

GEF SGP 7th Operational Phase – Core (Part 1)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10084

Countries

Global

Project Name

GEF SGP 7th Operational Phase – Core (Part 1)

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

10/19/2019

Review completed by PM

4/13/2020

Program Manager

Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Cleared 03/26/2020

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Comments addressed

Cleared 03/26/2020

02/14/2020 Yes, but please clarify the following:

In addition to the SGP thematic strategic initiatives, SGP will deploy the following cross-cutting initiatives as Grantmakers Plus and social inclusion activities (i.e. *CSO-Government-Private Sector Policy and Planning Dialogue Platforms*)

However, there's no description of how these initiatives will be deployed (in the form of grants, through a centralized mechanism, etc.)

Please explain and revise 02/14/2020

Agency Response

Thank you for the comment. We would like to offer the following clarifications. The Grant-maker Plus approaches are purposefully designed to promote cross-cutting initiatives that help accomplish several objectives for the SGP. While programming directions and procedures are defined at the global level as with the case for all SGP Strategic Initiatives, the actual activities are identified, planned and implemented at the country level applying the same process as all SGP grants. As such all resources ear-marked as grant-maker plus will be delivered as grants to appropriate CSO/CBO grantees. For example, dedicated grant maker support to the CSO-Government-Private Sector dialogue platforms will be managed by a relevant CSO at the country level to encourage strong partnerships among CSOs, government, private sector to replicate and scale up successful projects from pilot innovations to the mainstream. Targeted grant maker plus portfolio and projects managed by the CSO/CBOs will also promote the required social inclusion, including women, indigenous peoples, youth, and persons with disabilities. Finally, this window will also further community level innovations on any other emerging environmental and development issues, including those identified through participatory process of formulating the Country Programme Strategies.

New text added to clarify that grant maker plus are deployed at the country level in the form of grants to CSOs/NGOs – both UNDP Project Document and GEF CEO Endorsement Request

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/04/2020

Revision provided

Cleared

04/28/2020

Revision provided - 04/13/2020

However, for the one type of in-kind co-financing classified as IM, please note that where co-financing truly meets the definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized". For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines

Revision requested.

03/26/2020

Explanation provided but further revision needed:

Based on the evidence of co-financing provided, we have the following comments:

We take note and accept as evidence, the letter of co-financing signed by UNDP in the amount of \$4 million, which verbatim states that: ' UNDP is committed to the provision of \$4,000,000 in co-financing to support SGP implementation during OP7. As the Implementing Agency, UNDP has over years already provided significant levels of co-financing and will continue to do so'.

However, please note that as per GEF's respective Guidance (https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf), evidence of co-financing (i.e. a letter in this case) must be provided for each source of co-financing **and "pooling" of these resources in one co-financing letter is not correct.**

Therefore, please remove from the Portal and Pro-Doc as well as the response any text that may refer to this co-financing provided by UNDP as **pooled resources** from other sources.

In addition, please ensure that information in table C on co-financing is in line with what is provided in the co-financing letter and consequently, please revise the description on “how investment mobilized was identified”.

Revision and Clarification requested.

03/26/2020

2/14/2020

No.

The co-financing includes grant and in-kind co-financing for a total of \$64 million.

However, there’s no evidence of co-financing provided (no letters included in the request). While we understand that the co-financing at the small grant level will depend on the grants itself and it will only be confirmed later, as per the Policy on co-financing, “Agencies may report Co-Financing that is expected to be mobilized during project implementation from entities that are not known at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval, particularly in the case of Co-Financing from the private sector or beneficiaries. In such cases, Agencies may provide supporting evidence in the form of official project documentation with requirements that such Co-Financing be mobilized at a clearly expressed minimum level, over a pre-defined time frame.”

At this stage, evidence of co-financing (in the form of letters, agreed minutes, legal agreements or memoranda, etc.) from other donors and government should be provided. Please refer to the Policy Requirements (page 4 of document: https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf)

In addition, please review the Investment Mobilized” (IM) included in the table. “Investment Mobilized means Co-Financing that excludes recurrent expenditures” There are some in-kind co-financing that has been classified as IM. Please also clarify how the co-financing classified as Investment Mobilized meets that definition.

Needs revision.

Agency Response

Response 05/01/2020

We thank the reviewer for the comment. All co-finance that are in-kind have now been classified as “recurrent expenditures”.

Table C - co-finance in CEO ER document has been revised

Response 04/08/2020

We take note of the comments and removed all references to “pooled” funds from the portal responses and from the UNDP Project document.

Also, as suggested, we revised the table C in CEO endorsement document and added a note under the table to describe how “investment mobilized” were identified.

New text on IM under table C

Previous Responses

As for the Investment Mobilized figures, as far as possible these were estimated based on discussions with the SGP national personnel and other sources identified at the country level and also based on past experience with co-financing efforts. SGP requests grant recipient CSOs to contribute to their projects in cash to the best of their abilities, and have successfully secured significant amount of cash cofinance in the past. In all countries, the National Steering Committee (NSC) will support the SGP National Coordinator to follow this policy as appropriate. These contributions however will only be confirmed during project implementation at the time of grant project approval. To the extent possible, co-financing commitments has been differentiated between those corresponding to recurrent costs e.g. salaries of NGO or government staff, costs of premises, etc., and Investment Mobilized, corresponding to new and additional funding either directly contributed to SGP for application to SGP project grants (as grantee contributions in kind and in cash), or mobilized investment to support project objectives, as parallel finance.

UNDP co-finance letter resubmitted

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/04/2020

Explanation provided

Cleared

04/28/2020

Revision and clarifications provided 4/13/2020.

However, please note that the budget included as an annex file is not the same as the one included in the annexed Project Document (Prodoc). Please edit the Prodoc with the correct budget table.

Revision requested

03/26/2020

The Agency revised the budget table.

Some revision requested on PMC (point 1 below). These are the comments per budget item:

1. **On PMC:** Thank you for providing the breakdown of expenses separately for M&E, TA and PMC. We have one outstanding request: we noted that “Salary and benefits”, and “Contractual Services” are to cover remuneration for the CPMT and NCs and PAs. We would like to better understand how these two budget items are split among M&E, TA, and PMC. Therefore, please disaggregate salaries and benefits and contractual services further in separate rows with a brief description notes to show those attributable to TA, PMC and M&E.

In addition, please note that as per GEF Guidelines, *Audits* are considered PMC. Therefore, please classify this expense accordingly.

