

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

Review PIF 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

10/15/2019

Review completed by PM

4/16/2020

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

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.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

04/08/2020

Revised. Cleared

1- Please clarify the inclusion of fisheries under the LD component.

2- In addition, please explain if there is any scope for the SGP to support the Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) agenda as this is an important aspect of the global land agenda? If any, please include it in the text of the PIF.

3- Please include a mention of the alignment of the methodology for capturing results to the GEF's Results Framework under the M&E and Knowledge Management component.

4- Please make sure that the targets for the different indicators correspond exactly to the targets included under the core indicators in the corresponding table.

Revision needed.

4/7/2020

Revision and explanations provided.

Cleared

Agency Response

As per comments under **GEFSEC DECISION RECOMMENDATION part**, the description of activities, outcomes and results have been revised to only account for and reflect those that will be delivered under this project. All funding also including co-finance refers to the scope under the project and core funding allocation of \$64 million.

Submission 25 March 2020

1. In line with the integrated approach promoted by the GEF-7 programming directions and per the Implementation Arrangements for the SGP in GEF-7[1]¹, the SGP has adopted a set of strategic initiatives to promote integrated approaches to address key global environmental issues, as well as complement the Focal Area and Impact Programs at the community level. All the GEF-7 SGP Strategic Initiatives take a multi-focal area approach, addressing two or more focal areas under each initiative. Among these, the “Sustainable Agriculture, Fisheries and Food Security” Strategic Initiative will seek to coordinate and provide community-level inputs mainly to the LD and IW focal areas and direct SGP focus to support local farmers and fishers to promote and shift practices to sustainable agricultural and fisheries production and contribute to food security at the local level. In doing so, the SGP activities under this initiative is also expected to support measures that improve biodiversity friendly practices in agriculture and fisheries, promote community level actions that increase ecological connectivity and sustainable land management approaches at the landscape level. Thus, this component, while ensuring concrete results under the LD focal area as well as relevant GEF Impact Program namely the Food, Land Use, and Restoration (FOLUR), has been designed as an integrated approach to address inter-related key environmental issues in the agriculture, fisheries and food sectors through community-level actions.

2. With respect to the LDN, in relevant countries, where land degradation remains a visible problem and livelihoods continue to be jeopardized, SGP will support national efforts to address the challenge by supporting work towards Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN), applying the UNCCD LDN framework as appropriate. According to the report ‘Land Degradation Neutrality for Biodiversity Conservation: How healthy land safeguards nature’ launched in March 2020, LDN and the CBD’s 2011-2020 Strategic Plan for Biodiversity have multiple mutual objectives aimed at promoting the sustainable use of natural resources, ecosystems and biodiversity and can therefore strongly reinforce each other. Since both the UNCCD and CBD frameworks include a commitment to socio-economic goals, including contributing to health, livelihoods and well-being and ensuring that the benefits from the sustainable use of land and biodiversity accrue to all, especially women, indigenous peoples, and the poor and vulnerable, SGP will contribute to co-benefits between the two Rio Conventions. In this regard, the SGP will coordinate efforts to ensure that SGP programming considers national efforts such as LDN hotspots assessment, target setting. Reflecting the overall LDN framework, the SGP will employ measures to ‘avoid’, ‘reduce’ and ‘reverse’ land degradation in its grant making activities. Concrete measures at the country level will be identified as part of SGP Country Programme Strategy (CPS) formulation process in each country including where relevant incorporating LDN criteria during the selection of landscape/seascape for SGP intervention and identify concrete relevant activities to be supported.

3. A text noting the alignment of the methodology for capturing results to the GEF's Results Framework is now included under the M&E and Knowledge Management component. SGP priorities are aligned to that of the GEF-7 Programming Directions Paper and its outcomes to meet the GEF-7 targets. To capture global environmental benefits, SGP is aligned with 6 of the 11 GEF-7 core indicators. Guided by [Updated Results Architecture for GEF-7, 2018](#), only *direct* outputs and outcomes will be captured through the above indicators, i.e. only results that are attributed due to SGP's interventions.

