



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

GEF ID:	7993		
Country/Region:	Belarus		
Project Title:	Conservation-oriented Management of Forests and Wetlands to Achieve Multiple Benefits		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5495 (UNDP)
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:	\$120,000	Project Grant:	\$4,263,561
Co-financing:	\$14,100,000	Total Project Cost:	\$18,483,561
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Maxim Vergeichik

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 ?	11/20/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	11/20/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	11/20/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	

*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 focal area allocation? 	11/20/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	n/a	
	<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? 	n/a	
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>	<p>11/20/2014 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Please correct in Table A: CCM-2 Program 2</p> <p>12/10/2014 UA: Please correct in Table A: CCM-2 Program 4</p> <p>(Sorry for my earlier mistake. Why are you not using the drop-down menu of the template?)</p> <p>Further, the project appears to be better aligned with BD-1, program 1: "Improving Financial Sustainability and Effective Management of the National Ecological Infrastructure" and not with program 2? If this is the case, please revise table A accordingly.</p> <p>12/29/2014 UA: Has been corrected. The project is now correctly aligned to GEF FA objectives & programs.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared	
	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?	11/20/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
Project Design	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?	11/20/2014 UA: Not fully. Instead of focussing on barriers and threats in section A1.1, please re-focus the section on drivers of environmental degradation and how they will be addressed. 12/10/2014 UA: Has been addressed. However, please make sure that the text is in line with potential changes in Table B / project design (see #7). Cleared	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	11/20/2014 UA: Not fully. Component 3 is not fully clear. - Is there an outcome 3.1? - what kind of research is planned? - what is meant in the text by carbon dividends? - the component appears imbalanced in its emphasis on the artificial measures included (biotechnical activities, reintroduction of fledglings, artificial nests, etc.) 12/10/2014 UA:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Please revise Table B and the PIF text in line with following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If the project addresses BD-1, program 1: the design of the project would need to be better aligned with this program. - GEF does not fund inventories and distribution studies of species as proposed under "special research". This is not included in the BD strategy and has actually never been funded in the past. This would have to be funded by cofinance. - The use of the term carbon dividends is probably a translation problem. Better use carbon benefits instead. - The use the word bio-technical is probably also translation problem and likely to create misunderstandings as it is used different from what is defined as biotechnology. Please revise the text by referring to the proposed activities without using the term bio-technical. - GEF also does not do species re-introduction either, so please do not use this term. If I understand correctly, the proposed activities are not a re-introduction of species but only re-location. <p>12/29/2014 UA: Has been addressed in the latest re-submission.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	11/20/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	11/20/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	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)	11/20/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	11/20/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	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 	Innovative aspects: private sector involvement, community based management related to Bison management Sustainability and Replication is built into the project design, which incorporates long-term measures to improve the Protected Area System of	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>Belarus. Replication of project results will be enabled through the baseline projects of the Government.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</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>		
Project Financing	<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>11/20/2014 UA: Yes. However, only if the currently favorable ratio of grant to in kind can be confirmed at CEO endorsement stage.</p> <p>Cleared</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>11/20/2014 UA: Yes. However, only if the currently favorable ratio of grant to in kind can be confirmed at CEO endorsement stage and UNDP contribution is a grant available to the implementation of this project.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>11/20/2014 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency</p>	<p>11/20/2014 UA: Yes. Within norm.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	Cleared	
	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?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	11/20/2014 UA: No. Please address clarification requests. 12/10/2014 UA: No. Please address remaining clarification requests. 12/29/2014 UA: Yes. Project Manager technically clears the project. The project may be included into an upcoming work program.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	November 20, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	December 10, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 29, 2014	

* **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.**