



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

GEF ID:	4479		
Country/Region:	Guatemala		
Project Title:	Sustainable Forest Management and Multiple Global Environmental Benefits		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4637 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; CCM-5; CCM-5; LD-2; LD-2; LD-3; SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,400,000
Co-financing:	\$13,013,000	Total Project Cost:	\$17,413,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	July 01, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ian Gray	Agency Contact Person:	Santiago Carrizosa

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?	BD/LD/SFM 03/22/11 Yes. Guatemala is a party to the UNCBD, and UNCCD. CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: Yes to UNFCCC	
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	BD/LD/SFM 03/16/11 There is no non-grant instrument.	
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	BD/LD/SFM 03/16/11 Yes. There is a supporting letter signed by OFP Minister Ferrate dated 02/14/11. BD/LD/SFM 03/29/11 A new letter of support dated 03/28/11 has been provided to reflect the change in project title. BD/LD/SFM 16/05/11 GEFSEC requests a letter of	

		<p>Guatemala supporting implementation of the policy work listed in Component 1.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 15/06/11 A letter of commitment to the policy activities in Component 1 has been provided by the Minister of Environment and Natural resources.</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	<p>BD/LD/SFM 03/16/11 Yes. UNDP has experience in developing policies, institutional strengthening and participation of the non-governmental sector together with a history of implementing SFM and REDD activities including within 5 other LAC countries.</p>	
	5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>BD/LD/SFM 03/16/11 Yes. Co-financing is of the order of \$205,000 however UNDP has been instrumental in sourcing a further \$12.5 million in additional co-financing.</p> <p>UA for LD 04/01/11: UNDP's contribution to this project should be re-discussed. A higher contribution by UNDP could be expected in view of the requested SFM/REDD+ incentive funding from GEF.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 05/05/11 Additional contribution of \$40k included.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 16/05/11 Additional cofinancing from UNDP should be provided for a project of this scale and in the next version of the proposal please either indicate an increase in UNDP cofinance or provide an explanation and justification of the current financing package and UNDP's contribution to the total project budget including securing cofinancing.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 15/06/11 An increase in cofinance from UNDP of \$147,000 has been provided.</p>	
	6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff	<p>BD/LD/SFM 03/16/11 Yes. The 2010-14 LINDAF identifies</p>	

		conservation/sustainable use of biodiversity and climate change as priority areas for support to Guatemala, in particular through the PINFOR and PINAP forest activities. At national and regional levels UNDP has significant technical and project management experience.	
Resource Availability	7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	BD/LD/SFM 03/16/11 Yes. The overall amount is within the STAR allocation - no allocation has to date been utilized or included in PIFs awaiting CEO approval. CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: There are no other PIFs which have been submitted for CC funding. The PIF uses all the CC allocation for the replenishment period.	
	• the focal area allocation?	BD/LD/SFM 03/16/11 Yes. See above. The SFM/REDD component is at the 3:1 ratio.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	03/16/11 N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	03/16/11 N/A	
	• focal area set-aside?	03/16/11 N/A	
Project Consistency	8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	BD/LD/SFM 03/22/11 It is generally aligned with the framework but more clarity is needed. Occasionally there is a mention of how this project will help SFM, SLM, and BD (such as in outcome 1.1, outcome 1.2) but carbon is not mentioned. Please provide additional information on the integration of carbon issues. BD/LD/SFM 03/29/11 Additional references include carbon issues in the project framework and in the	

		<p>CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: Agree with above. Also, the title seems misleading, a title like "Sustainable Forest Management and multiple global environmental benefits" would seem to better match the text.</p> <p>CC/LH/Apr 5 11: Thank you for the modifications to date. Output 2.5.1 was revised to include something about dry forests (specifically performance based systems), yet the geographic area is described as humid forests. Please clarify. Also, SFM/REDD+ activities are expected to be synergistic. But the activities in western Guatemala seem to be different from the dry forest activities, with different stakeholders (for instance see agency response to #22, and the response to #27 about project mgmt costs indicates that the maximum percentage of project mgmt costs is being requested partially because the project is in two different geographic areas). Please explain how pilot 2 fits into this SFM project, such that synergies can be captured with the other proposed activities for SFM benefits.</p> <p>CC/LH/May 5 2011: Thank you for the additional information. There is still an issue with Table A and SFM, but this can be dealt with at CEO endorsement. See the response to Q35.</p>	
	<p>9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?</p>	<p>CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: Relevant objectives are included but the emphasis of the project does not appear to be clearly reflected in some of the specifics. For instance, see #8.</p> <p>CC/LH/Apr 5 11: Modifications were made, but please see #8.</p> <p>CC/LH/May 5 2011: To reword the original issue, the focal area of the funding and the objectives listed in the corresponding text in Table A do not</p>	

