



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT*

GEF Program ID:	4649		
Country/Region:	Regional (China, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand, Vietnam)		
Program Title:	GMS-FBP Greater Mekong Subregion Forests and Biodiversity Program (PROGRAM)		
GEF Agency:	ADB and World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Multi Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2; CCM-5; SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-2; CCA-1; CCA-2; LD-3; Project Mana; BD-1; BD-2; CCM-5; SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-2; CCA-1; CCA-1; LD-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$20,152,339
Co-financing:	\$131,896,100	Total Project Cost:	\$152,048,439
PFD Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2011
		Expected Program Start Dt:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Sanath Ranawana,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments on Program Framework Document
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	<p>8 Sep 2011 UA: For BD, CC, LD and SFM/REDD+ funds: Yes, the participating countries are eligible.</p> <p>9 Sep 2011 JS: The participating countries are either least developing countries or non-annex I parties to the UNFCCC. Vietnam is eligible for the SCCF from which it is seeking additional support under the program.</p>
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the program?	<p>8 Sep 2011 UA: Program Endorsement letters are expected to be submitted by September 15 by all participating countries.</p> <p>17 Sep 2011-CCA/JS Endorsement letters have not been submitted.</p> <p>23 Sep 2011 UA: Only a endorsement letter from Lao PDR has been submitted. The</p>

		remaining endorsement letters.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Are the Agencies' comparative advantages for this program clearly described and supported?	<p>8 Sep 2011 UA: Not fully. Comparative advantages of ADB and World Bank are clearly described and supported. Comparative advantage for UNEP is not clearly described and supported. The PFD does explain UNEP's role in the proposed project in Cambodia but does not explain UNEP's comparative advantage to participate in the program. UNEP's role in the regional project is unclear and no comparative advantage is described.</p> <p>9 Sep 2011 JS: ADB's comparative advantage regarding the GMS Biodiversity Conservation Corridors is clear. Please add that ADB is leading another SCCF project in Vietnam which gives it an advantage in designing projects related to climate change adaptation.</p> <p>16 Sep 2011 UA: Has been addressed. UNEP has withdrawn from the program.</p> <p>17 Sep 2011-CCA/JS Added information is satisfactory.</p>
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it?	n/a
	5. Does the program fit into the Agencies' programs and staff capacity in the country(ies)?	8 Sep 2011 UA: Yes.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	8 Sep 2011 UA: Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	8 Sep 2011 UA: Yes. But the amount requested for SFM/REDD+ exceeds the 3:1 ratio of STAR : SFM/REDD+ and needs to be adjusted accordingly. Right now, \$19.5 million of STAR are requested. The maximum SFM/REDD+ incentive that the program could receive is thus \$6.5 million. It appears that all individual national PIFs are requesting the maximum

		<p>SFM/REDD+ incentive for the regional support project is too high. The countries might want to consider contributing a portion of their SFM/REDD+ incentive to the regional support project.</p> <p>The Program Manager would like to emphasize that SFM/REDD+ incentive funding is not an entitlement of the individual countries. Each PIF under the program will have to provide a proper justification. It would be an advantage, if the countries show their commitment to the regional project by allocating a portion of the SFM/REDD+ funding it.</p> <p>16 Sep 2011 UA: As it stands now, the SFM/REDD+ incentive for the regional project under the PFD would have to be reduced to \$500,000. The total STAR amount invested into the program is \$16.08, which could trigger a maximum of \$5.36 million for the whole program.</p> <p>23 Sep 2011 UA: Adequately addressed.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access? 	<p>9 Sep 2011 JS: It should be noted that Cambodia and Lao-PDR both have climate change related LDCF projects that are CEO endorsed and approved respectively.</p> <p>17 Sep 2011 JS Please ensure that the proposed activities are coordinated with the projects mentioned in the previous comment.</p> <p>09/23/2011 -- CCA: YES. Please refer to Section 18 below.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	<p>9 Sep 2011 JS: Yes. The proposed grant is within the resources available from the SCCF program for climate change adaptation. It should be noted that \$3.3 m has been CEO approved for a SCCF project in Vietnam through ADB.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	<p>8 Sep 2011 UA: Yes. But amount of focal area set aside will have to be discussed. It is also unclear how much FA set asides are being requested. Please revise and expand Table D showing all requested amounts by source, country/regional, and focal area.</p> <p>12 Sep 2011/LH: As stated in UA's comments, not only the amount of focal area set aside will have to be discussed, but also the focal area/type of funds may need to be discussed.</p>

