



Global Environment Facility

GEF/C.20/Inf.4
September 16, 2002

GEF Council
October 14-15, 2002

**FORMAT FOR THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARIES OF
GEF PROJECT PROPOSALS**

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
STANDARD FORMAT	1
GEF Project Executive Summary	1
Project Document	2
Supporting Documents	3
ANNEX A: STANDARD FORMAT FOR GEF PROJECT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
ANNEX B. CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF GEF PROJECTS	7
ANNEX C: BIODIVERSITY EXAMPLE (UNDP)	11

INTRODUCTION

1. In May 2002, the Council “requested the Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies to take steps towards consistency in the presentation of project proposals. The Council also requested that an Executive Summary be presented for each project proposal, including the presentation of core project data, such as a summary of problem analysis, the aim of the project, a summary of project activities and envisaged results, key indicators for project success, compliance with provisions in operational programs, and strategic priorities of the business plan, financing plan, including incremental cost and co-financing, institutional coordination, policy framework, sustainability and replicability and risk analysis. The GEF Secretariat was requested to report back to the Council on its agreement with the agencies to modify the presentation of project proposals.”¹ The Council further requested “that project proposals include information on baselines, expected outputs, and impact indicators.”²

2. Currently, the most of this information is made available for each project, but it is not presented in a consistent format or in one place. Table 1 summarizes the information currently available for all full-size project proposals (the ones submitted for Council approval as part of a Work Program), indicates whether the Secretariat or the proposing agency prepares it, notes whether there is a standard format, estimates the typical length, and indicates where this information can be found.

3. The purpose of consistent documentation is to present a clear statement of the eligibility of the proposal and the GEF financing requested in a manner that can be compared across agencies. In the interests of mainstreaming, such documentation would maintain the existing distinction between documents required only and specifically for GEF purposes (which should be standardized) and those required for the internal processing of the agency concerned (which can remain agency-specific).

4. The Secretariat consulted with the Implementing Agencies and prepared a format for the requested GEF Executive Summary.

STANDARD FORMAT

GEF Project Executive Summary

5. The GEF-specific information (items 1 through 4 in Table 1) would be consolidated into a single Executive Summary in a standard format. It would be prepared by the agency proposing the project, and revised by them after Secretariat review of the project. This information will form part of the Work Program decision document sent to Council. The proposed format (Annex A) includes fields for the following types of information and the filled-out document would be published in hard copy for Council Meetings and posted on the web.

- (a) Project Identifiers; including a summary of Costs and Sources of Financing;

¹Joint Summary of the Chairs, para. 47.

²*Ibid.* para. 48.

- (b) Compliance with Project Review Criteria (the current Project Review Criteria are attached for reference at Annex B)³ and including a summary of the project rationale, objectives, outputs, activities, key indicators, risks, and assumptions;
- (c) Incremental cost analysis;
- (d) Project logical framework; and
- (e) Responses to external reviews and comments (including the review of the expert from the STAP Roster).

6. The Project Executive Summary will provide the Secretariat and Council with the basis for making recommendations and decisions on GEF support. As such, the document will be

- (a) Concise -- it would be about 6 pages plus annexes;
- (b) Self-explanatory -- it would not require the reader to consult the project document or other supporting documents; and
- (c) Specific -- it would consist of brief, project-specific, technical descriptions in support of the project review criteria and avoid generic compliance statements.

7. The format of the Executive Summary would be amended from time to time to reflect changes in the GEF *Project Review Criteria*; the criteria themselves will be revised to implement Council decisions.

8. An example of the use of the format for presenting the GEF Executive Summary of a project that is also submitted in the Work Program for October 2002 is attached (Annex C, UNDP/ADB project in biodiversity)

9. Formats for other stages of the GEF Project Cycle (Concept Review and CEO Endorsement) will be prepared consistent with the format for Council approval and used for internal processing.

Project Document

10. The full project document (including the review of the expert from the STAP Roster) would be in the format normally used by the agency for its internal decision-making. As currently required, the full document will be submitted at the time of the Secretariat review, would be publicly available, and would be posted by the Secretariat on the web.

³ See Annex A1 of *GEF Project Cycle*, GEF/C.16/Inf.7.

Supporting Documents

11. Other essential supporting documents submitted as part of a project review would be maintained on file. Such documents include:

- (a) The endorsement letter from the operational focal point(s);
- (b) The letters of commitment by counterparts and cofinanciers; and
- (c) Responses to the comments of the Secretariat and other agencies.

Table 1: Documentation of Full-Size Projects submitted for Council Approval

<i>Information</i>	<i>GEF Unit responsible</i>	<i>Standard format?</i>	<i>Typical length</i>	<i>Location</i>
1. Summary of the project and of expected project outputs	GEF Secretariat	Yes	2 paras.	Work Program cover note (part of the decision documentation)
2. Project Cover Note. Contains brief identifying information, a summary of objectives, a statement of costs and financing sources, a declaration of receipt of the country endorsement, and agency contact information	Agency	Yes	2 pages	Project Documentation, available on the web but not in hard copy
3. Memorandum confirming compliance with the GEF Project Review Criteria	Agency	No	4 pages	Project Documentation, available on the web but not in hard copy
4. Annexes on incremental cost, logical framework -- including indicators and outcomes, and responsiveness to STAP comments	Agency	No	Varies; sometimes up to 20 pages	Project Documentation, available on the web but not in hard copy
5. Project document	Agency	Agency standard, full project documentation needed for internal decision-making (e.g., UNDP PRODOC, World Bank PID).	Varies; sometimes as much as 150 pages	Project Documentation, available on the web but not in hard copy

ANNEX A: STANDARD FORMAT FOR GEF PROJECT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(Filled in template would not include this heading or the references to endnotes.)



