



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

GEF ID:	9861		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Fostering Partnerships to Build Coherence and Support for Forest Landscape Restoration		
GEF Agency:	IUCN	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-2 Program 3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$30,000	Project Grant:	\$625,000
Co-financing:	\$722,000	Total Project Cost:	\$1,347,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Joshua Schneck

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	07/07/2017 UA: Yes. Aligned with LD-2, program 3.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	07/07/2017 UA: This is a global project.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and	07/07/2017 UA: Yes.	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>07/07/2017 UA: Yes. Adequate at this stage.</p> <p>In the fully developed project document to be submitted for final CEO approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elaborate on the baseline scenario to include baseline that goes beyond a list of CPF member activities/projects, and - Elaborate on the incremental reasoning in relation to the baseline, so that the added value of the proposed project is better carved out. 	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>07/07/2017 UA: Yes.</p> <p>In the fully developed project document to be submitted for final CEO approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly define institutional arrangements including allocation of leads / tasks to different CPF members, and - Strengthen the role of and harness exiting research in the initiative. 	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>07/07/2017 UA: Yes.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Availability of Resources	7. 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? 	07/07/2017 UA: To be funded out of LD global set-asides.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	07/07/2017 UA: To be funded out of LD global set-asides.	
	<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"> Focal area set-aside? 	07/07/2017 UA: Yes. LD global set aside funding is available. In the fully developed project document to be submitted for final CEO approval: - make efforts to increase the cash co-financing contributions by CPF members and/or other sources.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	07/07/2017 UA: Yes. Program Manager recommends the project for CEO PIF approval. Please note comments to be addressed at final CEO endorsement stage.	
Review Date	Review	July 07, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.