Revision requested 03/26/2020

2. On the share of M&E: We take note of the decrease in the M&E budget’s share from 7.47% to 4.56%. We acknowledge the efforts made to respond to the recommendations of the Joint evaluation regarding strengthening of the monitoring system . We particularly recognize the actions taken to improve capturing of information and measuring of results to adapt to the GEF-7 Results Framework and its corresponding core indicators.

Having said that, we find that the M&E share is relatively higher compared to other GEF projects, including those in UNDP’s portfolio.

The Secretariat does not request any further actions or reductions of the share for this CEO Endorsement request. **However, we expect to see a further reduction on the share of M&E of GEF financing, in project 10414 which was resubmitted. We will address that issue during the review of that PIF**

No revision requested for the M&E in the CEO Endorsement Request (03/26/2020).

3. Breakdown of co-financing: We understand that the break-down of some of the co-financing by budget category may be difficult to estimate at this stage. We also, take note of the contribution of UNDP's confirmed co-financing in the amount of \$400,000 to cover PMC.

Given the 1:1 ratio of co-financing that the project foresees, the GEF Secretariat expects to that some of the co-financing will cover a larger share of PMC, once that co-financing is confirmed during project execution as well as for the PIF 10414 corresponding to Part II of the core funding that was just resubmitted. **We will address that issue during the review of that PIF 10414.**

No revision requested for the CEO Endorsement Request at this stage (03/26/2020).

4. On grants and non-grants. We take note of the 61% grants (\$39 million) to 39% (non-grants) ratio presented in the budget.

We agree that any changes between categories of budget that may affect the grants portion will be discussed and taken with the GEF Secretariat's engagement (i.e. at the relevant Steering Committee meeting or other formal communication).

Having said that, we expect to see an upward trend of that grants to non-grants ratio over time, and expect to see that trend reflected in the resubmitted PIF 10414, corresponding to Part 2 of the core funding request. We will address that issue during the review of that PIF 10414.

No further revision needed for the CEO Endorsement Request at this stage (03/26/2020).

Not clear. There are several revisions that have to be made as follows:

1- On PMC:

All costs besides the GEF Agency fee and M&E costs are captured under the PMC & TA column. The total percentage of PMC and TA is 28% .

The document establishes that PMC is capped at 10%, which is what was approved at PIF stage. However, since PMC and TA are aggregated under the same column, the actual level of PMC is not easy to determine.

Please revise the budget table to show clearly both categories: TA and PMC and provide the budgeted amounts separately for each category.

2. On M&E costs:

M&E represents 7.5% of the total budget. This is more than twice as much as the M&E budget for SGP in GEF-6, which was 3.1% of the total budget. The biggest items are travel (\$1.4 million) and contractual services (1.5 million) to cover in-country personnel such as National Coordinators and Program Assistants. Please revise the level of M&E and reduce the percentage as per GEF-6 levels.

3. On details of co-financing by budget category:

In addition, in the budget table UNDP provided a general sum for estimated co-financing (\$64 million) by source and by type (cash and in-kind), but not by expense category. Without this break-down, it won't be possible to determine how co-financers will share the burden of management costs and other expenses with the GEF. Therefore, we request that the estimated co-financing be budgeted by expense category.

Please revise the table accordingly and provide co-financing amounts by expense category.

4. On grants and non-grants:

Another important point about the budget is referred to the comment made in the document that that in any event where a budget revision is required between categories (i.e. country-level grants, M&E, PMC/TA costs), the issue will be brought to the attention of the SGP Steering Committee for the necessary review and strategic decisions.

This later statement is not acceptable. The GEF Secretariat expects that the funding allocated to grants will be protected and that no redistribution to other non-grant related expenses is done. Therefore, please remove that statement from the proposal and state that funding allocated to grants will remain as grants and not be transferred to cover any non-grant expenses.

Revisions needed 2/14/2020

Agency Response

Response 05/01/2020

This was clarified further with the GEF Sec colleagues and it was confirmed that the budget table included in the UNDP Project Document reflects accurately the figures reported in the EXCEL file shared separately with the GEF Sec. The EXCEL file is shared through the portal.

Response to comment about project duration 05/01/2020

The GEF Sec review dated 4/28/2020 pointed out that the project duration was wrongly reported in the GEF portal. We rechecked and indeed this was wrongly reported. We apologize for the mistake. The project duration should be 48 months and not 4 months. However, the relevant portal entry is now locked and does not allow us to amend the project duration. We hope that this note will be sufficient.

Response 04/08/2020

On the budget, as per the comments provided, we made the following revisions:

1. On PMC, as the two budget items “salaries and benefits” and “contractual services” were already split among M&E, TA and PMC, further details have been added to the budget description notes to clarify how the budget items were determined as below:

(a) The “salary and benefits” item covers the remuneration for CPMT staff and around 15% of SGP country programmes personnel who are on fixed term contracts (NCs and PAs that were recruited before 2008). The “contractual services” budget line covers the remuneration of majority of the SGP country programme personnel (about 85%) who hold consultant “Service Contracts” with limited benefits.

(b) In line with the established functions, the tasks of CPMT involve all three categories of PMC, TA, and M&E as CPMT manages the SGP global portfolio, provide technical assistance and advice on focal areas and other thematic areas of work and undertakes M&E, Knowledge Management and other services and support.

The tasks of National Coordinators involve mainly TA and M&E, including technical management of the country portfolio by providing thematic advice to the grantees capacity development workshops, communication and policy advocacy, knowledge management with communities and civil society organizations that contribute directly to achieve global environmental benefits.

The tasks of Programme Associate involve PMC and M&E, including working on finance, procurement, monitoring projects, and communication and knowledge management.

Thus, at the CPMT level, on average, about 30% of the staff time and cost is dedicated to PMC, about 55% to TA and 15% to M&E activities. As for Country Programme staff, which includes National Coordinator and Programme Assistant, around 70% of their time and cost are dedicated to TA, 20% to PMC and 10% to M&E.

(c) As suggested, cost associated to audit is now shifted to PMC.

2. Firstly, we thank the reviewer for the comment and recognizing the efforts that have been made to strengthen the M&E activities and alignment with the GEF-7 results framework and note that no further revision is required at this point.