		<p>Table D shows now correctly the requested amounts. 18 Sept 2011/LH: Although Table D matches the request, too much SFM is being requested as indicated earlier in this question. Please update Table D when funding request is modified.</p> <p>23 Sep 2011 UA: Adequately addressed.</p>
<p>Program Consistency</p>	<p>7. Is the program aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCE/SCCF results framework?</p>	<p>8 Sep 2011 UA: Yes for BD, LD, SFM/REDD+</p> <p>9 Sep 2011 JS: Additional clarification will be helpful. In the framework, project components that contribute the SCCF objectives should be identified.</p> <p>12 Sep 2011/LH: It is not always clear if climate change is being used to mean climate change mitigation, or climate change adaptation, and whether climate resilience (which is often used in the text) is mitigation or adaptation. CCM-5 objectives are for mitigation, and some climate resilience activities may be included in that. For instance forest fire prevention activities may be CCM-5 activities, although fire may be only a small risk in this area. An example is in Annex A-4, in the focal area column. Sometimes CC mitigation is written and sometimes the entry is climate change meaning CC-M (climate change mitigation) when the trust fund is GEF TF and CC-A when the trust fund is SCCF.</p> <p>17 Sep 2011 JS Satisfactory changes have been made.</p>
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCE/SCCF objectives identified?</p>	<p>8 Sep 2011 UA: BD-1, BD-2 CCM-5 LD-3 SFM/REDD-1 SFM-REDD-2 CCA-1, CCA-2</p> <p>9 Sep 2011 JS: SCCF objectives have not been articulated in the program goals. The key-focus will be on GEF BD-1 objectives, but for SCCF, it has to be ensured that these objectives will be climate resilient and natural resources important for vulnerable populations will be identified and protected proactively.</p>

		<p>well articulated in Table B and in the text. For instance, in Table 1 in section B.1.1., the outcome of CCM-5 objectives in component 3 is listed as "Economic valuation of biodiversity and conservation financing mechanisms developed and disseminated". This may simply be an error because it is a repeat of the text in the cell above. Regardless, I would expect to see something more like "MRVs developed and information for good practice for forest carbon management and finance developed and disseminated"</p> <p>18 Sept 2011/LH: My comment on this question in the previous review was not addressed. See above and address.</p> <p>17 Sep 2011 JS Not entirely addressed. Please address the comment regarding natural resources that are important to the livelihoods of vulnerable people living in the area.</p> <p>09/23/2011 -- CCA: YES. The revised PFD clarifies the extent to which considerations of climate resilience have been integrated into the overall program design. Table B highlights measures to assess climate change vulnerabilities; to enhance the resilience of communities, livelihoods, and conservation landscapes; and to share knowledge and build partnerships on climate-resilient landscape management practices. Section B.1 provides further detail on the approaches through which the SCCF grant will contribute towards relevant CCA objectives across the program.</p> <p>23 Sept 2011 LH: my comment was addressed, thank you.</p>
	<p>9. Is the program consistent with the recipient country(ies)' national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>8 Sep 2011 UA: Mostly. Please elaborate on the SFM/REDD+ component and it's consistency with national strategies and plans of the participating countries.</p> <p>9 Sep 2011 JS: In case of SCCF, alignment of the program with National Communications and NAPAs of individual countries where appropriate has not been presented.</p> <p>For Vietnam, activities proposed need to agree with priorities identified in the country's National Communications.</p> <p>12 Sep 2011/LH: Please elaborate on the Climate Change Mitigation component. Some information is mentioned about the REDD and FCPF, but please be more clear about the consistency with all major national carbon-related strategies and plans of participating countries.</p> <p>16 Sep 2011 UA:</p>