4. All targets mentioned under the different indicators have been revised to be consistent with those reported under the GEF core indicators.

[1] GEF/C.54/05/Rev.01

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

04/19/2020

Comment addressed

Cleared

04/17/2020

One outstanding comment remaining:

The project includes in-kind contribution from the private sector that has been classified as "investment mobilized". As per the GEF Guidelines, where co-financing truly meets the definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized".

Please reclassify

04/08/2020

Revised.

Please address the following remaining comment:

It's understood that at this stage, all co-financing is indicative and that most of the co-financing will be confirmed and realized at the country level.

However, regarding the statement that "The SGP CPMPT is currently in discussion with several partners including multilateral and bilateral donors", Please revise the "TBD" and **provide more information about who are those donors.**

Revision requested.

--- End 04/08/2020 ---

Not entirely.

Please describe the definition/approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures". For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf).

Revision requested.

Agency Response

Submission 17 April 2020

All in-kind co-finance from the private sector has been reclassified as “recurrent expenditures”

Submission 15 April 2020

As reported earlier, co-finance for SGP including the majority accomplished at the local / country level is usually confirmed during the formulation and approval of the SGP grant projects once the GEF-7 projects begin implementation. At the global level, CPMT is indeed in discussion with several potential donors, partners and private sector for potential mobilization of co-finance. These include bilateral donors such as Australia, Germany and Norway, foundations such as the MAVA foundation and others like Satoyama Initiative and Lions Share Fund. In addition, initial exploratory discussions are already on-going with Microsoft for possible partnership. The table C co-finance has been accordingly revised. These are ongoing dialogue for partnership and confirmed global level co-financing will be informed at CEO endorsement stage

Submission 25 March 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.

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

• 04/16/2020

We don't have further comments at PIF stage.

However, we do expect to see a further increase in the ratio of grants to non-grants at CEO Endorsement, and a higher proportion of co-financing covering PMC and other non-grant expenses.

For more detail, please see the box with recommendations to take into account at CEO Endorsement

Cleared 04/16/2020

04/08/2020

Thank you for providing a detailed budget and the breakdown of expenses separately for M&E, TA and PMC.

Please provide further revisions, as follows:

1. On the share of M&E: We see that the share of the M&E budget's is 4.56%.

While we acknowledge the efforts made to respond to the recommendations of the Joint evaluation regarding strengthening of the monitoring system and the actions taken to improve capturing of information and measuring of results to adapt to the GEF-7 Results Framework, we still find that the M&E share is relatively higher compared to other GEF projects, including those in UNDP's portfolio (i.e. SGP's share is 1 percent higher than that of other UNDP projects).

Therefore, please revise the M&E budget further.

2- On classification of expenses: Please note that as per GEF Guidelines, Audits are considered PMC. Therefore, please reclassify this expense accordingly.

Revision requested

3. On grants and non-grants ratio.

We take note of the efforts and measures taken to increase the proportion of funding allocated to direct grants to CSOs and CBOs in the budget compared to GEF-6.

As mentioned in the CEO Endorsement Request of project 10084 (Part I of SGP Core Funding for GEF-7), the GEF Secretariat expects to see an upward trend in the ratio of grants to non-grants for GEF-7 total funding, i.e. from Part 1 to Part 2.

Hence, please revise expenses accordingly to increase that ratio. Relative to that, the GEF Secretariat would expect to see part of the co-financing cover a larger share of non-grant expenses.

Revision requested---

- end- (04/08/2020) --

Please provide an explanation of the rationale behind the management cost level (percentage) and a clear indication of the expenses that will be covered with that amount.

In addition, please provide a detailed budget for the \$64 million, with clear identification of the grants component and the management costs as well as a description of how UNDP plans to increase the grants to management costs ratio. The template circulated by the Secretariat at the time of the review of the endorsement request should be used to prepare the budget table for this PIF.

