



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

|  |   |                              |                   |
|--|---|------------------------------|-------------------|
| GEF ID:                                    | 4905  |                              |                   |
| Country/Region:                            | Cambodia  |                              |                   |
| Project Title:                             | Strengthening National Biodiversity and Forest Carbon Stock Conservation through Landscape-based Collaborative Management of Cambodia's Protected Area System as Demonstrated in the Mondulkiri Conservation Landscape (CAMPAS Project) |                              |                   |
| GEF Agency:                                | UNEP  | GEF Agency Project ID:       |                   |
| Type of Trust Fund:                        | GEF Trust Fund  | GEF Focal Area (s):          | Multi Focal Area  |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | BD-1; BD-2; CCM-5; CCM-5; SFM/REDD+-1; Project Mana;  |                              |                   |
| Anticipated Financing PPG:                 | \$0   | Project Grant:               | \$4,718,182       |
| Co-financing:                              | \$14,154,546  | Total Project Cost:          | \$18,872,728      |
| PIF Approval:                              | October 03, 2012  | Council Approval/Expected:   | November 01, 2012 |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval                   |   | Expected Project Start Date: |                   |
| Program Manager:                           | Ulrich Apel   | Agency Contact Person:       | Max Zieren        |

| Review Criteria                | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|--------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Eligibility                    | 1. Is the participating country eligible?  | 30 Mar 2012 UA:<br>Yes.   |  |
|                                | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?                                   | 30 Mar 2012 UA:<br>Yes. Letter dated 23 Mar 2012, signed by Dr. Lonh Heal.  |  |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? | 30 Mar 2012 UA:<br>To be discussed based on additional information.<br><br>The country's preference for UNEP as stated in the endorsement letter is acknowledged. However, the co-financing that UNEP has brokered is comparably low and the most significant stems from another GEF Agency (ADB). This raises the question (a) if this \$5 million from ADB will |  |

|                       |  |   |  |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
|                       |  | selected as the implementing agency.<br><br>06 Sep 2012 UA:<br>Has been adequately addressed.<br><br>Cleared  |  |
|                       | 4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?                | n/a   |  |
|                       | 5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?                           | 30 Mar 2012 UA:<br>To be discussed based on additional information (please refer to #3).<br><br>06 Sep 2012 UA:<br>Additional information has been provided.<br>Cleared                 |  |
| Resource Availability | 6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): |   |  |
|                       | • the STAR allocation?   | 30 Mar 2012 UA:<br>Yes.   |  |
|                       | • the focal area allocation?   | 30 Mar 2012 UA:<br>Yes.   |  |
|                       | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access   | n/a   |  |
|                       | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?  | n/a   |  |
|                       | • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund  | n/a   |  |
|                       | • focal area set-aside?  | 30 Mar 2012 UA:<br>Application for SFM/REDD+ incentive is within ceiling; its justification has to be discussed (see clarification requests under #14, #24, #25)<br><br>06 Sep 2012 UA: |  |

|                     |  |   |  |
|---------------------|--|---|--|
|                     |  | reduced to a fully justified amount.<br>Cleared   |  |
| Project Consistency | 7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?  | 30 Mar 2012 UA:<br>Not fully. Please refer to questions and clarification requests under #14.<br><br>06 Sep 2012 UA:<br>Has been adequately addressed under #14.<br><br>Cleared   |  |
|                     | 8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?  | BD-1, BD-2<br>CCM-5<br>SFM/REDD-1   |  |
|                     | 9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP? | 30 Mar 2012 UA:<br>Yes. Consistent with National Capacity Action Plan for the three UN conventions.<br><br>The project concept was also listed in the NPFE.   |  |
|                     | 10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?  | 30 Mar 2012 UA:<br>TBD<br><br>06 Sep 2012 UA:<br>Has been adequately addressed in the comments sheet.<br><br>Cleared  |  |
|                     | 11. 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?        | 30 Mar 2012 UA:<br>Not fully.<br>a) The primary baseline as described in the PIF (p 11) is mixed. There appears to be a solid baseline concerning CSO sector providing assistance to BD conservation. The national programs are insufficiently financed and political will and commitment appears to be so weak, that this is mentioned as a problem to |  |

Project Design

(refer to #18). It is rather disturbing that project outcome 2.1 has to ensure the "motivation" of national and local government to secure BD conservation. b) The problem description can be made more concise. The bullet point list provided on p.13 is helpful. According to this list, the major problems are (i) intersectoral coordination and capacity, (ii) governance including law enforcement, (iii) lack of BD related information and monitoring. These three problems are clearly reflected in the stated project objective. Financing is certainly another issue, which is mentioned in the baseline description, but not in the problem analysis. But it features in expected output 1.1.3.