		at CEO endorsement. See the response to Q35.	
	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?	<p>CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: It is made clear that the current Forest Policy does not include thorny brush and dry forests as forest ecosystems, and a goal of Component 1 is to widen the scope of the Forest Policy to include those areas, and then Component 2 proposes activities for that type of vegetation/ecosystem. In general, are thorny brush areas like these commonly defined as forest for the purposes of reporting to the FCCC in other countries, or would this vegetation be unusual to include? That is, would the outcome be generally consistent with a majority of other countries with similar vegetation, or is this targeted to include some very low productivity lands and shrubs instead of trees? What is being deforested, the shrubby lands or the lands with trees? Please clarify.</p> <p>CC/LH/Apr 5 11: Addressed</p>	
	11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: It is not clear how the capacities developed here fits into \$3.4million REDD-readiness grant and needs from FCPF, and the UNREDD programme. If firewood extraction is a major reason for deforestation and degradation, perhaps dealing more directly with the core problem of meeting energy needs would more effectively contribute to institutional sustainability of project outcomes.</p> <p>CC/LH/Apr 5 11: In agency responses to this question was the sentence "An activity for coordination with the FCPF will be included as part of the PPG grant and the specifics will be determined at the time of CEO endorsement and included as part of the incremental cost analysis". Please include this general idea within the PIF text.</p>	

		<p>BD/LD/SFM 05/16/11 Outcomes 2.4 and 2.7: please ensure the focus of the outcomes is on the increase in capacity of municipal technical staff and community members rather than the use of UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 15/06/11 Addressed.</p>	
Project Design	<p>12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>BD/LD/SFM 03/16/11 No. The baseline projects of PINEP, PINFOR and BOSCOM together with the R-PP development and CONAP and UNWFP's activities are presented as the baseline. However the figures presented are largely historic; please provide information on the on-going projects over the proposed project lifetime.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 03/29/11 Current financial commitments for PINEP, PINFOR and UNWFP have been included.</p> <p>CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: Not clearly described. Please describe concisely but specifically how some of the co-financing activities for the baseline project, such as the Dry Forest Project, tie into the proposed GEF project. Also please further explain the basis for the assumption that thorny brush and dry forest ecosystems would be activities that could provide reasonable returns for LULUCF projects? One might think increased carbon in a dry ecosystem may lead to increased incidence or at least increased emissions from wildfires.</p> <p>CC/LH/Apr 5 11: A) In the response to #12 and #10, there was reference to the Conservation Plan for Guatemala's Dry Regions (CONAP ZOOTROPIC CDC.</p>	

		<p>twice, it sounds like an influential document in terms of your plans. Please mention include this document in the PIF, either in terms of national plans or related to baseline projects or stakeholders, as appropriate. B) Also the response labeled point b) "In component 2, the project only proposes activities related to the dry forest ecosystem..." and yet pilot 2 is listed as a humid ecosystem. Please explain this discrepancy.</p> <p>CC/LH/May 5 2011: Thank you for the additional information. Any remaining issues with this one can be dealt with at CEO endorsement. See the response to Q35.</p>	
	<p>13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: Please give more details about what the currently accepted definition of forestland in Guatemala is, and what it needs to change to, so that the "dry forest" areas can also be included as forests. (Forest definitions are important for carbon estimation.) For instance, will this drop the forest definition from 20% cover to 10% cover and include woodland trees?</p> <p>These core assumptions/ definitions are not clear.</p> <p>CC/LH/Apr 5 11: Added definition of forest to the PIF. If only 4% of the land base is dry forest, it is unclear how this approach is going to have major impact. Please address the issue of size of overall impact from this approach.</p> <p>CC/LH/May 5 2011: Thank you for the very clear response in the response comments. Including such a statement in the document at CEO endorsement would be very clear. Addressed.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: It is somewhat unclear. Output 2.1.1. on a pilot project for restoration and reforestation looks possibly like an Investment, not TA. Several of these items in this component</p>	

