Inclusive GEF Assembly Challenge Programme in Developing Countries

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11499
Countries

Global (Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, St. Vincent and Grenadines, Nigeria, Kenya, Tunisia, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Peru, Mexico, Thailand, China, Ecuador, Philippines, Suriname, Panama, Uganda)
Project Name

Inclusive GEF Assembly Challenge Programme in Developing Countries
Agencies

UNIDO
Date received by PM

2/13/2024
Review completed by PM

5/10/2024
Program Manager

Aloke Barnwal
Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

CEO Approval Request

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

UNIDO 22 May 2024

?In response to the GEFSec comments shared on 18 May 2024, participant countries list added next to "Global".

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

2. Project Summary.

a) 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?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project, is well written and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

- Please provide the project IDs which are highlighted in yellow.

- Please add the grant amount in the table 1 of the initiatives.

- In the first paragraph, please add that these initiatives were selected as winners through a global challenge organized as a special initiative under the Seventh GEF Assembly.

GEFSEC May 9 2024- Thanks. No further comments.

Agency Response

UNIDO 29/04/2024

- Provided. For the SCCF GEF ID: 11499

GEF ID project numbers revised throughout the document as well.

- Done.

- Done. Included in the middle of the first paragraph.

3. Project Description Overview
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?
c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and appropriately funded?
d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10%? If above 10%, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

a) Please consider slightly revising the objective to highlight other environmental benefits more explicitly. Once modified please revise it in all the places in the document.

e.g. To empower and support civil society organisations (CSOs) and community-based organisations (CBOs) in developing countries to implement high-impact and innovative initiatives that deliver climate change adaptation and environmental benefits in an inclusive manner.

b)

Outcome 1.1- please revise the language to read it like an outcome. "Dialogue" indicates more of process or output. What outcome is expected through the events, dialogues, workshops, webpage, communications, webinars, etc.? Perhaps you may consider "Enabling environment created for global dialogue, cross learning, knowledge sharing and enhancing inclusive community resilience and environmental benefits".

Output 1.1.1 - suggesting to revise it as " Strengthened inclusivity of the selected initiatives through the organization of at least three (3) thematic events and six (6) virtual meetings to allow for knowledge sharing, showcasing and learning.

PC2- please remove CCA in the outcomes and outputs considering that some of the initiatives are not purely CCA even though they would have adaptation benefits.

GEFSEC May 9 2024- Thanks.

Agency Response
UNIDO 29/04/2024

a) Done.

b) Done.

4. Project Outline
A. Project Rationale
a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?
b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?
c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
In the rationale- please make some reference to importance of biodiversity management and conservation and its inherent link with addressing climate change. Given that the winners include some projects which are more explicitly targeting BD and LD related interventions, it would be useful to provide some context and linkages between climate adaptation and conservation/management of natural resources and biodiversity.

In the descriptions and elsewhere "GEF/UNIDO project" is not needed to be stated necessarily. It is indeed funded by GEF through SCCF and would be implemented by UNIDO. So, it is obvious. Please remove such references.

GEFSEC May 9 2024- Thanks.

Agency Response
UNIDO 29/04/2024

- Paragraph added to Rationale.

- Done.

5 B. Project Description
5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the

project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?
b) Is there a description of how theGEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?
c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks are properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?
d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?
e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?
f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?
g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this MSP)?
h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?
i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component description/s?
j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?
k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?
l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

In the project description bullets, please add benefits related to biodiversity, NRM, pollution,, etc. also as some projects are more contributing to them rather than CCA explicitly. A link could be made that these benefits would lead to long term resilience of communities and the ecosystem, which are already vulnerable to climate change.

In terms of benefits, are there initiatives which have articulated benefits related to sustainable management of land and biodiversity? If yes, it would be useful to specify. The GHG emission reduction potential seems very high given that it is not an intended benefit. Please provide supportive methodology data.

GEFSEC May 9 2024- Thanks.

Agency Response
UNIDO 29/04/2024

Done. The following was added to the bullet points:

●Reduce vulnerability through locally-led adaptation, promoting biodiversity conservation, natural resource management, and pollution reduction.

●Implement holistic land management strategies, including sustainable practices, reforestation, and community-based approaches, to preserve soil fertility, combat deforestation, promote carbon sequestration, ensure sustainable land use, and safeguard ecosystems and biodiversity.

●Implement comprehensive pollution reduction measures, including promoting sustainable practices, adopting cleaner energy sources, and raising awareness, to safeguard ecosystems and human health.