There are many other outcomes and outputs in the project framework table B, which are not clearly in line with the problem description above. As I will elaborate in #14 and in the summary, the proponent might want to consider a more focused approach structured along the problem description.

CCM - 30 Mar 2012 FJ: Since extensive experience has been gained on protected areas and landscape management by numerous projects and initiatives in Cambodia, it is likely that the barriers identified in this PIF have also been identified by other projects and that they tried to address them.

Please (i) explain how these initiatives fared in trying to address these barriers, (ii) identify the experience gained in the effective ways to tackle them and (iii)

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>not tackled by these initiatives.</p> <p>06 Sep 2012 UA:<br/>Has been adequately addressed in the re-submission.</p> <p>Cleared for NR</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Sept 11, 2012:<br/>a) As it now appears that activities pertaining to carbon stock monitoring are part of the project, please add the relevant outcome in table A part I<br/>b) In the CEO endorsement request, detailed descriptions are needed on the activities pertaining to carbon stock monitoring.<br/>c) It is expected that the PPG will enable to identify the drivers leading to (i) Poor inter-agency/Inter-sectoral coordination for forested Pas; (ii) Lack of Integrating the Value of PAs, Forest &amp; Biodiversity, and Carbon sequestration in development processes; (iii) Economic Land Concessions ignoring and impacting on conservation including established PAs. It is also expected that details will be provided, in the CEO endorsement request, on what these drivers are and on how the project seeks to address them for these three key issues.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Sept 18, 2012:<br/>Cleared</p> |  |
|  | <p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve</p> |   |  |

|  |  |   |                                |
|--|--|---|--------------------------------|
|  | <p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p> | <p>30 Mar 2012 UA:<br/>Not fully. Based on a more focused approach, the incremental reasoning as provided: "The GEBs of this GEF intervention are expected to include an overall increase in ecological security of Cambodia's PA system covering 4.5 million ha and related BD resources, through...." would be appropriate but is not fully appropriate for the current concept.</p> <p>CCM - 30 Mar 2012 FJ:<br/>a) A proper incremental reasoning needs a better baseline description (see Q11);<br/>b) Please describe for each component the difference between what would have happened without GEF involvement and what would happen with the GEF funding.<br/>c) Please explain what the GEF funding will be used for each component of the proposal.</p> <p>06 Sep 2012 UA:<br/>Has been adequately addressed in the re-submission.</p> <p>Cleared for NR</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Sept 11, 2012:<br/>Cleared.<br/>At CEO endorsement, details are expected on how the project aims to ensure the participation of stakeholders such as the Ministries in charge of Economy and Finance, Interior, as well as the private companies.</p> |                                |
|  |  | <p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>   | <p>30 Mar 2012 UA:<br/>No.</p> |

Table B is not sufficiently clear:

a) The project title (please remove "former title") sounds like combining two different things: (i) strengthening the national PA system, and (ii) a demonstration on integrated landscape management in the Eastern Plains. It would maybe be better to clearly refer to (i) national efforts and (ii) a demonstration of this in the pilot region.

b) As mentioned above, there are several outcomes and outputs that do not contribute to the project objective.

- The entire component 3 is clearly an Enabling Activity, in particular Outputs 3.2.2 and related to that, 3.2.1.
- 1.1.3 on sustainable financing options - this ambitious output warrants more emphasis and detail in the project design if the project want to include this. Moreover, planning to end this output without any actions aimed at implementation of the financial option is disappointing. Please consider strengthening the implementation aspects.
- Component 2 is unclear as it contains many different outcomes that appear to be overambitious (2.1.3 and 2.2.1) or relates to other outputs (2.1.5 & 2.1.8).

c) The project framework does not make synergy between BD and CC objective clear and provides no justification for CCM funds to be invested and on why the SFM/REDD+ incentive is needed. Which of the outputs would be directly related to CC and to SFM/REDD+? And does this justify a \$478,000 investment from CCM and an additional topping up with \$1.4 million from the

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>seems that there is a reforestation of 1,000 ha planned which would provide for CCM funding justification but this does not appear in the project framework.</p> <p>CCM - 30 Mar 2012 FJ:<br/>d) The project title and objective do not mention any climate issues while CCM money is requested. Please justify.</p> <p>06 Sep 2012 UA:<br/>Has been adequately addressed in the re-submission.</p> <p>Cleared for NR</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Sept 11, 2012:<br/>e) The first paragraph of Part II A.1.1 mentions a table that is not there anymore.<br/>f) Item 2, page 14 of the PIF refers to a Component 3 that does not exist anymore.<br/>g) Please make sure, during the PPG, that the project establishes collaboration with specifically the FA as well as National MRV Technical Team, to agree on project-sponsored modalities of a sub-national REL/RL node in Mondulkiri Province. Special attention will be devoted to this during CEO endorsement request review.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Sept 18, 2012:<br/>Cleared</p> |  |
|  | <p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p> | <p>30 Mar 2012 UA:<br/>Please refer to #13.</p> <p>CCM - 30 Mar 2012 FJ:</p>   |  |



