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

GEF ID:	**4677**		
Country/Region:	**Thailand**		
Project Title:	**GMS-FBP: Strengthening Capacity and Incentives for Wildlife Conservation in the Western Forest Complex**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	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-1; CCM-5; SFM/REDD+-2; Project Mana; BD-1; SFM/REDD+-2;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$7,339,450**
Co-financing:	**$24,234,427**	Total Project Cost:	**$31,573,877**
PIF Approval:	**April 19, 2012**	Council Approval/Expected:	**June 07, 2012**
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?	6 Apr 2012: Yes, FCCC entered into force 1994.	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	28 Sep 2012 UA: Endorsement letter is missing. 6 Apr 2012: Endorsement letter was received, signed 26 March 2012, by OFP Mr. Chote Trachu. Please note that the endorsement letter includes a lower then 9% amount for the	

*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		agency fee than listed in Table D of the PIF. This would better be adjusted in the letter as soon as possible. 18 April 2012 UA: By CEO endorsement, Agency fees in the document and the endorsement letters need to be similar at maximum 9% of the project grant.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	10 April 2012 UA: Yes.	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. The project has been transferred from World Bank to UNDP. Cleared.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	n/a
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	10 April 2012 UA: Yes.	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	10 April 2012 UA: Yes.	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared.
	• the focal area allocation?	10 April 2012 UA: Yes.	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	n/a
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	n/a

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	n/a
	• focal area set-aside?	10 April 2012 UA: Yes for SFM incentive.	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared.
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	6 Apr 2012: a) Please ensure focal area outcomes and outputs in Table A match those in the project template document at http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/3624 b) Each OUTCOME should be in its own row in Table A with its individual funding request and co-financing. Note that an outcome can include more than one output. c) In the text in II.A.1.1., please better address the use of CCM-5 funding. What activities are specifically being considered to meet CCM objectives, perhaps such as an addition of a carbon monitoring system? In part I of the PIF: Please consider to state unambiguously whether the project is submitted under the GMS-FBP or not. The statement "subject to confirmation by the Government of Thailand" would need to be clarified now at this stage, not later. 17 Apr 2012/LH: a)-c) addressed. Cleared	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF	10 April 2012 UA: BD-1	09/25/2014 UA: BD-1

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	objectives identified?	CCM-5 SFM/REDD-2	CCM-5 SFM/REDD-2 Cleared.
	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?	9 Apr 2012: Please describe in the text the consistency with the Second National Communication for the FCCC. 17 Apr 2012/LH: Addressed. Cleared	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	10 April 2012 UA: Yes. Sustainability of capacity building is being addressed within the institutional framework.	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage. Cleared.
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?	10 April 2012 UA: Not fully. In the baseline project description, please describe the current activities related to CCM objectives and funding. 18 Apr 2012 UA: Addressed. Cleared.	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. 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?		09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Refer to section B.3 of the endorsement request. Cleared.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	9 Apr 2012: a) Please include a statement that if GEF funding is used for transaction costs for developing CDM projects, then all reflows will come back to the	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Incremental CCM activities have been clarified. Refer to comments matrix.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		project area and activities. b) CCM is virtually absent from the text on incremental value. Please include in the text the incremental CCM activities being undertaken to produce CCM outcomes and outputs. 17 Apr 2012/LH: Both are addressed. At CEO endorsement, please be clear about b) the incremental CCM activities vs SFM activities. Cleared	Cleared.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	9 Apr 2012: a) Please indicate how much funding from which focal area is going to each component. This can be done by adding estimates to Table B or if easier next to the component titles in section B.2. b) Please make more clear in Table B and the text what activities are being conducted to meet CCM objectives and produce CCM outcomes and outputs. The focus appears to be on wildlife benefits not CCM carbon benefits. 17 Apr 2012/LH: Addressed. Cleared	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared.
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	9 Apr 2012: At least Tier 1 indicative estimates of carbon benefits are expected at PIF stage in all CCM-5 or SFM projects. An estimate of hectares multiplied by carbon benefits per hectare is expected	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		by major activity. Include concise documentation of the source of the carbon factors. 17 Apr 2012/LH: Addressed. By CEO endorsement, please provide improved documentation for the estimates. 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?	9 Apr 2012: a) Adequate for PIF stage. By CEO endorsement, more details of how gender dimensions are taken into account are expected. Cleared	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	10 April 2012 UA: Yes. Adequate at PIF stage. By CEO endorsement, more details of how gender dimensions are taken into account are expected. Cleared	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared.
	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)	9 Apr 2012: Please address the risk that ecotourism activities will increase GHG emissions such that overall the project will increase carbon emissions, not decrease them. Mitigating activities could include ensuring that ecotourism related activities will be managed to minimize increased GHG emissions. 17 Apr 2012/LH: Addressed. Risk added. At CEO endorsement please concisely state what is being done to ensure GHG emissions	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		are managed. Cleared	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	10 April 2012 UA: Yes. The project fits strategically with the GMS-FBP and fits with its overall objectives.	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. The project fits strategically with the GMS-FBP and fits with its overall objectives. Cleared.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	10 April 2012 UA: Yes.	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		09/25/2014 UA: Yes. The project entails 3 changes as compared to the PIF, which have been discussed upstream with the GEFSEC and are considered minor. Cleared.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		n/a
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	9 Apr 2012: Yes. PMC are 5%.	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	10 April 2012 UA: Yes.	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if	10 April 2012 UA: Co-financing is acceptable in view of overall PFD arrangements.	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Co-financing has been confirmed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	confirmed co-financing is provided.		Cleared.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	10 April 2012 UA: Yes. Co-financing provided through FCPF.	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. $500,000 provided by UNDP. Cleared.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		09/25/2014 UA: Yes. CCM, BD, SFM TTs are included. Cleared.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Cleared.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	n/a	09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Refer to comments matrix. Cleared.
	• Convention Secretariat?	n/a	n/a
	• Council comments?		09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Refer to comments matrix. Cleared.
	• Other GEF Agencies?	n/a	n/a
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	09-28-2011 UA: No. The package is not yet complete. Please re-submit the project together with the endorsement letter. 10 Apr 2012: No. Please address comments and re-submit in time for this WP. In part I of the PIF: Please consider to	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		state unambiguously whether the project is submitted under the GMS-FBP or not. The statement "subject to confirmation by the Government of Thailand" would need to be clarified now at this stage, not later. 18 Apr 2012 UA & LH: Yes. PMs recommend the project for CEO clearance. 09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Program Manager recommends the project for CEO endorsement. Cleared.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	By CEO endorsement, Agency fees in the document and the endorsement letters need to be similar at maximum 9% of the project grant. At CEO endorsement, please be clear about the incremental CCM activities vs SFM activities. By CEO endorsement, please provide improved documentation for the carbon estimates. By CEO endorsement, more details of how gender dimensions are taken into account are expected. At CEO endorsement please concisely state what is being done to ensure GHG emissions are managed.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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?		n/a
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		09/25/2014 UA: Yes. Program Manager recommends the project for CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 28, 2011	September 25, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 10, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 18, 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.