GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW SHEET FOR MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

GEF ID:	**9754**		
Country/Region:	**Moldova**		
Project Title:	**Climate Adaptation & Forestry Project**		
GEF Agency:	**World Bank**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**155968 (World Bank)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Land Degradation**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**LD-1 Program 1; LD-3 Program 4;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	**$2,000,000**
Co-financing:	**$20,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$22,000,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Saliha Dobardzic**	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	The project is aligned with LD-1, Program 1, and LD-3, Program 4, focusing on afforestation of degraded land, rehabilitation of forest belts and degraded pastures, and preparation of integrated forest/pasture management plans.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes. The components and project design are appropriate.	
	3. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans	Yes, Country Partnership Strategy and Government's Action Plan for the Implementation of the Climate Change	

[1] 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)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Adaptation Strategy, as well as the Nationally Determined Contribution (2016) are referenced.	
Project Design	4. Does the project sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes.	
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes.	
	6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Yes.	
	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Please provide more information related to CSO involvement in the project.	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	Yes, the project's economic analysis shows that, if implemented effectively, the project would bring significant economic benefits to the beneficiaries.	
	9. 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)	The project provides an overall risk rating matrix, along with the explanations of the key risks, including risk mitigation measures where available.	
	10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	Yes, although there are some inconsistencies among the documents on	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		the cofinancing amount (e.g. GEF Data Sheet is not consistent with the Minutes of the Decision Meeting.) Please ensure consistency and submit evidence of all cofinancing commitments, at the latest prior to presenting the project to the Board.	
	11. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	The draft tracking tool should be submitted, at the latest, prior to presenting the project to the Board.	
	12. *Only for Non-grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?	N/A	
	13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	Yes, Country Partnership Strategy and Government's Action Plan for the Implementation of the Climate Change Adaptation Strategy, as well as the Nationally Determined Contribution (2016) are referenced.	
	14. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Yes, there is a results framework and monitoring plan, and project management and monitoring are budgeted for.	
	15. Does the project have description of knowledge management plan?	Yes.	
Availability of Resources	16. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	Yes.	
	• The focal area allocation?	Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the	N/A	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• Focal area set-aside?	N/A	
Recommendations	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	The project is recommended for CEO Approval.	
Review Dates	First Review	February 27, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		