



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

GEF ID:	4650		
Country/Region:	Lao PDR		
Project Title:	GMS-FBP: Strengthening Protection and Management Effectiveness for Wildlife and Protected Areas		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	128392 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-1; CCM-5; LD-3; LD-3; SFM/REDD+-2; Project Mana; SFM/REDD+-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$6,825,688
Co-financing:	\$27,450,000	Total Project Cost:	\$34,275,688
PIF Approval:	April 13, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 07, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Jiang Ru

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?	09-13-2011 UA: Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	09-13-2011 UA: Partly, with endorsement of the PFD. A separate endorsement letter for the PIF would be necessary after approval of the PFD. 11-16-2011 UA: A separate endorsement letter has been provided. Cleared.	

*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)
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	09-13-2011 UA: Yes.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	09-13-2011 UA: Yes.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	09-13-2011 UA: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	09-13-2011 UA: 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	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	09-13-2011 UA: Yes.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	09-13-2011 UA: BD-1 CCM-5 LD-3 SFM/REDD-2	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant	09-13-2011 UA: Yes. Consistent with: - NBSAP (to 2020) - Forest Management Strategy (to 2020)	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lao PDR Tiger Action Plan 2010 and National Tiger recovery Program - REDD Readiness Preparation proposal (RPP) - National Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan 2020 	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>09-13-2011 UA: Not fully. Please add a paragraph on this under section B1.</p> <p>11-16-2011 UA: Adressed. Cleared.</p>	
Project Design	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>09-13-2011 UA:</p> <p>a) Yes for BD, LD, and SFM. The baseline for GEF support are among others the ongoing activities of WWF and WCS and the GoL, which however, are not sufficient to achieve long-term biodiversity protection and significantly reduce deforestation.</p> <p>b) Please describe the current baseline project for forest carbon MRVs or forest estimates. If there is currently no baseline work, or is planned to be elaborated during the PPG, please make that information clear.</p> <p>11 Nov 2011: b) Thank you for the information, cleared for PIF stage. At CEO endorsement, we expect a description of the baseline for the purpose of calculating carbon benefits for the project sites, or a clear process by which the baseline will be developed by the end of the project for the purpose</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>of calculating carbon benefits.</p> <p>11-16-2011 UA: Cleared at PIF stage.</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>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>UA 09-13-2011: Not fully. Please elaborate further on the incremental value that GEF support, in particular the SFM/REDD incentive would add to FCPF's initiatives in Lao PDR.</p> <p>LH 19 Sep 2011: Please elaborate further on the incremental value provided by climate change mitigation funding.</p> <p>AL, 21 Sept, 2011: Regarding Component 1 (xiii) "methodology developed and piloted in at least one NPA for REDD", the incremental/additional reasoning is not clear. Please clarify.</p> <p>In relation to the PIF page 10 paragraph 2 : Please note that the GEF does not pay for transaction costs related to site-specific carbon finance activities. In line with good practice for carbon finance projects the project developer should design a reflow of carbon finance to cover up-front transaction costs first . In other words, the costs for "preparation</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>of a REDD+ Project Document, including a baseline carbon study of the pilot area site; reporting and verification for the voluntary market through VCS and CCBS" are expected to be recovered by the expected carbon revenue.</p> <p>11-16-2011 UA: Incremental value to FCPF has been elaborated on. Cleared.</p> <p>AL,18 Nov 2011: Incremental reasoning has been clarified for methodology in at least one NPA for REDD. This comment is cleared.</p> <p>LH/18 Nov 2011: The additional text on the description of the incremental value provided by the CCM funding is welcome. However, the project objective is listed as "increase capacity for effective protected area management, wildlife conservation and control of illegal wildlife trade". Please include terms that recognize the contribution of a multi-focal area LULUCF/SFM/REDD+ such as "increase capacity for effective protected area management, wildlife conservation and control of illegal wildlife trade through an SFM/REDD+ and multiple benefits approach".</p> <p>4 Jan 2012/LH: Cleared.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	UA 09-13-2011: Not fully.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>1) Since this is a SFM/REDD+ project, we request some estimation of the benefits, in particular carbon benefits already at PIF stage. The expected outcome (1.9.) "REDD+ yields benefits including increased income, decrease forest loss, biodiversity benefits...." would need to be somewhat quantified. Carbon calculations could be done on an area / IPCC tier 1 based estimation or with the "FAOexact" web based tool.</p> <p>2) Table 2 suggests that the majority of GEF support is going towards 'soft' interventions in component 1, such as capacity building, improved knowledge sharing, improved understanding at high levels of government....etc. Moreover, also the component 2 and 3 have "capacity building" in its heading. These are not objectives in GEF-5, only crosscutting issues that should be dealt with at output level. On the other hand, the project description in the text (especially section B1 referring to the pilot sites) suggest a much clearer focus on field activities. GEF would welcome this field focus and its reflection in Table B.</p> <p>LH 19 Sept 2011: a) Refer to the template reference guide at http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/3624 to fill out the CCM information in Table A. The guide refers to two outcomes: 5.1 and 5.2. Please include the numbers on the outcomes and outputs</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>for CCM.</p> <p>b) In Table A, each outcome should have its own row.</p> <p>c) The component discussion in the text in B.2. appears to have different items listed and discussed than are listed in Table B. If the items in B.2. are meant to further elaborate on the items in Table B, please make it clear which items in the text match which items in Table B.