UNDP notes that M&E investment in SGP is indeed slightly higher than other FSPs and MSPs considering the particular nature of the programme that is focused on working with CSOs and CBOs with limited capacity and also reflecting the sheer number and coverage of grant projects (i.e. over 3000 projects in 110 countries at any given time; mostly in remote far flung areas). Despite the challenges and costs that are associated to the activities, based on earlier upstream discussions with GEF Sec staff, UNDP has explored all possible means to come to the current presentation of the budget. M&E costs are also associated with the increased requirements of the GEF with respect to compliance with minimum agency fiduciary standards for safeguards, stakeholder and gender consultations, as well as for ensuring the free prior and informed consent (FPIC) of civil society partners with respect to project design and implementation. Further reductions in M&E activities and cost under project 10414 however will not be possible without corresponding consequences on the quality and quantity of M&E activities that could possibly increase risks of the grant projects. UNDP suggests that the issues on project 10414 may be discussed during the upcoming SGP Steering Committee.

3. We appreciate the recognition from the reviewer that the breakdown of co-financing has been provided as per the GEF cofinancing policy. As per the agreement, UNDP will strive to provide the 1:1 co-financing and report including on the evidence of such cofinance during the annual monitoring exercise. On the share of PMC from co-financing, UNDP will continue to strive to ensure proportionate level of resources (10%) are allocated to the activities under the UNDP cofinance.

4. We appreciate that no further revision is required at this point. As for the project 10414, UNDP would like to note that the SGP's finance projection for GEF-7 including the grant and non-grant ratio, has been informed by considerable and extensive efforts to improve cost efficiencies, reduce costs and increase cost-sharing. These efforts have successfully increased the share of grant from a minimum of 50% in GEF-6 (core resources alone, without considering STAR contributions to the SGP) to the currently projected 61% in GEF-7 (core resources, as above), even under a reduced overall programme budget. Moreover, this budget ratio was determined based on the projected costs for the entire duration of the SGP new operational phase of 4 years. Any change to the grant and non-grant ratio for project 10414 could possibly lead to corresponding consequences on the quality and quantity of programme support services, including the expansion to new countries. UNDP suggests that the issues related to project 10414 may be discussed during the upcoming SGP Steering Committee.

Previous Responses

1. As advised the revised budget presents the PMC and TA costs separately. PMC is still capped at 10% as approved with the PIF.

2. SGP has placed strong emphasis in strengthening and having robust M&E strategy that ensures that it is incorporated in SGP programming and grants management at three levels – global, country and at the individual grant projects. This was further beefed up following the Council decision, based on the recommendations made through the 2008 and 2015 Joint Evaluations of SGP, that reiterated the need to strengthen monitoring and evaluation. As such SGP has invested significant efforts and resources towards development and deployment of a strong M&E system, including inter alia, the development of a Results Based Management (RBM) strategy supported by country level results framework with a suite of suggested indicators (in line with the SGP Implementation Arrangements and GEF 7 Programming Directions); and the ongoing development of a robust SGP data base with improvements for data quality and data analysis. Additionally, at the field level, current SGP M&E strategy requires that all grantee projects are visited at least one time to monitor the project implementation and address risks if any, and that all projects no matter the thematic focus or approach integrate monitoring and evaluation activities without exception. Beyond this, during GEF-7, the SGP will align its results framework with that of the GEF and specifically to report achievements against GEF core indicators. This requires the SGP to invest resources to apply the GEF core indicator measurement methodology appropriate to the SGP context. Likewise, SGP's will be committed to comply fully with the enhanced GEF safeguards policy recommendations; entailing costs to develop appropriate measures and mechanisms. Given these background, it is essential to increase budget towards M&E compared to GEF-6, and it is not advisable to reduce the budget beyond a certain point without suffering significant programme effectiveness consequences. Against this backdrop, the M&E budget has not been significantly re-costed and revised to the maximum extent possible. The M&E budget now amount to around 4.8%.

3. With respect to co-finance, as noted also under comment (4) above, majority of SGP co-finance is confirmed at the country and project levels, during the implementation of the grant projects. Due to the nature of the SGP in that, the SGP grant making follows a call for proposal process based on a demand-driven approach. It is generally only possible to identify the kind of projects and the associated co-finance at the time of grant making. Thus, UNDP is not able to provide the break down by category for SGP co-finance as recommended at this point at CEO endorsement. However, for the confirmed co-finance committed by and/or managed directly by UNDP, similar level of cost-sharing for management costs has been committed. Thus, from the overall US\$ 4 million UNDP co-finance, US\$ 400,000 or 10% has been set aside for PMC.

4. On the issue of budget revision between different categories of budget (i.e. between country level grants, M&E, PMC and TA costs), in the unlikely event that such a shift is required, this shall be brought to the attention of UNDP and GEF and discussed through appropriate mechanisms, including a Steering Committee or other relevant mechanism and jointly explore and arrive at a strategic decision. The mechanism could be further discussed at the upcoming Steering Committee as required.

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/ adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Comments on core indicators have been addressed on the GEF portal.

Cleared 03/26/2020

There are changes in the core indicators target. Some explanations need to be provided:

o Target for indicator 4 on landscapes under improved practices moved from 5,000,000 to 1,100,000, and the specific sub-indicator 4.4 moved from 280,000 to 0—it may be a typing mistake on this last example as indicator 4.4 doesn't reflect the revised target level of 140,000 indicated in Annex A on the Project Results Framework. Please revised as needed.

- Target for Indicator 5 on Area of marine habitat moved from 100,000 to 50,000.

- Target 9 on POPs moved from 300 to 150. Issues to fix on this indicator include:

- Target for sub-Indicator 9.6 does not aggregate up to the main indicator 9. Please manually complete the data under the main core indicator 9 as needed.

- Target for sub-indicator 9.6 has not been updated to 150 as indicated in Annex A. Please reflect the revised level of results.

- The choice of sub-indicator 9.6 versus 9.1 is not clear given the language used in table B where it is stated that POPs will be “removed/disposed” and again in 1.A on Project description and in 1.6 on GEBs. Please clarify and adjust as needed.

- Target for Indicator 11 on beneficiaries moved from 400,000 to 200,000.

It is also difficult to reconcile some of the targets mentioned in the project results framework with the targets in the core indicators. SGP team could further clarify the mapping from the results framework to the core indicators.

