



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

GEF ID:	9089		
Country/Region:	Serbia		
Project Title:	Contribution of Sustainable Forest Management to a Low Emission and Resilient Development		
GEF Agency:	FAO	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):	CCM-2 Program 4; BD-4 Program 9; SFM-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$3,274,659
Co-financing:	\$26,180,141	Total Project Cost:	\$29,604,800
PIF Approval:	March 11, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	April 19, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Norbert Winkler

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	03/25/2015 UA: Not fully. The PIF is aligned with CCM-2 and SFM-2 objectives but insufficiently aligned with BD-4 Program 9. As Serbia is a flexible country the project could be aligned with CCM-2 and SFM-2 only. The SFM incentive can be triggered by one focal area if the country is flexible. Please provide information, if	Project justification has been revised to align with BD-4 Program 9, CCM-2 Program 4 and SFM-2. Kindly refer to the revised PIF. The OFP is in touch with UNEP, to develop another project.

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
		<p>available, regarding why the OFP only allocates \$2.5 million of its STAR towards the project while \$5.73 million are available. What are the plans of the OFP for the remaining STAR amount?</p> <p>The OFP might want to consider adjusting the endorsement letter accordingly, depending on the outcome of the discussion.</p> <p>YM 8/11/2015</p> <p>Yes. Comments were addressed, issues were cleared, and the PIF was revised.</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>03/25/2015 UA: Yes for CCM and SFM components, not consistent with BD Strategies.</p> <p>YM 8/11/2015</p> <p>Yes. The comment was addressed and the PIF was revised on page 12.</p>	PIF has been revised; please refer to section 6 (under Part II).
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>03/25/2015 UA: The general thrust of the project on the enabling framework for SFM is welcomed - enhancing policy frameworks, practices and capacities. However, it is unclear on how the work in the pilot areas contributes to</p>	Entire PIF has been revised, including the results framework and the justification.

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>above questions. It is also unclear why the project includes several outputs to include reports on gaps and needs, draft recommendations for improvements, etc. Ideally, this would all need to be in place as a baseline to justify GEF funding.</p> <p>Further please note that GEF doesn't fund data collection for BD.</p> <p>YM 8/11/2015</p> <p>Yes. The PIF has been revised accordingly.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>03/25/2015 UA: No. The project would need to better justify the GEF funding request with an incremental reasoning. The baseline contribution need to be clear - currently the text vaguely refers to "the baselineshould provide basis for:..."</p> <p>It is unclear why "the economic situation and the lack of awareness imposed a need for technical and financial assistance especially from GEF"?</p> <p>The incremental reasoning is also weak with regard to GEBs, several of which are not GEBs, e.g. the GEBs which are listed under BD benefits.</p>	<p>As mentioned above, the entire PIF has been revised (including baseline scenario, barriers, and incremental reasoning).</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		YM 8/11/2015 Yes. Comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	03/25/2015 UA: No. As mentioned above (#3) table B gives the impression that the project would only be a large PPG instead of striving for results. The project objective is also unclear. YM 8/11/2015 Yes. Comments were addressed, and the project framework and objective were revised.	Results framework and the project objective have been revised.
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	03/25/2015 UA: Yes.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	03/25/2015 UA: Yes.	
	• The focal area allocation?	03/25/2015 UA: Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Focal area set-aside?	n/a	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	03/25/2015 UA: No. Please address comments and clarification requests in this review. YM 8/11/2015 Yes. All comments were addressed, issues were cleared, and the PIF was revised accordingly. The Program Manager recommends CEO PIF/PFD clearance.	
Review Date	Review	March 25, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 11, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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?	10/25/2017 UA: Small changes, which have been justified. Cleared	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	10/25/2017 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	10/25/2017 UA: Cannot be fully assessed. Please submit the separate budget table (Appendix 3 of the project budget) - the Excel link in the document does not work. 11/20/2017 UA: Budget has been checked and found adequate. Cleared	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	10/25/2017 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	10/25/2017 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	10/25/2017 UA: Yes. Since this project is an SFM project including CC-M funding, please also submit the FAO EX-ACT tool as a	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>shared file for our records.</p> <p>11/20/2017 UA: EX-ACT tool calculations have been checked and found reasonable.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	10/25/2017 UA: N/A	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	10/25/2017 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	10/25/2017 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	10/25/2017 UA: Yes. Cleared	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	10/25/2017 UA: Yes.	
	• STAP	10/25/2017 UA: Yes.	
	• GEF Council	10/25/2017 UA: Yes. Comments from Germany and US have been responded to.	

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
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convention Secretariat 	10/25/2017 UA: None received.	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	10/25/2017 UA: No. Please address requests for additional documentation. 11/20/2017 UA: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.	
Review Date	Review	October 25, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	November 20, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		