Revision needed.

Agency Response

Submission 15 April 2020

1. We take note of the fact that the SGP M&E share is slightly higher than that of other UNDP projects. As recognized by the reviewer, the increased investment in M&E is a direct response to the recommendation made by successive Joint Evaluations to improve M&E in SGP and to align results reporting in line with the GEF-7 Results Framework, including funding initiatives where appropriate to develop SGP specific measurement methods in consultation with relevant GEF Advisors (e.g. measurement of GHG emissions reductions) . SGP will also continue to invest and enhance critical M&E infrastructure during GEF-7, including development and maintenance of a robust updated database system. This is particularly important because all SGP grant project data is processed through and stored on the SGP database; the data base serves as a one-stop facility to share with all stakeholders' real-time information on the SGP grant making status and other related updates. Further, in line with the relevant GEF policy on Social and Environmental Safeguards (SES), SGP will place special emphasis on implementing strategies to screen, avoid, monitor and reduce possible social and environmental risks related to SGP projects, including requiring enhanced procedures for engagement with Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) and other best practices. These will be guided by the rigorous application of the UNDP SES Procedures. Beyond the above, the M&E challenges in SGP is further compounded by the fact that SGP works 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). At the country level, following the SGP M&E Strategy, all grantee projects are visited at least one time and all projects integrate monitoring activities to report on the results, provide necessary technical assistance, and importantly reduce risks. Despite the challenges and costs associated with 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. Given all these, further reduction in the M&E budget is not considered feasible, as any reduction from the current level will have corresponding consequences on the programme effectiveness and increased risks, and quality of M&E functions within the programme. That said, we will further explore and review the budget by CEO endorsement.

2. As per GEF guidelines, costs related to audits have been reclassified as PMC and moved to the PMC budget category.

3. We thank the reviewer for recognizing the considerable efforts and measures undertaken by UNDP to present a funding projection for the GEF-7 that increases the total funding allocated as direct grants to CSOs and CBOs based on discussion with the GEFSEC. Please note that UNDP achieved this subsequent a detailed review that considered extensive efforts to improve cost efficiencies, reduce costs and increase cost-sharing. These efforts have increased the share of grants from 50% in GEF-6 core funds (not including the delivery of STAR resources) to the currently projected 61% in GEF-7 (core funds, not including the delivery of STAR resources), even under a reduced overall programme budget. This budget ratio was determined based on the projected costs for the entire duration of the SGP's new operational phase of 4 years, covering both Part 1 and 2 projects. Further reduction in non-grant costs will have impacts on the quality and quantity of the services rendered by the program. That being said, UNDP is committed to continue to explore and will provide further consideration to this by the time of CEO endorsement, including the

share of non-grants coverage by the different types of co-financing mobilized.

25 March Submission

We thank the reviewer for the recommendation. As advised, a draft and tentative detailed budget estimate for the US\$ 64 million 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. Management cost has been retained at the agreed 10 percent. Details on the expenses under each budget line is indicated in the provided table. UNDP, following advice from the GEF Secretariat, have extensively reviewed the GEF-7 budget and increased the grants to non-grants costs ratio by reducing the non-grants cost amount (even with the anticipated increase in country coverage) while making all efforts to minimize the extent possible the negative impacts of costs reduction to the effectiveness of the programme. UNDP is also planning to enhance strategical approach in increasing cofinance and mobilizing resource for the SGP.

Detailed budget for US\$64 million being submitted separately to GEF Sec

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

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

Note: The project requests \$64 million (50% of the total) from the SGP core funding approved by Council (total \$128 million).

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

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

04/08/2020

Comments addressed.

Cleared

Please provide an explanation of how the core indicators were calculated, and how they're aligned with the GEF approved methodology.

In addition, since an estimate for the sub-indicators under #6 and #9 has been provided (see below) the Core Indicator (see the paragraph below) should be included in the Core Indicator worksheet. These estimates look fine and should be included under the sub-indicators.

