

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

GEF ID:	9837		
Country/Region:	Cambodia		
Project Title:	Strengthening Capacity in the Agriculture and Land-use Sectors for Enhanced Transparency in		
	Implementation and Monitoring of Cambodia's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC)		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Capacity-building Initiative for	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
	Transparency		
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		CBIT-1; CBIT-1;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$863,242
Co-financing:	\$1,731,000	Total Project Cost:	\$2,594,242
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Dustin Schinn</b>	Agency Contact Person:	Alexandre Huynh

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	DS, May 22, 2017: Yes.	
<b>Project Consistency</b>	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	DS, May 22, 2017: Yes.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental	DS, May 22, 2017: Yes.	

<sup>&</sup>lt;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)?

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

## **PIF Review**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	DS, May 22, 2017: Yes.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	DS, May 22, 2017: Yes.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	DS, May 22, 2017: Yes.	
Availability of	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	The STAR allocation?	DS, May 22, 2017: The project requests funding from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
Resources	The focal area allocation?		
	The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?	DS M 22 2017	
	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	DS, May 22, 2017: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO approval.	
Recommendations		At CEO Endorsement Request stage, please provide a clearer description of how the project's data and results will also feed back into the national decision-making process, to enhance	

GEF-6 FSP/MSP Review Template January2015

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		the country's ambition over time, and for all relevant actors and ministries to be able to not just contribute, but to benefit from, the proposed project.	
D : D /	Review	May 22, 2017	
Review Date	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	<ol> <li>If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?</li> <li>Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</li> <li>Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?</li> <li>Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of</li> </ol>		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: 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?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:  • GEFSEC		
rigency responses	GEFSEC     STAP     GEF Council     Convention Secretariat		
	12. Is CEO endorsement		

<sup>&</sup>lt;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.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Recommendation	recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		