		<p>please say it is an investment, and put it into a separate component because TA and Inv grant types should be listed separately. Please be clear if field activities such as restoration and reforestation will include planting of trees or is this all natural regeneration? Will the 2.2.1/REDD+ pilot project targeting 20,000 ha include the area of the 2.1.1/res. & ref. area of 5160 ha, or are these two different areas? Are these activities just proposing plans for the pilots or are they actually conducting the pilot activities? The description of incremental activities (see #15) especially on the REDD+ 2.2.1 seems almost more like a plan. Will the pilot implement a payment scheme, or is this just proposing a payment scheme to be implemented after the project is over? Please clarify.</p> <p>CC/LH/Apr 5 11: I did not suggest that output 2.1.1 was an investment, I merely asked that if it was, please label it as such. Also see #8 about output 2.5.1</p> <p>CC/LH/May 5 2011: Any remaining issues on the framework can be dealt with at CEO endorsement. See the response to Q35.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?</p>	<p>CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: A clearer understanding of the baseline project would help in interpreting the description of the incremental GEF investment. In component 1, there is mention of coordinating with national stakeholders during the PPG to determine the added value of this proposal in the development of the R-PP for FCPF. Perhaps I do not understand, but couldn't the FCPF be consulted briefly now so that the PIF design is closer to be useful all around? Whereas in the project framework (Table B) the 20,000 ha REDD+ project sounded like a project, in the text it sounds like analysis and a resulting plan. If this is just</p>	

		<p>framework that it is a plan. With all the workshops mentioned, this is a perfect place to discuss special targeting of indigenous people and women.</p> <p>Considering the available data, one would think the real issues are known already. Is land tenure a problem, or is it a problem that will not be dealt with here? If there is to be a real payment scheme, please say a few more sentences about it. Will there be field measurements to verify carbon stock estimates used here, or just defaults. I hope so since REDD+ methodology usually means measurements for carbon. Please clarify.</p> <p>CC/LH/Apr 5 11: Thank you for the clarifications. Addressed.</p>	
	16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: The equations written out by for carbon benefits associating hectares with benefits are very much appreciated. However the avoided emissions on outcomes 2.2 and 2.5 seems low. Perhaps only part of the listed area is being deforested, if this is the case please indicate the assumptions about how the rate of deforestation is being expected to change. Also please indicate if REDD+ field measurement protocols are being taught in the workshops and expected to be applied to the pilot projects.</p> <p>CC/LH/Apr 5 11: Thank you for the clarifications. Please add more for clarification about the source of the deforestation rates. Footnote 2 on page 9 mentions an average rate but does not indicate what the source of the rates is. In addition, the rates are expected to be re-estimated and validated through the project.</p> <p>CC/LH/May 5 2011: Addressed.</p>	
	17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated.	CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: It is difficult to assess the cost-effectiveness. without	

	the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?	<p>some of the activities as mentioned in #15. CC/LH/Apr 5 11: Would like to see response to #8. Also, of less than 4% of the landscape is dry forest, it is unclear how the focus on dry forest is cost-effective compared to working in other forest types.</p> <p>CC/LH/May 5 2011: Addressed.</p>	
	18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?	<p>CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: Although it is mentioned that indigenous people and women will benefit from this proposed project, please briefly state that the proposed project will conduct some activities that specifically target indigenous peoples and women to ensure benefits will accrue to these groups. If this is more of a planning project, the benefits may be more indirect than direct. CC/LH/Apr 5 11: Addressed.</p>	
	19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?	<p>BD/LD/SFM 03/16/11 No. Please provide details on how stakeholders outside of government agencies and municipalities, particularly CSOs, are to be involved in the project.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 03/29/11 Cleared. Proposals for involving CSOs, IPs and local communities are now included.</p> <p>CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: Also please see the #18 about specific activities for indigenous peoples and women. CC/LH/Apr 5 11: Addressed CC concerns.</p>	
	20. 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>BD/LD/SFM 03/22/11 Please elaborate on the risk to the project from the potential lack of engagement/involvement of land users.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 03/29/11 Cleared.</p> <p>CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: It would seem the</p>	

