



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

GEF ID:	4835		
Country/Region:	Georgia		
Project Title:	Expansion and Improved Management Effectiveness of the Adjara Region's Protected Areas		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4732 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$80,000	Project Grant:	\$1,283,636
Co-financing:	\$13,715,142	Total Project Cost:	\$15,078,778
PIF Approval:	March 21, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 07, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Maxim Vergeichik

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?	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.	07 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Letter dated 22 Dec 2011.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. UNDP has strong track record with this type of projects.	07 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	n/a
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. In line with UNDAF and supported by country office.	07 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

		Yes. Georgia is applying for the total BD resources of \$1.5 million.	Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.	07 Nov 2013 UA: Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	n/a
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	n/a
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	n/a
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	n/a
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Aligned with BD-1.	07 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	07 Mar 2012 UA: BD-1	07 Nov 2013 UA: 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?	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Aligned with the Ecoregional Plan for the Caucasus (ECPC) and the key priorities of the NBSAP.	07 Nov 2013 UA: Yes. Aligned with NBSAP, National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP), Ecoregional Plan for the Caucasus (ECPC), and National Tourism and Investment Strategy 2008.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. The project's focus is not on capacity building; nevertheless, sustainability of capacity to be developed is addressed within the institutional framework.	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.
	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?	07 Mar 2012 UA: No. Under section B1 there is a lengthy description of the baseline situation (para 4 to 8) but only a short and unclear description of the baseline project(s) in paragraph 9 and 10. Please shorten the description of the general baseline situation to the absolutely necessary information directly relevant to the proposed project and elaborate on the	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.

Project Design		<p>the description currently stands, it is a list of different investments that appear to work independently. The sources of funds and the focus of what those investments are trying to address is unclear.</p> <p>15 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. The description of the baseline project has been adequately revised.</p>	
	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?		07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>07 Mar 2012 UA: Not fully. Following a better description of the baseline project, please elaborate on the incremental value of the GEF investment.</p> <p>15 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. The incremental reasoning has been adequately applied</p>	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>07 Mar 2012 UA: Not fully. 1) What is unclear to me is how the project works towards the overall goal of increasing public involvement for sustainable use and nature conservation as referred to in the title of the project. The project framework does not fully reflect increased public involvement. 2) Please insert Investment type (TA/INV) into Table B for the second component.</p> <p>15 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Has been adequately revised</p>	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.

	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	07 Mar 2012 UA: Will be assessed after the baseline project and the incremental value of the GEF investment has been further elaborated. 15 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.	07 Mar 2012 UA: 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?	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. socio-economic benefits will be derived from nature based tourism.	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	07 Mar 2012 UA: Not sufficient. There is only a short reference to public participation in the Table under section B5. Further information on the involvement of communities needs to be provided. 15 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Has been improved.	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.
	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)	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Adequate.	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	07 Mar 2012 UA: Not fully. Under B6, please provide additional information on the coordination with the KfW project, the private sector, and WWF, which are all listed as co-financers. 15 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Has been improved.	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes

	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. The project is fully consistent with what was approved at PIF stage.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		n/a
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes, 8.6% which is appropriate for a project < \$2 million GEF investment.	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	07 Mar 2012 UA: Please make an effort to increase the indicative co-financing. In particular, the in-kind contribution of the national government appears too low. 15 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. Has been increased to 1:4.	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	07 Mar 2012 UA: In case of German bilateral aid included as co-financing, we would require a letter of intent by KfW indicating their interest to co-finance this project. 15 Mar 2012 UA: KfW has expressed its 'no objection' by email.	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	07 Mar 2012 UA: UNDP contributes \$150,000 in grant.	07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators		07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.

Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.
	• Convention Secretariat?		n/a
	• Council comments?		07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		n/a
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	07 Mar 2012 UA: No. Please address clarification requests in this review. 15 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. PM recommend the project for CEO clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
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?		07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		07 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. PM recommends the project for CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 07, 2012	November 07, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 15, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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

PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	18 April 2012 UA: Yes.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	18 April 2012 UA: Yes. The itemized budget is appropriate and co-financing ratio in line with PIF.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	18 April 2012 UA: Yes. PM recommends the PPG for CEO approval.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 19, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 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.