



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:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	126225 (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; CCM-5; SFM/REDD+-2; Project Mana; BD-1; SFM/REDD+-2;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$7,339,450
Co-financing:	\$29,373,100	Total Project Cost:	\$36,712,550
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 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	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	6 Apr 2012: Yes, FCCC entered into force 1994.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>28 Sep 2012 UA: Endorsement letter is missing.</p> <p>6 Apr 2012: Endorsement letter was received, signed 26 March 2012, by OFP Mr. Chote Trachu.</p> <p>Please note that the endorsement letter includes a lower than 9% amount for the agency fee than listed in Table D of the PIF. This would better be adjusted in the letter as soon as possible.</p> <p>18 April 2012 UA: By CEO endorsement, Agency fees in</p>	

		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.	
	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?	10 April 2012 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?	10 April 2012 UA: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	10 April 2012 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	
	• focal area set-aside?	10 April 2012 UA: Yes for SFM incentive.	
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.	

		<p>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?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>17 Apr 2012/LH: a)-c) addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>10 April 2012 UA: BD-1 CCM-5 SFM/REDD-2</p>	
	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?	<p>9 Apr 2012: Please describe in the text the consistency with the Second National Communication for the FCCC.</p> <p>17 Apr 2012/LH: Addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>10 April 2012 UA: Yes. Sustainability of capacity building is being addressed within the institutional framework.</p>	
	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>10 April 2012 UA: Not fully. In the baseline project description, please describe the current activities related to CCM objectives and funding.</p>	

Project Design		Addressed. 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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>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 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.</p> <p>17 Apr 2012/LH: Both are addressed. At CEO endorsement, please be clear about b) the incremental CCM activities vs SFM activities.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>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</p>	

		<p>The focus appears to be on wildlife benefits not CCM carbon benefits.</p> <p>17 Apr 2012/LH: Addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>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 by major activity. Include concise documentation of the source of the carbon factors.</p> <p>17 Apr 2012/LH: Addressed. By CEO endorsement, please provide improved documentation for the estimates.</p> <p>Cleared</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>9 Apr 2012: a) Adequate for PIF stage. By CEO endorsement, more details of how gender dimensions are taken into account are expected.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>10 April 2012 UA: Yes. Adequate at PIF stage. By CEO endorsement, more details of how gender dimensions are taken into account are expected.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	

	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)	<p>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.</p> <p>17 Apr 2012/LH: Addressed. Risk added. At CEO endorsement please concisely state what is being done to ensure GHG emissions are managed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	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.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	10 April 2012 UA: Yes.	
	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?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	9 Apr 2012: Yes. PMC are 5%.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	10 April 2012 UA: Yes.	

	cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Co-financing is acceptable in view of overall PFD arrangements.	
	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.	
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?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>09-28-2011 UA: No. The package is not yet complete. Please re-submit the project together with the endorsement letter.</p> <p>10 Apr 2012: No. Please address comments and re-submit in time for this WP.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>18 Apr 2012 UA & LH:</p>	

		CEO clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>By CEO endorsement, Agency fees in the document and the endorsement letters need to be similar at maximum 9% of the project grant.</p> <p>At CEO endorsement, please be clear about the incremental CCM activities vs SFM activities.</p> <p>By CEO endorsement, please provide improved documentation for the carbon estimates.</p> <p>By CEO endorsement, more details of how gender dimensions are taken into account are expected.</p> <p>At CEO endorsement please concisely state what is being done to ensure GHG emissions are managed.</p>	
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 28, 2011	
	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.