Agency's Project ID:

Country: ^v

Project Title: ^{vi}

GEF Agency: ^{vii}

Other Executing Agency/Agencies: ^{viii}

Duration:

GEF Focal Area:

GEF Operational Program: ^{ix}

GEF Strategic Priority: ^x

Estimated Starting Date:

Financing Plan (in US\$):ⁱ	
<u>GEF Project/Component</u> ⁱⁱ	
Project	
PDF-A	Date of Agency Approval ...
PDF-B	
PDF-C	
<i>Subtotal GEF:</i>	
<u>Cofinancing</u>	
GEF Agency cofinancing:	
Other (names and type): ⁱⁱⁱ	
<i>Subtotal Cofinancing:</i>	
TOTAL Project financing:	
<u>Financing for associated activities if any</u>	
Other (names and type):^{iv}	
TOTAL Associated financing:	

Contribution to Key Targets of the Third Replenishment:^{xi}

Record of endorsement on behalf of the Government(s) ^{xii}

[Name(s) and title(s) of Operational Focal Point(s)]

_____ Date: _____

Approval on behalf of the accountable GEF Agency: This proposal has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the standards of the GEF Project Review Criteria for work program inclusion.

[Name, title, and signature of accountable officer] ^{xiii}

_____ Date: _____

1. Project Summary
 - (a) **Project rationale, objectives, outputs, and activities.**
 - (b) **Key indicators,^{xiv} assumptions, and risks (from logframe).**(1page)
 2. Country Ownership^{xv}
 - (a) **Country Eligibility**
 - (b) **Country Drivenness**(1/2 page)
 3. Program & Policy Conformity
 - (a) **Project Design**
 - (b) **Sustainability (including financial sustainability)**
 - (c) **Replicability**
 - (d) **Stakeholder Involvement**
 - (e) **Monitoring and Evaluation**(1 to 2 pages)
 4. Financing Modality and Cost-Effectiveness^{xvi}
(1/2 page)
 5. Institutional Coordination & Support
 - (a) **Core commitments & Linkages**
 - (b) **Consultation, Coordination and Collaboration between IAs, and IAs and EAs, if appropriate**(1 page)
- Annex A: Incremental Cost Analysis
(1 page)
- Annex B: Project Logical Framework
(2 pages)
- Annex C: Response to External Reviews^{xvii}
 - (a) **Council**
 - (b) **Convention Secretariat**
 - (c) **Review by expert from STAP Roster^{xviii}**(3 pages max)

ANNEX B. CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF GEF PROJECTS^{xix}

	Pipeline Entry	Work Program Inclusion (same as Pipeline Entry except where additions or modifications noted below)
1. COUNTRY OWNERSHIP		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country Eligibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country be a party (ratified) to the Convention appropriate to the project focal area (UNFCCC or CBD) and <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>For grants within the financial mechanism</u>, country be in conformity with eligibility criteria decided by the COPs; or <u>For grants outside the framework of the financial mechanisms of the Conventions</u>, country be eligible for country assistance from the UNDP or the World Bank. <i>(For international waters projects, only 2 applies)</i> For ODS projects, country should be eligible for country assistance from the UNDP or the World Bank and ineligible for funding under the multilateral fund of Montreal Protocol. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country Drivenness 	<p>Concept <u>consistent with priorities</u> of the country as identified in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National reports/communications to Conventions National or sector development plans such as NBSAPs, energy sector plans, etc. Recommendations of appropriate regional intergovernmental meetings or agreements. 	<p>Clear description of project's fit within:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National reports/communications to Conventions National or sector development plans Recommendations of appropriate regional intergovernmental meetings or agreements.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Endorsement 	xx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Endorsement by national operational focal point.

	Pipeline Entry	Work Program Inclusion (same as Pipeline Entry except where additions or modifications noted below)
2. PROGRAM & POLICY CONFORMITY		
Program Designation & Conformity	Identify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • primary Operational Program; or • Short-term measures; or • Enabling Activities 	Describe how project objectives are consistent with Operational Program objectives or operational criteria.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline the incremental reasoning of the concept, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem statement • What would happen without GEF (programs & global environmental consequences) – baseline scenario. • What would happen with GEF (programs & global environmental consequences) – alternate scenario. 	Describe: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sector issues, root causes, threats, barriers, etc, affecting global environment. • Project logical framework, including a consistent strategy, goals, objectives, outputs, inputs/activities, measurable performance indicators, risks and assumptions. • Detailed description of goals, objectives, outputs, and related assumptions, risks and performance indicators. • Brief description of proposed project activities, including an explanation how the activities would result in project outputs (in no more than 2 pages).^{xxi} • Global environmental benefits of project. • Incremental Cost Estimation based on the project logical framework. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe project outputs (and related activities and costs) that result in <i>global</i> environmental benefits • Describe project outputs (and related activities and costs) that result in joint <i>global and national</i> environmental benefits. • Describe project outputs (and related activities and costs) that result in <i>national</i> environmental benefits. • Describe the process used to jointly estimate incremental cost with in-country project partner. • Present the incremental cost

