



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

GEF ID:	5797		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Securing Tenure Rights for Forest Landscape Dependent Communities Linking Science with Policy to Advance Tenure Security, Sustainable Forest Management and People's Livelihoods		
GEF Agency:	FAO	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-2; LD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,000,000
Co-financing:	\$4,545,852	Total Project Cost:	\$6,545,852
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Fred Kafeero

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 ?		04/22/2014 UA: The countries participating in this global project are all eligible.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		n/a for a global project
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		n/a
	• the focal area allocation?		n/a
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		n/a

*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)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		04/22/2014 UA: Yes.
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><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 used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>		04/22/2014 UA: Yes. Aligned with LD-2.
	<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>		04/22/2014 UA: Yes.
Project Design	<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>		04/22/2014 UA: Yes.
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>		04/22/2014 UA: Yes.
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning</p>		04/22/2014 UA: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	sound and appropriate?		
	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?		04/22/2014 UA: Yes. refer to section A.3
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?		04/22/2014 UA: Yes. Refer to details in stakeholder description table, section A.2
	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)		04/22/2014 UA: Yes. refer to section A.4
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		04/22/2014 UA: Yes.
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <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 		Project has potential to experiment with new, diverse, more open and innovative channels of information sharing and capacity strengthening among target stakeholders. Such innovations will harness valuable experiences, create opportunities for joint learning, and strengthen capacities to meaningfully assess possibilities for action and to respond to ongoing and/or emerging

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 		<p>challenges.</p> <p>Strengthening or developing relevant capabilities will increase sustainability and the likelihood of effective replication. Enhancing knowledge communication, interaction and exchange across settings will serve an integral function in scaling up and out lessons and good practices (both existing and emergent) beyond the specific project countries.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>n/a - this is a 1-step procedure</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>04/22/2014 UA: Yes.</p>
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>		<p>04/22/2014 UA: Yes.</p>
	<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>		<p>04/22/2014 UA: Yes. Cofinancing has been confirmed with letters attached to the project document.</p>
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>		<p>04/22/2014 UA: Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		n/a
	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?		04/22/2014 UA: Yes.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		04/22/2014 UA: Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		n/a
	• Convention Secretariat?		n/a
	• The Council?		n/a
	• Other GEF Agencies?		n/a
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?		
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		04/22/2014 UA: Yes. The Program Manager recommends the MSP for CEO approval.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	First review*		April 22, 2014
Review Date (s)	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.