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

GEF ID:	**9781**		
Country/Region:	**Cambodia**		
Project Title:	**Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) in the productive, natural and forested landscape of Northern Region of Cambodia**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5770 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-1 Program 1; LD-1 Program 1; LD-3 Program 4;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$130,000**	Project Grant:	**$3,340,320**
Co-financing:	**$10,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$13,340,320**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Sarah Wyatt**	Agency Contact Person:	**Tashi Dorji**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	March 31, 2017 Generally yes, but please provide information about the KBAs in this area and their relationship to project activities. June 8, 2017 No, thank you for the very helpful additional information. However,	

[1] 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
		there seems to be some confusion about the IUCN KBA process at the global level. KBAs for the region have been delineated already and can be found in the World Database on Key Biodiversity Areas. Please discuss how the project will be helping these areas that have already gone through and expert process for identification. Ideally, they would be included or identified on the map included with the project. Please revise to include these areas. August 11, 2017 Yes, thank you.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	March 31, 2017 No, please provide information on how this project will relate to national Land Degradation Neutrality targets and their implementation. June 8, 2017 Cleared.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	March 31, 2017 No, please address the following issues:	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Sustainability - How will the agricultural support services and other activities be maintained following the completion of the project? Market transformation - Have the sustainable rice programs been successful thus far in increasing revenues for farmers? What lessons have been learned from their implementation in other places? June 8, 2016 Cleared.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	April 7, 2017 No, the incremental nature of this project is unclear. It mentions many initiatives, but not how it will build upon them. Note also that the table says total cost would be $20 million while the project is only $10 million including co-financing. June 8, 2017 Cleared.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	April 7, 2017 No, please address the following issues. - Component 2 - Please include a	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		theory of change for the adoption of new practices by farmers. How will the project get farmers, who are often risk adverse, to adopt sustainable practices? - Please clarify how the numbers were reached for hectares. The relationship between the numbers is confusing and how they were arrived upon. - Output 3.1 - What is a site? - Please define LUP. June 8, 2017 Thank you for the changes. Two additional minor clarifications would be helpful: 1. That only part of the 1,052,500 ha will be directly impacted by the project. 2. Please define what is meant by site - is a site a community, a single farm, a state? August 11, 2017 Yes, thank you for the edits.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	April 7, 2017 No, are there any indigenous or	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		traditional peoples in these areas that need particular attention? June 8, 2017 Thank you for the changes. At CEO Endorsement, please include information about how the engagement of IPs and women was ensured throughout project design and how the project will ensure inclusion in implementation.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	April 7, 2017 Yes.	
	• The focal area allocation?	April 7, 2017 While resources are available, there is only $781,000 remaining for LD. Cambodia can use its marginal flexibility to move up to $2 million between STAR focal areas. The Letter of Endorsement needs recognize that they are using this option. June 8, 2017 Please let GEF SEC know if any further information is needed on this	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		subject. August 11, 2017 Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Focal area set-aside?	NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	April 7, 2017 While the PIF is strong, there are still some issues that remain. Please revise and resubmit. Please include the Letter of Endorsement with the resubmission. June 8, 2017 Thank you for the substantive revisions. A few small issues remain. Please let us know if there are questions remaining on STAR utilization. August 11, 2017 The program manager recommends this project for CEO clearance pending the receipt of an updated Letter of Endorsement.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Review Date	Review	April 07, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 08, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 11, 2017	

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

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* 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?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

[3] 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.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	Additional Review (as necessary)		