	Pipeline Entry	Work Program Inclusion (same as Pipeline Entry except where additions or modifications noted below)
		estimate. If presented as a range, then a brief explanation of challenges and constraints and how these would be addressed by the time of CEO endorsement.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainability (including financial sustainability) 	Indicate factors that influence continuation of project benefits after completion of project implementation.	Describe proposed approach, within and/or outside the project, to address factors that influence continuation of project benefits after completion of project implementation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replicability 	Outline the potential for repeating the project lessons and transferring experience elsewhere.	Describe the proposed approach to knowledge transfer, if any (for e.g., dissemination of lessons, training workshops, information exchange, national and regional forum, etc) (could be within project description).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder Involvement 	Identify major stakeholders, relevant to project objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private sector NGOs Communities public agencies others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe how stakeholders have been involved in project development. Describe the approach for stakeholder involvement in further project development and implementation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring & Evaluation 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe how the project design has incorporated lessons from similar projects in the past. Describe approach for project M&E system, based on the project logical framework, including the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specification of indicators for objectives and outputs, including intermediate benchmarks, and means of measurement. Outline organizational arrangement for implementing M&E. Indicative total cost of M&E (maybe reflected in total project cost).
3. FINANCING		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financing Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicate potential sources of co-financing, if known. Indicate financing instrument, if known 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimate total project cost Estimate contribution by financing partners. Propose type of financing instrument
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost-effectiveness 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimate cost effectiveness, if

	Pipeline Entry	Work Program Inclusion (same as Pipeline Entry except where additions or modifications noted below)
		feasible. • Describe alternate project approaches considered and discarded.
4. INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT		
• Core commitments & Linkages	Identify linkages to IA's: • Country/regional/sub-regional/global/sector programs. • GEF activities with potential influence on the proposed project (design and implementation).	
• Consultation, Coordination and Collaboration between IAs, and IAs and EAs, if appropriate.	• Identify relevant activities of other IAs (and EAs) in the country/region. • Outline coordination, collaboration between IAs (and IAs and EAs) in project design, if any.	
5. RESPONSE TO REVIEWS		
Council		Respond to Council Comments at pipeline entry.
Convention Secretariat	Respond to comments from Convention Secretariat.	Respond to comments from Convention Secretariats .
GEF Secretariat	Respond to comments from GEFSEC on draft project concept document.	Respond to comments from GEFSEC on draft project brief.
Other IAs and relevant EAs	Respond to comments from other IAs, EAs on draft project concept document	Respond to comments from other IAs, relevant EAs on draft project brief.
STAP	Respond to comments from STAP on draft project concept document.	Respond to comments by STAP at work program inclusion
Review by expert from STAP Roster		Respond to review by expert from STAP roster. ^{xxii}

ANNEX C: BIODIVERSITY EXAMPLE (UNDP)



Agency's Project ID: CMB/02/G31

Country: Cambodia

Project Title: Tonle Sap Conservation

GEF Agency: UNDP/ADB

Other Executing Agency/Agencies:

Duration: 5 years

GEF Focal Area: Biodiversity

GEF Operational Program: #2

GEF Strategic Priority:

Estimated Starting Date:

March 2003

Financing Plan (in US\$):	
GEF Project/Component	
Project	3,246,420
PDF-A	Date of Agency Approval ...
PDF-B	350,000
PDF-C	
<i>Subtotal GEF:</i>	<u><i>3,596,420</i></u>
Cofinancing	
UNDP Capacity-21:	627,030
ADB loan	10,421,000
ADB non-lending	393,00
RGC:	3,895,000
Other international	200,000
<i>Subtotal Cofinancing:</i>	<u><i>15,536,030</i></u>
TOTAL Project financing: 19,132,450	
Financing for associated activities if any	
None	

Contribution to Key Targets of the Third Replenishment:

Record of endorsement on behalf of the Government(s)

H.E. Khieu Muth, Director General, Ministry of Environment. Date: July 2002

Approval on behalf of the accountable GEF Agencies: This proposal has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the standards of the GEF Project Review Criteria for work program inclusion.

.....
Tim Clairs, GEF Regional Coordinator, UNDP/Malaysia Date: August 2, 2002

Olivier Serrat, Project Manager, ADB Date: August 2, 2002

1. Project Summary

The overall goal of project is to support the conservation and sustainable management of natural resources and biodiversity in the Tonle Sap Basin. The project would assist Cambodia to identify and protect globally significant biodiversity in and around the Tonle Sap Lake, including developing an appropriate policy and legal framework to protect and manage the natural resources of the lake. The Project consists of three components: (a) strengthening natural resource management coordination and planning for the Tonle Sap Biosphere Reserve (TSBR); (ii) organizing communities for natural resource management in the TSBR; and (iii) building management capacity for biodiversity conservation in the TSBR.

2. Country Ownership

(a) Country Eligibility

Cambodia acceded to the Convention on Biological Diversity on 9th February 1995.

