



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

GEF ID:	5776		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Supply Change: Securing Food, Sustaining Forests		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$1,900,000
Co-financing:	\$2,725,000	Total Project Cost:	\$4,725,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ian Gray	Agency Contact Person:	Kristin McLaughlin

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	March 14, 2014 Global with funds sought from BD setaside.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	March 14, 2014 Global with funds sought from BD setaside.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	March 14, 2014 Global with funds sought from BD setaside.	
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of		

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	equitable access		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>March 14, 2014 The project is aligned with a single BD objective BD2 mainstreaming biodiversity into productive landscapes. Also contributes to CC and SFM objectives. Aichi Targets are identified but please detail further the SMART indicators to be used to track contribution.</p> <p>April 21, 2014 Cleared. Additional detail on tracking indicators provided in framework and in section B2.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>March 14, 2014 Global with funds sought from BD setaside, but contributes to increasing level of information and relevant analysis available to the international community and highly relevant to national land use planning and REDD+ discussions.</p>	
	<p>6. 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?</p>	<p>March 14, 2014 The baseline scenario is one of partial and limited data availability and fragmented publicly available information on the supply and demand of sustainable commodities. The lack of a comprehensive analysis is limiting the identification and selection of opportunities for action by public and private sector movers. It would be helpful to identify in the baseline the information</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>products already available. This is generally described but could benefit from specifics; this would then help support the incremental reasoning of the outputs from this work.</p> <p>April 21, 2014 Cleared. Additional description of baseline included. Further refinement is anticipated during project preparation.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>March 14, 2014 Overall clear sound and detailed but, please remove 3.1.1 this is taking place imminently and outputs cannot be retrospective. Also 3.1.4 is too vague it would be much clearer if outputs were in the form of reports or other knowledge products rather than the events themselves. 3.2 may also be redundant if 3.1.4 is not focused on the Iguassu Falls event.</p> <p>April 21, 2014 Cleared. Component 3 has been redesigned to focus on the provision of information for enhanced dialogue.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>March 14, 2014 a) GEBs need to be defined a little more clearly Section 5 is rather vague regarding the individual components. b) See Q 6 above about refining the baseline, this will improve incremental reasoning.</p> <p>April 21, 2014 Cleared. GEBs described support strengthened capacity among decision makers in public and private sectors</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		related to agricultural policies and commodity production.	
	9. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	March 14, 2014 CSOs included in lists of consultative partners. Please make explicit the link to local groups and IPs for example through the roundtable chapters. April 21, 2014 Cleared. Additional details added.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	March 14, 2014 Yes major risks and mitigation measures identified.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	March 14, 2014 Sufficient at PIF stage. By CEO endorsement clear identification of and means of coordinating with related initiatives will be expected.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, 	March 14, 2014 The project is addressing a gap in the information available to decision makers involved in sector policy, land use and commodity management without which clear strategic choices are difficult to	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>and if not, why not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>identify. However please provide strategy for sustaining the activities after the initial 24 months of the project.</p> <p>April 21, 2014 Cleared. Sufficient detail for PIF stage. Additional information sought as project preparation is completed.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
Project Financing	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>March 14, 2014 GEF funding levels appear realistic. Co-finance is low even for SFM-related projects. Please try and identify additional sources.</p> <p>April 21, 2014 Co-finance stands at \$2,725,000. Additional information on co-finance situation provided. It is expected that increased co-finance will be apparent following project development.</p>	
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line</p>	<p>March 14, 2014 UNEP is not contributing financially to the project but this is considered acceptable given UNEPs role.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	April 21, 2014 UNEP DEPI is providing \$300,000 in-kind support.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	March 14, 2014 PMC is 5%.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	March 14, 2014 PPG is within the norms.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	March 14, 2014 There is no NGA.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	March 14, 2014 Not at this stage – please see comments	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
PIF Stage		above. April 21, 2014 Yes. Recommended.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	1. Additional detail on activity baselines and targets. 2. Coordination with related initiatives. 3. Further consideration of project sustainability. 4. Increase in co-finance level.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	March 14, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 21, 2014	
	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.**