- Community-led biodiversity friendly practices and approaches in agriculture, forestry, fisheries, including improved management measures and strengthened governance of Indigenous Community-conserved areas (ICCAs) promoted covering at least 1.2 million ha of landscapes/seascapes.
- At least 240,000 ha of production landscapes and seascapes management, including restored degraded areas, applying climate-smart agriculture, sustainable land management, fisheries and food practices for improved productivity, food security
- Community level biodiversity compatible practices will also be promoted in around 100,000 hectares of marine habitats and MPAs.
- On land degradation, around 240,000 hectares of land (forest, agricultural and other production sector lands) will be brought under improved management practices, including at least 50,000 hectares of marine habitats that will be positively impacted; improved SLM technologies at the farm level will be applied to around 140,000 hectares while several CBO/farmer leaders will be established to promote and demonstrate climate resilient SLM approach.
- For international waters, efforts will be implemented to curb land-based pollution, including solid waste, sewerage, waste water, and agricultural waste from entering the waterbodies, and open burning avoided, will be continued (target to be assigned). This will benefit around 50,000 ha of marine habitats.

• Here are few more queries for consideration:

- There is no information completed under Indicator 1 on Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use, whereas the document refers to improving management practices in protected areas. Please consider reflecting the level of ambition under Indicator 1.
- Is it still planned that “SGP interventions will also support 15,000 hectares of forest restoration/avoided deforestation. (as indicated in section 1.6 on GEBs), as indicated in an earlier version of the PIF.” If yes, please consider reflecting this under sub-core indicator 3.2.

Several revisions/explanations needed 02/21/20

Agency Response

Thank you for the comments on the core indicators’ target. We would like to provide the following clarifications. The CEO Endorsement Request and the UNDP Project Document were earlier designed to account for the results of the entire GEF-7 SGP core resources. Following receipt of advice during the GEF Sec review of 11/17/2019, all quantitative core indicators and results targets in the results framework were halved to reflect the budget of \$64 million of Part 1 project (half of the GEF-7 core funding). In doing so, we recognize that some inconsistencies were introduced. These have now been corrected as described below to ensure consistency. In addition, based on extensive discussions with GEF colleagues during the past months since PIF approval, some targets were agreed to be scaled back (or removed) to reflect results directly attributable to the programme and in line with results methodology for GEF-7 core indicators.

(i) Target for indicator 4 has been reassessed. The target for Part 1 project is 1,100,000 hectares, half of what we have indicated for the entire GEF-7 funding. Also, the target for indicator “area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems (hectares) (GEF core indicator 4.3) was 280,000 ha for the entire GEF-7 core resource while halved to 140,000 ha for the Part 1 project.

(ii.) For indicator 5 on marine habitat and target 9 on POPs, please note both the indicator targets were halved (from 100,000 ha to 50,000 ha) and (300 to 150).

(iii.) The target for annex 9.6 has been updated to 150. Further, based on discussion with GEFSEC, SGP will apply sub-indicator 9.6 “Quantity of POPs/Mercury containing materials and products directly avoided”, which is defined as the amount of materials and/or products containing POPs/Mercury that has been avoided as a direct result of the GEF project. Per discussions with GEF results management colleagues, several challenges were identified in relation to the methodological application for indicators 9.1 and 9.2 in community-based programming such as calculating the amount of POP eliminated or reduced, in particular broken down by type of POP in line with the methodology given by GEF results architecture paper. These constraints accompanied by the relatively small size of chemicals portfolio which is largely focused on awareness raising (at 4% of SGP’s active portfolio) meant that indicator 9.6 was the most suitable indicator for SGP to report on.

(iv.) Target 11 on beneficiaries have also been revised from 400,000 to 200,000 due to the same reasons noted above, i.e. halved the original target for the entire GEF-7. .

With respect to reconciling targets mentioned in project results framework with targets in core indicators, please note the following:

(v.) The target on Community-led biodiversity friendly practices and approaches covers at least 1.15 million ha of landscapes/seascapes. This is composed of Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares) (GEF core indicator 4.1) at 1,100,000 ha + Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity (hectares; excluding protected areas) (GEF core indicator 5 at 50,000 ha).

(vi) The inconsistencies related to the land degradation target has been corrected. The revised indicator now reads as “On land degradation, around 140,000 hectares of land (forest, agricultural and other production sector lands) will be brought under improved management practices, including through the application of improved SLM technologies at the farm level while several CBO/farmer leaders will be established to promote and demonstrate climate resilient SLM approach.

(vii) the target for indicator 5 on area of marine habitat revised and halved from 100,000 to 50,000 as reasons noted earlier above..

With regards the additional queries related to indicator 1, please see below:

(viii) On indicator 1, while SGP interventions will contribute to improving the management effectiveness of protected areas (in particular, through the improved governance of Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas – ICCAs), the results are not reported under indicator 1 due to methodological challenges in using the METT. It was agreed with GEF Results Management colleagues that SGP programming is not conducive to utilization of METT (requirement for measurement of indicator) hence SGP results related to improved governance of ICCAs would be reported under indicator 4.

(ix) SGP still plans to support 7,500 ha of forest restoration (half of earlier reported 15,000 ha). This will be reflected under sub-core indicator 3.2

SGP contribution to relevant GEF core indicator revised to correct for consistencies –GEF CEO endorsement Request

Part II – Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/ adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Cleared 2/20/2020

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Cleared 02/20/2020

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

02/20/2020

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Cleared 02/14/20

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/26/2020

Comments have been addressed and revised

Cleared 03/26/2020

To some extent.

Please include a complete list of countries that will be part of the project, including any new country. It's important for the document to explain where the process of accession of new countries to the Programme is. With 2.5 years into GEF-7, there are some countries, such as Bangladesh, where the process should be completed or close to completion. Please provide a status report.

In addition, although we understand that the reference to 'Operational Phases' is an operating term, please replace the reference to OP7 for 'GEF-7' when describing what the project will do or achieve in this GEF cycle.

Finally, please revise the starting implementation date.

Please revise 02/20/2020

Agency Response

1. The list of new eligible countries and status is submitted as associated attachment as requested. There are currently 22 GEF eligible countries that are not part of the SGP (para 87-89). The GEF-7 Implementation Arrangement Paper on SGP , along with the information paper on Results and Core Allocation , noted that “all interested eligible countries could apply to join in GEF-7, while careful assessment will be conducted based on identified criteria”. Accordingly, significant progress has been made in the process of new countries inclusion Letter of interests from the GEF OFP indicating formal interest to join the SGP has been received from ten countries other associated requirements such as completed SGP application are under development in many of those countries, and appraisal missions are being conducted by the SGP CPMT during the past year. Once the appraisal is completed and a favourable decision is reached, the SGP operations can begin as soon as the GEF 7 resources are approved and available. As discussed, the access by new countries will be conducted in a phased approach in light also with the limited core budget, by providing priority to LDCs/SIDS and countries that have been in the waiting list for longer period.