The GHG calculations were removed throughout the project document because GHG emissions reduction is not the main focus of the project and it is not part of the core indicators. In addition, the figure previously provided is merely an aggregation of the individual proponent estimates which cannot be validated in absence of a methodology to calculate GHG emissions reduction.

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.
a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?
b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?
c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Please provide a justification for UNIDO's role as the Executing Agency.

GEFSEC May 9 2024- Thanks. For Manager's approval.

Agency Response
UNIDO 29/04/2024

- Done.

5.3 Core indicators
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 targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core

indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please consolidate the sectoral distribution. 1% allocation is quite minimal and could be merged with others. Please see if other consolidation is possible.

The GHG emission reduction estimate is very high for a small project like this. Please review. Any GHG estimation should be supported with analysis.

Has the number of beneficiaries also provided by the winners? For a project of this size, it looks very high.

The CI 2 is not consistent with the table provided in the project description. The table in the description indicates 208,503 hectares, whereas the indicator table says 208.01 ha. Pleas make it consistent and also be more realistic in setting this target.

The sub-indicators are not visible in the portal entry. All look zero. Given that this a one-step project, this is required.

GEFSEC May 9 2024- Thanks. Comments cleared.

Agency Response

UNIDO 29/04/2024

- The GHG calculations were removed throughout the project document because GHG emissions reduction is not the main focus of the project and it is not part of the core indicators. In addition, the figure previously provided is merely an aggregation of the individual proponent estimates which cannot be validated in absence of a methodology to calculate GHG emissions reduction.

- Yes, the number of beneficiaries was provided by the winners.

- The hectare indicators was also provided by the winners.

- This could be due to a technical issue, in any case we have inserted them again.

5.4 Risks

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

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 and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. Please also mention the alignment with the four sectoral themes which are for both the LDCF and SCCF.

GEFSEC May 9 2024- Thanks. Comments cleared.

Agency Response

UNIDO 29/04/24

- Done.

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 comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

For the KMGF targets, please streamline and consolidate to a few as relevant and provide some justification.

GEFSEC May 9 2024- Thanks. Comments cleared.

Agency Response
UNIDO 29/04/2024

We have reduced them to the following targets: contributing towards the achievement of the following targets: 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 20, 21, 22 and 23.

Also inserted this explanation under section C: Through the implementation of the selected initiatives, various aspects of biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management, and community resilience are addressed. By empowering local communities, promoting sustainable practices, and fostering inclusive approaches, the Projects aims to protect biodiversity, enhance ecosystem services, and contribute to the overall well-being of both people and the planet. The commitment to these targets underscores the project's dedication to achieving global biodiversity goals and creating a more sustainable and resilient future

7 D. Policy Requirements
7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response
7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response
7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response
8 Annexes
Annex A: Financing Tables
8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: 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 comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is PPG reimbursement requested and if so, is it within the eligible cap of USD 50,000?

b) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the OFP?s LOE? Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country?s STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines? e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

UNIDO 22 May 2024

?In response to the GEFSec comments shared on 18 May 2024, the LoE for Ecuador, Mexico and China were uploaded in the section where the other LoE are. We have also uploaded them under roadmap documents for easy access should GEF be unable to access it from the LoE section due to a technical glitch.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

8.6 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project before the PIF submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.7 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of the budget (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes, please refer to the comments related to the core indicators and adjust the results framework as appropriate.

Agency Response

UNIDO 29/04/2024

Done.

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.8 Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the project interventions will take place ?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

UNIDO 22 May 2024

?In response to the GEFSec comments shared on 18 May 2024, geo-locations have been added for project locations.

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.9 Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.10 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.11 a) 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.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Not yet. Please address the comments provided in the review sheet and attach the OFP letters received since submission of the CEO approval document.

GEFSEC May 9 2024- The project is technically cleared for PPO's review.

GEFSEC May 18, 2024- The agency is requested to address the following comments and resubmit the project

PO comments:

1. In General Project Information, please include the participant countries next to ?Global? in the field ?Country(ies)?.

2. Geolocation: fields related to the geo location of project activities are empty. You may consider adding the location of project activities, as available and applicable, with the location name, latitude, longitude, and Geo Name ID in the dedicated fields.

3. Letters of Endorsement (LoEs) review: I couldn?t find the LoEs for Ecuador, Mexico and China ? if you know where they are, please let me know, otherwise, please ask for them.

GEFSEC May 22, 2024

The Agency has addressed all the comments. The project is technically cleared by the PM.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	**4/1/2024**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**5/16/2024**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**5/22/2024**	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		