



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9089		
Country/Region:	Serbia		
Project Title:	Contribution of Sustainable Forest Management to a Low Emission and Resilient Development		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-2 Program 4; BD-4 Program 9; SFM-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$3,274,658
Co-financing:	\$29,960,000	Total Project Cost:	\$33,234,658
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	October 01, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Norbert Winkler

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	03/25/2015 UA: Not fully. The PIF is aligned with CCM-2 and SFM-2 objectives but insufficiently aligned with BD-4 Program 9. As Serbia is a flexible country the project could be aligned with CCM-2 and SFM-2 only. The SFM incentive can be triggered by one focal area if the country is flexible.  Please provide information, if	Project justification has been revised to align with BD-4 Program 9, CCM-2 Program 4 and SFM-2. Kindly refer to the revised PIF.  The OFP is in touch with UNEP, to develop another project.

<sup>1</sup> 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)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>available, regarding why the OFP only allocates \$2.5 million of its STAR towards the project while \$5.73 million are available. What are the plans of the OFP for the remaining STAR amount?</p> <p>The OFP might want to consider adjusting the endorsement letter accordingly, depending on the outcome of the discussion.</p> <p>YM 8/11/2015</p> <p>Yes. Comments were addressed, issues were cleared, and the PIF was revised.</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>03/25/2015 UA: Yes for CCM and SFM components, not consistent with BD Strategies.</p> <p>YM 8/11/2015</p> <p>Yes. The comment was addressed and the PIF was revised on page 12.</p>	PIF has been revised; please refer to section 6 (under Part II).
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>03/25/2015 UA: The general thrust of the project on the enabling framework for SFM is welcomed - enhancing policy frameworks, practices and capacities. However, it is unclear on how the work in the pilot areas contributes to</p>	Entire PIF has been revised, including the results framework and the justification.

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>above questions. It is also unclear why the project includes several outputs to include reports on gaps and needs, draft recommendations for improvements, etc. Ideally, this would all need to be in place as a baseline to justify GEF funding.</p> <p>Further please note that GEF doesn't fund data collection for BD.</p> <p>YM 8/11/2015</p> <p>Yes. The PIF has been revised accordingly.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>03/25/2015 UA: No. The project would need to better justify the GEF funding request with an incremental reasoning. The baseline contribution need to be clear - currently the text vaguely refers to "the baseline ....should provide basis for:..."</p> <p>It is unclear why "the economic situation and the lack of awareness imposed a need for technical and financial assistance especially from GEF"?</p> <p>The incremental reasoning is also weak with regard to GEBs, several of which are not GEBs, e.g. the GEBs which are listed under BD benefits.</p>	<p>As mentioned above, the entire PIF has been revised (including baseline scenario, barriers, and incremental reasoning).</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		YM 8/11/2015  Yes. Comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	03/25/2015 UA: No. As mentioned above (#3) table B gives the impression that the project would only be a large PPG instead of striving for results.  The project objective is also unclear.  YM 8/11/2015  Yes. Comments were addressed, and the project framework and objective were revised.	Results framework and the project objective have been revised.
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	03/25/2015 UA: Yes.	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	03/25/2015 UA: Yes.	
	• The focal area allocation?	03/25/2015 UA: Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Focal area set-aside?	n/a	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	03/25/2015 UA: No. Please address comments and clarification requests in this review.  YM 8/11/2015  Yes. All comments were addressed, issues were cleared, and the PIF was revised accordingly.  The Program Manager recommends CEO PIF/PFD clearance.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 25, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 11, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. 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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.