		<p>collection continuing to reduce carbon sequestration or increase emissions from deforestation would be notable. Increased carbon in dry landscapes may increase the loss of carbon due to wildfires. Are wildfires much of a risk, and if so, what can be done to mitigate that risk? Please address.</p> <p>CC/LH/Apr 5 11: Addressed CC concerns.</p>	
	21. Is the provided documentation consistent?	<p>CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: There appears to be inconsistencies between the project framework (Table B) and the text, but clarifying these as indicated in replies to other questions should make the document seem more consistent.</p> <p>CC/LH/Apr 5 11: Most inconsistencies are dealt with, however, the humid ecosystem work does not seem to belong in this dry forest project (see #8). Also performance based schemes usually need accurate and precise forest measurement schemes and these are not highlighted in anyway. If the dry forest area is only not quite 4% of the country, it seems more thought needs to go into spending the entire GEF5 CC allocation on this project which affects such a limited area.</p> <p>CC/LH/May 5 2011: Remaining inconsistencies should be dealt with at CEO endorsement. See the response to Q35.</p>	
	22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?	<p>BD/LD/SFM 03/16/11</p> <p>No. Please provide information on how the private sector and CSOs will be involved in the project.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 03/29/11</p> <p>Cleared.</p> <p>CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: In addition, please provide specific information about any connections with the National Alliance of Forestry Community Organizations of</p>	

		CC/LH/Apr 5 11: Clarifications were helpful. Addressed.	
	23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>BD/LD/SFM 03/16/11 The project builds on the existing GEF-UNDP project 'Consolidating a System of Municipal Regional Parks (MRPs) in Guatemala's Western Plateau' and the UNFCCC Adaptation Fund project 'Climate change resilient productive landscapes and socio-economic networks advanced in Guatemala'. CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: How this project has coordinated with REDD+ initiatives including FCPF and UNREDD would be a plus to include here if possible, but definitely needs to be discussed further at time of CEO endorsement. CC/LH/Apr 5 11: The activity for coordination with FCPF during PPG phase is expected, and text discussing coordination with FCPF will be expected at time of CEO endorsement. Addressed.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 05/16/11 Please confirm that no GEF funds will be used in the development of Guatemala's R-PP for the FCPF.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 15/06/11 Addressed.</p>	
	24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>BD/LD/SFM 03/16/11 The proposal provides a list of mainly government-related organisations. See Question 22 above on the role and involvement of non-government, private sector and CSO bodies.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 03/29/11 Cleared.</p> <p>CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: Please provide</p>	

		and the role of indigenous peoples and CSOs etc. CC/LH/Apr 5 11: Addressed CC concerns.	
	25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: Ten percent is the maximum allowed. Please explain costs more clearly as to why 10% is needed. Also, at time of CEO endorsement an M&E plan and explicit budget will be expected for tracking and reporting on the GEF project.</p> <p>CC/LH/Apr 5 11: Thank you for the clarification. The response to #8 is needed before clearing this one. Given the synergies expected in SFM projects, one does not expect to see that maximum project mgmt costs are needed because the activities are in different geographic regions. Further explanation on the project design and project mgmt costs are necessary.</p> <p>CC/LH/May 5 2011: Addressed.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 05/16/11 Please provide full breakdown of management costs.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 15/06/11 An indicative budget breakdown of PMC has been attached. A full detailed costing will be needed at time of CEO endorsement.</p>	
	28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the	<p>BD/LD/SFM 03/16/11 Overall yes, but the the budget allocated to the range of outputs within Component 1, in particular development of a</p>	

	reasoning principle?	<p>protocol for the monitoring of C flow appears limited. Please provide additional information.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 03/29/11 Detailed budget will be developed by the time of CEO endorsement.</p> <p>CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: It is difficult to know without further clarifications as requested in other questions on baseline project, etc. CC/LH/Apr 5 11: Addressed enough at this stage.</p>	
	29. Comment on indicated cofinancing at PIF. At CEO endorsement, indicate if cofinancing is confirmed.	<p>BD/LD/SFM 03/16/11 Co-financing is 1:3, with over \$11.5 million as grant co-financing. Please provide more information on co-finance from KfW "Dry Forest Project" and how KfW would be involved further into project design.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 03/29/11 More detailed description of collaboration and integration with the KfW Dry Forest Project will be developed by the time of CEO endorsement.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 05/16/11 Please clarify the relationship of the KfW grant and the GEF grant with regards to the project design and clarify if this is indeed cofinance to achieve the project objectives.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 15/06/11 Addressed. At CEO endorsement ensure full details of the links with the KfW cash co-finance.</p>	
	30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: It is unclear without further clarifications as requested in response to other review questions. Currently there seems to be a large imbalance between the amount of funding needed for the two pilot activities, but perhaps the reason for this will become</p>	

