



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

GEF ID:	4968		
Country/Region:	Chile		
Project Title:	Integrated national Monitoring and Assessment System on Forest Ecosystems (SIMEF) in Support of Policies, Regulations and SFM Practices Incorporating REDD+ and Biodiversity Conservation in Forest Ecosystems		
GEF Agency:	FAO	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):	CCM-5; BD-2; SFM/REDD+-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$6,293,684
Co-financing:	\$25,248,346	Total Project Cost:	\$31,542,030
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Marianne Burke	Agency Contact Person:	Rikke Olivera

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?	26 April 2012 Yes, FCCC ratified 1993. Yes CBD ratified 1997. Addressed.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	26 April 2012 Yes, OFP Ms. Ximena George-Nascimento dated 12 April 2012. Addressed.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	26 April 2012 Yes, addressed.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is	26 April 2012 There is no non-grant instrument.	

*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	Addressed.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	26 April 2012 Yes the project addresses a number of FAO's strategic objectives, and an FAO regional office is located in Santiago, with 3 forestry officers and operational staff who will support implementation of the project. Addressed.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	26 April 2012 Yes, with the STAR allocation, however please check that the SFM incentive is not greater than 1:3 once the project management costs are proportionally shared among the areas. (see question 23). 9 July 2012: Yes, SFM and PMCs have been attended to. Addressed.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	n/a	
	<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"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	n/a	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	26 April 2012 Yes, addressed.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	26 April 2012 a) For the SFM objective, the listed output 2.1 is instead an outcome indicator (p 98, GEF-5 focal area strategy document). Please revise, perhaps to Output	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>2.2: National forest carbon monitoring systems in place (number) or whatever is appropriate. If the proposal is to draw from both CC and SFM areas to fund the monitoring system which produces data for both areas, that is fine, just be clear.</p> <p>b) It is unclear if output 5.2, forests and non-forest lands under good management practices is an output here.</p> <p>c) Relevance with BD2 should be more clearly identified. This calls for mainstreaming BD issues into production landscapes. The scale of impact from Component 3 does not suggest mainstreaming. Please revise.</p> <p>Also see Q 14.</p> <p>9 July 2012: a, b) addressed. c) is still a concern, but specific suggestions for dealing with this topic are in Q14 and Q15.</p> <p>30 August, 2012: c) Addressed.</p>	
	<p>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?</p>	<p>26 April 2012 Yes for FCCC National Communication. NBSAP highlights the need to strengthen forest monitoring mechanisms.</p> <p>Please describe the consistency with the NPDF. 9 July 2012: Thank you, addressed.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>26 April 2012 Not clearly. Please include a few sentences targeted at addressing this.</p> <p>9 July 2012: Response indicates sentences were inserted into Section B.1. but these are probably now in Section B.2. Please insert one more sentence in component 1,</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>now Section B.2. and the end of the very first paragraph about mid-way down page 10. The paragraph ends "...and the Ministry of Environment." Then add the sentence (if you agree this is true): Building on this existing framework contributes to the sustainability of project outcomes.</p> <p>30 August, 2012: Addressed.</p>	
Project Design	<p>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?</p>	<p>26 April 2012</p> <p>a) Clarification question on last sentence in section before B.1. Baseline projects "...suggested that changes under 40% in forest cover had a good chance to be detected using this approach." Please rephrase. Does this mean that changes over 40% do not have a good chance at being detected?</p> <p>b) There seems to be duplication in describing the baseline project, and this tends to be confusing. Specifically, the baseline project section B.1. includes the proposal and components information that should go in the B.2. incremental section which also includes a section on without the GEF proposal. Please look again, streamline the information and ensure it is in the right section.</p> <p>9 July 2012: a) Addressed. b). Modification adequate for reducing duplication. 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 similar benefits?