



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

GEF ID:	6947		
Country/Region:	Belarus		
Project Title:	Belarus Forestry Development Project		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	147760 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,739,726
Co-financing:	\$40,714,000	Total Project Cost:	\$43,453,726
PIF Approval:	September 02, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	October 30, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ian Gray	Agency Contact Person:	Andrew Michael Mitchell

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	August 8, 2014 Yes UNFCCC ratified 2000, UNCBD ratified 1993.	December 22, 2014 UA: Yes.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	August 8, 2014 No LoE provided	December 22, 2014 UA: Yes. LoE has been provided. Letter dated Aug 18, 2014.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	August 8, 2014 STAR allocations stand at CC \$8.55, BD \$1.50 and LD \$0.5	December 22, 2014 UA: Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	August 8, 2014 Requested amounts are within allocation limits.	December 22, 2014 UA: Yes.

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>GEF6 SFM ratio is 2:1 rather than 3:1 or is there a reason for not applying for the full SFM incentive amount?</p> <p>August 25, 2014 GEF data sheet revised.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>? <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>	<p>August 8, 2014 Alignment with BD Program 9 on increased area of productive landscapes, CC4 Promoting conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks and SFM Objectives 1 and 2 on maintaining and managing forest resources.</p> <p>Contribution of the project to Aichi targets is not identified.</p> <p>August 25, 2014 Additional information provided in response matrix. Further detail will be expected by time of CEO Endorsement.</p>	<p>December 22, 2014 UA: Yes. Additional details have been provided in appraisal stage PAD. GEF comments at QER stage have been adequately responded to, the response matrix has been filed in PMIS.</p>
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>August 8, 2014 Alignment with CAS is described but how the project contributes to biodiversity and climate change planning needs to be identified.</p> <p>August 25, 2014 Additional information provided in response matrix. Further detail will be expected by time of CEO Endorsement.</p>	<p>December 22, 2014 UA: Yes. Additional details have been provided in appraisal stage PAD. GEF comments at QER stage have been adequately responded to, the response matrix has been filed in PMIS.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>August 8, 2014  The rationale for the original WB loan is clear however the subsequent integration of the GEF element requires some further refinement, it is very much peripheral rather than an integrated part. PDO outcomes are largely reflect the initial project with the addition of an HCV intermediate indicator. The baseline for GEF interventions has not been established.</p> <p>8.1 million ha of Belarus' forests are already PEFC certified and an additional 4.9 million ha FSC certified if these areas are already managed under certified regimes what addition improvements are expected over and above these certification standards, or is the selected SFE not certified?</p> <p>If reduced emissions from fossil fuel substitution in Component 1 is being targeted the baseline is not presented in any detail.</p> <p>If fires are a major issue what is the baseline incidence, loss rate?</p> <p>August 25, 2014  Additional information provided in response matrix. Further detail will be expected by time of CEO Endorsement.</p>	<p>December 22, 2014 UA:  Yes. Additional details have been provided in appraisal stage PAD. GEF comments at QER stage have been adequately responded to, the response matrix has been filed in PMIS.</p>
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>August 8, 2014  Component 1  Sub Component increased intensity of silviculture. What is the effect of thinning for lumber and residue removal rather than conventional thinning or thinning to waste on carbon stocks? While thinning will concentrate merchantable volume</p>	<p>December 22, 2014 UA:  Yes. Additional details have been provided in appraisal stage PAD. GEF comments at QER stage have been adequately responded to, the response matrix has been filed in PMIS.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>there is evidence that thinning reduces overall carbon stocking particularly if WTH for chipping is done.</p> <p>The list of potential activities in Paragraph 3 Page 10 are activities which are normally part of FSC certification requirements (most except for HCV are PEFC elements) and therefore would have to be in compliance or are subject to a corrective action to achieve compliance. Why is further support required? Please also provide rationale that increased harvesting activity will provide enhanced conservation benefits, for example, what biodiversity GEBs are at risk from stand closure with non-thin regimes?</p> <p>Sub Component use of woody biomass. Please provide additional detail on what the GEF contribution to this element is Sub Component nurseries. Table B does not mention this sub component. Note that the GEF supports reforestation but will not contribute to afforestation efforts which alter natural habitats.