2. The SGP Operational Phase (as in OP7) refers to the SGP's new phase of operation under the GEF-7 resource. This term has been operationally used and indicative of the fact that SGP operates on a "rolling modality", in that SGP funds and therefore grant-making operations from an earlier phase continues for some time under the new phase. Considering the fact that it typically takes the entire GEF replenishment cycle of 4 years with multiple PIFs to secure the SGP resources under the cycle, and given the coverage, depth and complexity of the SGP's operation in over 110 countries, this modality allows countries with different capacities, particularly LDCs and SIDS to implement and disburse the grants effectively All reference to SGP funds have been revised to indicate GEF-7 while programmatic and operations references indicate OP7 in an operating term.

3. With regard the starting date, the SGP operations in GEF-7 will effectively begin on the date the project document for the current phase is signed following the CEO endorsement of the first PIF/tranche. UNDP expects that this date will be in April 2020 which is indicated as the starting implementation date.

Revised update on new country status submitted as separate information

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Cleared 02/20/2020

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Cleared 02/20/2020

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This is a global programme with 110 participating countries. Each country will work on their Country Strategy and define the priority landscape/seascapes where grants will be focused.

Cleared 2/14/2019

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/26/2020

Comments have been addressed and revised

Cleared 03/26/2020

02/20/20 Not entirely,

The proposal does not include a comprehensive stakeholder engagement plan (SEP) with a description of stakeholders, interests, roles and responsibilities. As stated by the Policy on Stakeholder Engagement, at CEO Endorsement Request, Agencies should include a SEP or equivalent documentation, 'with information regarding Stakeholders who have been and will be engaged, means of engagement, dissemination of information, roles and responsibilities in ensuring effective Stakeholder Engagement, resource requirements, and timing of engagement throughout the project/ program cycle. '

It would help to include a comprehensive list of stakeholders with that information.

Please revise 02/20/2020

Agency Response

The success of the SGP programme is predicated on the effectiveness of its multi-stakeholder approach. SGP actively engages an extensive range of stakeholders including NGOs, CBOs, indigenous peoples, the private sector, government, academia, and donor partners. Civil society organizations (CSOs) will be both beneficiaries and direct participants in SGP through their inclusion in NSCs. Through its social inclusion approaches, SGP also emphasizes implementation of several

mechanisms to ensure strong meaningful participation of less represented groups including indigenous peoples and persons with disabilities (PwD), for instance, flexible approaches such as user-friendly project cycle approaches to ensure easier access and greater engagement. Similarly, SGP will continue to implement its proven gender mainstreaming approaches. As for private sector, SGP will include mechanisms for engaging with private sector through both targeted platforms such as the CSO-Government-Private sector dialogues and through regular grant projects by fostering enhanced involvement of private sector through public-private partnership and other means.

In terms of concrete SEP, at the start of each new SGP operational phase, the SGP Operational Guidelines requires each country programme to prepare a detailed programming and strategic document entitled the Country Programme Strategy (CPS). The CPS will facilitate a wide range of consultations during the process of its preparation. Such consultations will take into account both institutional stakeholders in the context of their involvement in the project (such as the Government and UNDP Country Office) and also more broadly for non-governmental stakeholders and prospective beneficiaries (Community-Based Organizations and community groups). Several meetings and workshops will be conducted to the extent possible to discuss the overall strategy for grant making during GEF 7 and importantly reach general consensus on key country programme outcomes, outputs, activities and institutional arrangements for the country programme. The table included in ProDoc (pages 32-33) provides a broad description of the role and responsibilities of key stakeholders and their involvement mechanisms and strategies. Mechanisms and strategies for stakeholder involvement will ensure that the relevant shareholders receive and share information and provide their inputs in the planning, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of grant projects and as appropriate play a role in sustaining the initiatives during and at the end of the grant project period and the closure of overall grant making.

Accordingly, the following initiatives at the global and country level will ensure continued stakeholder engagement in the project. At the global level, multi-stakeholder inception workshops are organized with the purpose to create awareness amongst global stakeholders of the project including the various teams within UNDP and UNOPS. At the country level, outreach and capacity development initiatives will facilitate awareness, review and informing of policy, stakeholder participation and documentation of best practices related to the SGP in the country. The new phase of the SGP will effectively be launched with the Call for Proposals (CfP), a process by which SGP publicizes the opportunity for SGP grants through various means including through mass media. The meetings of the NSC are important opportunities for engagement of the main stakeholders with agenda items that discuss achievements, challenges faced, corrective steps that should be taken etc. At such meetings, progress on planned grant making activities are also shared.

As for engagement of local communities, this is SGP's forte. SGP will employ a highly participatory approach to facilitate the involvement and participation of local communities, either as groups through their CBOs or represented by CSOs/NGOs that represent their interests. SGP will ensure the inclusion of both men and women in the planning and implementation of the grant activities. SGP will also continue to employ the proven capacity building approaches to ensure greater participation while also continue to adopt innovative and accessible forms of project grant templates (e.g. grant proposals through recorded form) to maximize participation.

New text added on "Stakeholder engagement plan" including a table describing broad roles and responsibilities of key stakeholder groups – UNDP Project Document **Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

-----03/26/2020

Comments have been addressed and revised

Cleared 03/26/2020

02/21/20 While we understand that SGP has taken a very proactive approach to address gender in the past and that this proposal includes some really good evidence of that, there are additional opportunities that should be taken into account including:

1. Gender considerations: There are no considerations on gender related to the 5 Strategic Initiates. Gender mainstreaming is elaborated on as part of the cross-cutting initiative dealing with Social Inclusion but even in that section there is little direct connection to the different strategic initiatives and context of the SPG.
2. Results framework: The section on gender mainstreaming clearly indicate that the SGP will measure and report on the GEF gender tags including: (a) contributing to closing gender gaps in access to and control over resources; (b) improving the participation and decision-making of women in natural resource governance; and (c) targeting socio-economic benefits and services for women. While the results framework includes sex disaggregated indicators related to beneficiaries and women's participation/leadership, there doesn't seem to be any specific indicator that would allow the SGP to measure its contribution to closing gender gaps related to access to and control over natural resources.

