



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4470		
Country/Region:	Iran		
Project Title:	Building a Multiple Use Forest Management Framework to Conserve Biodiversity in the Caspian Forest Landscape		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4078 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$1,900,000
Co-financing:	\$5,275,000	Total Project Cost:	\$7,275,000
PIF Approval:	March 31, 2011	Council Approval/Expected:	May 26, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Doley Tshering

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	03/04/11 IG Yes.	6 DEC 2012 UA Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	03/04/11 IG There is an endorsement letter from OFP Mr Barimani. There is a difference in the project title in the OFP endorsement "Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation into the management of globally significant Caspian forests" and the title given on the PIF "Building a multiple-use forest management framework to conserve biodiversity in the Caspian forest landscape", which better captures the outputs and outcomes of the project. Please amend to correspond.	

		Has been corrected. Cleared.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	03/04/11 IG Yes. UNDP has experience in supporting the development and implementation of forest governance systems and creation of PAs internationally. Regionally and in Iran UNDP has ongoing and recently completed biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management projects.	6 DEC 2012 UA Yes.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	03/04/11 IG NA	n/a
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	03/04/11 IG Yes the project is in line with the CCA and the UNDAF which highlights the need to address deforestation and forest degradation and the associated threats to biodiversity. UNDP has two staff in the environmental unit of the country office.	6 DEC 2012 UA Yes.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	03/04/11 IG The grant is within the STAR allocation.	6 DEC 2012 UA Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	03/04/11 IG Yes the grant is within the BD allocation of \$6.33 million	6 DEC 2012 UA Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	03/04/11 IG NA	n/a
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	03/04/11 IG NA	n/a
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		n/a
	• focal area set-aside?	03/04/11 IG NA	n/a

Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	03/04/11 IG Yes the project is generally aligned with the results framework.	6 DEC 2012 UA Yes.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	03/04/11 IG The project is entirely focused on BD-2.1 - developing policies and plans within Component 1 of the project. However the project also includes the development and enhanced management of PAs which may better reflect the objectives of BD-1, Outcome 1.1. The project also seems to miss the link to LD-2 in the projects efforts to reduce impacts from over-grazing and the expansion of agriculture within the forests. Please reconsider the project's alignment with BD-1 and LD-2. UA 03-21-2011: Has beend discussed and explained. The project will focus on BD-2. Cleared.	BD-2
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	03/04/11 IG Yes the project is well aligned with the NBSAP. The NBSAP works towards the target of 10% land cover in PA in the country, links between landuse in agriculture and forestry also feature prominently as does the priority for maintaining and rehabilitating degraded and threatened forests.	6 DEC 2012 UA Yes. In line with NBSAP.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	03/04/11 IG Yes the project clearly explains its ability to enhance capacity at three levels of the policy/regulatory framework, the instututional capacities of the implementing staff of the FRWO adn the DOE and the capacity of local	6 DEC 2012 UA Yes. Sustainability is being addressed within the institutional framework.

		from harmful practices to more sustainable livelihood creation methods. The project also includes the plan to have 5 further pilot areas identified by the end of the project.	
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	03/04/11 IG Yes a number of activities make up the baseline. The most immediate is the ongoing Conservation of the Caspian Forests identifying and maintaining forest reserves. Additionally affor/refor activities in degraded forest areas, woodlot development for fuel source substitution contribute to the baseline activity. Additionally work is ongoing in the agriculture sector to resolve land rights issues and reduce grazing pressure on forests.	6 DEC 2012 UA Yes. No changes in comparison to PIF.
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		6 DEC 2012 UA Yes.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	03/04/11 IG Yes the incremental activities are clearly described at local institutional and policy level. Clearly the project adds an important link between the forest and agriculture sectors and develops the ability to manage multi-use landscapes. As described institutional capacities currently lack capacity to implement and maintain a multi-use model and focus narrowly on their own sector resulting in lost opportunities for securing environmental benefits.	6 DEC 2012 UA Yes. Main added value of GEF support is the cross sectoral approach that mainstreams BD into land use planning and forest management.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	03/04/11 IG Yes the project framework gives a clear description of the project and expected	6 DEC 2012 UA Yes. Framework has a clear link to NRSAP priority of conserving and

		<p>03-04-2011 UA: The CFM component (#3) should be explicitly designed to be able to monitor and evaluate the environmental impact of the activities. In view of GEBs, the component should not only generate benefits, but also catalyze effective forest management through M&E with credible evidence about what works and under what conditions.</p> <p>03-30-2011 UA: Comment has been taken into account in revised version. Cleared.</p>	ecosystems.
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>03/04/11 IG Yes. The success of the project is based on the premise that GEBs will accrue from the correct identification and subsequent management of biodiverse landscapes. Given the project's clear three-level methodology, that builds on existing forest and agriculture sector projects and the clear understanding of the importance of the local communities for the success of the project, the methodology and assumptions are appropriate.</p> <p>03-04-2011 UA: As the expected GEBs are forest related, the project should be designed in a way that carbon benefits can be measured.</p> <p>UA 03-21-2011: Comment will be taken into account during project design. Cleared.</p>	<p>6 DEC 2012 UA Yes. GEBs are sustainable management of 800,000 ha Caspian Hyrcanian forest.</p>