|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>A11 may not be considered as a methodology to describe CCM incremental benefits since they do not take into account what would have happened with the baseline projects and initiatives.</p> <p>Please provide a methodology that clearly account for the difference between CO2 results with baseline activities and CO2 results related to project activities.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Sept 11, 2012:<br/>At CEO endorsement: please take into account the fact that deforestation is higher in forest types that have less carbon content, to avoid overestimating CO2 losses when calculated with an average deforestation rate.</p> |  |
|  | <p>16. 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?</p> | <p>30 Mar 2012 UA:<br/>Not fully. Please elaborate on what tangible support the component 2 will provide and how output 2.2.1 links to (forest) conservation. GEF support to alternative livelihood activities is usually only provided based on thorough analysis of the economic and social viability of these activities. How will the feasibility of this activity be assessed - it is not mentioned in the PPG?</p> <p>06 Sep 2012 UA:<br/>Has been clarified in the re-submission.</p> <p>Cleared</p>   |  |
|  | <p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>   | <p>30 Mar 2012 UA:<br/>No. More detail is needed on the CSO involvement including co-financing. Which private sector entity is planned to</p>   |  |

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  |   | <p>financing?</p> <p>06 Sep 2012 UA:<br/>Has been clarified in the re-submission and comments sheet.</p> <p>Cleared</p>  |  |
|  | 18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience) | <p>30 Mar 2012 UA:<br/>Not fully. Please mention the lack of GoC commitment and motivation (as mentioned in the baseline situation) as a risk and elaborate on measures to mitigate that.</p> <p>06 Sep 2012 UA:<br/>Has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>  |  |
|  | 19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?  | <p>30 Mar 2012 UA:<br/>Not fully. In section B.6, please provide a more concise description of the envisaged co-ordination with related key initiatives, in particular the ADB led program (GMS-FBP).</p> <p>06 Sep 2012 UA:<br/>Has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>  |  |
|  | 20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?  | <p>30 Mar 2012 UA:<br/>Yes.</p> <p>CCM - 30 Mar 2012 FJ:<br/>Considering the extensive objectives of the project and the importance of the impacts of economic and/or illegal activities, please clarify how the other government agencies (beside the MoE and MAFF) will be involved and at which stage of the project.</p> |  |

|                   |  |   |  |
|-------------------|--|---|--|
|                   |  | FJ/CCM - Sept 11, 2012:<br>At CEO endorsement stage, details are expected on the way the project seeks to improve how the PAs' issues are taken into account when ELCs issues are raised through the Council of Ministers.  |  |
|                   | 21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?     |   |  |
|                   | 22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?               |   |  |
| Project Financing | 23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?  | 30 Mar 2012 UA:<br>Yes. 5%.   |  |
|                   | 24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | 30 Mar 2012 UA:<br>No.<br>The project as presented would need a much higher co-financing to achieve the expected outcomes. Given that the current concept does not provide justification for an additional SFM/REDD+ investment, the proponent might want to consider focusing the projects approach on enhancing the sustainability of the PA system and to reduce the GEF investment while at the same time make efforts to increase the co-finance.<br><br>06 Sep 2012 UA:<br>Accepted at PIF stage. Efforts will be made to increase/confirm co-financing at CEO endorsement stage. |  |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  | <p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing;<br/>At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p> | <p>30 Mar 2012 UA:<br/>Indicative co-financing is not considered adequate, in particular:<br/>- Clarify why ADB provides the major amount of co-finance, in this context, please substantiate the intent of ADB to co-finance the project.<br/>- Provide more detail on CSO co-finance, if possible.<br/>- Additional SFM/REDD+ investments would need to be co-financed as well.</p> <p>CCM - 30 Mar 2012 FJ:<br/>The co-financing presented by the Cambodian government over the 5 years of the project represents more than 50% of the MoE total budget for protected areas. Please justify the plausibility of such co-financing.</p> <p>06 Sep 2012 UA:<br/>Accepted at PIF stage. Efforts will be made to increase/confirm co-financing at CEO endorsement stage.</p> <p>Cleared for NR</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Sept 11, 2012:<br/>At CEO endorsement, details are expected regarding the feasibility of the high co-financing amount the MoE is proposing for the project compared to its overall budget and activities.</p> |  |
|  | <p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>                          | <p>30 Mar 2012 UA:<br/>In case this would be a focused BD project, the in-kind contribution of UNEP would be appropriate. As presented as a SFM/REDD+ project the co-operation with the UN-REDD+ program (\$10,000 so far) would need to</p>  |  |