In addition, regarding indicators 21 "Number of SGP projects led by women and/or mainstream concrete mechanisms for increased participation of women". This indicator includes two very different issues and considering the importance of SGP's support to women led projects perhaps the Agency could consider separating these indicators into two: one that focuses on projects led by women and a second dealing with projects that incorporate concrete measure for women's participation.

Please revise 02/21/20

Agency Response

Thank you for the comprehensive comments on gender approach at SGP. The SGP is among the first to develop a comprehensive gender mainstreaming strategy. The Strategic Initiatives will be carried out through regular grant-making and as such, the projects under these will follow the gender mainstreaming process as stipulated under the SGP gender mainstreaming strategy. Such a process will ensure that the SGP projects and approaches are gender responsive.

SGP will implement recommended actions under its gender mainstreaming strategy including but not limited to making sure that gender and socially inclusive perspective is applied to all SGP grant making procedures and activities while also making sure that at the national and project level information is collected and shared across gender and social divides.

Gender consideration and key entry points have been articulated under each of the strategic initiatives as suggested. For instance, under the chemicals and waste management portfolio, in GEF-7, SGP will focus on organizing and formalizing the waste management sectors informally managed by poor women and help them to develop income-generating activities models such as organic farming, recycling, waste to resource production, and alternative livelihoods, such that SGP interventions support gender transformations rather than entrenching established gender roles. Furthermore, SGP will continue promoting awareness raising, capacity development and networking among women for sound chemicals and waste management.

Similarly, under the strategic initiative Sustainable agriculture and fisheries, and food security, the SGP will work with women entrepreneurs and women led organizations as well as farmers, focusing on agricultural production through improved yields, value addition processes and helping farmers (men/women) to better market their farm products at the right time and with proper prices. Gender roles will be carefully considered and integrated into training and other SGP interventions (e.g. on post-harvest technology to reduce losses in agriculture production).

Under the community-based conservation strategic initiative, the SGP will: (i) improve knowledge and information collection and management systems to enhance awareness about best practices including gendered nature of these practices; (ii) support community-based efforts to improve policies that support conservation and sustainable use; (iii) and ensuring gender considerations mainstreamed into natural resources management.

Under catalyzing sustainable urban solutions, women as a subsection of the population, particularly with the current migration trends from rural/peri-urban areas to urban areas, are most vulnerable to access to basic services and negative effects of environmental, social and economic impacts. SGP will place an emphasis on building capacities as well as a gender equity-based access herein. This will include support to entrepreneurship, in green jobs, development of new partnerships of private sector- communities and government to support engendered access to green microfinance, skills development and using community evidence to support policy level changes and scaling up of initiatives.

As for the specific indicators to close gender gaps, one of the reasons that these were not reflected in the programme results framework was based on a request to minimize the number of indicators SGP reports to the GEF, however such indicators will be tracked and reported in the Annual Monitoring report. These indicators

are now clearly reflected in the results framework and SGP is ready to spear head on its implementation and monitoring. Also, as part of SGP annual monitoring process, SGP has been historically captured data on ‘Number of projects with gender considerations’ This addresses performance on projects that incorporate concrete measure for gender sensitivity, including women’s participation. With regards to the indicator “Number of SGP projects led by women and/or mainstream concrete mechanisms for increased participation of women”. We agree with the suggestion and will separate the indicator. The following gender indicators have been added in the project results framework.

Indicator 21a: Number of SGP projects led by women; 30% of SGP portfolio

Indicator 21b: Number of projects that contributing to closing gender gaps related to access to and control over natural resources;

Indicator 21c: Number of projects that improve the participation and decision-making of women in natural resource governance 20% SGP portfolio

Indicator 21c: Number of projects that target socio-economic benefits and services for women.

New gender indicators have been added in the results framework – both UNDP Project Document and GEF CEO Endorsement Request
“Indicator 21” has been revised to cover the two issues separately.

Specific text under strategic initiatives added to indicate an appropriate gender focus – UNDP Project Document.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Cleared 02/14/20

Agency Response

Risks

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Cleared 02/21/20

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/26/2020

Comments have been addressed and revised

Cleared 03/26/2020

02/21/2020 To some extent.

Given the importance of the SGP to support Indigenous Peoples and local communities, there are potential synergies with the Inclusive Conservation Initiative financed by the GEF. Please explain how the two programs will coordinate and complement each other.

Revision needed 02/21/20

Agency Response

During GEF7, the SGP will proactively coordinate with several GEF-7 Impact Programs and multi-agency initiatives, including inter alia the Congo Basin Initiative, Dryland Landscape initiatives, and the Inclusive Conservation Initiative (ICI).

Specifically, about the ICI, SGP has been in close communication with the GEF Secretariat, the GEF Indigenous Peoples' Advisory Group (IPAG), and relevant GEF agencies since the early formulation stage of the GEF7 Inclusive Conservation Initiative (ICI). For example, during the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII) in 2019, SGP worked with the GEF Secretariat to convene a group of concerned GEF agencies to discuss comparative advantage and possibilities for synergies and lessons learned for implementation pertinent to the ICI. As articulated in the ICI PIF approved by the GEF Council in Dec 2019, SGP will continue to work with the ICI to leverage the experience, networks and lessons from the SGP in the following ways, to: (i) seek recommendations from IPLC partners who are SGP partners and graduate organizations that may be potential candidates for ICI investments in selected geographies and territories; (ii) engage with the SGP during the formation of the Interim Steering Committee as part of the PPG consultation phase of the ICI over the course of 2020; (iii) build on and learn from SGP collaboration and consultation experiences with IPLCs in target ICI geographies and territories; (iv) engage on policy initiative with SGP in ICI countries, including appropriate recognition of indigenous peoples' and community conserved areas and territories (ICCAs) as recognized by the CBD Aichi targets, 2014 IUCN World Parks Congress, and post-2020 CBD negotiations; (v) collaborate on CSO-Government dialogues in ICI countries with respect to IPLCs land, territories and resources; and (vi) develop and collaborate on learning and capacity building initiatives between and among SGP and ICI, including with respect to the design of Indigenous Peoples fellowship programmes.

