

GEF SGP 7th Operational Phase ? Core (Part 2)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10414

Countries

Global

Project Name

GEF SGP 7th Operational Phase ? Core (Part 2)

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/4/2020

Review completed by PM

12/17/2021

Program Manager

Elsa Temm

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 CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Cleared 04/09/2021

Agency Response

Response to GEF comments on 07/12/2021 (received under GEFSEC DECISION)

We have updated the starting date to 1 March 2022 due to the delay that we have experienced in Part 2 CEO endorsement review and approval.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Cleared 04/09/2021

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 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 CEO Endorsement Request

Cleared: 05/12/2021

Additional proof of co-financing has been submitted.

Not entirely.

The co-financing includes grant and in-kind co-financing for a total of \$64 million. However, only evidence of co-financing for one source (UNDP) has been provided. To this regard, the letter does not specify if the co-financing will be in kind or cash, or grant. Please review and include a revised letter identifying the type of co-financing provided by UNDP.

In addition, there are a number of co-financing sources listed with no evidence provided.

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 during implementation, at this stage of CEO Endorsement we expect to receive proof of co-financing from donor agencies and governments and private sector as expressed below.

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.?

Hence, as stated above. 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)

Please revise 04/09/2021

5/24/2021

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

We take note of the letter of co-financing signed by UNDP in the amount of \$5 million. However, in Table C and in the explanation provided in the review sheet, it's clear that this is the amount channeled by UNDP from other sources (bilateral donors and private sector) 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 provide a revised letter or evidence of co-financing separately for each funding source.

Agency Response

Response to comments from 05/24/2021

We thank the reviewer for the comment and would like to provide the following clarification.

With regard to the co-financing provided, due to near universal presence in nearly 170 countries, UNDP has indeed leveraged its demonstrated ability to deliver financial and programmatic support to a wide range of partners including government agencies and local communities globally by mobilizing co-finance from several partners to the SGP. Notably during the GEF-7 period, UNDP has mobilized a total of EURO 15 million (equivalent to US\$ 17.8 million) from the Federal Ministry for Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU). Under the auspices of the Global Support for Indigenous Community Conserved Areas (ICCA) programme (GSI-ICCA) delivered through SGP, these funds are expected to complement the urgent response and recovery needs of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) and compliment as cofinance to the GEF SGP. As requested, we would like to provide the funding letter from BMU (received 22 October 2020) to UNDP and associated grant agreement as evidence of this co-financing.

Please note that UNDP mobilizes co-finance for the entire duration of OP7 SGP global programme, which is planned for 2020-2024. As such, in addition to accounting for the mentioned US\$ 5 million cash co-finance for SGP part 2 project from this partnership, we would like to note that it will also be included as co-finance for the SGP part 3 project (and any further project as relevant), which will be submitted for CEO endorsement in due course.

Response to comments from 04/09/21

We thank the reviewer for the comment. SGP's co-finance is indeed differentiated between grant and in-kind. In-kind co-finance corresponds to related costs e.g. salaries of NGO staff, costs of premises, etc. at country and project levels, while grants are new and additional funding either directly delivered through SGP at the global and country levels as well as cash cofinancing mobilized by the grantees.

As acknowledged in the reviewer's comment, majority of SGP co-finance is from the beneficiaries at the local / country level and usually confirmed during the formulation and approval of the SGP grant projects once this project begin implementation. At the global level, CPMT has indeed mobilized through UNDP both grants and in-kind cofinance from several donors, partners, and private sector. As reflected in the CEO endorsement document (Table C), these include bilateral donors such as Governments of Japan, Germany and Norway; foundations such as the MAVA foundation and private sector (e.g. Microsoft).

With respect to the cofinancing letter that has been issued from UNDP for this Part 2 project, the entire amount mentioned (US\$ 5 million) is grant and reflects cash/grant mobilized and channeled through UNDP including, MAVA Foundation (\$2 million), Japan Biodiversity Fund (US\$0.5 million), German Government funded ICCA-GSI (\$2.5 million). These cofinance is evidenced and documented with concrete grant agreements between UNDP and the respective donors.