(b) Country Drivenness

The Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) has given high priority to the conservation and sustainable management of the natural resources, including biodiversity in the Tonle Sap lake basin. It has nominated Tonle Sap as a Biosphere Reserve under UNESCO's Man and Biosphere Program. Conservation and sustainable management of the lake's natural resources is highlighted as a priority in several strategic documents of the Government including, the National Environmental Action Plan, National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, and the National Wetlands Action Plan.

3. Program & Policy Conformity

(a) Project Design

The overall project goal is the conservation and sustainable management of natural resources in the Tonle Sap Basin. There specific objectives of the project are:

- (a) Strengthening natural resource management coordination and planning for the Tonle Sap Biosphere Reserve (TSBR).
- (b) Organizing communities for natural resource management in the TSBR.
- (c) Strengthening management capacity for biodiversity conservation in the TSBR

These are consistent with the objective of OP #2, which is the conservation and sustainable use of the biological resources in coastal, marine, and freshwater ecosystems.

The expected outputs of the project are:

- (a) Establishment of a coordination framework and information dissemination mechanisms.
- (b) Mapping and demarcation of the TSBR.
- (c) Development of policies and capacity to support community-based natural resource management.
- (d) Empowerment of communities to manage natural resources.

- (e) Demonstration of technical packages of sustainable livelihoods.
- (f) Enhancement of capacity for biodiversity conservation in the core areas of TSBR.
- (g) Development of biodiversity monitoring systems.
- (h) Promotion of biodiversity conservation awareness, education, and outreach.

(b) Sustainability (including financial sustainability)

A number of factors will contribute to the sustainability of project benefits beyond the completion of the GEF project.

- Very strong commitment from the RGC at all levels, from central down to provincial and local levels, to manage the natural resources of the Tonle Sap in a sustainable manner.
- Establishment of a permanent Tonle Sap Biosphere Reserve (TSBR) Secretariat within the Cambodia National Mekong Commission, an inter-agency body and this would facilitate inter-sectoral cooperation in planning and resource use in the Tonle Sap. RGC is committed to provide operational budget for the Secretariat.
- The TSBR has been charged with, among other things, the development of long-term revenue sources for conservation and research activities.
- There are strong indications that RGC is willing and able to provide long-term financial sustainability to the program.
- Capacity building for community-based natural resource management, in order to substitute expensive (and ineffective) central government-based management, will lead to a lowering of costs.

(c) Replicability

Tonle Sap is unique in many respects (size, habitats, species), and the project as such cannot be replicated in another area. Nevertheless, natural resource management capacity and knowledge developed under the project such as mechanisms for information collection and dissemination and environmental education and awareness programs can be replicated in other situations and locations in Cambodia.

(d) Stakeholder Involvement

During the PDF-B formulation phase the identification and assessment of stakeholders in the TSBR has focused on the three core areas, which are considered to be the key areas containing significant global biodiversity. This has involved meetings, workshops and semi-structured interviews with individuals and groups of public (Government) and private stakeholders (NGOs, villagers and business operators) at the national, provincial and local level. The results of these consultations played a major role in the design of the project. Effective involvement of stakeholders, including local authorities, local communities, and fishing lot owners in natural resource management activities would continue during project implementation.

(e) Monitoring and Evaluation

UNDP-GEF will also monitor project performance particularly in line with the indicators included in the Logical Framework Matrix. The project will be subject to tripartite review (TPR -- joint review by representatives from the Government, ADB and UNDP – essentially the Project Steering Committee) at least once every 12 months, the first such meeting to be held at the end of the 11th month from the start of implementation.

The Executing Agency will be responsible for ensuring the Annual Project Report is prepared and submitted to each TPR meeting at least one month in advance. The National Project Director shall prepare and submit the quarterly project progress report to UNDP-Cambodia and the Executing Agency. The National Project Director will be responsible for preparing Project Implementation Reviews required by GEF.

4. Financing Modality

The total cost of the project is \$19.1 million, with a GEF grant of \$3.9 million and total of about \$15.2 million in co-financing from ADB loan, and grants from UNDP-Capacity 21, ADB non-lending assistance, and other international donors.

5. Institutional Coordination & Support

(a) Core commitments & Linkages

UNDP is contributing directly to capacity building in Cambodia, and specifically in the vicinity of the Tonle Sap through the UNDP Capacity 21 Programme. The proposed GEF-funded intervention forms an integral part of the ADB loan program negotiated with the RGC, and is therefore entirely consistent with the ADB's Country Program.

(b) Consultation, Coordination and Collaboration between IAs, and IAs and EAs, if appropriate.

UNDP and ADB have worked closely together in the preparation of the proposed GEF intervention and the ADB-funded loan program. The two preparatory processes (as well as the Capacity-21 process) were closely coordinated, with regular and extensive exchange of information and ideas. The World Bank/GEF "Water Utilization Project" is implemented through the Mekong River Commission (MRC). Both the MRC and the CNMC have been key stakeholders participating in the design of this proposal, and will also be involved in project implementation.

The close collaboration between UNDP and the ADB forged during the preparatory phase will be continued during project implementation. Both agencies will contribute to providing technical and administrative support to the project team, based on harmonized implementation arrangements for the three components of the project.