Of special relevance to the GEF7 Inclusive Conservation Initiative will be the Global Support Initiative for Indigenous Peoples and Community-Conserved Territories and Areas (ICCA-GSI), supported by the Government of Germany (BMU), and implemented by the SGP in 26 countries at the global level. The ICCA GSI has supported the networking and creation of CSO coalitions in support of protected and conserved areas at national, regional and global levels. Notable results relevant to the ICI may include: (i) analysis of threats and opportunities for ICCAs in target geographies; (ii) assessment of legal and policy frameworks required to enhance ICCA recognition; and (iii) development and field-testing of tracking tools including the ICCA Security Index, self-strengthening methodology for territories of life, and protected area governance scorecards.

In addition, IUCN and Conservation International may engage and learn from SGP OP6 innovation programmes and their outputs for areas of thematic investment under ICI including work on youth and climate change, indigenous peoples' access to energy, artisanal and small-scale gold mining (ASGM), and the blue economy.

Revised text has been added to describe current and future planned concrete coordination efforts – both UNDP Project Document and GEF CEO Endorsement Request

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Cleared 02/21/20

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Comments addressed

Cleared 03/26/2020

02/21/2020 To some extent. There's a need to include a description of a budget, key deliverables and timeline, and explain how it will contribute to the project's overall impact.

Agency Response

We thank the reviewer for the comment. As a global programme distributed in than 125 countries, SGP undertakes extensive knowledge management activities ranging from documenting processes and good practices to sharing knowledge widely between country programmes effectively.

The objectives knowledge management in SGP are to: capture knowledge, leverage local expertise and give voice to civil society, identify new approaches and ways of learning, improve effectiveness, improve capacities of staff and grantees, promote and encourage innovation, address operational and programmatic challenges effectively, influence policy and scale up good practices.

To implement the SGP knowledge management system, different actions at the three levels of global, national and project level are envisaged. At the global level, SGP provides guidance on how to capture and disseminate knowledge and conduct knowledge exchange at the local level so that it can be aggregated at the global level; shares technical publication and provides guidance of each focal and cross cutting areas of work; organizes regional workshops to exchange knowledge and provide training to its staff; and shares good practices emerging from the portfolio at global conferences and events. SGP also establishes partnerships with a variety of partners to upscale best practices in environmental conservation and works to capture and disseminate the lessons learned and best practices of its massive portfolio in case studies, fact sheets, publications, and new media. Below is a description of key KM practices done at the global level. Key global level knowledge management practices include: the knowledge management platforms including the digital library of community innovations, communities connect platform; bringing CSO voices to global forums; Portfolio reviews and case studies; Best practices; Coaching and mentorship; Story-telling, mapping technologies and expert locators; and communities of practice (CoPs).

At the national level, each country programme composed by a National Steering Committee, a National Coordinator and sometimes a Programme Assistant, work directly with the communities in (i) capturing their lessons; (ii) conducting knowledge exchanges; (iii) organizing training workshops; (iv) establishing and nurturing networks of NGO's and CBO's; (v) working with the government in achieving national environmental priorities; (vi) and helping to scale up and replicate best practices and lessons learned. Each country programme outlines a knowledge management plan as part of their Country Programme Strategy for each operational phase of the programme. In addition, country programme teams provide guidance and develop capacity of local communities and standardize the uptake of information, lessons learned and best practices. Based on these experiences, country programmes routinely produce knowledge materials in local languages, including project fact sheets, informational brochures and case studies, to disseminate at key national events and conferences. Some of the specific activities carried out at the

national level include: knowledge fairs; stakeholder workshops; creating or strengthening networks; centres of excellence or demonstration sites; training and how to manuals; leverage the NSC and knowledge broker.

At the project level, each project needs to include a knowledge management plan with a corresponding budget that allows the programme to capture their experience as well as to access the training needed to carry out the projects. Knowledge management activities at the project level could include peer to peer learning, training and facilitated exchange of knowledge.

The budget for knowledge management is distributed to countries and global. At the global level, costs items include contractual services for publications including editing, printing and distribution, while country level knowledge management costs are embedded in the workshops, awareness and outreach categories. The estimated total for KM is around US\$ 750,000 for the project period.

While the meta indicator in the results framework is “Indicator 27: Number of SGP countries reporting improved knowledge outcomes (access, dissemination, result) due to knowledge fairs and other initiatives”, during the OP7 period, the SGP will be tracking knowledge management results through several micro indicators such as below:

of Peer-to-peer exchanges

of Knowledge fairs

Portfolio review publications

Revised text included under the Knowledge Management section – UNDP Project Document

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Comments addressed

Cleared 03/26/2020

02/21/20

Yes.

However, please refer to the comments about the level of the M&E costs above and revise the amounts.

Revision needed 02/21/20

Agency Response

The M&E costs have been revised. Please see response earlier to recommendation under finance section.

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Cleared 02/14/20

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Letter submitted

Cleared 03/26/2020

No. Co-financing letters (or documentation that provides evidence of co-financing) are missing.

Please revise 2/14/2020

Agency Response

The UNDP Co-financing letter is hereby submitted.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Please see comments referred to indicators.

02/21/20

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The following are UNDP's responses to comments received from the GEF Secretariat on November 7, 2019:

The CEO endorsement request for the project GEF ID 10084 now corresponds to the \$64 million GEF core funds only (half of the \$128 million SGP core funds under GEF-7), and the description of activities, the results (core indicators) and the corresponding budget refers exclusively to the scope of this project.

UNDP notes that according to the established SGP modalities and procedures approved by the GEF Council, SGP has special features as a corporate program of the GEF, distinct from the regular GEF FSP, including its rolling modality and sequenced approach in accessing GEF funds during the replenishment cycle. The SGP core funding is approved by the GEF Replenishment (i.e. \$128 million for GEF-7), and the overall approach and strategy of the SGP operation is approved by the GEF Council through the *SGP Implementation Arrangement* (GEF/C.54/05/Rev.01, June 2018 for GEF-7) for each GEF replenishment cycle. Country allocation of SGP core resources align with the GEF Council information paper on the *Management of Core Funding and Results Framework for GEF-7* (GEF/C.55/Inf.05, Dec 2018).

UNDP concurs that each project/tranche of SGP funds is allocated a distinct GEF project ID under the concerned GEF replenishment, whilst all contributing to the overall strategic directions of the SGP operational phase. Moreover, the *Policy on Monitoring* (GEF/C.56/03/Rev.01, June 12, 2019) defines that SGP reports on its results, financial information, and fund allocation by operational phase. Therefore, each project of the SGP will cumulatively contribute to the agreed approach, strategy, and results in the respective GEF replenishment period.

