



# Eighth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme (Tranche II)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11698

**Countries**

Global (Uganda, Cuba, Marshall Islands, Cook Islands, Indonesia, Kenya, South Sudan, Tajikistan, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Chile, Nicaragua, Guyana, Venezuela, Jamaica)

**Project Name**

Eighth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme (Tranche II)

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

9/20/2024

**Review completed by PM**

9/25/2024

**Program Manager**

Elsa Temm

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

### 1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/24/2024

Yes. The project meets the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding, responding to GEF-8 Programming Strategy and the SGP 2.0 Implementation Arrangements for GEF-8.

Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

### 2. Project Summary

**Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?**

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/24/2024

Cleared

GRT: 9/24/2024

Not fully.

The summary describes problems to be addressed, as well as project objectives and strategies to deliver GEBs and other expected results, including livelihood outcomes, emphasizing social inclusion of vulnerable and marginalized groups. Please, however, address the following:

1. Consider limiting the word count to the 250 words (the summary is currently 343 words).
2. Consider reframing the project around the important role CSO's to deliver on GEBs (not only as vulnerable social groups and socio-ecological resilience) as well as experiences of GEF investment in SGP for over 30 years with UNDP.
3. Elaborate on the projects' alignment and adherence to the SGP 2.0 Implementation Arrangements and Operational Guidelines for the SGP 2.0 in GEF-8

### Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks. Please see the revised summary, the word count is now limited to under 250 words.

### 3 Indicative Project Overview

**3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?**

**b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**

### Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/24/2024

Now cleared

Almost all comments addressed. However, relevant component type i.e. INV or TA is still missing in component 3.

GRT: 9/24/2024

Not yet.

a) Project objective presented is clear and stated as "Community-based and civil society organizations are technically and financially supported to design and deliver locally led initiatives that address complex socio-ecological challenges to foster resilience, enhance livelihoods and deliver global environmental benefits". Please enter for each component the relevant component type i.e. INV or TA accordingly. Component 2 and 3 are missing such component type in the Portal PIF entry.

b) No. While the overall, the components and outcomes are appropriate to achieve the project objective and indicators, please address the following:

- Component 1: Program co-design and inclusive governance (budgeted as TA): The percentage of 15% for this component (out of the total financing amount) appears to be very high considering the project scope and outputs. It is not clear from the outputs or the component description of how this amount will strengthen CSOs/CBOs' capacities to deliver community-led grants. Please kindly clarify, review and revise further.
- Please confirm if component 2 of \$12,600,396 is 100% intended for grants to CSOs/CBOs. If it is, then the grants to CSOs/CBOs ratio over total project costs including agency fee is only 66% (\$12,600,396/\$19,079,464). Please revise the budget to increase the grants to CSOs/CBO ratio to 72% of total project costs including agency fee as per the SGP 2.0 policy in the SGP 2.0 Implementation Arrangements for GEF-8.
- Component 3. Knowledge Management and Learning: The allocation to this component suggests a 6% of the total project cost, exceeding the 3% target described in the SGP 2.0 Implementation Arrangements for GEF-8. Please review and revise accordingly.

While reviewing the above, please consider the below suggestions to:

1. Revise the overall balance and allocations of the components and providing a breakdown of budget/output to better explain the budget distribution.
2. Consider the re-assignment of resources between components to reflect the parameters established in the SGP 2.0 Implementation Arrangements for GEF-8.
3. Consider transferring budget from Component 1 to Component 2 and/or provide further explanation and clarification of the nature of the investments to be made and the activities to be implemented, i.e. as technical assistance/capacity development.

### Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

The % of Component 1 was reduced and component description revised accordingly, this component includes technical assistance and capacity building in line with the 3% target under Output 1.2.

The % of component 2 was revised in line with the 72% grant ratio.

The % of component 3 was revised in line with the 3% target for KM&L.

**3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?**

## Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/24/2024

Cleared

GRT: 9/24/2024

Almost. Important considerations on gender equality and inclusion of other important stakeholders such as youth, indigenous peoples and persons with disabilities are incorporated in all 4 components.