</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>26 April 2012</p> <p>See Q11. There are a number of items that clearly show the project is incremental, and please summarize and present in one place in section B.2. and summarize the innovative aspects too. We do see that this information is provided in the document, but concisely presenting it in section B.2. would be more clear.</p> <p>9 July 2012: Addressed.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>26 April 2012</p> <p>a) For each component, please indicate how much GEF funding each focal area is contributing. These numbers can be typed into Table B by component, or just summarize within each component writeup in the text on p. 9-10.</p> <p>b) Please indicate in Table B if component 3 is TA or INV.</p> <p>c) We see outputs 1.2.1 as an INV that could go under component 2 and outputs 2.1.2 and 2.2.2 as outputs which are more TA. The difference is that systems that can generally automatically be able to produce informational reports and maps given new data can be thought of as investments, while a one-time produced map or report by a number of people working on it is simply a completed product. A well-designed web based system and tools may be able to allow tool users to fairly easily produce reports and maps from new data automatically. Producing a report is simply an end in itself and this is technical assistance. Please consider moving these outputs to the Investment component and focusing TA in a TA component. Please also be clear that the system developed will produce results consistent with FCCC needs, and also useful for project level management responses.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>d) Will the set of tools and methodologies in output 1.2.1 be available for others to use and modify? That is, will they be some type of open source? This should be highlighted. The more generally available the tools and code are for use by others, the more likely the replicability.</p> <p>e) The output 3.1.4 pilot could be the output 5.2 for CC-5 as good practice. Please provide a preliminary estimate in terms of hectares and carbon benefits, which will be further examined during PPG. Also the three forest models, will these be expected to have benefits?</p> <p>f) the text as written indicates one of the innovative parts of this project is the inclusion of social and economic indicators. We agree as this will help pinpoint the real issues and problems so that efficient actions can be designed. Are these indicators the typical suite for the Montreal process for SFM, or will there be additional ones? Please clearly include this item in Table B.</p> <p>30 August, 2012: f) addressed.</p> <p>g) Will the 3.1.2 valuation information be consistent with IPCC guidance on carbon or will this be directed at CDB or CCD, or is the intention to meet requirements of all Conventions</p> <p>h) In Table B and the text, the term bi-annual is used (2 times a year). Would biennial be what is meant?</p> <p>i) Benefits seem to be limited in relation to BD Outcome 2.2. This is seeking mainstreaming of BD conservation into productive landscapes, however within Component 3 the level of change in policy/planning committed to seems very small. Wider implementation would be expected to qualify as mainstreaming. Please revise.</p> <p>j) Is Output 3.1.4 describing the development of a</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>PES mechanism? If so please explain this a little more clearly and also how STAP guidance on PES is to be incorporated.</p> <p>9 July 2012: a, b, c, d, e, h, g, j) Addressed.</p> <p>i) Thank you for the revisions. In section B.2. just above the heading on incrementality of GEF and co-financing, are four pilot items a, b, c, and d. B-D are excellent introductory sentences. Please add a few more sentences to each. These appear to be the means by which mainstreaming takes place so it needs to be clear how this is happening. The text focuses on the pilot, but what is being looked for here is the envisioned outputs and outcomes at the end. Yes there is uncertainty, and of course further development is expected by CEO endorsement to help reduce that uncertainty. Also see comments in Q15.</p> <p>30 August, 2012: i) addressed.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>26 Apr 2012 No, please look again at the last paragraph on GEBs in section B.2, and modify. Some items to consider: a) Please include estimated carbon benefits for the pilot (3.1.4 in Table B) using at the least IPCC Tier 1 approach. If the three forest models are expected to have benefits, please describe those. b) Because the NFI is only covering about two-thirds of the area of forest, it appears the GEF funding will allow for the full system on the remaining one third, and also include the land use change information. Please provide this separate estimate of the size of CO2 changes on this area that will be able to be counted when this system is finished. c)Also please include some notion of the increase in precision of carbon estimates due to GEF funding, or</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>of the targeted precision for carbon estimates in the system design.</p> <p>d) In terms of biodiversity, will the system be able to have a reliable area estimate of primary forests etc? If so, what is the additional estimate expected due to this system?