In accordance to the GEF Secretariat comment, the revised budget table for the project ID 10084 refers only to the \$64 million of core funding and in the GEF Secretariat advised template (please see Budget Table in UNDP Project Document). UNDP concurs that the request for GEF-7 Core funds is distinct from the GEF-7 STAR funds endorsed to the SGP, which will be collated and submitted to the GEF Secretariat at a later stage and will be assigned a different project ID.

Following the requested budget categories under the template, all costs besides the GEF Agency fee and M&E costs are captured under the PMC & TA column: the PMC have been capped at 10 percent of the GEF Grant amount and relevant technical assistance are included under the same column. The GEF Agency Fee is presented below the total GEF Grant amount, and this will be reported separately to the Trustee as per the *GEF Policy and Guideline on the Project Cycle*. A budget line on country level small grants to CSOs/CBOs is included to provide the full picture of the project budget

As requested, cofinancing to the GEF grant is also reflected in the budget table. The majority of SGP cofinance is mobilized from beneficiaries (i.e. grantee partners), the private sector, government, foundations, and others generated in the form of cofinancing to individual grants at the country level. In accordance with the GEF *Policy on Co-financing* (FI/GN/01, June 2018), UNDP will capture the cash and in-kind co-financing mobilized from the beneficiaries and others during programme implementation and provide supporting evidence of cofinancing secured through its annual monitoring report.

With regards to the allocation of SGP core resources to the participating countries, it will follow the GEF Council Information paper on the *Small Grants Programme: Management of Core Funding and Results Framework for GEF-7* (GEF/C.55/Inf.05), whereby initial allocations will be made equally and equitably across eligible countries. Further, as per the information paper, reallocation may be made of any unused Core funds during the final years of the operational phase, thereby promoting the effective and efficient utilization of the SGP GEF-7 Core resources. In line with this, rather than including a table in the CEO endorsement with an equal amount for all countries, UNDP proposes that the initial equal allocation of GEF-7 Core grant per country to be noted in the project document. Such initial allocation will be in a range of \$300,000-\$350,000 (depending on the number of new countries that may join during the period) under the Project ID 10084. The amount will be prorated for new OP7 countries depending on the time they join the SGP during the GEF operational cycle.

In accordance with the Terms of Reference of the SGP Steering Committee and as practiced in the past, in the event that a budget revision is required between categories (i.e. country-level grants, M&E, PMC/TA costs), the issue will be brought to the attention of the SGP Steering Committee for the necessary review and strategic decisions.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Addressed.

02/21/20

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/04/2020

Yes. The CEO Endorsement Request is recommended.

Comments were addressed and clarifications provided. The duration of the project is 48 months and since the entry field is locked for the Agency, ITS will fix it on the back-end.

04/28/2020

Not at this stage, Please address the comments on budget and co-financing and correct the duration of the project in number of months

03/27/2020

Not at this stage. Please address the comments above on: co-financing and budget classification.

02/21/20:

Not at this stage. Please address all the comments and revisions requested.

11/7/2019

Not at this stage.

Before the GEF Secretariat can proceed to review the CEO Endorsement Request in its entirety, please kindly note that the submission has to match the requirements for a stand-alone full-sized **project** and not refer to a phase or to other types of SGP projects. The request for endorsement must comply fully with the GEF Policy on the Project and Program Cycle (Policy: OP/PL/01) and its corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01), as well as with other associated policies and procedures.

This means that Project ID 10084, as a stand-alone project, should only focus on the use of the SGP **Core** resources committed through the corresponding approved PIF. The key information presented in the CEO Endorsement request, both in the Portal entries and in any other associated project documents, must match the scope of the approved PIF, in this case GEF ID 10084. All financial information presented, similarly, must only refer to the project presented for endorsement.

In addition, the Secretariat will require more detailed information on budget and planned uses of funds in order to be able to carry a full review of the project endorsement document. Such information must be disaggregated by project components/activities and by expenditure categories. As a result, for the resubmission of CEO Endorsement request of ID 10084, the Secretariat requires a detailed budget table, which is attached below. The Secretariat may require further details through

expenditure reports during project implementation. This also means that each stand-alone SGP project will be expected to reach closure with the Trustee on its own, once all project grants will be disbursed, regardless of other projects closure.

Therefore, and to summarize, in order to fully review the CEO endorsement request for this SGP Global First Tranche ID 10084, we require the following amendments and additional information in the resubmission:

- 1- The CEO Endorsement request must correspond to project GEF ID 10084 totaling \$64 million of core funds only. The reference to SGP Phase 7 may be relevant to strategic orientations but is not relevant to the definition of the project scope and processing. Hence, the description of activities, the results (core indicators) and the corresponding budget should exclusively refer to the exact scope of Project ID 10084.
- 2- Consequently, the budget table should not include any reference to STAR funding (as STAR projects if any will be processed through other instruments) - instead, it should only relate to the \$64 million of core funding. This budget table should also include separate columns for co-financing from non-GEF sources - please provide details of the proposed budget according to the two templates provided below.
- 3- Once the grants amount, the Agency Fee and M&E costs are defined for the project, all other costs should be captured in the Project Management Costs (PMC). Those categories, thereafter, and as in all agreed budget, are not fungible.

The following templates will be shared in an excel spreadsheet with UNDP .

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The Project encompasses the first part (\$64 million -inclusive of Agency fees) of the core funding approved by the Replenishment participants and the Council to finance grants to community-based organizations and civil society in recipient countries under the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP).

In GEF-7, the SGP will adopt and strengthen primarily five interrelated approaches including empowering local communities, supporting community innovation on emerging issues, promoting partnerships and broader adoption, serving as a dependable global community-based grant mechanism and platform for the environment etc. In doing so, the SGP aims “to promote and support community-based innovative, inclusive, and impactful initiatives, and foster multi-stakeholder partnerships to tackle global environmental issues” in programme countries. SGP will employ several strategic initiatives (SI) namely: community-based conservation of threatened ecosystems and species; sustainable agriculture and fisheries, and food security; low-carbon energy access co-benefits; local to global coalitions for chemicals and waste management; catalyzing sustainable urban solutions; CSO-Government-Private Sector Policy and Planning Dialogue Platforms; Enhancing social inclusion; and Monitoring and Evaluation and Knowledge Management.