



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	<b>5099</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Bangladesh</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Expanding the PA System to Incorporate Important Aquatic Ecosystems</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>4620 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Biodiversity</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-1; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,626,484</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$8,450,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$10,076,484</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ulrich Apel</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Sameer Karki</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	n/a	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes. But please enter the area figures in Table A under expected focal area outputs.  19 Sept 2012. Done. Cleared.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	BD-1	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Yes.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes. Through institutional framework, including community based ecosystems management and co-management arrangements.	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Yes.	

	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	Yes. Incremental reasoning has been applied and GEBs are being created.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes.	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	Yes. Sufficient at PIF stage, more details will be provided at CEO endorsement stage.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes. Sufficient at PIF stage, more details will be provided at CEO endorsement stage.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Yes.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes.	
	20. Is the project implementation/execution arrangement adequate?	Please describe why the Forestry Department is considered to be the appropriate executing agency and how it will co-ordinate with other related	

		19 Sept 2012. Addressed in the resubmission. Cleared.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Please check the figures: the subtotal/total in Table A are incorrect.  Please select type of co-financing from the drop down menu in all lines in Table C.  19 Sept 2012. Addressed in the resubmission. Cleared.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Please correct data inconsistencies in the tables.  19 Sept 2012. Addressed in the resubmission. Cleared.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes. UNDP provides \$1.25 million in grant.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators as applicable?		

	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>31 August 2012 (Ulrich Apel): Not at this stage.</p> <p>Please address clarification requests and re-submit. Program Manager will finalize the review upon receipt of a corrected version.</p> <p>19 Sept 2012. This PIF has been technically cleared and maybe included in an upcoming Work Program.</p> <p>14 Jan 2013: updated PIF with 9.5% Agency received and filed into the system.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	#16, #17	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 31, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 19, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 14, 2013	

	Additional review (as necessary)		
--	----------------------------------	--	--

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Yes.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes.
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	Not at this stage. Program Manager will finalize review of PPG upon resubmission of PIF.  19 Sep 2012:  Yes. Program manager recommends PPG for CEO approval.  14 Jan 2013: updated PPG request with new Agency fee received and filed.
	4. Other comments	PPG should to be completed earlier in order to accomplish CEO endorsement within 18 months of Council approval.
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 31, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 19, 2012

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.