

GEF SGP 7th Operational Phase - Strategic Implementation using STAR Resources mainly in LDCs and SIDs (Part 3)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10655

Countries

Global (Afghanistan, Argentina, Bahamas, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Colombia, Congo DR, Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gabon, China, Palau, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Jamaica, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Micronesia, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, Tanzania, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Venezuela, Togo, Tonga, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zimbabwe, Nepal)

Project Name

GEF SGP 7th Operational Phase - Strategic Implementation using STAR Resources mainly in LDCs and SIDs (Part 3)

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

8/28/2020

Review completed by PM

10/15/2020

Program Manager

Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2020

Revised and corrected.

Cleared

10/19/2020

Sub-totals by focal area between table A and D are slightly different – please amend:

- o sub-total by BD in table A is \$23,499,120 but in table D \$23,499,118 (two dollars difference);
- o sub-total by CC in table A is \$10,563,236 while in table D \$10,563,237 (one dollar difference);
- o similarly, sub-total by LD in table A is \$9,393,806 while in table D \$9,393,807 (one dollar difference).

Revision requested

10/14/2020

Revision provided

Cleared

Not entirely. The project is aligned with the Small Grants Programme priorities as stated in the GEF-7 Programming Directions, which are in turn aligned with the GEF's Focal Areas.

However, the funding and activities under CCM2-6 : "Demonstrate mitigation options with systemic impacts for food systems, land use and restoration impact program" as presented are not eligible under the approved GEF-7 programming directions.

This is because, CCM-2's land use and restoration activities are only eligible in GEF-7 as they relate to the Food Systems, Land Use, and Restoration Impact Program (FOLUR IP).

Please review 9/29/2020

Agency Response

10/19/2020

We thank the reviewer for pointing this out. All focal area totals in table A and table D has been adjusted.

10/12/2020

We thank the reviewer for the comment and take note that CCM 2.6 funding and activities are only eligible under the FOLUR IP. Accordingly, funds reflected under this have been redistributed to CCM 1.1 and CCM 1.3 in table A.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/14/2020

Revision provided

Cleared

To some extent

Please provide an output for activity: “Community-led actions to enhance protection of threatened species including enhancing transboundary conservation”

Please review 9/29/2020

Agency Response

10/12/2020

The third output in table B has been rephrased as following to provide more clarity to the scope and intent of the output:

“Community-based measures for reducing pressures on threatened species including addressing human wildlife conflicts and promotion of sustainable livelihoods supported in all countries”

New output under component 1 in table B

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/14/2020

Revision provided

Cleared

Not entirely.

While, it's understood that more concrete and accurate description of co-financing will be provided at CEO Endorsement stage. At this stage, please describe the definition/approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures".

The relevant Policy requirement at PIF stage is the following: Agencies provide indicative information regarding the expected amounts, sources and types of Co-Financing, and the sub-set of such Co-Financing that meets the definition of Investment Mobilized (IM)". IM is defined as the "sub-set of co-financing that excludes recurrent expenditures.

Revision requested 9/29/2020

Agency Response

10/12/2020

As per the definition provided under the GEF Cofinancing Guidelines, SGP's cofinancing commitments are differentiated between those corresponding to recurrent costs e.g. salaries of NGO 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 for approaches, most of the SGP co-financing will continue to be mobilized and confirmed at the project level, while UNDP as the implementing agency for SGP will mobilize co-finance both from its own sources and from other sources including governments, private foundations, multilateral donors, international NGOs at the global and country levels.

Based on on-going efforts by UNDP to explore potential co-finance, UNDP is pleased to confirm US\$ 5 million in new co-finance that can be categorized as “investment mobilized”. These include several new initiatives such as collaboration with the Lion’s Share COVID-19 response and from recent commitment from the Government of Germany as support to Indigenous Peoples to deal with COVID-19 impacts. While final figures will be confirmed at CEO endorsement stage, table C – finance has accordingly been revised.

Foot note included to define the approach taken to differentiate co-finance between “investment mobilized” and “recurrent expenditure”

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/14/2020

Revision provided. Please note that still, it's not accurate to say that the "management cost level for SGP STAR allocation has been agreed at the level of 10% ". Management costs will continue to be assessed based on the services provided. We note that the budget categories are clear in the table.

Cleared

The level of Project Management Cost (PMC) is not in line with GEF’s Policies and Guidelines.

The proposed PIF includes a 10% PMC. The justification provided is that “PMC is agreed at 10% for SGP”. This assertion is not accurate. The PMC for the SGP global programme core resources is assessed based on the proposed services to be provided. Therefore, there’s no fixed percentage that has been agreed. In

addition, this PIF covers additional STAR funding for a project that is already ongoing and that has already requested PMC. The core funding requested under two separate PIFs, i.e. 10084 and 10414, already includes a PMC level of 10%.