</p> <p>Component 2. Is this work restricted to the single SFE or wider?</p> <p>Component 3. Details of GEF Outcomes missing from Table B. While supportive of improved FMIS the GEF contribution to this needs to be identified</p> <p>Detail in Table B is very limited could be improved for example the PCN mentions draft legislative acts, regulatory legal and technical standards in Component 1 and 2.</p> <p>August 25, 2014</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Additional information provided in response matrix. Further detail will be expected by time of CEO Endorsement.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>August 8, 2014            GEBs are only generally described and incremental reasoning is limited. Addition detail is required overall for biodiversity benefits targeted if the area is already certified.            GHG benefits from improved forest management, fire control and fuel substitution are not estimated. As in GEF 5 we still require some albeit very preliminary estimate of carbon benefits at this stage. The 2012 inventory submission of Belarus may provide a starting point.</p> <p>August 25, 2014            Additional information provided in response matrix. Further detail will be expected by time of CEO Endorsement.</p>	December 22, 2014 UA: Yes. Additional details have been provided in appraisal stage PAD. GEF comments at QER stage have been adequately responded to, the response matrix has been filed in PMIS.
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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?		December 22, 2014 UA: Yes.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	August 8, 2014 Additional detail will be expected in the PAD at time of CEO Endorsement.	December 22, 2014 UA: Yes. Additional details have been provided in appraisal stage PAD.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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)	August 8, 2014 Major risks are identified. Additional detail will be expected in the PAD at time of CEO Endorsement.	December 22, 2014 UA: Yes. Additional details have been provided in appraisal stage PAD.
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	August 8, 2014 Very limited information provided about FLEG. Are there any links to efforts such as Forest Europe and standards development, the European Forest Fire Information System  August 25, 2014 Additional information provided in response matrix. Further detail will be expected by time of CEO Endorsement.	December 22, 2014 UA: Yes. Additional details have been provided in appraisal stage PAD. GEF comments at QER stage have been adequately responded to, the response matrix has been filed in PMIS.
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	August 8, 2014 Given the extent of certification in Belarus please provide the rationale for additional support for basic certification requirements for conservation issues in Component 1.  August 25, 2014 Additional information provided in response matrix. Further detail will be expected by time of CEO Endorsement.	December 22, 2014 UA: Yes. Additional details have been provided in appraisal stage PAD. Also refer to comments at PIF stage. GEF comments to certification have been taken into account by the task team.
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		December 22, 2014 UA: Yes. Fully in line with what was agreed at PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	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?		December 22, 2014 UA: Yes.
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?	August 8, 2014 Co-finance appears adequate. Please revise the figures in Total Project Cost.  August 25, 2014 Cleared.	December 22, 2014 UA: Yes. Co-financing confirmed through IBRD loan. Minutes of negotiation will be provided as soon as available.
	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?	August 8, 2014 Co-finance is \$46 million IBRD loan	December 22, 2014 UA: Yes.
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	August 8, 2014 See footnote 5 on Data Sheet PMC should be based on Subtotal rather than Total Project Cost.  August 25, 2014 Cleared.	December 22, 2014 UA: Yes.
	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	August 8, 2014 PPG not requested.	December 22, 2014 UA: No. Refer to comments at PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	August 8, 2014 There is no NGL.	n/a
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Will be provided at time of board approval.
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		December 22, 2014 UA: Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		December 22, 2014 UA: Yes.
	• Convention Secretariat?		n/a
	• The Council?		December 22, 2014 UA: Yes. Response to German comments provided.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		n/a
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. <b>Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	August 11, 2014 Not at this stage, please see issues above.  August 25, 2014 Technically cleared.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. <b>Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		December 22, 2014 UA: Yes. Program manager recommends CEO endorsement.
	First review*	August 11, 2014	December 22, 2014
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 25, 2014	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	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.**