



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	<b>10050</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Regional (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia)</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Upscaling of Global Forest Watch in Caucasus Region</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Biodiversity</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-4 Program 9;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$27,399</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$972,604</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$3,460,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$4,432,604</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ulrich Apel</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Ersin Esen</b>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	04/14/2018 UA: Yes. Aligned with BD-4, program 9.  Cleared	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	04/14/2018 UA: Yes. As outlined in the PIF, the three countries have shown commitment to improve their forest management information systems by moving forward with a number of baseline activities, including MEA implementation and adoption of	

<sup>1</sup> For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>related policies and laws, including the NEAPs, INDCs, NBSAPs, NAPs To UNCCD, FNCs of UNFCCC, and new national forest policies. All three governments have also increased state funding for sustainable forest management.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers<sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>04/14/2018 UA: Not fully.</p> <p>1) Major questions arise with regard to the issue of sustainability, in particular how the ownership of the national governments of the customized data platforms and web-based tools can be ensured after the project ends and how funding for the upkeep and maintenance can be secured. In this context, it is concerning that the risk assessment is "HIGH" for "weak coordination among ministerial bodies and lack of support form national governments" and that the proposed mitigation measures are somewhat generic (capacity building, coordination teams, etc.).</p> <p>Please elaborate on the sustainability issue by including more information</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>about the intent and the strategy to address it, including the question of future funding. Please include this information in a concise way in the PIF section 1.6: "Innovativeness, sustainability, and scaling-up". It would also be helpful to provide preliminary experience with the issue of sustainability in the ongoing GFW project in Georgia and Madagascar.</p> <p>2) Furthermore, the project proponents are encouraged to explore linkages and synergy of the project with the newly launched Resource Watch platform in the PIF.</p> <p>At PPG and CEO endorsement stage: further elaborate on those linkages and synergy during the PPG and present them at CEO endorsement stage.</p> <p>05/04/2018 UA: Has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>04/14/2018 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the</p>	<p>04/14/2018 UA: Yes.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	GEBs?	Cleared	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	04/14/2018 UA: Yes.  Cleared	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	04/14/2018 UA: The proposed grant amount is within the available STAR allocations of the countries under the reduced scenario in GEF-6.  However, GEF trust fund is experiencing cash flow problems due to deferred donor payments at the end of GEF-6. The project can only be approved if sufficient resources become available. GEFSEC will monitor availability in cooperation with trustee and provide timely updates.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	04/14/2018 UA: Focal area allocations are within the margin of flexibility.  On availability, see also comment above.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	n/a	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	04/14/2018 UA: No, please address comments.  05/04/2018 UA: Yes. The PM recommends this project for technical clearance. A final decision on clearing, however, will be made based on availability of resources in the final months of GEF-6.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	April 14, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 04, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.