



**GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND**

GEF ID:	9232		
Country/Region:	Regional (Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar)		
Project Title:	Sustainable Management of Peatland Ecosystems in Mekong Countries		
GEF Agency:	IUCN	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1; BD-1 Program 2; BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$2,907,064
Co-financing:	\$9,450,000	Total Project Cost:	\$12,357,064
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Yoko Watanabe	Agency Contact Person:	Scott Perkin

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>The project is identified to align with BD4-9, CCM2-4, LD3-4, SFM 3 and 4. Please identify the relevant BD Aichi target that the project will be contributing to.</p> <p>20 Sept 2015 The linkage with specific Aichi Targets have been clarified. On the SFM objective, the project is in line with SFM3, but not SFM4. Please</p>	

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		delete SFM 4, and delete or move the identified amount to SFM3.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>Not sufficient. Please provide clear information on how this project align with the national strategies related to CBD, UNFCCC, and UNCCD. Please identify relevant objective/section of these documents related to the project initiative in each country. The information currently provided is insufficient to recognise the linkages.</p> <p>20 Sept 2015 Adequate information provided at this stage.</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>Drivers: No. Insufficient information on the drivers and threats to peatlands in the concerned countries. Please provide additional information.</p> <p>Sustainability: No. Unclear. The PIF, at one point, informs that further assessment and development of national strategy/action plan is required to conserve and sustainably use the peatlands. But the activities in Cambodia and Laos are rather focused on site based management (with very limited STAR finance). To ensure sustainability of the activities, the project design needs to</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>be reviewed and revised, and focused on priority and cost-effective actions.</p> <p>Scaling and Innovation: No. It is unclear how issues of upscaling will be addressed through such limited investment in each country. It is also unclear how sustainable income generation methods and alternative agriculture practice could be innovative, and whether these measures actually respond to the key drivers and threats.</p> <p>20 Sept 2015 Additional information provided but not sufficient. On the sustainability issue, please clearly indicate in the project framework and other relevant section that the national plans that will be developed will incorporate concrete measures on institutional and financial structures and approaches.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>1) Besides the development of the regional strategy and its endorsement by the ASEAN ministers, it is unclear what the baseline activities are in each of the participating countries. The PIF only notes "excellent results" from the former EU project without any specificity. Please clarify the results and identified gaps in each of</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the country.</p> <p>2) It is also unclear what the EU grant contribution will be doing, and what the GEF will be financing to compliment. The coordination mechanism for implementation is also unclear. Please clarify.</p> <p>3) Cofinancing ratio is less than 1 to 2. This is not adequate. Please increase cofinancing to at least 1 to 3 or more, following recent cofinancing ratio of other GEF projects in the participating countries.</p> <p>20 Sept 2015 Additional information provided but not sufficient.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We understand that there are actually many projects and programs underway that are assessing and surveying peatlands in these countries. Baseline and incremental reasoning of these activities is not clear. Please further clarify what has already been done and what are being planned, and what the GEF project will be doing on these issues. - While information on the four sites are helpful, please provide information on the baseline and incremental reasoning for GEF investment. If surveys and 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>assessments are already underway with other investments, consider shifting finance of component 1/2 towards component 3.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>Without clear information on the baseline and cofinancing initiatives, it is hard to examine whether the suggested project framework is appropriate or not. Please provide the necessary information noted under section 4.</p> <p>On the GEBs, please provide specific and tangible information on the global biodiversity benefits, including species and ecosystem services, not a very general and vague statement as currently provided. Please also provide specific information on the sustainable land management benefits.</p> <p>To ensure consolidated and collaborative approach among the participating countries, it would make more sense to have the components based on issues, not by countries. For example, this would mean components such as: 1) assessments and mapping; 2) national strategy and institutional framework development; and 3) demonstrate best practices in selected priority sites. It could potentially enable more meaningful</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>and effective technical assistance and knowledge exchange on related activities among the countries, rather than just putting three small country-level projects in one umbrella.</p> <p>As noted above, it would be important to review the scope of the project and examine if small demonstration activities are the most needed and cost effective investment at this point, when the countries have not completed basic assessment and strategy development. Further baseline analysis (including drivers and threats), are required to build a more convincing and comprehensive project design.</p> <p>Component 4 on regional collaboration, as it stands, is very vague and do not provide any value added. Please review and consider appropriate strategy and actions.</p> <p>The PIF requires substantial revision in project design and other elements.</p> <p>20 Sept 2015 Substantial revision has been made on the project design, however, requires further clarification/revision on below: 1) institutional and financial</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>sustainability issues to be incorporated as commented above.</p> <p>2) GEB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please clarify extent of protected areas coverage and non-PA coverage (i.e. landscape) for peatland conservation and sustainable use. - The CO2 reduction estimate seems rather high for the coverage. Please clarify the method being used. <p>3) Coordination: Please further clarify on how this regional project will be managed in relation to the other GEF-6 peatland projects in Indonesia and Malaysia.</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>Gender - considering strong relevance, please clarify and ensure gender analysis will be included as part of the socio-economic assessment at the PPG stage, and gender responsive results framework will be developed by the time of CEO endorsement. Please also provide appropriate information based on country situation rather than cut and pasting same information for all related projects.</p> <p>IPs - Please clarify that the appropriate IPs Plan will developed through a FPIC process.</p> <p>20 Sept 2015 Additional information provided.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Please clearly state that the IP plan will be developed based on the FPIC process.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	<p>Cambodia: LD resource is within the GEF-6 allocation. SFM incentive ratio is 1 to 2.</p> <p>Laos: LD and CC resources are within the GEF-6 allocation. SFM incentive ratio is a little less than 1 to 2.</p> <p>Myanmar: BD and CC resources are within the GEF 6 allocation. SFM incentive ratio is 1 to 2.</p> <p>PPG: The PPG amount is much higher than the norm. Please reduce to 100k for projects below \$3m.</p> <p>Agency fee: It is slightly higher than 9%. Please revise.</p> <p>20 Sept 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The PPG amount needs to be based on GEF Grant amount (excluding Agency Fee). Please revise it to 100k. - The Agency Fee is still higher than 9%. Please reduce it to \$257135 (9% of the GEF Grant amount). 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	Refer above.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of 	n/a	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	equitable access		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	n/a	
Recommendations	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>No, please review the comments carefully and review the scope of the project. The PIF requires substantial revision.</p> <p>20 Sept 2015 No. Substantial revision has been made but some elements have not been addressed fully. Please refer to the above comments and resubmit.</p> <p>7 Dec 2015 The PIF has been revised accordingly, and ready to be technically cleared. However, the PM has recognized that the GEB targets under the Table F and the text (page 13) are not consistent both on BD coverage and CCM GHG targets. Please kindly review the numbers again, and revise the table F accordingly. Further, the GHG emission target should be under item 4 on CCM, not item 5 on Chemicals under the table F. Please resubmit the revised PIF.</p> <p>8 Jan 2016 Yes. The GEFSEC received a revised PIF that adequately responds to the earlier comments. The PM</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		technically clears the PIF for work program inclusion.	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 18, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	December 07, 2015	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Recommendation			
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		