



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

GEF ID:	5005		
Country/Region:	Vietnam		
Project Title:	GMS-FBP Integrating Biodiversity Conservation, Climate Resilience and Sustainable Forest Management in Central Annamite Landscapes		
GEF Agency:	ADB	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; BD-2; CCM-5; CCM-5; LD-2; LD-3; SFM/REDD+-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,794,954
Co-financing:	\$55,546,000	Total Project Cost:	\$59,340,954
PIF Approval:	October 03, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	November 15, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Sanath Ranawana

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?	25 May 2012 UA: Yes. FJ/CCM - June 1, 2012: Yes Viet Nam ratified the UNFCCC on Sept 25, 2002	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	25 May 2012 UA: Yes, letter dated May 18, 2012. However, the endorsement letter has inconsistencies in the figures, which need to be corrected. Please make sure that the endorsement letter endorses the amount as correctly listed in the PIF,	

*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>table D.</p> <p>6 Sep 2012 UA: Corrected endorsement letter provided.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	5 May 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?	5 May 2012 UA: Yes.	
Resource Availability	6. 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>5 May 2012 UA: Yes.</p> <p>However, the PIF mentions in section C1 that the OFP has dedicated \$150,000 to the PPG phase. Is this indeed the case? Currently, the endorsement letter does not include any amount above the project grant.</p> <p>6 Sep 2012 UA: PIF now excludes PPG grant.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	<p>5 May 2012 UA: Yes.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - June 1, 2012: Yes</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<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"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	5 May 2012 UA: Yes for SFM/REDD+ incentive.	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	5 May 2012 UA: Yes.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	BD-1, BD-2 CCM-5 LD-2, LD-3 SFM/REDD-1	
	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?	5 May 2012 UA: Yes. Consistency with relevant plans is described in detail in the PIF. FJ/CCM - June 1, 2012: a) Please briefly clarify the consistency of the project with Viet Nam's UNFCCC National Communication (2010), National Portfolio Development Document, and UNFCCC Technology Needs Assessment. b) Please consider clarifying how the extensive Vietnam legislation mentioned in the PIF is actually implemented. FJ/CCM - Sept 6, 2012: a) Cleared b) Thank you for the clarification. Please provide details, at CEO endorsement stage, on the concrete status of application of the existing	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Vietnamese legislation relevant to the project, the difficulties and opportunities it offers and how the project will deal with the cases where it is insufficient or insufficiently applied.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	5 May 2012 UA: Yes. Sustainability of capacity building is being addressed within the institutional framework.	
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?	<p>5 May 2012 UA: Yes. Baseline projects in the Greater Annamite Region are well-described.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - June 1, 2012: The baseline description does not sufficiently describe climate change activities. a) Please clarify, in the baseline, the activities already developed or that would be developed without the GEF (i) to restore or enhance carbon stocks, and (ii) to monitor (or establish monitoring systems for) carbon stocks. This should then help clarify the incrementality of the proposed project. It seems that a lot of activities are already underway on forest carbon stocks monitoring (Silva Carbon, JICA, FAO, Finland cooperationâ€). â€</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Sept 6, 2012: Thank you for the clarification. Please explain how the project will ensure that the experience gained by the project and by existing (limited scale) MRVM pilots in the target provinces can enable scaling up local MRV systems and ensuring their sustainability in the long</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		run.	
	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>5 May 2012 UA: Yes. The increment of the GEF-funding lies in addressing the identified thematic and spatial gaps, as identified in the PIF in section B2, page 21.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - June 1, 2012: Please clarify Q11 to enable assessing the incrementality.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Sept 6, 2012: Please address the remaining comment in Q11.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>5 May 2012 UA: Not fully. Please clarify what it is meant by the reference to the agencies and GEF after each output. One would assume that these constitute funding alignments, however, not always a reference in the text is provided, e.g. for the output 1.1.3 no reference is provided under the detailed description of the subcomponents.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - June 1, 2012: a) Please clarify the scope of the activities to be undertaken under sub-</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>component 2.3. and especially whether monitoring activities will solely focus on carbon stocks or also encompass indicators concerning biodiversity, land degradation, and others.â€</p> <p>b) Please clarify the method to be used by the project for carbon monitoring.</p> <p>c) Sub-component 2.2. includes setting up 3 SFM/REDD+ pilot sites while further in the document, reference is made to existing SFM pilot sites set up by GIZ in Kon Tum and Quang Binh Provinces with similar objectives. Please clarify the added value of the new pilot sites proposed for the project.</p> <p>d) Please clarify how the project will ensure that the activities and results of the project may have a long-term, sustained effect. The sustainability of the enhanced carbon stocks expected thanks to the project seems to solely rely on the financial support provided by the project. It is unclear how these outcomes will be sustained/protected once the project is completed.</p> <p>e) Please also clarify how the socio-economic drivers leading to forest depletion will be effectively addressed. As described in the PIF agricultural and mining development could have a strong impact on this region's forest coverage and participatory processes alone may not be sufficient in facing the associated economic incentives.</p> <p>6 Sep 2012 UA: First comment has been addressed in the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>revised version.</p> <p>Cleared for NR</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Sept 6, 2012:</p> <p>a) Thank you for the clarification. It is understood from the response provided that the MVRM of the proposed ADB-GEF project will serve several purposes including capturing climate change co-benefits, improved data on land degradation, and contribute to improved biodiversity monitoring. Please, then, include LD and BD funding for sub-component 2.3 to cover the related part of the monitoring while re-arranging the sub-components funding in a way that the different focal areas allocations do not change at the level of the whole project</p> <p>b) Further details are expected at CEO endorsement stage on the method to be used by the project for carbon monitoring.</p> <p>c) Thank you for the clarification. Further details are expected at CEO endorsement stage as to how the project will ensure its added value and in particular how it will enable to go beyond pilot sites and piloting methods.</p> <p>d) It is expected that the CEO endorsement request will detail how the project design will ensure that the support incentives, local legislation, monitoring, enforcement, punitive and safeguard measures put in place will be sustained beyond the completion of the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>project. e) Please address the remaining comment in Q18.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>5 May 2012 UA: Yes.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - June 1, 2012: a) Please clarifies the pools considered in the carbon estimates considered in Annex B and especially when soil carbon stocks are taken into account and when they are not. b) Please clarify the accuracy of the carbon-stock estimates listed in table 1 (standard error, range, and other factors). c) The calculations presented in Annex B assessing the CO2 impact of the project need to consider the CO2 gains that would occur thanks to the baseline projects as these cannot be attributed to the GEF financing. Please clarify and modify accordingly. d) The comparison between activities in SFM pilot areas (19,997 ha) and in Ecological Restoration Zones (ERZ) (2,000) shows that activities in the former manage to provide almost 10 times more CO2 gains than activities in the latter for less than twice the financing cost. Please justify.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Sept 6, 2012: a) Cleared. b) The response provided is insufficient. The estimates of the carbon-stock provided in table 1 should come with a</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>standard error, or a range of values rather than with a single number. Estimated project impacts would then need to take this uncertainty into account.</p> <p>c) and d) Cleared</p>	
	<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>	<p>5 May 2012 UA: No. The description is rather generic and creates a cause-effect chain from the project activities to better productivity in other sectors, which is difficult to follow. Please revise section B3 so that it provides a clear, concise and realistic picture of the socio-economic benefits, through which measures they will be achieved and how these will support the achievement of global environmental benefits.</p> <p>6 Sep 2012 UA: Has been addressed in the comments sheet. However, at CEO endorsement stage a concise description of the socio-economic benefits will be required, in particular those for Indigenous Peoples, through which measures they will be achieved and how these will support the achievement of global environmental benefits.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>5 May 2012 UA: Yes. Considered sufficient at PIF stage. At CEO endorsement stage, please provide more detailed information on how a participatory agenda will be pursued in the implementation of</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>project's subcomponents, in particular those with indigenous peoples and community participation.</p>	
	<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>	<p>5 May 2012 UA: Not adequately. Please revise the table in a way that it becomes clear what the risk is, e.g. "Local support for proposed forest and SFM interventions" does not make clear to what risk this refers.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - June 1, 2012: Economic drivers threatening the forest seem to be driven by Kinh people while the population targeted by the project for participation in forest protection/restoration activities appears to be ethnic minority groups. It seems then that the project activities may not be sustainable in the long run. Please clarify and explain how the project intends to mitigate such risk.</p> <p>6 Sep 2012 UA: Has been clarified in the comments table. At CEO endorsement stage, a more comprehensive risk assessment table will be required.</p> <p>Cleared for NR</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Sept 6, 2012: Thank you for the response provided. Some additional clarification is needed. The response explains that the impacts of development sectors (e.g. mining) and land use conflicts will be addressed through project OMP's , and PES/PFES</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		evaluation. However, the OMPs, as described in the PIF, do not seem to target the economic drivers threatening the forest, nor does it seem to target the participation of Kinh people who may be key for these economic drivers. Besides, the PIF does not also explain how the PES/PFES evaluation results will be used to counter current economic drivers threatening the forest.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	5 May 2012 UA: Yes. FJ/CCM - June 1, 2012: Please clarify Q11. FJ/CCM - Sept 6, 2012: Please address the remaining comment in Q11.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	5 May 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?	5 May 2012 UA: Yes.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	5 May 2012 UA: Yes. FJ/CCM - June 1, 2012: Please address Q15 d).	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		FJ/CCM - Sept 6, 2012: Cleared	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	5 May 2012 UA: Please clarify why the co-financing table lists WWF/KfW as co-financers with \$7.196 million in kind. The project framework table only mentions WWF. Moreover, please confirm whether this is indeed in-kind contribution. 06 Sep 2012 UA: Has been clarified in bilateral discussions. Cleared	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	5 May 2012 UA: Yes.	
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	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	5 May 2012 UA: No. Please address clarification	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
PIF Stage		<p>requests.</p> <p>Please submit a revised endorsement letter.</p> <p>The PIF would also benefit from a spell check.</p> <p>FJ/CCM - Sept 6, 2012:06 September 2012 UA: No. Please address the remaining comments.</p> <p>September 20, 2012 UA: The PIF has been technically cleared by the Program manager.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>(1) At CEO endorsement stage, please provide more detailed information on how a participatory agenda will be pursued in the implementation of project's subcomponents, in particular those with indigenous peoples and community participation.</p> <p>(2) More detail will be required concerning the models to be applied in the subcomponent "forest restoration and enrichment planting". Please also address cost-efficiency in the design of these models. Currently, 2000 ha are planned with high unit costs of \$800 - \$1,300 per ha.</p> <p>(3) More details and precision will be needed for the estimation of the CO2 impact of the project.</p> <p>(4) At CEO endorsement stage a concise</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>description of the socio-economic benefits, in particular those for Indigenous Peoples, through which measures they will be achieved and how these will support the achievement of global environmental benefits will be required.</p> <p>(5) At CEO endorsement stage, a more comprehensive risk assessment table will be required.</p> <p>(6) At CEO endorsement stage, details are expected on the concrete status of application of the existing Vietnamese legislation relevant to the project, the difficulties and opportunities it offers and how the project will deal with the cases where it is insufficient or insufficiently applied.</p> <p>(7) Further details are expected at CEO endorsement stage as to how the project will ensure its added value and in particular how it will enable to go beyond pilot sites and piloting methods.</p> <p>(8) It is expected that the CEO endorsement request will detail how the project design will ensure that the support incentives, local legislation, monitoring, enforcement, punitive and safeguard measures put in place will be sustained beyond the completion of the project.</p> <p>(9) Further details are expected at CEO</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		endorsement stage on the method to be used by the project for carbon monitoring.	
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*	May 25, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 06, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 20, 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?	<p>CCM/FJ - Dec11, 2012: a) Please clarify how the PPG will help address the comments 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12 of Q31 of the PIF review. Please consider adding budgeted PPG activities (activities table and consultant tasks description) to ensure these will be addressed.</p> <p>NR/UA - Dec 11, 2012 b) Please take Council comments (Nov 2012) on cooperation with Finland's bilateral project's into account in project preparation; c) Please address STAP comment on "trans-boundary conservation mechanism for selected species". Trans-boundary issues do not appear to feature in the proposed preparation activities.</p> <p>NR/UA & CCM/FJ - Feb 21, 2013:</p>

		Has been addressed.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	CCM/FJ - Dec11, 2012: a) Co-financing of PPG is very low (1:0.33) compared to project co-financing (1:14.6). Please increase PPG co-financing to a level commensurate with project co-financing. b) Please takeout PPG activity 3 since it refers to agency's activities (finalization of the CEO endorsement request document) that may not be funded by a GEF PPG. Please also review the team leader tasks as a consequence of this change. NR/UA & CCM/FJ - Feb 21, 2013: Has been addressed.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	NR/UA & CCM/FJ - Dec11, 2012: No, please address the above comments. NR/UA & CCM/FJ - Feb 21, 2013: No. One outstanding funding issue in Table D needs to be corrected. PPG cannot be charged to "multifocal area". Please bring in line with endorsement letter. NR/UA & CCM/FJ - March 1, 2013: Yes. Table has been corrected. The PPG is recommended for CEO approval.
	4. Other comments	The project proponents are encouraged to coordinate their efforts better under the umbrella of the GMS Forest & Biodiversity Program. The World Bank is currently preparing the Laos FSP under this Program with one site to be selected in the Annamite Mountain Range with high potential for tranboundary cooperation.
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 11, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 01, 2013

* 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.