Table C ? cofinance has been revised to reflect the correct cofinance amount and category from UNDP.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

Budget comments:

Regarding the proportion of grants to be directly executed by CSOs and CBOs, during the PIF review, the GEF Secretariat made the following comments for consideration at CEO Endorsement:

"UNDP to further maximize the ratio of grants disbursed to local civil society and community-based organizations in the countries, compared to the non-grant expenses (including M&E and KM). Thus, for the CEO Endorsement request of this 10414 project, the GEF Secretariat expects to see an upward trend in the grants ratio from the 61% estimate included in the CEO Endorsement Request for Part 1 (ID 10084) , that moves the share towards the levels included in the 2007 joint evaluation of the SGP. "

The Agency has indeed reviewed the proportion and increased the grants ratio by 0.5 per cent or \$320,000. We acknowledge this effort as a step in the right direction, but we still consider it insufficient. Again, please make additional efforts to rationalize estimated expenses and move the ratio of the budget allocated to direct grants to CSOs compared to other expense items towards the ratios for GEF-3 included in the analysis of the IEO's 2017 Joint Evaluation.

On a related point, the travel amounts and the M&E amounts seem high, particularly in light of the restrictions posed by the current pandemic which will also restrict travel for some time to come and to cost savings already experienced in the travel item in the past 12-15 months. It is expected that these savings would translate in more *cash in hand* for the GEF-7 cycle, hence reducing the allocation from this tranche to travel and other related expenses.

In addition, the budget should be disaggregated further, in light of the amounts that are being projected by category. For Please provide information on the contractual services (more than 9 million dollars projected)

Please revise 04/09/2021: GRT

We take note that UNDP has revised the proportion of grants going to CSOs to 62% of the total budget for this part 2. This represents 1 percentage point up from the core Part 1 project. We acknowledge this effort as a step in the right direction and as such consider that our comment has been addressed. We expect, however, UNDP to continue its efforts to further improve the ratio of grants disbursed to local civil society and community-based organizations in the countries, compared to the non-grant expenses (including M&E and KM).

Agency Response

Response to comments from 05/24/2021

We appreciate the reviewer acknowledging our efforts made to increase the proportion of funds being disbursed to local civil society and community-based organizations.

As the reviewer will agree, this came about through a comprehensive exercise by UNDP to explore the maximum cost efficiencies and cost-savings in the SGP operations including also concerted efforts to mobilize co-finance and cost-sharing opportunities

Response to comments from 04/09/21

We thank the reviewer for recognizing the efforts made by UNDP to increase the grants ratio by undertaking measures to reduce the funding allocated to other items, including through extensive efforts to improve cost efficiencies, increase cost-sharing and limit spends under other funding categories. As noted by the reviewer, as part of the above efforts for, part 1 (ID 10084), UNDP was able to increase the ratio of grants to 61% going to CSOs and CBOs. At the time of first submission, UNDP reviewed the budget for Part 2 and further increased the allocation to grants to the extent possible.

The above increase was in fact the maximum that was possible without jeopardizing the programme services delivered by SGP particularly considering the expansion to few new countries. Having said that, given the current on-going pandemic and associated travel restrictions, planned travel under the M&E are not possible, hence UNDP was able to achieve further cost-savings under the M&E. The cost-savings have been reassigned to grants thereby increasing the total ratio of the grants to 62% in the current submission.

Moreover, it should be noted that, some of the savings under the travel will be offset by costs from unplanned and unforeseen items including supporting enhanced communication, facilitating NSC oversight through digital means as more countries adopt adaptive management responses to cope with the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Moreover, given the critical role of SGP in providing much needed support to communities, despite the pandemic, SGP activities including M&E has been progressing relatively unhindered. We thank the reviewer for recognizing the efforts made by UNDP to increase the grants ratio by undertaking measures to reduce the funding allocated to other items, including through extensive efforts to improve cost efficiencies, increase cost-sharing and limit spends under other funding categories. As noted by the reviewer, as part of the above efforts for, part 1 (ID 10084), UNDP was able to increase the ratio of grants to 61% going to CSOs and CBOs. At the time of first submission, UNDP reviewed the budget for Part 2 and further increased the allocation to grants to the extent possible.

On the budget under contractual services, this covers the cost of technical assistance provided by the SGP country programmes in over 111 countries, including around 80% of National Coordinators and Programme Associates that are under consultant contract.?

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 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 CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. Cleared 04/09/2021

Agency Response

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 CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. Cleared 04/09/2021

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. Cleared 04/09/2021

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. Cleared 04/09/2021

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. Cleared 04/09/2021

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. Cleared 04/09/2021

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. Cleared 04/09/2021

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 CEO Endorsement Request

04/09/2021

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 CEO Endorsement Request

Please delete the comment to the review sheet (Agency Response) as it applies to the other project.