Annex A: Incremental Cost Analysis

Components, Outputs, and Activities	Baseline	Alternative	Increment
Strengthening NRM Coordination and Planning for the TSBR <i>1.1 Coordination framework and information dissemination mechanisms are established</i>	\$200,000 (UNESCO/RGC)	\$2,903,000	\$2,703,000 <u>Of which:</u> ADB-financed loan: \$2,362,000 RGC funds: \$341,000
<i>1.2 Best-practice land use rules and guidelines are identified and demarcation is carried out</i>	\$1,250,000 (WB projects and MLMUPC LMP)	\$2,372,000	\$1,122,000 <u>Of which:</u> ADB-financed loan: \$907,000 RGC funds: \$215,000
<i>1.3 Policy and capacity to support community-based natural resource management are developed</i>	\$330,000 (RGC fisheries reform)	\$1,133,000	\$803,000 <u>Of which:</u> ADB-financed loan: \$36,000 ADB TA: \$393,000 UNDP-Cap21: \$328,600 RGC funds: \$46,000
Project management	\$nil	\$404,000	\$404,000 <u>Of which:</u> RGC funds: \$404,000
Organizing Communities for Natural Resource Management in the TSBR <i>2.1 Coordination framework for community-based natural resource management is developed</i>	\$750,000 (FAO Phase 3)	\$5,590,000	\$4,840,000 <u>Of which:</u> ADB-financed loan: \$2,897,000 UNDP-Cap21: \$134,300 RGC funds: \$1,809,000
<i>2.2 Communities are empowered to manage natural resources</i>	\$750,000 (FAO Phase 3)	\$4,807,000	\$4,057,000 <u>Of which:</u> ADB-financed loan: \$3,704,000 RGC funds: \$353,000
<i>2.3 Technical packages in support of sustainable livelihoods are demonstrated</i>	\$100,000 (RGC)	\$337,000	\$227,000 <u>Of which:</u> ADB-financed loan: \$225,000 RGC funds: \$2,000
Project management	\$nil	\$227,000	\$227,000 <u>Of which:</u> RGC funds: \$227,000
Building Management Capacity for Biodiversity Conservation in the TSBR <i>3.1 Capacity for management of biodiversity in the core areas is enhanced</i>	\$280,000 (RGC and Ramsar SGF for Boeng Chhmar)	\$2,076,800	\$1,796,800 <u>Of which:</u> GEF: \$1,274,800 ADB-financed loan: \$281,000 RGC funds: \$241,000
<i>3.2 Systems for monitoring and management of biodiversity are developed</i>	\$300,000 (RGC and WCS)	\$1,330,300	\$1,030,300 <u>Of which:</u> GEF: \$760,300 WCS: \$200,000 RGC funds: \$70,000
<i>3.3 Biodiversity conservation awareness, education, and outreach are promoted</i>	\$200,000 (FAO-GECKO / Osmose)	\$988,330	\$788,330 <u>Of which:</u> GEF: \$574,200 UNDP-Cap21: \$164,130 RGC funds: \$49,000

GEF project management and review	\$nil	\$775,120	\$775,120 <u>Of which:</u> GEF: \$637,120 RGC funds: \$138,000
TOTALS	\$4,160,000	\$22,942,450	\$18,782,450 <u>Of which:</u> ADB Loan: \$10,421,000 ADB Nonlending TA: \$393,000 GEF: \$3,246,420 UNDP Cap -21: \$627,030 WCS: \$200,000 RGC: \$3,895,000

Annex B: Project Logical Framework

		Targets	Monitoring Mechanisms	Key Assumptions
Overall Project Components and Outputs	FUNDING			<i>Components, Outputs, and Activities to Objective</i>
Component I: Strengthening Natural Resource Management Coordination and Planning for the TSBR				
1.1 <i>Coordination framework and information dissemination mechanisms are established</i>				
1.1.1 Strengthen the Tonle Sap Biosphere Reserve Secretariat facilities and structures	ADB	1.1.1 TSBR secretariat established and operational by mid-Year 1	1.1.1 Project reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interministerial cooperation takes place and endorses TSBR Secretariat recommendations
1.1.2 Create legal capacity in the TSBR Secretariat, to address legal and coordination issues in the TSBR	ADB	1.1.2 Establish Legal and Policy Unit by mid-Year 1 and rationalize designation of core areas in TSBR by end-Year 1.	1.1.2 Project reports and policy documents	
1.1.3 Develop common policy objectives for management of the TSBR resources and core areas	ADB	1.1.3 A common policy on core areas agreed by DoF and the MOE by end-Year 1, and quarterly interministerial meetings are held to implement it from Year 1	1.1.3 Minutes of interministerial meetings and policy documents of Ministries	
1.1.4 Develop a TSBR Environmental Information Database (TSBR-ED) for the management & development of the Tonle Sap	ADB	1.1.4 TSBR-ED operational and mechanisms for its updating and dissemination in place by mid-Year 2.	1.1.4 Records of database usage and additions	
1.1.5 Develop and implement national environmental education campaign		1.1.5 Environmental education messages are disseminated through appropriate media outlets and schools by end-Year 1 and on a continuing basis throughout thereafter.	1.1.5 Number of messages and campaigns and feedback from audiences	
1.2 <i>Land use</i>				