	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>03/04/11 IG The PIF includes outlines of the measures taken to involve local people to adopt less damaging agricultural practices and enhance NTFP-related income generation. Employment opportunities for 25,000 people are mentioned but not detailed.</p> <p>Further information on the socio-economic benefits likely to result for these communities will be required at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>UA 03-21-2011: Has been addressed. Cleared.</p>	<p>6 DEC 2012 UA Yes. Socio-economic benefits being generated through gender sensitive community forest approaches.</p>
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>03/04/11 IG No. The engagement at local level in Component 3 is clear. However; less information is provided on how civil society is able to contribute to Components 1 & 2. Gender issues are mentioned only very briefly but do not explain actions or outcomes.</p> <p>Please provide additional information on the role of civil society in Components 1 & 2 and how other social issues such as gender will be addressed.</p> <p>UA 03-21-2011: Has been addressed in revised PIF. Cleared.</p>	<p>6 DEC 2012 UA Yes.</p>
	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>03/04/11 IG Yes. The highest risk is associated with the potential; for local communities to be unwilling to participate. The efforts to have early and widespread consultation and engagement together with clear identification of the benefits</p>	<p>6 DEC 2012 UA Yes.</p>

		the best approach to reduce the risk.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	03/04/11 IG Yes. The project builds on existing project activities and can learn lessons from the recently completed Conservation of Biodiversity in Central Zagros project.	6 DEC 2012 UA Yes.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	03/04/11 IG Yes. Details of the executing bodies are clear.	6 DEC 2012 UA Yes.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		6 DEC 2012 UA Yes. Fully in line with what was approved at PIF stage.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		n/a
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	03/04/11 UA The project management costs in Section A are exactly 10% of project costs. Please note that these costs are not a lump sum - detailed justification of actual costs will be required by CEO endorsement. UA 03-21-2011: Has been reduced to 9%. Cleared.	6 DEC 2012 UA Yes.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	03/04/11 IG Yes. Funding levels seem appropriate for the existing level of activity and the scope of the projects actions.	6 DEC 2012 UA Yes. Slightly increased compared to PIF stage.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if	03/04/11 IG Cofinancing is 1:2.7	6 DEC 2012 UA Yes. Slightly increased compared to PIF stage.

		<p>comments under review question #5 and clarify whether a part of the baseline funding is actually essential for achieving the project's objective.</p> <p>UA 03-30-2011: Has been clarified in additional response to review comments. Cleared.</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>03/04/11 IG Cofinancing from the Agency is \$150,000.</p> <p>03-04-2011 UA: Please explore increasing the co-financing from UNDP.</p> <p>UA 03-21-2011: Co-financing from the Agency has been increased to \$250,000 and total cofinancing only marginally increased to a total of \$5,175,000. Please explore whether at least a fraction of the mentioned baseline funding would qualify as co-financing. It seems that the three mentioned baseline projects/programmes with their funding of \$33 million, \$120 million, and \$7 million (annually of the next 5 years) implement activities that to a small part could be considered essential for achieving the project objective.</p> <p>UA 03-30-2011: Additional clarification has been provided. UNDP will strive for leveraging higher co-financing at CEO endorsement.</p>	6 DEC 2012 UA Yes.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		6 DEC 2012 UA Yes.

	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		6 DEC 2012 UA Yes.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		6 DEC 2012 UA Yes. Adequate response provided.
	• Convention Secretariat?		n/a
	• Council comments?		n/a
	• Other GEF Agencies?		n/a
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	03/04/11 IG & UA No. Please address the comments and issues identified in this review. UA 03-21-2011: All comments and issues have been adequately addressed in the revised PIF version, except the co-financing. Please refer to comments under question #5 and #29. UA 03-30-2011: Yes. Additional clarification regarding co-financing has been provided. PM recommends the PIF for CEO clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	UNDP has promised significant increase of co-financing at CEO endorsement stage. UNDP will also explore what fraction of baseline financing can be considered co-financing. Refer to response provided to March 23, 2011 review comments filed under project documents and check accordingly.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		6 DEC 2012 UA Yes.

	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		6 DEC 2012 UA Yes. PM recommends CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 04, 2011	December 06, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 21, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 30, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

*** This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	06-29-2011 UA: Yes. The proposed activities are appropriate for a PPG and are well oriented at the design of the FSP in line with the concept presented at PIF stage.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	06-29-2011 UA: Yes. The total consultant costs as well as the average costs / week are appropriate.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	06-29-2011 UA: Yes.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	June 29, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.