



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9858		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Supply Change: Promoting Reduction of Deforestation Impacts of Commodity Supply Chains		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4 Program 9;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$1,000,000
Co-financing:	\$2,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$3,050,000
PIF Approval:	July 20, 2017	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Paul Hartman	Agency Contact Person:	Ersin Esen

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>07/13/2017 Yes. Aligned with BD-4, program 9.</p> <p>In the fully developed project document to be submitted for final CEO approval please:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explicitly articulate which Aichi Targets the project will help achieve. - Strengthen the description of the project's contribution to avoiding loss of forests and globally significant biodiversity 	

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)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Design	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Cleared 07/13/2017 N/A This is a global project	
	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	07/13/17 Yes. Adequate at this stage. In the fully developed project document to be submitted for final CEO approval please strengthen of the description of how deforestation from commodities is leading directly to BD loss in the priority ecoregions described. Cleared	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	07/13/17 Yes. Cleared	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	07/13/17 Yes. Cleared	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	07/13/17 Yes. Cleared	
	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
Availability of Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	07/13/17	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		To be funded from BD global set aside.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	07/13/17 To be funded from BD global set aside.	
	<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"> Focal area set-aside? 	07/13/17 This is from BD global set aside, where remaining funding is sufficient. In the fully developed project document to be submitted for final CEO approval make efforts to increase the cash co-financing contributions, particularly from private sector. Cleared	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	07/13/17 Yes. Program Manager recommends the project for CEO PIF approval. Please note comments to be addressed at final CEO endorsement stage.	
Review Date	Review	July 13, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	November 7, 2017 Yes. The target outcome of hectares protected from deforestation increased from 1m to 2m ha of forest. Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 were all modified slightly with sufficient description explaining and justifying these changes. Cleared	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	November 7, 2017 Yes, GEF financing will support the Supply Change platform to track and document results of company actions, shifts in supply sourcing, changes in producer or supplier behavior, reduction in deforestation, and protection of forests and the critical biodiversity that depends on those forests. This will increase transparency and awareness, and raise	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		visibility of companies across the commodities supply chain that have made sustainability commitments to low or zero-deforestation, thus increasing pressure on them to meet their commitments on the protection of forests and their globally significant forest-dependent biodiversity. Cleared	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	November 7, 2017 Yes, financing is sufficient to meet the project objective in a cost-effective way. Cleared	
	4. 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)	November 7, 2017 Yes, potential risks are described and response measures identified. Cleared	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	November 7, 2017 Yes, co-financing has been confirmed and evidence provided. Cleared	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	November 7, 2017 Yes. Tracking tools have been completed. Cleared	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	N/A	
	8. Is the project coordinated with	November 7, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	Yes, the project is coordinated with many related initiatives, including the GEF financed Commodities IAP and WRI GFW, and other major initiatives in the deforestation from commodities supply chains realm. Cleared	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	November 7, 2017 Yes, the project includes a budgeted M&E Plan. Cleared	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	November 7, 2017 Yes, Supply Change is itself a knowledge platform and clear description of how the information it generates is provided. Cleared	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEFSEC 	November 7, 2017 Yes, 1) Aichi Targets that the project will contribute to (5 & 7) have now been identified. 2) Description of how deforestation from commodities is leading directly to BD loss in priority ecoregions is better described, and the explanation of the project's contribution to avoiding loss of these forests and their globally significant biodiversity	

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		strengthened. 3) Co-financing has been increase. Cleared	
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	November 7, 2017 Yes, the project is recommended for CEO approval.	
Review Date	Review	November 07, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		