</p> <p>e) Please explain more clearly what BD related GEBs are expected. In particular the link between the BD elements in the project framework and the GEBs as described in the final paragraph of B.2 is not clear. Please explain where the recuperation of 1 million ha of degraded forest is included.</p> <p>f) If Component 3 is proposing to originate carbon credits please expand a little on the proposed scale and the expected methodology.</p> <p>9 July 2012: a, b, c) Addressed. d) Addressed. Please highlight this additional area perhaps in the table discussed in the next item e) and provide Tier 1 IPCC carbon estimates (or the current estimates that exist) for the aboveground portion. It may be very uncertain about possible changes, yet just say it is uncertain but IF that entire area were deforested, this would be an estimate of how much carbon would be emitted. e) The main issue is that there needs to be more emphasis on the mainstreaming not just the pilots. So for example, in the GEB part on P12/13, one items is to estimate the area over which the mainstreaming will take place, the 2,000 ha is just the pilot. Also say something like "...this will be implemented in roughly XX,000 ha forest..."</p> <p>In addition, what would be most helpful here for clarity is a table of outputs. An example PIF with such a table that was approved can be viewed in the public database of GEF projects, can be found at</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>http://www.thegef.org/gef/project_detail?projID=4750 entitled Multiplying Environmental and Carbon Benefits in High Andean Ecosystems. See page 13 of that PIF. Including an analogous table here in this section (B.2., GEBs bottom of this page 12 and continuing onto 13.</p> <p>f) Providing an estimate of potential carbon credits if mainstreaming occurs would be useful. Yes it is uncertain, perhaps a range can be offered.</p> <p>30 August, 2012: d, e, f) addressed.</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>26 April 2012 That a socioeconomic analysis by gender will be conducted during the PPG is noted. Please consider making a statement here that the project will be designed to ensure direct benefits (such as employment) to women.</p> <p>9 July 2012: Thank you, addressed.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>26 April 2012 a) Please say more about the involvement of indigenous people, such as if safeguards are expected to be used. b) By CEO endorsement, clearly identify the roles of CSOs.</p> <p>9 July 2012: a) Addressed. Cleared.</p>	
	<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>	<p>26 April 2012 Please rewrite the first risk which seems to be that climate change may occur and a monitoring system not designed for that may be rendered obsolete. Then the mitigation measure is the monitoring component needs to be intensified. The last sentence on the risk side seems to belong in the mitigation measure column.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		9 July 2102: Addressed.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	26 April 2012 Adequate at PIF. By CEO endorsement, also include any new developments such as with the UN-REDD program.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	26 Apr 2012 More information is needed about how the other key stakeholders and interest groups will participate in this project (see B.5.), but it is noted this will be further detailed during project preparation. Adequate at PIF.	
	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?	26 Apr 2012 PMC is 5%. This rate should be proportional across the focal areas and SFM request amounts. Please revise. 9 July 2012: Addressed.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	26 April 2012 Once the items in Table B are clarified, this question will be revisited. 30 August, 2012. Addressed.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-	26 April 2012 Cofinancing is currently 1:4 with a number of stakeholders participating, with both in-kind and grants.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>financing is provided.</p> <p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>26 April 2012 FAO is providing \$350,000 in kind and \$67,000 in grant funding.</p>	
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?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>2 May 2012 Not recommended at this time. Please address comments.</p> <p>10 July 2012: Please address remaining comments to Questions 8c,10,14, and 15.</p> <p>30 August, 2012: The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.</p> <p>This is being considered a priority in light of considerations such as geographical and focal area balance.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	See PIF comments 17b, 19, and 20.	
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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	May 02, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	July 10, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 30, 2012	
	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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.