



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

GEF ID:	5356		
Country/Region:	Global (Georgia, Madagascar)		
Project Title:	Global Forest Watch 2.0 FW 2.0		
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-2; LD-3; CCM-5; SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$136,987	Project Grant:	\$5,342,465
Co-financing:	\$68,300,000	Total Project Cost:	\$73,779,452
PIF Approval:	April 23, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval			
Program Manager:	Ian Gray	Agency Contact Person:	Edoardo Zandri, GEF Task Manager

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 ?	April 9, 2013 Georgia party to CBD June 02, 1994; FCCC entered into force October 27, 1994; CCD ratified July 23, 1999. Madagascar party to CBD April 03, 1996; FCCC entered into force August 31, 1999; CCD ratified June 25, 1997.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	April 9, 2013 Letter dated March 14, 2013 from Ns N Tkhilava (OFP Georgia) March 18, 2013 and letter available from Mrs C Ralalaharisoa (OFP Madagascar).	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

		<p>Resources remaining to be allocated are:</p> <p>Georgia</p> <p>BD \$0</p> <p>CC \$2,000,000</p> <p>LD \$1,900,000</p> <p>Madagascar</p> <p>BD \$23,312,000</p> <p>CC \$3,740,000</p> <p>LD \$1,695,000</p> <p>Please check Total Project Costs in Table A and B as these should match.</p> <p>Please check FA and country fund requests in Table A and Table D match. For example Table A BD2 Indicative Grant Financing is \$913,242 however Table D BD Grant Amount is \$1,780,822.</p> <p>April 14, 2013</p> <p>Finance figures are not resolved. Please address the following:</p> <p>FA Strategy Framework and Finance Overview GEF Project Grants differ</p> <p>FA Strategy Framework and Project Framework GEF Project Grants differ</p> <p>Finance Breakdown and FA Strategy Framework GEF Project Grants per Trust Fund differ</p> <p>Finance Breakdown and Finance Overview GEF Project Grants / Fees differ</p> <p>April 15, 2013</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	<p>April 9, 2013 CCM JS</p> <p>Yes the requested grant amount is available for both Georgia and Madagascar from the CCM allocation.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	<p>NA</p>	

	Technology Transfer)?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	<p>April 9, 2013 Please check SFM/REDD+ funds requested in Table A and Table D are equal. Table A request is over the 3:1 ratio.</p> <p>April 14, 2013 Addressed</p>	
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>April 9, 2013</p> <p>1. At the moment the means through which the project would contribute measurable progress is not clear. For example BD1 how would the project as described create an increase in sustainable managed landscapes or LD3.1 how does the project result in integrated land management planning.</p> <p>2. CCM JS</p> <p>The proposal states that the project will contribute towards the CCM-5 objective and CCM-5.3 outcome. However, the proposal does not clearly articulate how such objectives and outcomes will be directly achieved through the proposed project activities.</p> <p>04/12/2013 CCM JS</p> <p>The explanation provided in section A.1.3 is sufficient for PIF stage.</p> <p>Recommended Action by CEO</p> <p>Endorsement:</p> <p>Explanation stating that the project will increase transparency and access to information is appreciated. Processes through which this ability and information will be actually utilized and</p>	

		threats to forests needs to be specified and developed.	
	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?	<p>April 9, 2013</p> <p>1. Please explain how GFW will complement planned activities and augment progress towards goals. At the moment the level of integration seems limited.</p> <p>2. Please explain how the project links to Madagascar's REDD+ activities within FCPF.</p> <p>3. CCM JS</p> <p>The PIF does not specify the elements of the National Communication the project addresses. There is also no information on how the project fits into the development agenda and countries' plans for forests.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: Please explain how the project contributes towards targets identified in the National Communications and helps fill the gaps identified in such studies. Discussion on the role of the project in helping the countries attain their development goals related to forests and mitigation is needed.</p> <p>4/12/2013 CCM JS</p> <p>Yes for PIF Stage. Identification of national environmental policies that the project aligns well with is sufficient for PIF stage.</p> <p>Recommended Action by CEO</p> <p>Endorsement: Please state what objectives 1,2, 3 etc are in the National Communication of Georgia and specify</p>	