		<p>17 Sep 2011 JS Above comment has not been addressed in B2 for Vietnam, China and Myanmar. Description given for Thailand addresses climate change mitigation and not adaptation – please elaborate on consistency with Thailand's strategies, plans, assessments etc. concerning adaptation.</p> <p>09/23/2011 -- CCA: YES. Section B.2 of the revised PFD elaborates on the ways in which the proposed program responds to the adaptation priorities put forward in Thailand's Five Year Strategy on Climate Change 2008 to 2012 and Vietnam's National Target Program to Respond to Climate Change. In the case of PRC, the proposed program is aligned with the adaptation measures described in National Climate Change Programme. As the Myanmar NAPA is expected to be submitted during 2011, the relevance of the program for the country's urgent and immediate adaptation needs should be demonstrated in the design of the regional project.</p>
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of program outcomes?</p>	<p>8 Sep 2011 UA: Yes. More elaboration will be required in each of the individual PIFs under this program.</p> <p>12 Sep 2011/LH: Please briefly elaborate on the contributions of the sustainability of program outcomes related to climate change mitigation. 18 Sept 2011/LH: The modifications are acceptable at the PIF stage. Thank you. Addressed for CCM.</p>
<p>Program Design</p>	<p>11. Is the description of the baseline scenario/baseline project – what would happen without GEF financing – reliable, and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>8 Sep 2011 UA: Some improvements needed: - Para 52: what is meant here with "\$180 million of co-finance"? Does this refer to baseline funding or co-finance for the baseline projects and if so what is the total funding of the baseline? - Please elaborate on the (vi) Redd+ strategies in these countries and where they are in terms of developing MRV systems. It would be important for GEF to understand if and how the proposed program can contribute to a regional approach or harmonized MRV systems - Table 2: Please remove reference to the requested GEF funding as it is partly inconsistent with the funding requests in Table A, B, and D. Also remove "*Notes" on endorsement letters of Thailand</p> <p>9 Sep 2011 JS: In the regional project baseline, stresses to the natural resources and populations due to climate change have not been mentioned. Climate change threats to the GMS and associated economic and social processes should be identified, and</p>

climate change should be added. This information should be added to Table 2, both under regional program and individual projects specially Vietnam.

Clear description of baseline projects, and their status is lacking. In case of Vietnam, table 2 lists 4 baseline projects whereas the description of the project in Annex 1 lists only 2 baseline projects. Please also explain what the Carbi Project is, it is mentioned in the Annex but not in Table 2. Description of economically and socially important natural resources in the project area, and the risks imposed by climate change to them is not provided. Risks to the baseline projects due to climate change is not presented.

12 Sep 2011/LH: Some improvement is needed in terms of carbon management. What are the baseline conditions in terms of common knowledge about good practices for increasing forest carbon, especially perhaps in tropic peatland areas? For instance, is this information known and just needs to be disseminated and implemented, or does some information need to be developed?

16 Sep 2011 UA:

The baseline table still includes a proposed UNEP project, which will have to be discussed at later stage and should thus not yet be mentioned here.

Other points have been addressed.

18 Sep 2011/LH: the response to my comment discusses the regional PIF. It is not clear in the regional PIF yet what the final funding will be because too much SFM/REDD+ is being requested overall. In terms of tools, (mentioned in the response), the GEF reserves our rights to tools we fund so that they are available for use as appropriate. Also, the sustainability of tools is a consideration; they have maintenance and updating needs in the future. Please briefly state how these tool issues will be dealt with.

17 Sep 2011 JS

Added information on the effects of climate change in the participating countries and status of baseline projects is helpful.

In table 2, addition of climate change related gaps in the baseline regional project is noted. Please extend the climate change impact and vulnerability analysis to identify and plan the protection of natural resources that are key to the livelihoods of the people living in the area.