“Indicator 6 -Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated (metric tons of CO₂e) -SGP portfolio will apply low carbon technologies to around 7500 households and increase installed total renewable energy (RE) capacity of 300 KW from around 25 technologies that will be demonstrated. SGP will demonstrate around 25 innovative integrated urban energy solutions. GHG benefits will be estimated and reported during annual reporting. Indicator 9 -Reduction, disposal/destruction, phase out, elimination and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials and products (metric tons of toxic chemicals

reduced)-a total of 150 tons of POP containing products/materials will be removed or disposed. Actual reduction in specific chemicals will be estimated during annual reporting.”

In addition, please provide a detailed description of the alignment of the methodology used to estimate the indicators with the GEF's Results Framework

Please revise

Agency Response

The core indicators have been revised.

25 March Submission

We thank the reviewer for the opportunity to clarify how the SGP contribution to the core indicators were estimated. The SGP considered several factors including a trend analysis of earlier results of related indicators and utilizing community-based methodologies. A reflection was also made on the continued implementation of landscape/seascape approach which supports stronger linkages between projects and possibility to have a deeper impact on both global environment and livelihoods at the community level. Furthermore, key issues that were considered in terms of alignment with GEF methodology included: (i) the compatibility of a given indicator with the local and grassroots driven work of the SGP; (ii) inclusion of direct impacts as defined by methodological parameters of the GEF-7 core indicators; (iii) trade-off between potential cost of applying the GEF result measurement methodology as is to the benefits in terms of limited results generation potential of many small and dispersed SGP projects. This was also extensively discussed with GEF colleagues during the past year whereby, 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.

Regarding the indicator 6, while SGP will continue to track its results using its current methodology, it is currently not possible for SGP to apply the GEF recommended methodology for estimating Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and as such the target is not included. SGP has held extensive consultations with recognized experts in the field of CO2 emissions measurement as well as with the GEF Secretariat colleagues on the indicator and target. Due to the nature of SGP (several hundred small projects in climate change focal area per phase, for example it is around 800 during the OP6 period to date), measurement of emissions for each project is not feasible from both cost and capacity considerations. However, as a pilot initiative, during GEF 7 period, SGP plans to contract a recognized expert, who will analyze related OP6 projects and will help develop an approach to measure CO2 emissions for SGP projects building on GEF methodologies. This exercise will be carried out in consultation with the GEF climate change specialists and will be used to train SGP country programmes on the methodologies and data collection.

For target 9 on POPs, the target has been updated and included in the GEF core indicators worksheet. Based on further 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. This sub-indicator is considered appropriate for community-based programming.

See core indicator worksheet submitted separately

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

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

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response As per comments under **GEFSEC DECISION RECOMMENDATION part**, all references to and representation of the SGP operational phase 7 and related SGP instruments have been deleted. The PIF elaboration now relates only to the current project and activities that will be funded under the core funding allocation of \$64 million.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

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

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Cleared

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

04/16/2020

Thank you for the clarification regarding Malaysia and the financial procedures to transition the country programme to its new upgraded status.

Thank you for providing a list and status of new countries. We expect that once the global pandemic has passed and activities can proceed, UNDP will resume its efforts to see new eligible countries join the programme.

No additional information requested at this stage.

Cleared 04/16/2020

Map included.

04/08/2020

To some extent, the PIF makes reference to 110 countries. This number coincides with that of the countries covered by the Programme in GEF-6. However, first, Malaysia has already been upgraded and a separate PIF has been approved for this country. And second, to understand where the process of accession of new countries to the Programme will be under this project, please provide a complete list of **any potential new country (ies)**, complementing what was submitted in the CEO Endorsement Request of Part 1 (project 10084) .