Please revise the PMC percentage to levels as per the GEF's Policies and Guidelines.

The GEF Secretariat distinguishes between grants to CSOs and all other use of funds with the objective of maximizing grant resources to CSOs; these non-grants component should include expenses incurred for technical assistance and capacity-building activities for CSOs and CBOs such as workshops and trainings, and monitoring and evaluation, as well as the GEF Agency fee.

Revision requested for both the level of PMC, justification and inclusion of a detailed budget as per GEF Sec's template shared with the agency in previous occasion. 9/29/2020

Agency Response

10/12/2020

(a) The management cost level for SGP STAR allocation has been agreed at the level of 10% to cover the additional cost of operation and monitoring activities that are required to manage the additional STAR resources at the country level. Also, as alluded to in the GEF Secretariat's comment, the **management costs for the SGP are accounted for the entirety of SGP finance including GEF Core and STAR resources** and cofinance. Thus, the previous Part 1 and 2 projects with Core resources and the estimation of management costs have been calculated and considered with the 10% PMC from the current STAR PIF. Given the reduced level of GEF-7 core resources available to the SGP compared to the former operational phases and the efforts to maximize grants under the core PIFs, this was critical and necessary.

Further, it is worth noting, that SGP grants are made to CSOs and CBOs that have relatively limited capacity requiring significant amount of handholding support and as such different from other projects whose primary clients include well capacitated government agencies and other partners. This translates into a need for higher management cost in general compared to a regular FSP/MSP project, with the need to provide capacity building and other related activities. Moreover, individual country STAR allocation to SGP is below US 2 million. Thus, all SGP country allocations could be essentially considered as MSPs and as such as per GEF policies and guidelines, the 10% PMC for MSPs could be considered.

Therefore, while all efforts are being made to increase the share of the PMC cost with the cofinancing sources, it is not possible to reduce the PMC percentage of the Part 3 PIF at this point as advised.

(b) A draft and tentative detailed budget estimate for the requested STAR amount is hereby provided with the amount of grants clearly identified together with other costs such as M&E, Knowledge Management, Technical Assistance and Project Management costs. This budget estimate will be further finetuned and confirmed at the time of CEO endorsement request.

Detailed budget template will be submitted separately, outside formal submission to GEF Sec

9/22/2020

Response to : Please note that there are a number of Letters of Endorsement (LOEs) for STAR funding in countries that were signed by Operational Focal Points (OFP) who are no longer in in office at the time of submission. Therefore, before the GEF Secretariat proceeds with the review and considers the PIF, please obtain updated LOEs for those countries, signed by the current OFP, and resubmit the PIF.

UNDP followed up with the relevant countries where the GEF OFPs has changed to request revised LOEs. Of the 6 countries, 4 countries (Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Yemen and Guinea Bissau) issued revised LOE that is included in the current resubmission while revised LOEs from 2 countries (Madagascar and Somalia) are outstanding and will be submitted as soon as these are received. In addition, 3 countries namely Laos, PNG and Nauru has fully utilized their GEF STAR resources despite issuing LOE to SGP. The funds for the PIF has been accordingly adjusted.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2020

The LoE for Burkina Faso was valid at the time of attempted submission on August 10, 2020. Due to problems with the Portal, the submission was only possible on August 28, 2020. Therefore, since the issues were out of the direct control of the Agency, the GEF Secretariat will accept the LoE.

For Bahamas, an email from the current OFP clarifying the amounts is included in the supporting documents.

For Senegal, the LoE signed by the current OFP has been included only.

A new LoE for Nepal has been included and the PIF adjusted accordingly.

Cleared 10/20/2020

10/19/2020

Updated LoE for Somalia has been included.

However,

1. Letter of Endorsement:

(i) The figures in the text of the LoE and in the Table need to match. For Bahamas the table in the LOE is by \$ thousand but indicating by \$, though in the preceding para it was correctly stated at \$550,000 – to avoid requesting a new LoE, please request an email from the OFP in which he/she clarifies the amounts in the table (all FA amounts + the Total have to be complete) – then this email needs to be uploaded in the section “Documents”.

(i) For Burkina Faso, LoE was dated 18 Mar 2019 and signed by the previous OFP . The new OFP in our website has changed since 10 Aug 2020, before the PIF was submitted. A new LoE is required.

(i) For Senegal, LoE is not signed by current OFP – a new LoE is required.

Revision needed

As noted by the Agency, there are 2 countries (Madagascar and Somalia) that need to resubmit their LoE, signed by the current OFP and indicating clearly the amounts by Focal Area.

