



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

GEF ID:	9950		
Country/Region:	Montenegro		
Project Title:	Growing Green Business in Montenegro		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5488 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1 Program 2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$771,690
Co-financing:	\$4,643,490	Total Project Cost:	\$5,415,180
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ming Yang	Agency Contact Person:	Marcel Alers

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>MY 11/9/2017 Yes.</p> <p>This project (GEFID 9950) was developed on the basis of the GEFID 9672. Both of the two projects have the same title, components, outputs, and implementation and executing agencies. The GEFID 9672, which was in two steps of MSP, has been technical cleared, but not proceeded, due to GEF budget cut. Now, the agency (UNDP) would like to proceed the project with one step MSP. The GEF SEC thus canceled the GEFID 9672 project and gave a new GEFID</p>	

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)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>9950 for the project. Detailed project technical reviews on this GEFID 9950 is available at the GEF PMIS saved for GEFID 9672 project.</p> <p>For convenience, the comments and responses for GEFID 9672 are copied for this project in this box and all boxes below.</p> <p>11/30/2016 MY Yes, It is aligned with GEF6 CCM-1 Program 2: To develop and demonstrate innovative policy packages and market initiatives to foster new range of mitigation actions.</p>	
	<p>2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>MY 11/9/2017 Yes, only in a minor change and it is reasonable.</p>	
	<p>3. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>MY 11/9/2017 Yes.</p> <p>11/30/2016 MY Not completed at this time. The PIF described project consistency with the country's national strategies and plans that are related to the UNFCCC. But that is not sufficient. Please try to demonstrate or estimate how this MSP will contribute to the targets of GHG emission reductions which the country has pledged to the UNFCCC in its NDCs.</p> <p>3/6/2017 MY Yes, comments were addressed and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		issues were cleared.	
Project Design	4. Does the project sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>MY 11/9/2017 Yes.</p> <p>11/30/2016 MY Not completed at this time.</p> <p>It is not clear why the country does not have good green business as of today. Please find and present root causes (or root drivers of the current situation).</p> <p>In the section of Innovation on page 12, please focus on this project, rather than other projects or platforms.</p> <p>In the section of potential for scaling up on page 12, please use stronger arguments or facts rather than objective statements while justifying potential scaling up.</p> <p>3/6/2017 MY</p> <p>Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>	
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>MY 11/9/2017 Yes.</p>	
	6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>MY 11/9/2017 Yes.</p> <p>11/30/2016 MY Not at this time.</p> <p>1. Put numbers to each of the project outputs in Table B, and estimate the cost</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>for each of them;</p> <p>2. Put the number of training workshops and vocational training programs in the outputs of Component 2 on page 2;</p> <p>3. At outputs of Component 3, put the number of banks that will receive TAs from the project;</p> <p>4. Indicate the number of policies and regulations to be mainstreamed;</p> <p>5. Most importantly, the INV sub-component in Component 3 looks like a TA sub-component. Please revise it and make it a real INV sub-component. Examples of such INV sub-component include the signed loan agreements between the green business developers and the local banks, with their investment plan and amounts of capital in the loan documents. Please call the PM if any clarification is needed.</p> <p>3/6/2017 MY</p> <p>Yes, comments were addressed and issues were cleared.</p>	
	<p>7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>MY 11/9/2017</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>11/30/2016 MY</p> <p>Not completed yet.</p> <p>Please justify if and how this project is relevant to indigenous people.</p> <p>3/6/2017 MY</p> <p>Not completed yet, but the commend can</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		be addressed during the CEO endorsement stage. Please estimate any impact of the this project on Roma, the Minority and Indigenous Peoples in Montenegro. B7 11/30/2016 MY Yes.	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	MY 11/9/2017 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)	MY 11/9/2017 Yes.	
	10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	MY 11/9/2017 Yes.	
	11. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	MY 11/9/2017 Yes.	
	12. <i>Only for Non-grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	MY 11/9/2017 N/A	
	13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	MY 11/9/2017 Yes.	
	14. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and	MY 11/9/2017 Yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	targets?		
	15. Does the project have description of knowledge management plan?	MY 11/9/2017 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?	MY 11/9/2017 Yes.	
	• The focal area allocation?	MY 11/9/2017 Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	MY 11/9/2017 N/A	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	MY 11/9/2017 N/A	
	• Focal area set-aside?	MY 11/9/2017 N/A	
Recommendations	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	MY 11/9/2017 Yes. The project has been technically cleared. The PM recommends CEO Approval.	
Review Dates	First Review	November 09, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		