		Targets	Monitoring Mechanisms	Key Assumptions
<p><i>practices and demarcation in support of biodiversity conservation are developed by FAO</i></p> <p>1.2.1 Develop best-practice land use rules for flooded forest and adjacent agricultural areas</p> <p>1.2.2 Demarcate boundary between flooded forest and agricultural land</p> <p>1.2.3 Produce management plans and maps</p> <p>1.2.4 Develop methodology to define resource tenure rights of communities in state-owned land</p>	<p>ADB</p> <p>ADB</p> <p>ADB</p> <p>ADB</p>	<p>1.2.1 Land use guidelines suitable for insertion in future title documents of agricultural lands are developed by mid-Year 1.</p> <p>1.2.2 Fisheries and multiple-use domains are demarcated by mid-Year 1.</p> <p>1.2.3 Land use plans and maps are prepared and disseminated by end-Year 1.</p> <p>1.2.4 Methodology for defining boundaries is developed and subdecree revisions are prepared by mid-Year 1.</p>	<p>1.2.1 Guidelines available in all relevant Ministries</p> <p>1.2.2 Contract for map development</p> <p>1.2.3 Subdecrees prepared and on public record</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAO methodology is well enough developed to enable rapid replication. • National level processes can be fine-tuning at the local level.
<p>1.3 <i>Policy and plans to support sustainable community fisheries are developed for TSBR</i></p> <p>1.3.1 Build capacity of the DoF Community Fisheries Office (CFO)</p> <p>1.3.2 Refine fisheries sub decrees to facilitate community fisheries management</p> <p>1.3.3 Refine and apply the fisheries related elements of the common policy objectives developed by the TSBR secretariat.</p>	<p>Cap21</p> <p>ADB</p> <p>Cap 21</p>	<p>1.3.1 Six key staff within CFO are trained by end-Year 1.</p> <p>1.3.2 Necessary subdecrees are refined.</p> <p>1.3.3 Stakeholder consultation and information dissemination processes carried out in the five Project Provinces by end-Year 2 and on a continuing basis thereafter.</p>	<p>1.3.1 Staff records and performance records</p> <p>1.3.2 Gazette records</p> <p>1.3.3 Annual Report of DoF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff salaries for CFO and CFS are made available • The DoF endorses the common policy objectives developed by the TSBR Secretariat

<p>Component 2: Facilitating Community-Based Natural Resource Management in the TSBR</p> <p>2.1 <i>Coordination framework for community-based natural resource management is developed</i></p> <p>2.1.1 Prepare detail design document by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) implementation team</p> <p>2.1.2 Establish PIUs in the five Project provinces</p> <p>2.1.3 Establish Provincial Natural Resource Management Committees (PNRMCs)</p> <p>2.1.4 Implement training program for staff of relevant provincial line agencies</p>	<p>ADB</p> <p>ADB</p> <p>ADB</p> <p>Cap 21</p>	<p>2.1.1 Detailed design document prepared within first quarter of Year 1.</p> <p>2.1.2 PIUs established and operating in the five Project provinces by end-Year 1.</p> <p>2.1.3 PNRMCs operate within Year 1 and include NGOs, communities, provincial, and district line agencies</p> <p>2.1.4 Four staff each from Provincial DoF Community Fisheries Sections (CFS), DOE, and DA/DF per Project province are selected and trained by end-Year 1, of which half are dedicated to extension activities</p>	<p>2.1.1 Design document approved</p> <p>2.1.2 Operational records and participatory evaluations</p> <p>2.1.3 Minutes of meetings</p> <p>2.1.4 Training records</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely mobilization of FAO team under a service contract. • PNRMCs are able to successfully mobilize interest groups • Staff of suitable quality and orientation are made available.
<p>2.2 <i>Communities are empowered to manage resources</i></p> <p>2.2.1 Develop a selection process to identify and prioritize communities for social organization</p> <p>2.2.2 Conduct social organization</p> <p>2.2.3 Review boundaries and</p>	<p>ADB</p> <p>ADB</p> <p>ADB</p>	<p>2.2.1 Up to 60 fisheries communities and 20 forestry communities are organized in each of the five Project provinces by end-Year 5.</p> <p>2.2.2 Committees organized by mid-Year 1 and actively networking by end-Year 1.</p> <p>2.2.3 Agreements and endorsements on</p>	<p>2.2.1 Number of fisheries and forestry communities organized each year in each of the five Project provinces.</p> <p>2.2.2 Number of committee meetings and minutes of the meetings</p> <p>2.2.3 Number of written agreements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line agencies and resource users recognize community organizations. • The judicial system effectively validates conflict resolution by community organizations.