		clarified/made consistent. CC/LH/Apr 5 11: Thank you for your clear explanation. Would like to see response to #8. CC/LH/May 5 2011: Any remaining issues on the framework can be dealt with at CEO endorsement. See the response to Q35.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: Tracking tools for BD, LD, CC (LULUCF), and SFM expected to be completed by time of CEO endorsement.	
	32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>BD/LD/SFM 03/22/11 Please address comments above.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 04/11/11 The comments above have been addressed sufficiently. However, the PIF is not cleared at this stage. UNDP's contribution to this project should be discussed. A higher contribution by UNDP would be expected in view of the requested SFM/REDD+ incentive funding from GEF. Please address this and the follow-up questions from CC below.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 05/05/11 Issues addressed.</p> <p>CC/LH/Mar 21 2011: Please address comments.</p>	

were addressed, a few remain. In particular, 1) see #8, clarify the activity in the humid area in this proposal which is focused on dry forests, and describe the synergies from combining a small activity in a humid area with the majority dry forest activities in a different geographic area.

2) a performance based scheme usually needs precise measurements for carbon in the landscape, not GIS planning level type approaches. Please be clear that there will be precise measurements. 3) If dry forests are less than 4% of the country, the impact of this project, which uses the entire CC allocation from GEF5, seems limited. Please clarify how this project will have major catalytic impact.

CC/LH/May 5 2011: Any remaining issues can be dealt with at CEO endorsement. See the list in Q35. This project on approaches for management of multiple benefits, particularly in dry forest areas in this region, is unique and could have impact in other areas of the region.

BD/LD/SFM 05/16/11
Please address the following:

1. GEFSEC requests a letter of endorsement from the government of Guatemala supporting implementation of the policy work listed in Component 1.
2. Additional cofinancing from UNDP should be provided for a project of this scale and in the next version of the proposal please either indicate an increase in UNDP cofinance or provide an explanation and justification of the current financing package and UNDP's contribution to the total project budget including securing cofinancing.
3. Outcomes 2.4 and 2.7 please ensure the focus of the outcome is on the increase in capacity of municipal technical staff and community members rather than

		<p>Scorecard.</p> <p>4. Please confirm that no GEF funds will be used in the development of Guatemala's R-PP for the FCPF.</p> <p>5. Please provide full breakdown of management costs.</p> <p>6. Please clarify the relationship of the Kfw grant and the GEF grant with regards to the project design and clarify if this is indeed cofinance to achieve the project objectives.</p> <p>BD/LD/SFM 15/06/11</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>May 5 2011:</p> <p>By time of CEO endorsement:</p> <p>1) Ensure the focal area funding matches the text of the objectives of the components. The specific problem is in Component 2, pilot 2 and Component 1. In Table A pilot 2, the funding sources are listed as BD and SFM/REDD. But two focal areas are needed to qualify for the SFM/REDD incentive. This pilot also lists carbon benefits. One way to deal with this is to take some climate funds from another component and add them here. Component 1 indicates there are BD benefits as expected outcomes, yet there is no listed BD funding. It could work to place some of the BD funding currently listed in pilot #2 here in component 1. Listing the funding this way will show that we are accountable by assigning the funds for the appropriate focal area benefits.</p> <p>2) GEF funds should not be used for funding compliance of existing policies. Table A, output 2.4.3. seems to indicate that GEF funding will be used to provide staff for "control of illegal use of forest (e.g. illegal logging...". Please modify this text, and also design activities such that GEF funds are not used for funding</p>	

		<p>simplest solution would be to remove the text "for control of illegal use of forest (e.g. illegal logging&#x2013;extraction)"</p> <p>3) From Q29, please ensure a detailed description of collaboration and integration with the KfW Dry Forest Project.</p> <p>4) Completed BD, LD, CC (LULUCF), and SFM tracking tools are expected.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 16, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 08, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 15, 2011	

* 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.

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.