23 Sept 2011 LH: The specific issues I had have been addressed.

		<p>plan the protection of natural resources that are key to the livelihoods of the people living within the conservation landscapes. Component 2 has also been strengthened to include targeted individual and community livelihood strategies in relation to climate change impacts on ecosystem services and natural resources.</p>
	<p>12. Are the activities to be undertaken by the program partners (or for which they will provide funding) sufficient given the nature of the program and is it likely that these activities (or funding) will not materialize if the GEF does not fund this program?</p>	<p>8 Sep 2011 UA: Yes. It is likely that the program activities will not materialize without GEF support and would be insufficient.</p> <p>9 Sep 2011 JS: The individual baseline projects to be implemented by ADB, WB, UNEP and other partners seem to be strong and financially capable of continuing their respective activities. However, in case of program as a whole to be viable, the GEF financing is crucial.</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>8 Sep 2011 UA: Not sufficient. Please elaborate in section F, paragraph 54 on the incremental reasoning. Please include here the statements made in paragraph 39. What is also missing is the incremental reasoning regarding the creation of multiple benefits and how the SFM/REDD+ incentive funding will create incremental global benefits.</p> <p>9 Sep 2011 JS: The PFD gives general information that without the SCCF funding climate change risks will not be integrated in this regional landscape level program. Provided information is not sufficient to discern at the regional and national level the risks climate change poses to the natural resources in the area and the populations that are dependent on these resources. The gaps related to climate change, specifically the target natural resources and populations that are most vulnerable to climate change have not been identified at the regional or the country level. Therefore, it is not possible at this stage to assess the additional cost reasoning.</p> <p>Regarding Vietnam, the climate risks the baseline project faces need to be identified and elaborated in context of the project and the program as well. This information should be added to table 2 and Annex 1. The aspects of the baseline projects that the SCCF funds will be contributing towards are unclear.</p> <p>12 Sep 2011/LH: Please be more clear about how this project incrementally will benefit carbon MRVs or inventories. Conserving and rehabilitating landscapes will likely benefit carbon, but a measuring system of some type is needed for the carbon to have value.</p>

		<p>funding can pay for this given that too much SFM funding is requested. Most of these outputs/outcomes could as easily come from CCM-5 funding.</p> <p>17 Sep 2011 JS Information provided on page 41 related to additional cost reasoning under SCCF is satisfactory. However, please ensure that various sections (table 2, E, H paragraphs 60 and 65-69) throughout the PFD related to SCCF and climate change resilience provide consistent information regarding natural resources in focus, beneficiaries and the proposed activities.</p> <p>23 Sept 2011 CCM: it is still unclear what outcomes and outputs CCM will be used for and therefore it is difficult to say the activities financed are based on incremental reasoning.</p> <p>09/23/2011 -- CCA: YES. The revised PFD describes consistently the additional cost reasoning, the targeting and the proposed activities associated with the SCCF grant.</p> <p>26 Sept 2011 CCM LH: Added text is helpful. The contributions of SFM and CCM will need to be clarified in the individual PIFs. Addressed.</p>
	<p>14. Is the program framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>8 Sep 2011 UA: Not fully.</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is lacking here is a mentioning of SFM/REDD+ related outcomes. Please check our SFM/REDD+ Results Based Management (RBM) framework - the program should include an outcome that aims at enhancing the capacity to account for GHG emission reduction / increase in carbon stocks. - Please clarify what is meant by "Enhanced profiles of priority Biodiversity landscapes and whether this is an output or outcome - Please clarify at what level "forest and watershed management plans address BD and Climate resilience? - Is "Improved co-ordination mechanism between organizations engaged in combating illegal trade" rather an outcome? And if so, please add a related output <p>Component 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outcome 2.1 - please include related outputs on how to achieve this, e.g. REDD+ pilots, PES pilots, region-wide MRV, region-wide reference levels? - Which "SFM/REDD+ measures" will be adopted? - Please include estimated outcome targets for carbon benefits (these estimates can be presented in more detail later in the PIFs, but we need an overall area and tonnes CO2 estimation at this stage.