</p> <p>d) There is only one outcome/output in Table B that appears to be related to CCM funding, and that is in component 1. Yet this looks to be funded by SFM/REDD+.</p> <p>e) Clearly show CCM activities in Table B, and indicate they result from CCM objectives.</p> <p>f) For each component in Table B, include a cost breakdown by focal area.</p> <p>11 Nov 2011: 1) Thank you for the estimates of CO2 benefits, but please include the amount of area that corresponds to the CO2 estimates. Items labeled a) through f) have been adequately addressed.</p> <p>11-16-2011 UA: The project framework has been revised in line with comments.</p> <p>4 Jan 2012/LH: This is adequate for the PIF stage, but detailed documented information is expected for CEO</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		endorsement.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>UA 09-13-2011: No. Please refer above to the requested estimation of incremental benefits.</p> <p>11-16-2011 UA: Can only be assessed after additional information on areas is provided (see #14).</p> <p>4 Jan 2012: Cleared. For CEO endorsement, incremental benefits should consider the effect of ecotourism on increasing GHG emissions. Increasing GHG emissions which will occur through ecotourism should be minimized or the resulting increased emissions will counteract the reductions in forest emissions. Project activities are intended to be synergistic. Cleared at PIF stage.</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>UA 09-13-2011: Yes. This is sufficient at this stage. A more detailed description will be required at CEO endorsement stage.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>UA 09-13-2011: Yes. This is sufficient at this stage. A more detailed description will be required at CEO endorsement stage.</p>	
18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk	<p>UA 09-13-2011: There is no mentioning of climate change risks. Please clarify whether there is none.</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	11-16-2011 UA: Has been clarified.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>UA 09-13-2011: In section B6, please make a stronger link to the parent program, the GMS-FBP. We understand that the project is a key element of this program.</p> <p>Please provide a few more details on how the co-operation with FCPF could look like, not only in the pilot site, but also at a national level.</p> <p>If Nam Et Phu Louei is a pilot site, please elaborate on the co-operation with the GEF-4 MSP and with the issues why this is on hold.</p> <p>11-16-2011 UA: Has been addressed. Cleared.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	UA 09-13-2011: Yes. Information is sufficient at this stage.	
	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?		
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	UA 09-13-2011: Yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>UA 09-13-2011: This needs to be discussed after the project framework has been reviewed by the project proponent. Although the co-financing is solid in terms of type and being new and additional funding, GEF would welcome a higher co-financing. This discussion would necessarily be made simultaneously with the discussions on the parent program.</p> <p>11-16-2011 UA: Has been discussed in context of the parent program. Cleared.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>UA 09-13-2011: Refer to #24 above.</p> <p>AL, 21 Sept, 2011: We appreciate that FCPF is involved in the project and will provide 3.4 million co-financing. However, please clarify what activities will be funded by FCPF under component 1. Would FCPF be the final buyer of the voluntary credits? It is indicated in the PIF that FCPF will help design a mechanism which will ensure the revenues go back to the villages. However, please make sure part of the carbon revenues to be set aside to cover the transaction costs (doc preparation, monitoring, verification and etc.) and then the rest can flow back to the villages as incentives to continue the good practices.</p> <p>11 Nov 2011: At endorsement stage, describe what specific activities the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>reflows are used for. It is still unclear who will be the final buyer of the voluntary credits. During the project design phase and by CEO endorsement, identify probable buyers to mitigate the risk of lack of buyers on the voluntary carbon market.</p> <p>11-16-2011 UA: Cleared at PIF stage.</p> <p>4 Jan 2012/LH: Additional information was provided in the revision. a) During the project design phase and by CEO endorsement, identify specific probable buyers to mitigate the risk of lack of buyers on the voluntary carbon market. b) be clear about who is considered to be the "owner" of the credits until such time that a buyer purchases them.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UA 09-13-2011: Yes.	
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?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</p>	<p>UA 09-13-2011: No. Please address issues and clarification requests in this review.</p> <p>11-16-2011 UA: No. We have a few follow-up clarifications on the provided additional information. Please see items #13, #14, #15. Upon provision of these additional clarifications, the PIF can be recommended for CEO clearance. However, please note that CEO clearance will also depend on a proper endorsement of the parent GMS-FBP by the other participating countries.</p> <p>04 JAN 2012 UA & LH: The PIF is technically cleared by the Program managers. As noted earlier, recommendation for CEO clearance is pending a proper endorsement of the parent GMS-FBP by the other participating countries.</p> <p>11 April 2012 UA: Yes. PM recommends the PIF for CEO clearance.</p>	
	<p>31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>Please note items #11, #15, #16, #17, #25 to consider during CEO endorsement.</p> <p>a) Also please note that carbon benefit estimates with documentation of how they are calculated is expected at CEO</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		endorsement. A description of how these benefits will be measured and verified over the project life is also expected. b) Project activities are intended to be synergistic. That is, increasing GHG emissions which will occur through ecotourism should be minimized or the resulting increased emissions will counteract the reductions in forest emissions. The CEO endorsement document should include a discussion about how the emissions increase due to ecotourism is minimized.	
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*	September 13, 2011	February 04, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 16, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 04, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 11, 2012	
	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.