



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:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,900,000
Co-financing:	\$5,175,000	Total Project Cost:	\$7,075,000
PIF Approval:	March 31, 2011	Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 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 ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	03/04/11 IG Yes.	
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	03/04/11 IG NA	
	3. 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	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 9-8-2010

Agency's Comparative Advantage		<p>the outputs and outcomes of the project.</p> <p>Please amend to correspond.</p> <p>UA 03-21-2011: Has been corrected. Cleared.</p>	
	4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	<p>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.</p>	
	5. 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. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<p>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</p>	

		degradation and the associated threats to biodiversity. UNDP has two staff in the environmental unit of the country office.	
Resource Availability	7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF 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.	
	• the focal area allocation?	03/04/11 IG Yes the grant is within the BD allocation of \$6.33 million	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	03/04/11 IG NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	03/04/11 IG NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	03/04/11 IG NA	
Project Consistency	8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	03/04/11 IG Yes the project is generally aligned with the results framework.	
	9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF 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.	
	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant	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	

	conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?	country, links between landuse in agriculture and forestry also feature prominently as does the priority for maintaining and rehabilitating degraded and threatened forests.	
	11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional 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 communities and farmers to move away 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	12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) 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.	
	13. Is (are) the 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 the problems are clearly described - inadequate coordination of different sectors policy/regulation, limited institutional capacity for enforcement, technical management and coordination efforts, and inadequate local community involvement together with limited community technical capacity for sustainable land management methods.	
	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 outputs.	

		<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>	
	15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?	<p>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.</p>	
	16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation 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>17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>	<p>03/04/11 IG Yes - the project clearly builds on existing activities at both the policy and local level and also seeks to integrate the major land-use actors, the local communities, at an early stage.</p>	
	<p>18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/ adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?</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>19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?</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>	

	20. 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)	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 of their participation are recognised as the best approach to reduce the risk.	
	21. Is the provided documentation consistent?	03/04/11 IG Yes. The documentation is well prepared and provides a clear rationale and outline of the project.	
	22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?	03/04/11 IG No. State actors roles are clearly identified throughout as is the role of local communities in Component 3. However the role of civil society in Components 1 & 2 and how CSOs will be involved in Component 3 is not clear. Please provide additional information on the roles and involvement of civil society. UA 03-21-2011: Has been provided in revised PIF. Cleared.	
	23. 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.	
	24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	03/04/11 IG Yes. Details of the executing bodies are clear.	
	25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost	03/04/11 UA The project management costs in Section	

Project Financing	appropriate?	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.	
	28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost reasoning principle?	03/04/11 IG Yes. Funding levels seem appropriate for the existing level of activity and the scope of the projects actions.	
	29. Comment on indicated cofinancing at PIF. At CEO endorsement, indicate if cofinancing is confirmed.	03/04/11 IG Cofinancing is 1:2.7 UA 03-21-2011: Please refer to comments under review question #5 and clarify whether a part of the baseline funding is actually essential for achieving the project's objective. UA 03-30-2011: Has been clarified in additional response to review comments. Cleared.	
	30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	03/04/11 IG Yes. Given the clear focus of activities, funding levels seem appropriate for the existing level of activity and the scope of the projects actions.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	Will be required at CEO endorsement stage.	
	32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		

Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>03/04/11 IG & UA No. Please address the comments and issues identified in this review.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>UA 03-30-2011: Yes. Additional clarification regarding co-financing has been provided. PM recommends the PIF for CEO clearance.</p>	
	35. 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	36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 04, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 21, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 30, 2011	

* 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.

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.