- what is lacking here is the inclusion of the development and promotion of safeguards for land tenure security, peoples participation, gender issues, benefit sharing, etc.

All adjustments in the framework should be brought in line with the PFD text in the related sections.

Please also replace "Multi Trust Fund" with the Trust Fund names GEF TF and SCCF, where appropriate.

9 Sep 2011 JS:

The investment component (component 2) of the program includes climate change, which is appropriate from the CC-A point of view as SCCF prioritizes generation of concrete adaptation benefits.

Outcome 2.3 and 2.4 would benefit from habitat design informed with climate trends.

Components 1 and 3 should include climate change into their appropriate outcomes and outputs to clarify that they will be resilient to climate change because of the program. In order for climate risks to be integrated into other components, it is first necessary that climate related information is available and pertinent to the project locations. Therefore, it is key to have specific inclusion of data and information regarding climate change in component 3, and outcomes 3.1 and 3.3.

It is fully dependent on the soundness of the program, whether the relatively small level of the SCCF's financial contribution can have a strong impact on the program. Therefore, it is suggested to clearly identify and integrate climate resilience in relevant outcomes and outputs in program components.

For the Vietnam country project, components do not explicitly integrate climate change resilience. Climate change resilience should be embedded into institutional building activities of component 1. As establishing "a green corridor" between Laos and Vietnam is a priority for the project, Component 1 should include establishment of institutional coordination mechanism between the protected areas in Lao-PDR and Vietnam.

Component 2 needs to have a targeted approach. As presented, it is too general and focuses on all aspects of forests and watersheds. Most important and vulnerable ecosystem service/resource needs to be targeted so that climate change resilience could be properly designed and monitored.

		<p>sharing and awareness building in their activities.</p> <p>12 Sep 2011/LH: Although Table A seems to clearly include CCM-5 objectives, these are not clear in Table B except in Component 3. However, the funding for component 3 alone is not consistent with the amount for CC-M in Table A. Please be clear what are the CCM-5 funded outcomes or outputs in Table B. The way the SFM/REDD+ fund was set up, projects using these funds are expected to have carbon benefits and carbon (CO2) benefit estimates are expected. However at this stage, they may be Tier 1 estimates.</p> <p>18 Sept 2011/LH: I will address this comment after the issue with the too large of SFM request is dealt with.</p> <p>17 Sep 2011 JS Suggested changes have been made in component 1 and 2. However, contrary to the "Agency's responses," component 3 still has not integrated climate change resilience in its outcomes and outputs. Please see the previous comment regarding the importance of incorporating climate change resilience into this component.</p> <p>09/23/2011 CCM/LH: a) Outputs and outcomes in Table A and Table B, and the Annex text (and other text), including PIFs and concepts notes, for CCM-5 do not match. Please clarify and make consistent. b) In Table A, each focal area outcome/output needs it own row with funding.</p> <p>26 Sept 2011 CCM LH: b) has been clarified in its own document because the form did not allow for what is needed. Thank you, addressed. a) The outputs and outcomes match better. Any remaining issues can be dealt with in the individual PIFs. Addressed at the PFD stage.</p> <p>09/23/2011 -- CCA: YES. Considerations of climate resilience and adaptation have been incorporated in Component 3, notably in outcomes 3.3 and 3.5.</p>
	<p>15. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the program, and b) how they will support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>8 Sep 2011 UA: Not fully clear. Please elaborate in section G. The text is currently quite generic. GEF has now a gender policy and a safeguard policy and this will need to be reflected here. Please also refer to comments to the Program Framework under #14 regarding safeguards.</p> <p>9 Sep 2011 JS: Not clear in both the description of the program and the Vietnam project. Clear description of socio-economic benefits that will be generated through improved management of protected areas and adjoining production areas by making them</p>