define community resource rights	ADB	boundaries and resource rights obtained not later than mid-Year 2	2.2.4 Community natural resource management plans	
2.2.4 Support development of community natural resource management plans	ADB	2.2.4 Community natural resource management plans (land use and zoning plans) for the transition zone of the TSBR in place by end-Year 2	2.2.5 Monitoring reports by independent institute (e.g., Cambodia Development Resource Institute)	
2.2.5 Mobilize NGOs to support community based natural resource management		2.2.5 NGOs actively engaged in supporting community based natural resource management from the first quarter of Year 1 and on a continuing basis thereafter.		
2.3 <i>Technical packages in support of sustainable livelihoods are demonstrated</i>	ADB	2.3.1 Technical packages for sustainable fisheries, aquaculture, agroforestry, and community forestry identified and developed by end-Year 2 and promoted on a continuing basis thereafter.	2.3.1 Number of technical packages for sustainable aquaculture, agroforestry, and community forestry identified, developed, and promoted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and development expertise is available. • Cooperation with other international bodies and line agencies is forthcoming, e.g., Mekong River Commission (MRC), Oxfam-Americas.
2.3.1 Identify, develop, and promote sustainable livelihoods based upon natural resource management	ADB	2.3.2 Opportunities for value adding of fishery products identified by end-Year 2 and demonstrated on a continuing basis thereafter.	2.3.2 Number of successful applications for value adding of fishery products	
2.3.2 Identify opportunities for value adding of fishery products, based on analysis of financial, management, and marketing aspects				
Component 3: Building Management Capacity for biodiversity conservation in the TSBR				
3.1 <i>Capacity for management of biodiversity in the core areas is</i>	ADB	3.1.1 Two Protected Area	3.1.1 Annual reports of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-stakeholder agreement on

<p><i>enhanced</i></p> <p>3.1.1 Establish and equip Protected Area Management Units and Core Area Management centers</p> <p>3.1.2 Demarcate core areas and buffer zone and develop overall core area and buffer zone management plans</p> <p>3.1.3 Develop and implement staff training in protected area management</p> <p>3.1.4 Institute a process for periodic assessment of potential additional core areas within the TSBR</p>	<p>GEF</p> <p>GEF</p> <p>GEF</p>	<p>Management Units established by end-Year 1 and three visitor centers established during Project life</p> <p>3.1.2 Core areas and buffer zone demarcated by end-Year 2, core area and buffer zone management plans in place by end-Year 2</p> <p>3.1.3 Execute comprehensive training needs analysis (TNA) by End-Year 1 and implement training program on an annual basis from Year 2 until Year 4.</p> <p>3.1.4 Core area designation process developed by mid-Year 1 and approved by end-Year 1 and applied on a continuing basis thereafter</p>	<p>MAFF and MoE</p> <p>3.1.2 Contract for map development</p> <p>3.1.3 Training attendance records</p> <p>3.1.4 frequency of assessment exercises</p>	<p>boundaries forthcoming</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff are made available for training.
<p>3.2 <i>Systems for monitoring and management of biodiversity are developed</i></p> <p>3.2.1 Design and implement a biodiversity monitoring program for TSBR</p> <p>3.2.2 Establish a rapid response mechanism for seasonal protection of key biodiversity.</p> <p>3.2.3 Develop a strategy for the control of exotic species and conduct management</p>	<p>GEF</p> <p>GEF</p> <p>GEF</p> <p>GEF</p>	<p>3.2.1 Identify indicator species for monitoring program by end-Year 1 and start monitoring program from Year 2 and on a continuing basis thereafter.</p> <p>3.2.2 Fully resourced rapid response team in operation by end-Year 1</p> <p>3.2.3 Strategy in place by mid-Year 2 and management trials operational by end-Year 2 and on a continuing basis thereafter</p>	<p>3.2.1 Biodiversity assessment reports and the TSBR-Environmental Database</p> <p>3.2.2 Frequency of rapid response exercises</p> <p>3.2.2 Surveys indicate that impacts on key biodiversity species are reduced</p> <p>3.2.4 Records of numbers of apprehended poachers and illegal users</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring accurately targets key biodiversity and results feed back into management decision making • The PA designation and demarcation mechanism can be sufficiently flexible. • Exotic species are controllable at existing limits of spread with the resources available • Officials are not amenable to

<p>trials</p> <p>3.2.4 Develop and implement a strategy to enforce laws and regulations in and around core areas</p> <p>3.2.5 Identify income-generation activities that directly threaten biodiversity in the core areas and develop alternative livelihoods to modify these activities</p>	<p>GEF</p>	<p>3.2.4 Strategy in place by mid-Year 2 and enforcement operational by end-Year 2 and on a continuing basis thereafter</p> <p>3.2.5 Target focus groups identified by end-Year-1, demonstration trials underway in all three core areas by end-Year 2, and expanding/replicated thereafter</p>	<p>3.2.5 Reduction in (number of persons involved in) livelihood activities that threaten biodiversity</p>	<p>bribery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative livelihoods can be identified and supported, and do not end up forming supplementary (instead of alternative) sources of income.
<p>3.3 <i>Promote awareness, education and outreach on biodiversity conservation in TSBR</i></p> <p>3.3.1 Develop and implement Environmental Awareness, Education and Outreach Program (EAEOP)</p> <p>3.3.2 Provide floating education centers</p> <p>3.3.3 Integrate EAEOP into selected schools around the TSBR</p>	<p>GEF</p> <p>GEF</p> <p>GEF</p>	<p>3.3.1 Strategy for EAEOP and education tools developed by end-Year 2. Outreach program operational in the four Project provinces at mid-Year 3</p> <p>3.3.2 Four floating education centers equipped and operational by mid-Year 3</p> <p>3.3.3 EAEOP integrated into "cluster schools" program of Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MOEYS)</p>	<p>3.3.1 Numbers of villages and schools hosting outreach events</p> <p>3.3.2 Numbers of visitors to floating education centers</p> <p>3.3.3 Numbers of schools endorsing the EAEOP</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing school curricula is flexible enough to allow uptake of EAEOP Teachers are available

Annex C: Response to STAP Review

C1. A possible weakness noted by the STAP reviewer is a lack of a clear and comprehensive strategy to ensure long-term cost recovery and financial sustainability. Continued investment beyond the project will be needed, particularly in conservation and community-based activities, and consideration should be given to adding a permanent trust fund or similar sustainable financing mechanism (SFM) to provide for this. The scale of the long-term financing need should be assessed as soon as possible, and the design and fund-raising efforts to capitalize the SFM should be undertaken during project implementation. This would help the project to address the long-term future without delaying the urgently-needed start of this important initiative.