|                                   |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
|                                   |  | 06 Sep 2012 UA:<br>Has been significantly increased.   |  |
|                                   |  | Cleared  |  |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? |  |  |
|                                   | 28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?  |  |  |
| Agency Responses                  | 29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:  |  |  |
|                                   | • STAP?  |  |  |
|                                   | • Convention Secretariat?  |  |  |
|                                   | • Council comments?  |  |  |
|                                   | • Other GEF Agencies?  |  |  |
| <b>Secretariat Recommendation</b> |  |  |  |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage       | <b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>  | 30 Mar 2012 UA:<br>No. The project requires a major revision in terms of focus, project framework, and budget including co-financing.<br><br>FJ/CCM - Sept 11, 2012:<br>No, please address the few remaining comments of Q11 a) and Q14 e) and f).<br><br>UA/NR, FJ/CCM - Sept 18, 2012:<br>The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program |  |
|                                   | 31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.   | a) Confirmation of co-financing, in particular ADB co-financing.<br>b) By the CEO endorsement request, details are needed on the drivers of three following key issues and on how the  |  |

inter-agency/Inter-sectoral coordination for forested Pas; (ii) Lack of Integrating the Value of PAs, Forest & Biodiversity, and Carbon sequestration in development processes; (iii) Economic Land Concessions ignoring and impacting on conservation including established PAs.

c) At CEO endorsement, details are expected on how the project ensures the participation of stakeholders such as the Ministries in charge of Economy and Finance, of Interior, and the private companies.

d) At CEO endorsement stage, details are expected on the way the project seeks to improve how the PAs' issues are taken into account when ELCs issues are raised through the Council of Ministers.

e) At CEO endorsement, details are expected on the agreement with the FA as well as National MRV Technical Team on project-sponsored modalities of a sub-national REL/RL node in Mondulkiri Province.

f) At CEO endorsement: take into account the fact that deforestation is higher in forest types that have less carbon content, to avoid overestimating CO2 losses when calculated with an average deforestation rate.

g) At CEO endorsement, details are expected regarding the feasibility of the high co-financing amount the MoE is proposing for the project in relation to its overall budget and activities undertaken.

h) At CEO endorsement, details are expected on the sustainability of finance

|   |   |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|
|   |   | on the concrete implementation plans for such strategy.<br>i) Details on the activities pertaining to carbon stock monitoring. |  |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG? |  |  |
|   | <b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>   |  |  |
| Review Date (s)                             | First review*   | March 30, 2012   |  |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  | September 06, 2012   |  |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  |  |  |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  |  |  |
|   | 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.

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

| Review Criteria | Decision Points   | Program Manager Comments   |
|-----------------|---|--|
| PPG Budget      | 1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate? | <p>30 Mar 2012 UA:<br/>Not fully. The PPG would have to brought in line with the revised PIF.</p> <p>Other points are that currently, the PPG includes a gap analysis and the PIF does as well. The PPG does not appear to include topics such as feasibility of alternative livelihood component.</p> <p>CCM - 30 Mar 2012 FJ:<br/>The PPG includes expenses for a consultant working on CCM related issues but its activities do not appear in the project preparation table. Please clarify.</p> <p>06 Sep 2012 UA:<br/>Addressed.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Sept 11, 2012:</p> |

|                            |  |  |
|----------------------------|--|--|
|                            |  | <p>ensure that the issues raised in Q31 b), c) and d) of the PIF review will be addressed.</p> <p>b) Please justify why the use of international consultants for the PPG outweighs the use of local consultant for the preparation of a project that stresses the importance of empowering the national stakeholders.</p> <p>c) Activity 8 of Table B cannot be counted as part of a PPG (a PPG cannot be used to draft, edit, and finalize the GEF project documents and the internal UNEP documents). Please take it out of the PPG and revise the financing and co-financing figures to maintain the same co-financing ratio.</p> |
|                            | 2. Is itemized budget justified?             | <p>30 Mar 2012 UA:<br/>Not fully. We usually expect co-financing in line with PIF co-financing ratio.</p> <p>06 Sep 2012 UA:<br/>In kind contributions accepted.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Sept 11, 2012:<br/>No, Please address the above comments.</p>   |
| Secretariat Recommendation | <b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b> | <p>30 Mar 2012 UA:<br/>Not at this stage. PPG will be revisited after PIF has been revised and re-submitted.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Sept 11, 2012:<br/>No, Please address the above comments.</p> <p>UA for NR - Oct 10, 2012:<br/>PPG is recommended for CEO approval.</p>   |
|                            | 4. Other comments                            |  |
| Review Date (s)            | First review*                                | March 30, 2012   |
|                            | Additional review (as necessary)             | October 10, 2012   |

\* 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.