		<p>and local economies that could be expected as a result of the program and integration of climate resilience have not been described.</p> <p>17 Sep 2011 JS: Provided explanation is satisfactory.</p>
	16. Is public participation taken into consideration, and the roles of the various stakeholders identified and addressed properly?	<p>8 Sep 2011 UA: Not addressed. Please elaborate on public participation and stakeholders and their roles in section K.</p> <p>23 Sep 2011 UA: Adequately addressed.</p>
	17. Does the program take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	<p>8 Sep 2011 UA: Not sufficiently. Climate change risks need to be elaborated on in Table 3. Other reviewers will provide more detail on this below.</p> <p>9 Sep 2011 JS: With inclusion of SCCF, the program acknowledges that climate change poses a risk to the its objectives and its associated projects. However, clear identification of the climate change related issues such that targeted mitigation measures could be employed is missing.</p> <p>17 Sep 2011 JS: Provided explanation is satisfactory.</p>
	18. Is the program consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>8 Sep 2011 UA: Yes.</p> <p>9 Sep 2011 JS: The PFD does not contain any information on climate change related projects that are in preparation in any of the listed countries. Under LDCF/SCCF there are projects being prepared in Vietnam, Cambodia, and Lao-PDR. Any possible linkages and synergies should be explored.</p> <p>17 Sep 2011 JS: Additional information requested in the previous comment has not been provided.</p> <p>09/23/2011 -- CCA: Yes. Appropriate coordination and knowledge sharing mechanisms with relevant LDCF/SCCF projects in the region have been adequately described in Table 2 of the revised PFD. The program will review and assess approaches and methods, as well as initial lessons, from these initiatives and apply these to strengthen the design of its adaptation measures.</p>
	19. Is the project implementation/	8 Sep 2011 UA:

		<p>16 Sep 2011 UA: UNEP has withdrawn from the program. Some of the references to UNEP have to be removed to avoid confusion, e.g. in the institutional structure chart (Figure 3).</p>
<p>Program Financing</p>	<p>20. Is funding level for program management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>8 Sep 2011 UA: Program management costs are 5%. This is fine as long the are co-financed in the same ratio as the program. Please adjust.</p> <p>16 Sep 2011 UA: Has been adjusted.</p>
	<p>21. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>8 Sep 2011 UA: No. Co-financing needs to be improved or all objectives and for the program management costs.</p> <p>9 Sep 2011 JS: The program result framework does not clearly show SCCF funding that will be allocated towards different components and respective outcomes/outputs.</p> <p>12 Sep 2011/LH: a) The framework does not clearly show how CCM-5 funding is allocated toward the components and outcomes. Please clarify. b) In Table D, focal areas should be listed as BD, CC (with the trust fund indicating whether CC-A or CC-M), and then SFM, by country. Currently BD and CC is muddled together with SFM. c) so it is unclear at this time whether the funding per objective is appropriate and adequate.</p> <p>18 Sept 2011 LH: what is still not understandable is why the term adaptation is mentioned over 51 times in this program document for \$0.5million, but climate mitigation is mentioned half that many times but GEF is providing about \$3.5million, about 7 times as much as adaptation. Please clarify the reason for this difference. Also, I will respond to this when the SFM funding amount if straightened out.</p> <p>16 Sep 2011 UA: Co-financing per objective is adequate.</p> <p>17 Sep 2011-CCA/JS The project framework has been revised to show SCCF amounts allocated for</p>