Several paragraphs have now been added on financial sustainability, based on the UNDP internal reviewer's comments. Possibilities for establishing a trust fund for future conservation activities was explored, but rejected on the grounds that i) the supporting legal framework is not in place (e.g. laws that allow charitable organizations to be exempt from tax), and ii) the absence of internationally credible legal and financial institutions that can provide an independent and quality service.

C2. The biodiversity section has been reinstated into the brief (was erroneously omitted).

The STAP reviewer commented that the project brief is not clear on the role of fees to be charged by government for the use of biosphere reserve resources, and noted that the issue of cost recovery and government ability to make adequate budgetary allocations could usefully have been treated in more detail, and the lack of a comprehensive strategy to ensure financial sustainability for non-governmental dimensions of the project.

The section on sustainability has been greatly expanded and includes a substantial section on financial sustainability. Possibilities for establishing a trust fund for future conservation activities at TSBR were explored, but rejected on the grounds that i) the supporting legal framework is not in place in Cambodia (e.g. laws that allow charitable organizations to be exempt from tax), and ii) the absence of internationally credible legal and financial institutions that can provide an independent and quality service.

The STAP reviewer commented that there remains a concern that substantial project investment in a very poor, rural area may stimulate in-migration, leading to worse pressures at project completion than would otherwise have been the case. Seasonal migration into the TSBR is already an issue, and is one of the main reasons for focusing on securing tenure rights and developing community NRM plans.

-
- ⁱ In conformity with the requirements of the policy on cofinancing (see paper for GEF/C.20). These categories can be expanded if needed. The amounts are in dollars, not in thousands or millions of dollars.
- ⁱⁱ Where there is more than one agency involved, the amount channeled through each would be specified separately.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Type includes: bilateral, multilateral, beneficiary, government, regional/national institutions, private equity, public equity, other.
- ^{iv} As above.
- ^v If multicountry, include names of all countries in which activities will take place and which will endorse the project. If global, state GLOBAL.
- ^{vi} Do not repeat the name of the country or names of the countries in the title.
- ^{vii} The GEF Implementing Agency or Executing Agency with direct access. Where there is an Executing Agency operating under expanded opportunities but without direct access, include first the IA and then the EA. Where more than one IA, include all.
- ^{viii} National executing agency or agencies, or other intermediate organization such as a regional body or multilateral organization that is executing the project.
- ^{ix} Include OP# or identify if a short term measure (STRM) or full-size Enabling Activity (EA).
- ^x Strategic priorities will be proposed for Council consideration in the context of the GEF Business Plan.
- ^{xi} All the key indicators of expected outcome that apply, irrespective of principal focal area or OP. The key indicators of interest here are those in the Policy Recommendations in the form accepted by Council.
- Additional land under improved management for conservation or protection (ha.);
 - Additional productive landscape under conservation (ha.) including land around protected areas that are under productive use, but supporting habitats and ecosystems;
 - GHG emissions avoided or sequestered (tCO₂)
 - Amount of methyl bromide and HCFCs phased out (ODPt)
 - Land protected from degradation (ha.)
- ^{xii} Endorsements are required from Operational Focal Points in each country where activities would take place.
- ^{xiii} The accountable officer should be the staff member authorized to agree to any changes required in the project proposal (e.g., the GEF Executive Coordinator)
- ^{xiv} There is ongoing work. Coordinated by the M&E unit, on indicators. Agreed indicators will be incorporated in the format.
- ^{xv} Refer to the *GEF Project Review Criteria* for the following sections, in *GEF Project Cycle* GEF/C.16/Inf.7 Annex A1.
- ^{xvi} The financing plan is on the first page and need not be repeated here. Further information on the financial instrument should be described, in accordance with the review criteria.
- ^{xvii} Whichever are relevant.
- ^{xviii} Replaces the standard annex on the response to the STAP Review.
- ^{xix} From *GEF Project Cycle*, GEF/C.16/Inf.7 Annex A1
- ^{xx} No endorsement from national operational focal point is required at pipeline entry if no project preparation funds are requested.
- ^{xxi} A project/program could undertake detailed design (specification of project outputs) during the first phase of implementation, with clear benchmarks for approval of the subsequent phase. A project could also be an adaptable program loan with several phases, where achievement of the clear benchmarks at the end of each phase is a necessary condition for approval of the next phase. In such projects, describe in detail the project output for the first phase and describe briefly the project activities for that phase.
- ^{xxii} STAP Roster Review, and IA response, is a required annex of the project brief.