Revision requested

Agency Response

Submission 15 April 2020

The SGP global currently counts as 110 countries. As is the practice, countries that transition from the global to UCP continue to be part of the global programme both programmatically and operationally until the Project Document for the respective UCP country is signed. This practice is particularly relevant considering SGP adopts a rolling modality among operational phases and that the previous operational phase projects are still under implementation (i.e. OP6 grant projects) in these transition countries. As such Malaysia will fully transition into a UCP country once the GEF-7 SGP Malaysia Project Document is signed.

As for new countries, as earlier discussed with GEF Sec colleagues, a phased approach will be followed to add new country programmes, based on a number of factors, including the results and scheduling of SGP appraisal missions that will confirm country commitment to apply the SGP mechanism, the availability of GEF-7 and other resources, as well as travel restrictions and considerations pertaining to COVID-19 in 2020. An updated status of the new countries is being provided separately

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

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

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

Agency Response

Risks

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

04/19/2020

Comment addressed

Cleared

04/17/2020

Thank you for addressing the comments and providing information on the SESP pre-screening process as well as the overall project risk rating and types of risks.

Could you please attach UNDP's "Social and Environmental Screening Template" if possible.

Revision requested

04/08/2020

To some extent. Additional information is required:

The PIF states that UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards (SES) and accompanying Social and Environmental Screening Procedures (SESP) will be applied to the 'design of the Project Document and in the review for approval of SGP Country Programme Strategies', that guide the approval of the small grants in each country.

However, please note that the **GEF's Updated Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards**, requires that at PIF level, Agencies provide indicative information regarding any Environmental and Social Risks and potential Impacts associated with the proposed project or program; and any **measures to address such risks and impacts**' and this applies to 9 different minimum standards beyond climate risks.

Hence, please provide the following:

- An overall preliminary risk rating for the project;
- A description of the types of risks and, if available, risk ratings for the identified type(s)
- Any early screening/assessment report(s) and / or any indicative plans/measures to address identified risks, if available.

Please refer to the Policy at: https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/gef_environmental_social_safeguards_policy.pdf

And to the guidelines of the Policy at:

(https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/guidelines_gef_policy_environmental_social_safeguards.pdf)

Agency Response

Submission 17 April 2020

The pre-SESP form is submitted as a separate annex

Submission 15 April 2020

Per UNDP’s policy and in conformity with the GEF Policy on SES, the current PIF has been pre-screened by applying the UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP).

The result of this pre-SESP indicate the following:

- The overall preliminary risk rating for the project is “moderate”

- In terms of specific risks, at least three were identified as risks at the global level, while other risks will depend on the nature and type of interventions that each of the SGP country programmes will decide to focus on. The former three are presented below with a description of associated risk mitigation measures. Details on the other risks is in the detailed pre-SESP shared as a separate document.

<p>Risk 1: Project may potentially reproduce discriminations against women based on gender</p>	<p>The project will prioritize work with women’s groups, particularly poorer and more vulnerable women, as well as girls’ groups; team will formulate strategy to engage women/girls’ groups as primary actors in landscape and resource management and micro and small enterprise development. All GEF SGP proposals are reviewed and approved by a National Steering Committee comprised of experts in different fields, including a gender focal point.</p>
<p>Risk 2: A progressively drier and warmer climate may enhance the possibility of catastrophic weather events in part due to potentially increased frequency and intensity of rainfall in mountain ecosystems.</p>	<p>The risk of climate change is one of several reasons that the project has chosen to emphasize landscape-level management and coordination in productive landscapes. The project will promote a variety of adaptive biodiversity and land resource planning and management actions in forests, pastures and other agroecosystems. The project will build on SGP’s experience with the Community Based Adaptation (CBA) project which has piloted and tested approaches to enable communities to adapt to climate impacts and to build resilience and enhance food security. These lessons will be assessed and more broadly adopted within SGP programming in OP6.</p>
<p>Risk 3: IPs may not be sufficiently consulted on or involved in activities that impact their lands, territories and/or culture</p>	<p>In-depth consultations with IPs will be carried out as they develop their proposals and prepare their projects. All project concepts and proposals are subject to review and approval by the National Steering Committee (NSC), including the NSC IPs focal point, and experts members of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG), where relevant. Potential social impacts of projects are assessed by the National Coordinator and the NSC as part of proposal development, and actions to mitigate risk are incorporated into each proposal prior to approval. A comprehensive guidance note for SGP Country Programmes will be prepared on how to apply the SESP at the country level during the Country Programme Strategy (CPS) implementation, small grant project design and formulation, and community level monitoring during implementation.</p>

