



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

GEF ID:	<b>4498</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Global</b>		
Project Title:	<b>National Communication to the UNFCCC</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCM-6; CCM-6; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$11,330,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$2,013,500</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$13,343,500</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Rawleston Moore</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>George Manful</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	The project is a global umbrella project, however there needs to be clarification provided on the countries which will participate	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Letters of endorsement for each country participating in the project need to be provided.  Update 8th September 2011  Endorsement letters have been provided, however for Guinea-Bissau a letter from the political focal point has been provided. A letter from the operational focal point needs to be provided from	

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

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the operational focal point from Guinea-Bissau.</p> <p>Update September 16</p> <p>The correct letter letter from the operational focal of Guinea-Bissau has been provided. The project will now include 22 countries with an endorsement letter from the operational focal point of St. Lucia provided.</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	The agency's comparative advantage is clearly described. UNEP has extensive experience providing technical backstopping and assistance for this kind of activity	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	The project fits into the Agency's program.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?	The proposed grant requested is within the focal area set aside	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	The project is aligned with the GEF CCM results framework. The project once successfully implemented will assist countries to prepare their national communications	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	CCM-6 is the relevant focal area objective and it has been identified	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	The project will allow countries to meet their commitments to the UNFCCC.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	The project will allow countries to build capacities to identify key sectoral vulnerabilities and to do greenhouse gas inventories.	
Project Design	11. 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?	The project will provide countries with the resources to fulfill their commitments pursuant to Articles 4.1 and 12 of the UNFCCC. The baseline is sufficiently described	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	The activities proposed in the project are appropriate .	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	The project framework is clear. The first component will allow participating countries to do stocktaking and self-assessment activities to prepare their	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>project documents and national workplans. The second component of the project will allow countries to prepare their national communications.</p> <p>Please revise Table A, so that each expected FA outcome has its own budget figure.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	N/A	
	16. 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?	There is a clear description of the socio-economic benefits	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	N/A	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	The project takes into account potential risks and identifies mitigation options to reduce the risk	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The project is coordinated with the relevant related initiatives	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	The project implementation arrangements are adequate	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The project management cost are appropriate	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>The funding per objective is appropriate, however the total project should cost US\$30million inclusive of fees, if it is to include 60 countries. The total figure needs to be adjusted based on the number of countries from which UNEP receives letters of endorsement.</p> <p>Update September 8 2011</p> <p>The project has been reduced to 21 countries. The total project costs is now US\$10,815,000.</p> <p>Update September 15</p> <p>The project has been increased to 22 countries. The total project cost is now US\$11,330,000</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The GEF provides full cost for enabling activities.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	This will be done on a country by country basis. The GEF provides full cost for National Communications activities	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council comments?</li> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p><b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b></p>	<p>The PIF is not being recommended for clearance. The total project should be a maximum cost US\$30 million inclusive of the fee. Endorsement letters from each country participating in the project need to be submitted, and total resources requested for the project need to be adjusted according to the number of countries participating.</p> <p>Update September 8 2011</p> <p>The PIF is not yet cleared. The project is now for 21 countries, US\$10,815,000. Endorsement letters have been provided, however there is a need to provide the correct endorsement letter from Guinea Bissau. A list of the countries participating in the projects should also be provided. An explanation of the elements/components of the national communication should be provided in</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>section B2.</p> <p>Update September 16 2011</p> <p>The relevant changes have been made. The project is now for 22 countries, with an endorsement letter for St. Lucia on file. The project costs are now US\$11,330,000. The PIF is recommended for clearance</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat	<b>3. Is PPG approval being</b>	

Recommendation	<b>recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.