



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

GEF ID:	5775		
Country/Region:	Global (Ethiopia, Indonesia, India, Kenya, Niger)		
Project Title:	Building the Foundation for Forest Landscape Restoration at Scale		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$1,900,000
Co-financing:	\$9,300,000	Total Project Cost:	\$11,300,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ian Gray	Agency Contact Person:	Mohamed Sessay

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 ?	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>This is a global MSP that will target five countries (India, Indonesia, Kenya, Niger, and Ethiopia), all of which are GEF eligible.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>The MSP is seeking only global set-aside funds from the LDFA.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	

*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	March 24, 2014 No STAR resources are included. Cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	March 24, 2014 A total of \$2.085 million is being requested from the LD focal area, which is available. Cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	March 24, 2014 The full amount requested is available from the focal area set-aside. Cleared	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <i>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</i>	March 24, 2014 The MSP is aligned with the LD focal area strategy, and objective LD2 is identified as focus. However, given the focus on integrated management of forest landscapes (including agroforestry), please consider changing the contribution to objective LD3 instead of LD2.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<i>used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	<p>April 23, 2014</p> <p>The alignment is now appropriate.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>The MSP aims to build on existing commitments by five countries to increase area of forest landscapes under restoration through integrated management. It will contribute through increased information and analysis, which will be relevant to national land use planning and REDD+ discussions in other countries as well. In this regard, please clarify links to existing national plans, including the UNCCD National Action Programs (NAPs).</p> <p>April 23, 2014</p> <p>Reference to UNCCD NAPs is now included.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	6. 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?	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>Although the gathering of credible baseline information is a key part of the project, some additional detail is required on the baseline situation as follows:</p> <p>a) In Section A.1 (1), please clarify human dimensions of forest landscape degradation (i.e. estimate of affected people)</p> <p>b) In the same section A.1(1), please clarify linkages to the UNCCD and its</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>10-year strategy</p> <p>c) In A.1 (2), please elaborate on relevant efforts that are underway or being planned to address gaps.</p> <p>d) In A.1 (3), please provide adequate justification for targeting the five countries, including clarification of the baselines to be transformed by the GEF alternative. What level of political commitment and ownership is there for the project?</p> <p>April 23, 2014</p> <p>All the comments have been addressed, but additional details on affected populations and national baselines in target countries should be provided in the full MSP.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>No, the project framework needs some work. Please address the following:</p> <p>a) Please provide a brief narrative to clarify each of the components. The content of Table B and text on Page 10 could be harmonized more to ensure consistency of outcomes and outputs proposed. For example, output 4 under component 1, outputs 5 and 6 under component 2, and 2 under component 3 do not sound like outputs. Please include only outputs that can be monitored and measured or quantified for reporting purposes.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>b) Component 1- seems to largely focus on national commitments but Output 1.3 is more about planning and policy augmentation which may better fit as part of the Component 2 enabling conditions? Also Output 1.4 needs to be more specific.</p> <p>c) Component 2 - are these tools already developed and in use? Some further description of their status could be provided (perhaps through reference to available existing information), and additional detail of the final product these tools provide will sharpen these outputs.. Outputs 2.1 and 2.3 seem very similar, please differentiate.</p> <p>d) Component 3 - please explain how the private sector is involved. If large scale mixed restoration is to be successful the involvement of the private sector in the long term will be necessary. What private sector actors are considered potential partners? What incentivizes their participation in the project?</p> <p>April 23, 2014</p> <p>The project framework has been revised to take into account comments. Additional details on outcomes related to engagement with the private sector should be provided in the full proposal.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning</p>	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>Because this is a global project, GEBS are not explicitly identified. However,</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	sound and appropriate?	<p>reference is made to alignment with GEF priorities based on biodiversity, climate change mitigation and adaptation benefits. Yet these are clearly not consistent with the project approach.</p> <p>a) Please revise A.1 (5) to focus mainly on what can be possibly tracked at larger scale as a result of countries delivering on their commitments, such as improvement in tree and vegetation cover leading to measurable GEBs.</p> <p>b) With respect to incremental reasoning in A.1 (4), please start by referencing the UNCCD 10-Year strategy.</p> <p>c) Also in A.1 (4), please clarify how the project will specifically complement funding contributed by the Govs of Germany and UK.</p> <p>April 23, 2014</p> <p>All comments have been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	9. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>List of stakeholders provided is largely governmental. CSO and NGO need to be included in list of stakeholders as basis</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>for enhancing public participation. Please make explicit the link to local groups and IPs, including in the target countries. The private sector appears to be absent. Finally, please provide a brief narrative on types of roles envisaged (i.e. Lead EA, Partner EA, etc.) to clarify the categorization of stakeholders.</p> <p>April 23, 2014</p> <p>Comment has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>Yes major risks and mitigation measures identified.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>No. Two concerns need to be reasonably addressed:</p> <p>a) The PIF lacks adequate reference (beyond the India SLEM/CPP) to other relevant initiatives for coordination. Please provide a summary of other existing initiatives (including GEF projects) that are appropriate for coordination with the proposed project.</p> <p>b) The GPLFR has a key coordinating role and this needs to be further described. Additionally collaboration with REDD+ readiness efforts needs to be clear.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>April 23, 2014</p> <p>Comments have been addressed, but additional details on initiatives should be provided in the full proposal.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>The project is reinvigorating a much needed approach for forest landscape restoration, which will clearly enhance the LD focal area mandate. Part of the reason for slow uptake is that restoration has largely been done at smaller scale without real examination of the range of options, outcomes and methods available. Sustainability is largely based on the success of the tools and the ability to support implementation of restoration plans. Scaling up and roll-out to other regions and countries is a good possibility. Please clarify how preparation of and piloting of the tools in the five mentioned countries will serve as basis for rolling-out widely.</p> <p>April 23, 2014</p> <p>Comment has been addressed, and approach to scaling-up clarified.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>The amount requested and breakdown is fine. Please justify the sum for Component1 which is largely securing political commitment. Is there potential for private sector co-finance?</p> <p>April 23, 2014</p> <p>Comments have been addressed, and further details on private sector co-financing should be provided in the full proposal.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>The co-financing amount and composition is fine. However, some contribution from the target countries should be explored. Please address.</p> <p>UNEP is contributing \$300,000 in-kind support to the project, which is fine.</p> <p>April 23, 2014</p> <p>Comment has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	March 24, 2014 Yes, PMC is 5%. Cleared	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	March 24, 2014 PPG is within the norms. However, the amount needs to be justified in the text, including details of what will be achieved during the PPG phase. April 23, 2014 PPG is now justified. Cleared	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/a	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
	24. Is PIF clearance/approval	March 24, 2014	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at PIF Stage	being recommended?	No. the PIF cannot be recommended at this stage. Please address all issues raised in the review. April 23, 2014 Yes, PIF is now recommended.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	April 23, 2014 Please ensure the following issues are adequately considered during development of the full proposal: 1. Approach to private sector engagement and anticipated roles during implementation, including potential for to leverage additional co-financing 2. Nature of populations affected by forest degradation globally relatively to scale of restoration potential highlighted in the proposal 3. Baselines in target countries, including planned and existing initiatives for effective coordination to maximize the catalytic effect of GEF financing 4. Clarity of how the project will contribute to monitoring of GEBs from FLR 5. Evidence of constructive engagement for collaboration with the GPFLR partners to facilitate cross-integration of work programs (e.g. FAO, CIFOR)	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	March 24, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 23, 2014	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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.**