Based on the full application of the UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards and the comprehensive application of the SESP at the time of the CEO Endorsement, if indicated, a detailed risk mitigation / management plan including strategies on engagement and information sharing to key stakeholders will be developed and shared.

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

04/16/2020

Revised

Cleared

04/08/2020

As mentioned in past review, please classify UNOPs as 'other'. Please note that UNOPS is not a GEF Agency.

Revision requested

----end 04/08/2020 ---

Not entirely.

Please

In addition, the Execution Agency UNOPS is not a GEF Agency. Please classify it as "other".

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

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

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

N/A- Global project

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2020

Yes. The PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

04/17/2020

Not at this stage. Please include the PIF's submission date (which is blank) and address the remaining comment, on the classification of IM in the co-financing section and if possible attach UNDP's "Social and Environmental Screening Template" .

04/08/2020

Not at this stage. Please address the comments above and resubmit the project through the Portal.

11/7/2019

Not at this stage.

Before the GEF Secretariat proceeds to review the PIF GEF SGP 7th Operational Phase – Core (Part 2) in its entirety, please kindly note that this is a PIF for a stand-alone full-sized **project**, not a phase or a combination of instruments, and it should be processed as such. It must therefore comply fully with all requirements of 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 all key information corresponding to the PIF presented in the Portal must be referring to the Project only and to its core funding allocation (\$64 million).

Therefore, in order to fully review the PIF request for this SGP Global Second Tranche ID 10414, we require the following amendment in the resubmission:

- All aspects of the PIF request must refer to the \$64 million of core funds only, and not mix references and representation relative to Phase 7 or to existing or future SGP instruments, as currently presented.

- The description of activities, outcomes and results (core indicators), as well as any financial representations, should exclusively refer to the scope and funding of the project itself.

Not at this stage:

The PIF was revised and resubmitted by the Agency. However, since this PIF is directly linked to the CEO Endorsement of the first PIF (GEF ID 10084) it cannot be processed and reviewed until there's absolute clarity on issues regarding the financial, programmatic and operational information requested to be provided in the CEO Endorsement of project 10084. Once the CEO Endorsement is processed and cleared, this PIF 10414 can be considered.

1/16/2020

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1- UNDP to include a detailed budget, with a comprehensive description of the costs classified under each budget item, and their correspondence between PMC, TA and M&E .

2- 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.

3- A table with the planned allocation of resources to each one of the countries, including the new ones. This allocation amounts should distinguish between actual grants to CSOs and other expenses (grant to non-grant amounts).

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Review

Agency Response

Additional Review (as necessary)

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The SGP is a GEF Corporate Program that finances community-led initiatives to address global environmental and sustainable development issues. It is specifically designed to mobilize bottom up actions by empowering local civil society organizations, and poor and vulnerable communities, including indigenous peoples and women. The programme aims at empowering them to find innovative solutions in addressing global environmental challenges. The active participation of local communities in developing, testing and applying innovative solutions can play a key catalytic role for transformational change across a range of socio-economic settings, ranging from LDCs, SIDS, as well as middle and upper-middle income countries.

This project is part 2 of the SGP core funding approved by the Replenishment participants and Council members for GEF-7. Grants to CSOs and CBOs will have a greater focus in promoting and supporting innovative and scalable initiatives at the local level to address global environment issues in priority landscapes and seascapes. 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.