Wildlife Program (GWP) with \$4.42 million in GEFTF resources as Additional Financing (AF) to a previously approved \$29 million IDA loan. The parent project components are: 1. Strengthen Capacity for PAs Landscape Planning and Management; 2: Strengthen Opportunities for Ecotourism and NTFP Value Chains; 3: Improve Access and Connectivity; 4: Project Management, Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation; and 5: Contingent Emergency Response.

The Government of Cambodia joined the Global Wildlife Program in the expectation of cooperating with other countries that face similar challenges linked to biodiversity and wildlife management, PA development and management, ecotourism, and law enforcement. The partnership with GWP will further strengthen Cambodia’s engagement on illegal wildlife trade, law enforcement, and forest governance of PAs. Specifically, it will enable a more effective exchange of lessons learned, use of innovative technology solutions, technical assistance, and possibly future financing for improved law enforcement, ecotourism, and PA management, with concrete opportunities for cooperation with neighboring countries and with regional and global partnerships.

The parent project will support development and implementation of PA management plans in seven PAs (total - 2,029,199 ha) in this landscape, which will help reduce forest degradation. With the GEFTF Additional Finance, the overall eligible project area will increase by 490,500 ha and the targeted PAs under improved management will increase by 72,700 ha. With the expansion of the project area, the project will be able to expand existing activities planned under component 1.2. and component 2.2.