		towards these priorities. In case of Madagascar, please identify project activities that will directly contribute towards Madagascar's priority of Strengthening National Forest Programmes (NFP) through afforestation or reforestation. Please substantiate these alignments with respect to GHG emission goals of the countries.	
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?	<p>April 9, 2013</p> <p>1. The baseline is poorly described for both countries. A1.2 is mainly about GFW in a global sense rather than the two pilot countries.</p> <p>2. There needs to be clearer detail of ongoing activities by government and other parties to address deforestation and degradation.</p> <p>3. The project is clearly a tool which will provide considerable useful information additional detail is required on how this information provision is turned into activities in each country that will avoid deforestation and forest degrade.</p> <p>4. Please provide some information on existing inventory, MRV processes in the two countries for forests and forest carbon.</p> <p>4/12/2013 CCM JS Yes for PIF Stage.</p> <p>Recommended Action by CEO Endorsement: In Madagascar, please elaborate on the information systems the existing forest and carbon related projects have been using and identify their shortcomings in gathering accurate information and also identify the limitations of the existing</p>	

		deforestation.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>April 9, 2013</p> <p>1. The details provided in Table B are clear, however while these describe how the GFW platform will be initiated in each country it is not clear how these will result in the in the types of outcomes and outputs expected in the FA objectives. Additional detail is necessary to explain how the project moves from being an information based platform to actual progress in the two countries to address deforestation and forest degradation.</p> <p>2. CCM JS</p> <p>No. Overall, the project components do not articulate the application of GFW 2.0 in estimating and monitoring carbon stocks in the forests. It does not include outcomes and outputs that use information generated by GFW 2.0 to control deforestation on the ground and estimate carbon stocks protected.</p> <p>3. Specific comments on each component are provided below: Component 1: Please clarify whether new high resolution images will be purchased through the project or the existing images will be manipulated more rigorously to achieve an improved resolution. Installation of computer servers in each country is not clear. The project proposes to use cloud computing services, in such a case, installation of servers could be redundant. In addition, such installation in the countries with low technical capacity would make servers difficult to</p>	

		<p>Component 2: Clear estimate of the expected reduction in deforestation and carbon emissions due to application of GFW 2.0 needs to be provided.</p> <p>Component 3: Engagement with the private sector needs to be clarified further with identification of types of partners and their roles.</p> <p>April 14, 2013 Additional details added, sufficient for PIF stage.</p> <p>Recommended Actions by CEO Endorsement: By CEO Endorsement full details are expected on how the project will use the information generated to address deforestation and forest degradation on the ground. Additionally 1) clear details of how GFW 2.0 will be used through the project to estimate and monitoring carbon stocks in the forests in the specific target areas, 2) further information on the selection of ICT infrastructure, 3) fully developed estimates of the expected reduction in deforestation and carbon emissions due to application of GFW 2.0, 4) engagement with the private sector needs to be clarified further with identification of types of partners and their roles needs to be provided.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>April 9, 2013 1. The high-level benefits of GFW of supporting conservation and management of forests are clear. A1.4 does not however identify tangible GEBs that will result from the implementation of this project in Georgia and Madagascar. A1.4 presents considerable information on</p>	

		<p>explain what the project will affect in terms of securing GEBs from them. The risk remains that GFW will provide a clearer picture of how these resources are being lost or degraded but will not contribute to efforts to secure their existence.</p> <p>2. CCM JS</p> <p>GEBs related to carbon stocks preservation and emission reduction (tCO₂ e) is unclear. The proposal needs to describe and estimate the carbon stocks that would be protected and emissions that will be prevented by application of the GFW 2.0 in the two pilot countries.</p> <p>April 14, 2013</p> <p>Additional detail provided. Sufficient for PIF stage. By time of CEO Endorsement complete details on how GFW will be used for on the ground conservation and management of forests in each country and how this is expected supports ongoing activities is expected. Additionally further refinement is expected on quantification of GEBs related to BD, CC and LD. It is expected that GHG related benefits are based on the deforestation that may be reduced in the target sites and not simply on the assumptions of the use of the GFW 2.0 countrywide.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of:</p> <p>a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and</p> <p>b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		