The project proposal includes a map with the countries that are part of the project.

Cleared 04/09/2021

Agency Response

This comment was accidentally entered and has now been deleted.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

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 CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. Cleared 04/09/2021

Agency Response

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 CEO Endorsement Request

Not entirely.

? If possible, please provide a standalone and comprehensive gender analysis and strategy as part of this part 2 submission.

? The section on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment has not been updated. It refers to activities that has taken place since the submission of part 1 (e.g. translation of the on line course to French and Spanish ? which was completed earlier this year). Please ask UNDP to update the section on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment accordingly.

? The submission references SGP's gender mainstreaming strategy but it does not include a link to this strategy. Please ask UNDP to provide the link and or upload in the portal as part of the submission.

Revision requested 04/09/2021

5/24/2021 GRT Cleared

Agency Response

Response to comments from 04/09/21

We thank the reviewer for the comment related to revision of the section on gender equality and women's empowerment to include new and existing efforts to promote gender mainstreaming in SGP.

SGP considers gender equality and empowerment as essential elements for achieving sustainable development and global environmental benefits. In this regard, SGP has developed a global gender guidance note, which advises SGP country teams on preparing and/or updating their Country Programme Strategies (CPS) on all aspects related to gender, including development and mainstreaming in the CPS results framework as well as to consolidate and update the guidance on how to mainstream gender at the different levels of the programme.

Thus, at the country level, gender is an integral component of the Country Programme Strategies (CPS) by having a specific section to analyze the country context and approach, and SGP country programme teams support all NGO and CBO partners to consider gender in designing and implementing projects by having a gender focal point in the National Steering Committee and applying specific review criteria for project appraisal.

At the global level, considering the nature of the SGP and given the demand-drive approach of the SGP, a comprehensive gender analysis has not been carried as part of the part 2 project submission. Instead, all SGP countries undertake gender mainstreaming during the process of the CPS formulation. Integration of gender into the CPS is also guided by the SGP Gender Action Plan. The gender guidance note and the Gender Action Plan are shared with this submission.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. Cleared 04/09/2021

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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 CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. Cleared 04/09/2021

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 CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. Cleared 04/09/2021

Agency Response

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 CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. Cleared 04/09/2021.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

Not entirely.

Please provide a detailed KM budget and timeline with deliverables.

Please review. 04/09/2021

5/24/2021: GRT

cleared

Agency Response

Response to comments from 04/09/21

Knowledge management is a key aspect of SGP that positions it as a "knowledge leader" in capturing and sharing the work of communities and CSOs towards sustainable development and global environmental benefits. SGP's OP7 Knowledge Management Guideline and System outlines the different levels at which SGP's knowledge is being captured and shared, which includes global, country, and project levels.

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; shares good practices emerging from the portfolio at global conferences and events; and establishes partnerships to upscale best practices in environmental conservation and disseminate lessons learned widely.

Detailed costs and workplan on knowledge management and communications efforts are being discussed and decided on an annual basis at different levels, aligned to the editorial calendar and annual work plan. In 2021, some of the deliverables planned include maintenance and updating of different KM and communication platforms, brochure and publications on different thematic areas (including wildlife conservation, climate change, plastics, international waters, and others), a set of factsheets on the SGP's Innovation Programmes, workshops and knowledge management fairs at the country level. Further, relevant KM activities are being encouraged and organized through the SGP grants by CSOs/CBOs as part of the project activities.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. The project includes a ESS assessment.

Cleared 04/09/2021

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. Cleared 04/09/2021

Agency Response

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 CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. Cleared 04/09/2021

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. Except for the co-financing letters.

See above.

04/09/2021

Agency Response

Response to comments from 04/09/21

Please see response to comment 4 - cofinance.

Response to GEF comments on 07/12/2021 (received under GEFSEC DECISION)

As requested, we have uploaded the budget table under Annex E of the GEF Portal

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

04/09/2021

Not at this stage.

Please address the comments above and resubmit.

01/13/2021

Not at this stage.

Please resubmit and include the Checklist for CEO Endorsement Template duly filled out for this project.

055/24/2021 GRT

Please address the comment part 1 box 4

07/12/2021 GRT

not at this stage. please revise

1. The expected Implementation Start date has already past
2. Cut and paste the budget table under Annex E of the Portal entry

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/16/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/13/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/9/2021	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations