



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

GEF ID:	4942		
Country/Region:	India		
Project Title:	Integrated Biodiversity Conservation and Ecosystem Services Improvement Project		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	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; BD-4; CCM-5; SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-2; Project Mana; BD-2; CCM-5;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$20,500,000
Co-financing:	\$115,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$135,500,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Akiko Nakagawa

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?	6 Apr 2012: Yes, FCCC ratified 1993	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	6 Apr 2012: Yes in a letter dated 3 April 2012, OFP is Mr. Hem Pande.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	6 Apr 2012: Yes. The agency has a \$1.5 billion portfolio of projects with the Ministry, and is the implementing agency for forest carbon instruments. Cleared.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	6 Apr 2012: There is no non-grant instrument.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	6 Apr 2012: Yes. The agency fits with the existing and next country office strategy. The	

		Cleared.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	6 Apr 2012: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	6 Apr 2012: 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?	Yes. SFM incentive is within ceiling. Please note that the total SFM incentive requested by a country across all its PIFs is \$10 million maximum. Please TICK BOX for SFM/REDD+ in Part I of the PIF! 13 Apr 2012: Addressed. Cleared	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	6 Apr 2012: Not exactly. a) For the CCM outcomes (and corresponding outputs) use the template at http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/3624 . (There is no outcome 5.3, use outcome 5.1) b) Each outcome row in Table A should	

		<p>have funding for outcome 2.1 and 2.3 separated)</p> <p>Please TICK BOX for SFM/REDD+ in Part I of the PIF! And remove question mark from "parent program, this is an individual project.</p> <p>13 Apr 2012: All items addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>6 Apr 2012: BD-2, BD-4 CC-5 SFM/REDD-1, SFM/REDD-2</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>6 Apr 2012: a) Please describe how the project is consistent with the NPF. D. b) Please specifically describe how the project is aligned with the UNFCCC National Communications.</p> <p>13 Apr 2012: a) & b) addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>6 Apr 2012: Please include more details about how the developed capacities will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes.</p> <p>13 Apr 2012: Additional explanation for over the next ten years adequate at PIF stage. Addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</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?

6 Apr 2012:
Not exactly clear.
a) The actual barriers to improved forest quality are described on p.4 as encroachment, land use change, unsustainable utilization of the forest resources, etc. Yet the baseline project seems focused on improving forest cover, enhancing carbon sequestration, etc., and not addressing the drivers of the problem. Rather the solution proposed here seems to be adopting new tools and technologies and capacity building for good practices. Please explain and justify this approach in light of the fact that the problems are not directly addressed.
b) There are some inconsistencies in estimates. In section B.6. (and other places in the text), the baseline project GIM creates the potential to improve 10 million ha, but then at the top of page 7 the text indicates the 1 million ha from this GEF project will be a subset of the 10 million ha, not in addition to the 10 million. Please make the description of the baseline project consistent throughout.

13 Apr 2012:
a) Explanatory text in Responses to GEFSEC document is adequate for PIF. By CEO endorsement, please include text addressing these points in endorsement document.
b) Consistency of baseline project in terms of size made consistent. Addressed.

Cleared

	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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>6 Apr 2012: Because the baseline project is unclear, the incremental activities are unclear. Please check for consistency and clarity of the incrementality of the activities after making modifications about the baseline project (Q11).</p> <p>for BD: Please include more specific information on the GEBs to be generated by this project.</p> <p>13 Apr 2012: Incrementality adequate at PIF stage. Please more clearly include good practices for climate change mitigation objectives by CEO endorsement.</p> <p>For BD GEBs, the project would contribute to conservation of globally threatened species, such as the Royal Bengal Tiger, Black Bear, Forest Owlet and Vulture etc. It would also improve the biodiversity values in the global hotspots of Western Ghats and Eastern Himalaya. Of the globally threatened species in the Western Ghats, 129 are 'Vulnerable', 145 are 'Endangered' and 51 are 'Critically Endangered'.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>6 Apr 2012: Not entirely clear.</p> <p>a) The differences between CCM and</p>	

example in Table A, it appears that the core output for CCM-5 may not be 1m ha but rather 500,000 ha with the other 500,000 ha treated under SFM1. Furthermore, although the areas are the same, the total costs for the SFM-1 is \$10m greater than for CCM5 for the same area of land. Please explain the differences of the expected activities and why the costs per ha differ so much.

b) Please reconsider using the term co-benefits in the project objective and text. If a term is needed the term multiple benefits is more accurate. In the project objective, dropping the term of co-benefits altogether would be more accurate. That is, perhaps rearrange the sentence to say "To strengthen institutional capacities for conservation of globally significant biodiversity and enhanced carbon sequestration and sustainable flow of ecosystem services in production forests of central Indian highlands and Western Ghats hotspot" Ensure all uses of the term co-benefits are reconsidered to instead use the term multiple benefits.

c) The project management costs are not proportional. No PMC are assigned to the CCM budget, but the SFM incentive bears the highest PMC. The costs should be proportioned among the focal areas (including SFM). Table A will need to be updated accordingly.

d) Please indicate how much of each focal area funding is being spent on each component either by placing directly in Table B somewhere under each component, or perhaps by indicating the amounts in the text by

This helps with the interpretation of the outcomes and outputs.

- e) The name of component 1 should include the notion of "and carbon stock monitoring", as this output is included in the component.
- f) Note that M&E costs should also be proportioned among the focal areas (including SFM).
- g) As in a), also please explain the distinction between the carbon stock monitoring systems between the CCM and SFM objectives.
- h) Please consider using SFM objectives such as payment for environmental services which would directly address the drivers of degradation rather than indirect activities.
- i) Please include some more specific information on the nature of the IAS work.
- k) Please provide information on the forest types where the project will be conducted.

13 Apr 2012:

- a) Estimates in table made consistent. By CEO endorsement, include reasoning for cost differences which is now in the Responses document text. Note that regeneration planting is usually a CC-5 activity, and SFM is usually natural regeneration on existing forest land. Please ensure proposed activities involving tree planting are attributed to appropriate focal area.
- b) Addressed.
- c) PMCs are much closer to proportional, but BD still has lower

		<p>estimates are expected to be proportional or the differences justified.</p> <p>d) The indicative nature of the estimates are recognized. Thank you for providing, addressed.</p> <p>e),f), and g) Addressed.</p> <p>h) As indicated in Response, at CEO endorsement in the text please have considered use of PES and if it is not used, please explain why not.</p> <p>i) and k) Addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>6 Apr 2012:</p> <p>a) A bit more details about carbon benefit estimates are needed at the PIF stage. An IPCC Tier 1 approach is acceptable, with the expected number of hectares, multiplied by a reasonable carbon benefit factor. Hectares of reduction in avoided deforestation or restoration or in the different areas should be listed separately, with the totals summed at the end. The per hectare factors discussed on page 7 could be acceptable. Briefly document the source of the factors. The carbon benefit estimates should be additional to a baseline.</p> <p>b) Carbon benefits should be additional. That is, if an activity is performed for biodiversity benefits, then just counting the carbon benefits in those activities is not necessarily additional. Please provide a brief justification as to how the carbon benefits are additional.</p> <p>13 Apr 2012: The indicative estimates and explanation are clear for both a) & b). Thank you.</p>	

		Cleared	
	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?	6 Apr 2012: As stated in the PIF, by CEO endorsement a detailed clear description of socio-economic benefits including gender dimensions, as well as how delivering these benefits will support the achievement of incremental benefits is expected following further study during project preparation. Cleared for PIF stage	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	6 Apr 2012: PIF states that more precise roles and responsibilities are expected during project preparation phase. At CEO endorsement, detailed information about participation by the public, including CSOs and indigenous people, is expected. Cleared for PIF stage	
	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)	6 Apr 2012: a) In the risk on land ownership, the mitigation strategy relating to dealing with squatters should explicitly mention safeguards. b) Local community participation is important in this project, and the drivers of degradation or deforestation are not dealt with directly in the project. Please address the risk that communities will not be properly engaged or motivated enough to meet the desired outcomes and outputs. 13 Apr 2012:	

		Cleared	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>6 Apr 2012: The project appears to be coordinated with or complementary to other related initiatives. Some activities of this project seem related to Small Grants Programme (SGP) activities, including GEF SGP projects. Please describe how this project relates or not to SGP activities in the country.</p> <p>13 Apr 2012: Explanation provided.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	6 Apr 2012: Yes.	
	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?	<p>6 Apr 2012: The overall amount is appropriate, at 4.6%. a) PMCs should be proportionally shared among the focal areas, or justified as to why they are different. b) The percentage of PMCs for GEF funding should be better in line with the percentage of PMCs for co-financing.</p> <p>13 Apr 2012:</p>	

		shared. b) Addressed. Cleared	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	6 Apr 2012: a) The funding and objectives for CCM and SFM seem to be paying for the same thing (good practice and inventory system pilot). Please explain the distinction. (This is also mentioned in Q14.) 13 Apr 2012: Addressed. At CEO endorsement, please ensure clarity about what outputs are being attributed to which focal area objective. If funding from several focal areas are contributing to the same output, that could be fine, please just be clear about the proportion. Cleared at PIF stage.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	6 Apr 2012: a) The PIF mentions the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility and UN-REDD, as well as CIF connections to the World Bank. Please briefly explain why these programs are not included here. 13 Apr 2012: Thank you for the explanation in responses. Addressed. Cleared	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	6 Apr 2012: Yes. The World Bank contributes a \$15m loan.	
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?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	10 April 2012 UA & LH: No. Please address clarification requests. Upon receipt of a revised version that adequately addresses all comments, the PMs will recommend the project for CEO clearance. 13 April 2012 UA & LH: Yes. PMs recommend the PIF for CEO clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	10 April 2012 UA: By CEO endorsement, among the other points listed in this review, we expect an elaborated project framework with more specific information on the community forest management component planned in Nagaland.	
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*	April 10, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 13, 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.