	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>April 9, 2013 A.2 provides details of key partners in GFW at a global level. There is limited detail of how the project would interact only that MEP in Georgia and MEF in Madagascar will coordinate efforts to involve key stakeholder groups.</p> <p>April 14, 2013 Additional information provided. Sufficient for PIF Stage. At time of CEO Endorsement additional details are expected on specific stakeholder groups within both countries and clear details of how they are involved in GFW2.0.</p>	
	<p>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)</p>	<p>April 9, 2013 1. Risk #2 please see comments on Q5-8 on integration with national structures. 2. CCM JS Please clarify the political situation and stability in the participating locales, especially Madagascar.</p> <p>April 14, 2013 Additional details provided. Sufficient for PIF stage. At time of CEO Endorsement full details of how GFW2.0 is integrated with national structures and how GFW2.0 will liaise with national and sub-national partners. Additional detail will also be expected on how the project will mitigate the risks anticipated due to the political conditions in Madagascar and how the encouragement of transparency, and use of information to reduce deforestation will foster the necessary strong institutional framework at local and national level.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country</p>	<p>April 9, 2013 Brief details of coordination is noted with FLEGT initiatives and national REDD</p>	

		<p>REDD efforts underway in Madagascar some detail of which of these are pertinent and could coordinate efforts would be useful, otherwise the projects appears isolated from existing efforts. What coordination is possible with FLEG activities in Georgia.</p> <p>April 14, 2013 Sufficient details provided for PIF stage. At time of CEO Endorsement full details of how the project is integrated into national and regional initiatives are required.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <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 likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>April 9, 2013 The project is clearly using an innovative approach to address a decades-old problem. Sustainability is dependent on sufficient users finding utility in the product, the use of GFW by both government and private sectors gives it broad potential application and therefore future support. GFW is built on country by country and is therefore scalable to other countries and regions.</p>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		

Project Financing	<p>financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>The majority of funds are supporting Component 1 the design and application of the system in the pilot countries. As noted above this will provide the information platform but will not necessarily result in the securing of GEBs in the two countries.</p> <p>Component 1.2 are the integrated land use plans national in scale?</p> <p>April 14, 2013 Sufficient detail for PIF stage. By CEO Endorsement clearer details of the integration of GFW2.0 into landscape level planning and how this will be implemented are expected.</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>April 9, 2013 Cofinance is at \$86,300,000 giving a ratio of 1:12, of which 49% is cash cofinance. UNEP is providing \$300,000 in-kind cofinance.</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>April 9, 2013 PMC is at 4.97%.</p>	
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency 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?</p>	<p>April 9, 2013 Cleared within norms.</p>	
	<p>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	<p>April 9, 2013 There is no NGI.</p>	

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?	<p>April 9, 2013 Not at this stage please address issues identified above.</p> <p>April 14, 2013 See remaining issues on resources Q3.</p> <p>April 15, 2013 Q3 addressed. Cleared.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>Q4. Utilization of information from GFW2.0 in fight against deforestation and degradation.</p> <p>Q5. Identification of contribution to ongoing national activities.</p> <p>Q6. Elaboration of existing information systems and their shortcomings and how GFW2.0 reinforces.</p> <p>Q7. Refinement of details of Components.</p> <p>Q8. Integration/support of ongoing activities and further quantification and refinement of GEBs.</p> <p>Q10. Information on stakeholders.</p> <p>Q11. Liaison with national partners and</p>	

		risks. Q12. Deeper consideration of integration with other activities.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	April 10, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 14, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 15, 2013	

* 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.