



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

GEF ID:	4945		
Country/Region:	Cambodia		
Project Title:	Collaborative Management for Watershed and Ecosystem Service Protection and Rehabilitation in the Cardamom Mountains, Upper Prek Thnot River Basin		
GEF Agency:	ADB	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-1; LD-2; LD-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,100,917
Co-financing:	\$4,940,000	Total Project Cost:	\$6,040,917
PIF Approval:	April 12, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 07, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Sanath Ranawana

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?	11 April 2012 UA: Yes.	16 June 2014 UA: Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	11 April 2012 UA: Yes.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	11 April 2012 UA: Yes. ADB is the co-ordinating agency for the parent program.	16 June 2014 UA: Yes.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	n/a
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	11 April 2012 UA: Yes. Fits into ADB regional work in the GMS.	16 June 2014 UA: Yes.

*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	11 April 2012 UA: Yes.	16 June 2014 UA: Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	11 April 2012 UA: Yes for LD.	16 June 2014 UA: Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	n/a
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	n/a
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	n/a
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	n/a
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	11 April 2012 UA: Yes. Clearly aligned.	16 June 2014 UA: Yes. Similar to PIF stage.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	11 April 2012 UA: LD-1, LD-2, LD-3	16 June 2014 UA: Yes. Same as PIF stage.
	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?	11 April 2012 UA: Yes. Consistent and well described in the PIF.	16 June 2014 UA: Yes.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	11 April 2012 UA: Yes. Sustainability is addressed within the institutional framework.	16 June 2014 UA: Yes.
	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	11 April 2012 UA: Yes.	16 June 2014 UA: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	assumptions?		
	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?		16 June 2014 UA: Yes.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	11 April 2012 UA: Yes. Main increment is the unified landscape approach to SLM with multiple benefits for BD and CCA.	16 June 2014 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	11 April 2012 UA: Yes. Clear and fully in line with what has been approved in the PFD.	16 June 2014 UA: Yes. In line with PIF stage.
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	11 April 2012 UA: Yes.	16 June 2014 UA: Yes.
	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?	11 April 2012 UA: Yes. Described and in line with what has been approved in the PFD.	16 June 2014 UA: Yes.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	11 April 2012 UA: Yes. Further details are expected at CEO endorsement stage.	16 June 2014 UA: Yes. Sufficient detail has been provided. Refer to section B1 and table 2 in the CEO endorsement template.
	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)	11 April 2012 UA: Yes. Has been taken into account.	16 June 2014 UA: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	11 April 2012 UA: Yes. Well-coordinated and under the umbrella of the GMS-FBP parent program.	16 June 2014 UA: Yes.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	11 April 2012 UA: Yes.	16 June 2014 UA: Yes.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		16 June 2014 UA: Yes. Fully in line with what was proposed 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?	11 April 2012 UA: Yes.	16 June 2014 UA: Yes.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	11 April 2012 UA: Yes.	16 June 2014 UA: Yes.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	11 April 2012 UA: In line with what has been indicated in The PFD.	16 June 2014 UA: Cofinancing has been con-firmed. Refer to 3 submitted co-financing confirmation letters.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	11 April 2012 UA: Yes.	16 June 2014 UA: Yes.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		16 June 2014 UA: Yes.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		16 June 2014 UA: Yes.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• STAP?		16 June 2014 UA: Yes.
	• 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?	11 April 2012 UA: Yes. PM recommends the child project for clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
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?		n/a
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		16 June 2014 UA: Yes. Program Manager recommends the project for CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 11, 2012	June 16, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	
	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.