



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW SHEET FOR MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

GEF ID:	9840		
Country/Region:	Global (Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Dominica, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Mexico, Panama, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela)		
Project Title:	Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (6NR - LAC-II)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	6127 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-EA;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$1,501,500
Co-financing:	\$691,000	Total Project Cost:	\$2,192,500
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Midori Paxton Senior Technical

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	June 1, 2017 Yes, this is an enabling activity for producing the 6th National Report.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	June 1, 2017 Yes, fully in line with the requirements of the 6th National Report.	
	3. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	June 1, 2017 Yes.	
	4. Does the project sufficiently	June 1, 2017	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Design	indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Not applicable for an enabling activity. Cleared.	
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	June 1, 2017 Enabling activities are fully incremental. Cleared.	
	6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	June 1, 2017 Yes clear for achieving project objectives, but national reporting will not produce GEBs, per se. Cleared.	
	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	June 1, 2017 Yes.	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	June 1, 2017 Yes.	
	9. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	June 1, 2017 The project presents an adequate risk assessment for national reporting. Cleared.	
	10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	June 1, 2017 Yes. Cofinancing is not required for	

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		enabling activities, however, in the OFP endorsement letters, confirmation of in-kind contributions is provided. Cleared.	
	11. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	June 1, 2017 NA.	
	12. <i>Only for Non-grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	June 1, 2017 NA.	
	13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	June 1, 2017 Yes.	
	14. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	June 1, 2017 Yes.	
	15. Does the project have description of knowledge management plan?	June 1, 2017 Yes.	
Availability of Resources	16. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	June 1, 2017 NA.	
	• The focal area allocation?	June 1, 2017 Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	June 1, 2017 NA.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	<p>June 1, 2017</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	<p>June 1h, 2017</p> <p>Yes this is funded from the biodiversity focal area set aside.</p>	
Recommendations	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	<p>June 1, 2017</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
Review Dates	First Review	June 01, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		