Please revise 09/29/2020

Agency Response

10/19/2020

(a) As advised, we followed up with the Bahamas OFP. The OFP has issued an email confirming that stated amounts indeed refer to \$ thousands. This email has been included in the documents submitted with the current submission.

(b) For Burkina Faso, UNDP initiated submission of the PIF on 10 August 2020, before the new OFP for the country was announced. As GEFSEC was informed, due to technical issues with the portal however, the actual submission was delayed. GEFSEC has clarified that, as this was due to technical issues with the GEF portal, a new letter of endorsement is not required.

(c) The revised LOE for Senegal was included together with the old one. The revised/new LOE is submitted again.

(d) As discussed and agreed with the GEF Program Manager, an additional country Nepal is included in the current submission. The letter of endorsement from the OFP of Nepal is included with the submission documents.

10/15/2020

Updated LOE for Madagascar is provided

10/12/2020

As noted by the reviewer, UNDP has followed up with several countries where the GEF OFP has changed to request new letter of endorsement signed by the current OFP. Many of these were already submitted during the last submission. Revised LOEs from Madagascar is included in the current submission.

The only one outstanding is from Somalia and this will be submitted by 13th October.

Revised LOEs included in the submission

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

No PPG is requested.

Cleared 9/29/2020

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/14/2020

Revision provided.

Cleared

The unit for sub-indicator 5.1. is “number of fisheries”. Target is currently set at 5,000 so please revise the number. Also, please note that the targeted hectares are currently 1 M ha under sub-indicator 4.1. At the same time, the number of beneficiaries is only 120,000, making it over 8ha per beneficiary. These are mostly LDCs/SIDS so that ratio seems high. Please make sure that these different targets are aligned.

Please revise 9/29/2020

Agency Response

10/12/2020

We offer thanks for the comment and provide the following clarification. Based on trend analysis of earlier SGP results in the previous phases, SGP estimated that community measures under this PIF would contribute towards adoption of improved practices in 5,000 ha of marine habitats. However, as pointed out by the reviewer and upon further review, we realized that none of the sub-indicators under this, including sub-indicator 5.1 can be appropriately reported towards by SGP due to the potentially high cost and complexity of applying the relevant GEF result measurement methodology to small and dispersed SGP projects. Thus, after further consultation with the participating countries, it was agreed that this target and sub-indicator will be removed. SGP contribution under biodiversity focal area will instead concentrate on indicator 4.1 - Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (qualitative assessment, non-certified). Also, while we are confident that community led biodiversity-friendly practices and measures will cover a large area, including vast areas of ICCAs that are effectively governed by local communities and Indigenous Peoples, we agree that 1 million may be too ambitious. We have as such reduced the targeted hectares to 500,000 ha. With this the SGP contribution to the GEF core indicators are fully aligned.

Revised indicator targets in Table F and revised relevant text under the section – global environmental benefits (page 26)

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion **Yes, Cleared 9/29/2020**

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/14/2020

Revision provided.

Cleared

Yes. However, in the description of the project, please correct the reference to 55 countries, since there are only 52 countries included in this PIF. Also correct the reference to the total STAR funding requested and mention the 4 new countries, by name.

Revision requested 9/29/2020

Agency Response

10/12/2020

We thank the reviewer for pointing out this oversight. The number of countries has been corrected to 54 with a total STAR request of US\$ 45,161,408.

While the earlier submission was initially for 55 countries, GEF Secretariat later informed that there were 3 countries that did not have remaining STAR despite issuing an endorsement letter (Lao PDR, Nauru and PNG) thus they were removed at the time of submission and reduced to 52 countries. Since the last submission, 2 additional new countries providing endorsement of STAR are China and Palau.

Revised text under Part II 1a in the PIF

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/14/2020

Revision provided.

Cleared

Not entirely. Please make reference to the already approved projects related to GEF-7 core resources and how this additional funding will build on that. Also, make reference to any other GEF or non=GEF projects upon which this proposed project will build.

Revision requested. 9/29/2020

Agency Response

10/12/2020

As advised, additional text on the GEF core resources approved for SGP and other investments mobilized from additional donors have been included under the baseline section.

The additional GEF resources from STAR will build on these and other important investments, partnerships and lessons that form a strong baseline to deliver enhanced results in the relevant countries. These will include, but not limited to, increasing access to grants to higher number of CSOs/CBOs as would be possible solely through the core resources alone, leverage funding to open new resources and collaborations, enhance overall impact of community-led initiatives to address global environmental and sustainable development issues, in particular as related to the GEF focal areas.

PIF, project baseline page 17

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/14/2020

Revision provided.

Cleared

Once the baseline is revised, please revise this alternative scenario as appropriate.

