



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

GEF ID:	5880		
Country/Region:	Global (Bolivia, Brazil, Botswana, Belize, Cote d'Ivoire, Cameroon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Jamaica, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Malawi, Mexico, Mozambique, Panama, Peru, Paraguay, Suriname, El Salvador, Tanzania, Uganda, South Africa)		
Project Title:	Knowledge for Action: Promoting Innovation Among Environmental Funds		
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-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$913,240
Co-financing:	\$2,522,800	Total Project Cost:	\$3,436,040
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Yoko Watanabe	Agency Contact Person:	Robert Erath

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 ?	This is a global project. The identified participating countries are all eligible for GEF BD finance.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	n/a as this is a global project.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	n/a	

*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)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	Yes, the project amount is within the remaining GEF-5 BD focal area allocation.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	This project is expected to be financed through the BD FA set-aside finance. As noted above, the project amount is within the GEF-5 BD FA allocation.	
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>	Yes, it is well aligned with BD1 on sustainable financing of PA system.	
	<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>	Yes, the proposal is well aligned with the CBD biodiversity strategy and targets, as well as country level NBSAP and other strategies.	
	<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>	Baseline projects and initiatives, particularly led by the Redlac and Cafe are sufficiently described. Further details on their linkage and coordination are expected by the time of MSP approval.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	Yes, the project framework is sufficiently clear at this stage. Concrete baseline data/information as well as targets should be clarified by the time of MSP approval.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes, sufficiently described at this stage. Tangible and measurable Global Biodiversity Benefits should be further determined by the time of MSP approval, particularly on the benefits towards protected areas systems as this project is specifically linked to BDI.	
	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?	Stakeholder involvement is adequately informed. However, concrete coordination mechanisms with the CSOs should be further clarified by the time of MSP approval.	
	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)	Yes, adequately explained. Further details and analysis are required by the time of MSP approval.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, coordination with ongoing GEF trust fund related projects and other initiatives are noted, particularly by the CFA. Coordination mechanism and roles should be further clarified by MSP approval, particularly with CFA and other related key initiatives.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • 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>Yes, the project is innovative as it promotes design and implementation of innovative conservation finance tools through existing networks of Environmental Funds to complement the traditional sources of funding for biodiversity conservation. Active involvement of private sectors through various innovative funding mechanisms is also an innovative element of this project.</p> <p>On sustainability, the project will reinforce Environmental Funds in their effort to improve conservation finance in a long term by mobilizing significant financial resources from diverse sources.</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>Yes, the cofinancing ratio is 1 to 2.5 and considered adequate.</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>Cofinancing is identified from FFEM, Redlac, and Cafe. There is no cofinance identified from UNEP.</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?		
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes, PMC is about 5% of the project grant and proportionate to the cofinance.	
	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?	No PPG finance is requested as they have secured resources from other sources for project preparation. In particular, it is important that Global Environmental benefits (GEB), baseline and targets, and coordination mechanism with other relevant initiatives, are further clarified during the preparation of the MSP proposal.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	
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?	Yes, the PM recommends the PIF for CEO approval.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
PIF Stage	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	June 12, 2014	
Review Date (s)	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.**