		<p>23 Sept 2011 CCM/LH: same comments as above. For CCM the objectives and funding are not appropriate. For example, the concept note for Vietnam says it is an adaptation project, yet it is funded with CCM funds. This is unacceptable and has to be changed. Cambodia is only about LD objectives so I am not reviewing that. The concept notes for the other projects are PIFS, but I do not have a copy of the latest regional PIF version. And the Lao and Thailand PIF looks inconsistent with what is discussed as CCM outputs/outcomes in Table B if not other text. Please make the PFD and PIFs match.</p> <p>26 Sept 2011 CCM LH: The Vietnam concept note in the Annex has been significantly revised, and additional text has been added in the PFD especially to paragraph 15. This is acceptable at this time. Any other issues with outcomes and outputs and objectives can be dealt with at the individual PIF stage. Addressed.</p>
	<p>22. Comment on the indicated co-financing.</p>	<p>8 Sep 2011 UA: The proposed 1:5 co-financing ratio is considered too low for this type of programmatic approach. The proposed co-financing of UNEP of \$50,000 is unacceptable. The proposed contributions of national governments of Lao PDR, Vietnam, and Cambodia need to be significantly increased and all four countries including Thailand might want to consider cash contributions to the program. GEF would also welcome contributions from China and Myanmar.</p> <p>16 Sep 2011 UA: Has been satisfactorily addressed. Additional efforts to secure co-financing should be made during the program preparation stage.</p>
	<p>23. Are the co-financing amounts that the Agencies are bringing to the program in line with their roles?</p>	<p>8 Sep 2011 UA: Yes for ADB and World Bank. No for UNEP. Please also refer to other comments made to co-financing in #21 and #22.</p> <p>9 Sep 2011 JS: In case of the participating project in Vietnam, ADB is bringing \$ 30 million and the WB is bringing \$ 9 million, which is in-line with their respective roles.</p> <p>16 Sep 2011 UA: Cleared.</p>
<p>Program Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>24. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>	
	<p>25. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&F Plan that monitors</p>	

	and targets?	
Agency Responses	26. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 	
Secretariat Recommendation		
PFD Clearance	27. Is PFD clearance being recommended?	<p>09-12-2011 UA: No. Please address issues raised and clarification requests in this review.</p> <p>09-16-2011 UA: No. Please make the following revisions: 1) Table D need to be revised with regard to the regional funding request for the regional project. 2) Annex A: List of child projects: please check whether the Cambodia project is a FSP and whether the Lao or the Thailand PIF are submitted together with the program. 3) some UNEP reference to be taken out.</p> <p>17 Sep 2011 JS: Not at this stage. Please address comments under questions 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18. Please ensure that information provided on SCCF (climate resilience) throughout the PFD (including tables B and 2) is consistent with information provided on pages 40-41.</p> <p>23 Sep 2011 UA: No, please address comments made by the CCM below and resubmit a revised PFD. Upon receipt of the revised PFD that adequately address the comments, the PFD can be technically cleared and recommended for WPI pending submission of endorsement letters from all participating countries.</p> <p>09/23/2011 -- CCA: YES. All recommendations have been addressed and the PFD is recommended for clearance.</p> <p>23 Sept 2011 CCM/LH: For the PFD to be recommended by climate change mitigation, the following is needed: a) The concept note for Vietnam needs to separate out the climate mitigation activities associated with CCM-5 funds, and describe the activities clearly; b) Table A should show one row per outcome-</p>

		<p>Table B for the CCM objective; and c) a block of text within the body of the PFD, should describe what is being done with the CCM funds, consistent with the concept notes per country and Table B.</p> <p>26 Sept 2011 CCM/LH: The three concerns listed in 23 Sept comments have been addressed. Any related remaining issues can be dealt with at the individual PIF stage. As indicated in #28, CCM funding must focus on CCM objectives, in a cost-effective way; CCM funding is not to focus on adaptation activities. We recommend PFD clearance.</p> <p>26 Sep 2011 UA: YES. The revised PFD has adequately addressed all comments from NR, CC-M and CC-A reviewers, the PFD is recommended for WPI subject to timely submission of endorsement letters from all participating countries.</p>
	28. Items to consider at subsequent individual project submissions for CEO endorsement.	<p>26 Sept 2011 LH: In the individual "child" PIFs, please ensure: a) CCM funding must focus on CCM objectives, and in a cost-effective way. b) CCM funding is not to be used for adaptation activities. c) outputs and outcomes attributed to SFM/REDD+ and CCM objectives should be clarified.</p> <p>09/23/2011 -- CCA: Please refer to Section 9 above.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 08, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 17, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 23, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 26, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	

*** This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the program. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.**

REQUEST FOR PROGRAM COORDINATION BUDGET/PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
Program Coordination Budget/Project Preparation Grant for Program	1. Are the proposed activities for program coordination appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PCB/PPG for Program approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	

	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.