However, considering the emphasis placed on these stakeholders in the SGP 2.0 (and consistent with the Implementation Arrangements, the Operational Guidelines and the Results Framework) please elaborate on gender responsive measures in the narrative description of the project's components.

With regards to KM and M&E ? see above comments on funding.

## Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

The narrative description of project components was revised accordingly.

**3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?**

**b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**

**c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

## Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/24/2024

Cleared

GRT: 9/24/2024

a) Not yet: Please see comments above

b) Yes: Cofinancing is set at a ratio of 1:1 to the GEF Project Grant and outlined in the Indicative Cofinancing Table, including contribution in kind and grants through diverse actors. please be advised that these will ne need to be confirmed during the CEO endorsement.

c) Partly: The PMC is set at 5%, however please be aware that, in line with the SGP 2.0 Implementation Arrangements, that cap for PMC is 10% of the total project costs (net of Agency fee).

#### Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

PMC is now set at 10%.

### 4 Project Outline

#### A. Project Rationale

##### 4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

**a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?**

**b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/24/2024

Cleared

GRT: 9/24/2024

Almost. The overarching situation is adequately described and includes overview of key barriers. However, some additional information and specific details on the counties included in this project would be appreciated, as well as more detailed information related to the four countries that include co-management arrangements (Cuba, Jamaica, Uganda, and Venezuela) that have signed LOIs and LOEs with UNDP.

#### Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

The baseline situations in the participating SGP countries and co-management arrangements where applicable will be further examined during the stakeholders? engagement process that will

take place during the formulation phase to inform the Global SGP ProDoc. This is now reflected in the PIF accordingly.

#### **4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT**

- a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**
- b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?**
- c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?**
- d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/24/2024

Cleared

GRT: 9/24/2024

Almost.

The project describes efforts to enable partnerships with CBOs/CSOs by providing adequate financial and technical support to enable locally led solutions to complex socio-ecological issues faced by local communities. It looks to combine financial grants with tailored technical assistance, training, organizational strengthening, capacity development, coordination among actors at landscape and seascape levels and the expansion of knowledge management, communication, and monitoring.

While the project reference strategy to build on previous SGP programming, additional information related to ongoing UNDP SGP programs and situational assessment of new countries should be provided.

#### Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

The stakeholders' engagement process during ProDoc formulation will provide an accurate snapshot of the current state of the ongoing SGP programs and inform relevant situational assessments in the new countries.

#### **5 B. Project Description**

## 5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

**a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?**

**b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?**

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/24/2024

Cleared

GRT: 9/24/2024

Mostly.

The theory of change describes the logic and causal pathways of the project, including how activities will address barriers and contribute to the outcomes and goal of the project.

However, please include in the ToC diagram and accompanying narrative, additional specific linkages to the GEBs and core indicators expected to be achieved with this project.

Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

ToC's associated description was revised to include linkages to SGP 2.0 Core Indicators and GEBs.

## 5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

**Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

## 5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

**a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?**

**b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).**



**c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area**

**d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/24/2024

Cleared

GRT: 9/24/2024

Not fully.

It is noted the project is envisaged to be executed under a direct implementation modality and that; *?context-specific implementation arrangements will be actively explored in the participating countries at the local, national and global level in close coordination with relevant stakeholders?.* Furthermore that *?CSOs-led co-execution arrangements to be determined on a case-by-case basis in line with national priorities, local needs and the capacities of potential responsible parties?.*

In this context, please:

1. Provide a justification for the direct implementation modality
2. Provide an update on assessment of possible national executing arrangements prior to CEO endorsement and ensure that the guiding principles behind the country level governance and implementation arrangements, as set out in the Operational Guidelines are respected.
3. Clarify further the required separation of implementing and executing functions (within GEF Agency) in accordance with GEF Policy on Minimum Fiduciary Standards and provide an organigram which clearly presents the separation of implementing and execution functions at both the global and national levels, including firewalls between the delivery of program oversight and quality assurance performed by FAO and program execution undertaken by FAO.
4. Given that GEF resources in at least 4 countries are to be divided between FAO and UNDP, please provide further details of the expected (co-management) implementation and execution arrangements, in these countries.

Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

This section was revised to further explain the execution arrangements and the separation of implementation and execution functions.

During ProDoc formulation, country assessments will be conducted to determine potential national execution arrangements on a case-by-case basis in line with SGP 2.0? Operational Guidelines and in consultations with country stakeholders.

Co-management arrangements will be further explored during ProDoc formulation using tripartite consultations to ensure maximum coordination, harness synergies and complementarities while supporting a smooth transition from OP7 to OP8.

**5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?**

**b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?**

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/24/2024

Cleared

GRT: 9/24/2024

Mostly. 4 of the 11 GEF-8 core indicators are to be reported against (3, 4, 5 and 11). The indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits appear to be reasonable and achievable. However, further information please on how these were calculated beyond *?The estimated targets for the core indicators and sub-indicators reflect the causal pathways, assumptions and risks to be finetuned during ?PPG consultations? specific to each country?.*

Please reference the SGP-specific Results Framework included in the SGP 2.0 Operational Guidelines for GEF-8, including the SGP-specific indicators 12 and 13, and elaborate how these will be measured and reported against.

Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

Targets for core indicators 3, 4, 5 and 11 were estimated using the available information at PIF stage, which is based on assumptions and causal pathways. Given the demand driven nature of the SGP, it is only by engaging country stakeholders during project preparation through consultations

that these estimates could be further fine-tuned based on past performance, actual national priorities and local needs. For example, in line with the SGP 2.0 guidelines to use sex, age, and disability disaggregated data to inform program design and enable results-based monitoring, the target for core indicator 11 (45,000 beneficiaries including 22,500 women, 7,200 youth and 7,200 persons with disabilities) was determined using global averages given the global nature of the project, these will be revised following country consultations to reflect country-specific contexts prior to CEO endorsement.

SGP-specific indicators 12 and 13 were added to the Core Indicators? table, with initial estimates for targets related to women and youth beneficiaries included. To determine the remaining targets for Core Indicator 9 and SGP-specific indicators 12 and 13, consultations will be conducted with country stakeholders during ProDoc formulation to gather data and inputs based on past performance, local needs and the demographics of potential landscapes and seascapes. The program will design and deploy an online platform and an innovative monitoring tool to build data management capacity at country level, it will facilitate the submission of grant proposals and streamline the grants? review, monitoring and reporting processes.

**5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

**5.6 RISKS**

**a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?**

**b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**

**c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/24/2024

Yes. The overall risk rating has been set as Moderate. The key risks, their rating and a Rating Explanation of risk and mitigation measures are addressed in the project concept design. Risks cited include Climate risks, environment and social political and governance, macroeconomic, strategies and policies, technical design of project or program, Institutional capacity for implementation and sustainability, fiduciary: Financial Management and Procurement, and stakeholder engagement. The ESS screening report has been submitted and the risk ratings are consistent.

Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

**5.7 Qualitative assessment**

**a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**

**b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**

**c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/24/2024

Yes. The project emphasizes innovation and cross learning as key elements of its strategy. Under Output 3.1, a fusion approach will be used by blending traditional knowledge with technological and policy innovations to support socio-ecological solutions that are socially acceptable and compatible with traditional laws, customs and cultural values. The project will look to mainstream innovations into SGP proposals as part of the incubation services provided to grantees, for example through FAO's experience in developing Acceleration Zones. The project further discusses development of participatory country program strategies at the inception phase, aligned with national targets and MEAs. Further details on strategies for scaling up local initiatives are expected to be incorporated and articulated prior to CEO Endorsement.

Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

**6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities**

**6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?**

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/24/2024

Yes. The project is aligned with the SGP 2.0 thematic priorities as outlined in the GEF-8 Strategy and programming directions. The project references GEF-8 focal area strategies and Integrated

Programs. Further details on the project alignment are expected to be incorporated and articulated prior to CEO Endorsement.

Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

**6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)**

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/24/2024

Yes. Further detailed descriptions of alignment and contribution to MEAs, including UNFCCC, UNCCD, and CBD as well as tentative linkages with the Global Biodiversity Framework Fund (GBFF) to be expected and articulated prior to CEO Endorsement.

Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

**6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?**

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/24/2024

Cleared

GRT: 9/24/2024

Almost. The project states that SGP-supported socio-ecological initiatives are expected to deliver biodiversity targets aligned with all the 23 GBF targets, but only goes on to list 4 of these aligned with 4 core indicators. Please expand on the specific target numbers.

Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

The text was revised to list the specific target numbers.

#### **7 D. Policy Requirements**

##### **7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?**

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/24/2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

##### **7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?**

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/24/2024

Yes. A list of stakeholders and dates of consultation is provided. Furthermore, a Stakeholder Engagement Plan is planned to be developed before CEO endorsement. During the development of the country program strategies, it is also mentioned that further consultations will take place.

Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

#### **8 Annexes**

##### **Annex A: Financing Tables**

**8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

**STAR allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/24/2024

Cleared

GRT: 9/24/2024

Mostly. The distribution of budget resources/component should be revised as commented in section 3.

Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

The financial tables were revised accordingly.

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/24/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat's Comments<sub>n/a</sub>

Agency's Comments

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's Comments

**SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?**

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/24/2024

Cleared

GRT: 9/24/2024

No PPG is requested. Please remove references to PPG in the main text or explain further.

Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

This was revised accordingly.

**8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat's Comments



GRT: 9/24/2024

Yes. Cofinancing is outlined in the Indicative Cofinancing Table, including contribution in kind and grants through diverse actors. These will need to be confirmed during the CEO endorsement.

#### Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

#### Annex B: Endorsements

**8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/24/2024

Cleared

GRT: 9/24/2024

Not yet.

1. Cuba - No LOI uploaded in the portal. Please provide LOI
2. Uganda - Uganda has requested a similar STAR amount from both FAO and UNDP in two separate LOEs: for FAO \$1,154,000 dated 11 Sept. For UNDP, dated 29 Jan for 1,543,228. Please check, confirm with OFP and revise.
3. Zambia ? Not included in your PIF. Please remove LOE/LOI from portal
4. Jamaica - LOI in portal - please confirm that STAR is allocated to UNDP and not FAO
5. South Sudan: - Please note that the LOI states that project will be executed by Ministry of environment (please see above comment on government entity executing SGP project)
6. Chile - please note that LOI states that project will be executed by Ministry of environment (please see above comment on government entity executing SGP project)
7. Indonesia - No LOE in Portal. Please provide an LOE

#### Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

Please note that Zambia's LoI/LoE were already removed and do not show in the portal under Annex A (Record of endorsement of GEF OFPs). FAO received an LoI and no LoE from Jamaica. Cuba's LoI, Indonesia's LoE, and the revised Letters from Chile (LoI/LoE) and South Sudan (LoE) were uploaded.

**Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?**

Secretariat's Commentssee above comments

Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

**Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?**

Secretariat's Commentssee above comments

Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

**8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?**

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's Comments

**Annex C: Project Location**

**8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?**

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/24/2024

Cleraed

GRT: 9/24/2024

Partly. It is noted that the targeted landscapes and seascapes will be identified during the inception phase as part of the formulation of the country program strategies. Please provide additional georeferenced information at CEO Endorsement.

Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

Georeferenced data made available during country consultations during project formulation will be provided at CEO Endorsement.

#### **Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating**

**8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?**

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 9/24/2024

Yes. Safeguard screening document has been uploaded and there is consistence in risk ratings.

Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

#### **Annex E: Rio Markers**

**8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?**

Secretariat's Commentsyes.

Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

**Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet**

**8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?**

Secretariat's Commentsyes.

Agency's Comments

10/17/2024

Noted with thanks.

**Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's Comments

**9 GEFSEC Decision**

**9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?**

Secretariat's Comments

GRT: 10/24/2024.

Cleared

Please address missing component type for component type 3

GRT: 09/24/2024

Not yet. Please respond and address the above comments.

Agency's Comments

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>9/25/2024</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/24/2024</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		