



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

GEF ID:	6940		
Country/Region:	Lao PDR		
Project Title:	Sustainable Forest and Land Management in the Dry Dipterocarp Forest Ecosystems of Southern Lao PDR		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5448 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$130,000	Project Grant:	\$10,879,174
Co-financing:	\$54,740,013	Total Project Cost:	\$65,749,187
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	October 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Johan Robinson

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 ?	08/19/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	08/19/2014 UA: Yes. Letter dated August 6, 2014. Cleared	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	08/19/2014 UA: Yes.	

*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	08/19/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	<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"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	08/19/2014 UA: Yes for SFM incentive. Cleared	
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>	08/19/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	<p>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>	08/19/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and</p>	08/19/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	based on sound data and assumptions?		
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>08/19/2014 UA: Not fully. Please include in Table B under component 2 an outcome that covers the intended work on HCVPs. In the respective PIF text, please outline by whom and how the mentioned activity of identification and setting aside HCVPs will be done and whether this will include the development of a HCVP toolkit (e.g. the HCVP toolkit for Vietnam) to allow identification of HCVPs in the national (or provincial) context.</p> <p>8/25/2014 UA: Yes. Has been adequately addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>08/19/2014 UA: Not fully. GEBs are being described but the CO2 mitigation estimate needs to be entered into Table F.</p> <p>8/25/2014 UA: Figures has been entered. In the future, please provide only numerical figures in Table F; additional explanations can be provided in a footnote.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	9. 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		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	08/19/2014 UA: Yes. Refer to section A2. Cleared	
	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)	08/19/2014 UA: Not fully. Risk 4 on financial constraints is formulated in an unclear way and questions the objective of component 3. Please revise. 8/25/2014 UA: Has been revised. Cleared	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	08/19/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <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 	08/19/2014 UA: The three issues have been adequately explained in the PIF. The work on HCVF in Lao PDR is considered innovative. Refer to page 11 f. Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	scaling up the project's intervention.		
	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	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	08/19/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	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?	08/19/2014 UA: Please clarify indicative co-financing by ADB. As 85% of the cofinancing is coming from ADB, please provide additional information on how this will be confirmed at CEO endorsement. 8/25/2014 UA: Clarification provided. Cleared	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	08/19/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	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	08/19/2014 UA: Yes. PPG is requested within thresholds. The PPG request is recommended for CEO approval in line with PIF clearance.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	Cleared	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	
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:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	08/19/2014 UA: No. Please address clarification requests. PLEASE CORRECT: Table B: Typo in the figure for Project Management Costs (PMC). Table D: Agency fees do not add up to the indicated total. Table D: Requested SFM incentive is > 50% of STAR. Table E: Requested SFM incentive is < 50% of STAR	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		8/25/2014 UA: Yes. All clarification requests have been adequately addressed. The PIF is technically cleared by the PM and may be included into an upcoming WP.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	August 19, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 25, 2014	
	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.**