Revision requested. 9/29/2020

Agency Response

10/12/2020

The SGP provides support to achieve global environmental benefits at the community level. It strengthens the capacity of communities and civil society organizations, increases their knowledge and awareness about environmental threats, and provides them financial support to overcome short-term decision-making that negatively affects environmental resources. Without the GEF support including through access to GEF STAR endorsement from the countries, there will be limited support available for CSOs/CBOs and local and national actors will not be afforded many opportunities to build on the strong community-led actions for environmental protection and overall sustainable development, which in turn will impact negatively the potential for replication and scaling of innovations that have been tested and nurtured by the SGP.

New text added under alternative scenario; page 20

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/14/2020

Revision provided.

Cleared

Yes. However, please refer to the comment made to the CCM2-6 and revise accordingly.

Revision requested. 9/29/2020

Agency Response

10/12/2020

The reference to CCM 2.6 has been removed. Please see response to comment 1.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, Cleared. 9/29/2020

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/14/2020

Revision provided.

Cleared

Please see comments on the indicators above. **9/29/2020**

Agency Response

10/12/2020

Please see relevant response earlier on revised targets.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, Cleared. 9/29/2020

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, Cleared. 9/29/2020

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, Cleared. 9/29/2020

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, Cleared. 9/29/2020

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, Cleared. 9/29/2020

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, Cleared. 9/29/2020

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, Cleared. 9/29/2020

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, Cleared. 9/29/2020

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, Cleared. 9/29/2020

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, Cleared. 9/29/2020

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2020

LoE for Burkina Faso was accepted by GEF Sec

An email from Jamaica's OFP clarifying the amounts is included

LoE for Senegal is valid.

New LoE for Nepal is included in the resubmission

Cleared

10/15/2020

Updated LoE for Somalia has been included. No other LoEs are pending.

Cleared

10/14/2020 P

10/14/2020

P

lease provide the updated LoE for Somalia

Please revise

Please note that the two of Letters of Endorsement (LOEs) for STAR funding in Madagascar and Somalia that were signed by Operational Focal Points (OFP) who are no longer in office at the time of submission.

Please resubmit new LoEs and include clear endorsement of funding by Focal Area.

Please revise 9/29/2020

Agency Response

11/9/2020

UNDP has reviewed all endorsement letters and made necessary updates as requested.

10/12/2020

Revised LOEs for Madagascar and Somalia (and any additional ones) have been obtained with clear indication of the funding by focal area as relevant.

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 the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/9/2020

Yes, the PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

11/9/2020

Not at this stage. Please review.

11/7/2020

Not at this stage. Please check all endorsement letters and remove the ones that are not valid

10/19/2020

Not at this stage, please see above several additional comments.

10/14/2020

Not at this stage. Please see above and resubmit.

Not at this stage, please review the comments provided by the GEF Secretariat and resubmit with the appropriate changes and additional information. **9/29/2020**

Please note that there are a number of Letters of Endorsement (LOEs) for STAR funding in countries that were signed by Operational Focal Points (OFP) who are no longer in office at the time of submission. Therefore, before the GEF Secretariat proceeds with the review and considers the PIF, please obtain updated LoEs for those countries, signed by the current OFP, and resubmit the PIF.

Not at this stage, please review the comments provided by the GEF Secretariat and resubmit with the appropriate changes and additional information. 8/31/2020

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review

8/31/2020

	PIF Review	Agency Response
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/29/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/14/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/15/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/19/2020	

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The objective of the proposed project is to promote and support innovative and scalable initiatives, and foster multistakeholder partnerships at the local level to tackle global environmental issues in priority landscapes and seascapes. This will be achieved through small grants to CSOs and CBOs in 54 countries, amongst which 24 countries are Least Developing Countries (LDCs) and 14 countries are Small Island Developing States (SIDS). The STAR funds included in the project will supplement the core grant allocation of GEF SGP (\$128 million) in these country programmes. Moreover, at least 4 countries that allocated STAR resources are new countries (countries that are newly going to be part of the SGP) supporting the path towards “universal access” to the Program by eligible countries.

Small grants will be targeted primarily towards local communities and civil society organizations, the poor and vulnerable, to access appropriate level of funding as they develop their capacity, take measured risks in testing new methods and technologies, and to innovate at the local level. SGP will also support projects that would serve as “incubators” of innovation, with the potential for broader replication of successful approaches through larger projects supported by the GEF and/or other partners. In this context, the SGP will strengthen its partnership approach as a CSO-led multi-stakeholder platform, by working closely particularly with private sector and government. The SGP grantees and partners will act as effective and important force to mobilize bottom up, civil society movements for systemic change in promoting environmentally sound sustainable development at the national, regional, and global levels.

The project components are:

1. Community-based conservation of threatened ecosystems and species

2. Sustainable agriculture and fisheries, and food security
3. Low-carbon energy access co-benefits
4. M&E and Knowledge management