



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

GEF ID:	4794		
Country/Region:	Global (Antigua And Barbuda, Burkina Faso, Dominica, Fiji, Grenada, St. Kitts And Nevis, Myanmar, Niue, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Suriname, Tuvalu, St. Vincent and Grenadines)		
Project Title:	Umbrella Programme for National Communication to the UNFCCC		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-6; CCM-6; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$7,210,000
Co-financing:	\$1,281,000	Total Project Cost:	\$8,491,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Rawleston Moore	Agency Contact Person:	George Manful

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	<p>The project is a global umbrella project. A list of the participating countries should be included in the project document.</p> <p>Update April 6th 2012.</p> <p>A list of countries has been provided. There needs to be a discussion between the GEF and UNEP on the participating countries.</p>	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>Letters of endorsement for countries participating in the project need to be provided.</p> <p>Update April 6th 2012</p> <p>Endorsement letters from the</p>	

		provided. UNEP is requested to re-examine the endorsement letter from Tuvalu.	
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.	
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	The project will allow countries to meet	

	strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?		
	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.	
	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.	
Project Design	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 project documents and national workplans. The second component of the project will allow countries to prepare their national communications.	

	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 indigenous 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.	
	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?		
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The project management cost is appropriate.	

Project Financing

	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The total project cost is US\$11,330,000, and the funding per objective is appropriate and adequate to achieve expected outcomes and outputs.  Update April 6th 2012  The total project cost is now \$US7,210,000, as the project is for 14 countries. The funding per objective is appropriate and adequate to achieve expected outcomes and outputs.	
	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.	
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:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	The PIF is not being recommended for clearance. There are no endorsement letters for the project. In order for full consideration of the project endorsement	

		<p>submitted. A list of the countries participating in the project should also be included in the project document.</p> <p>Update April 6th 2012</p> <p>The PIF is not recommended for clearance. There needs to be a discussion between the GEF and UNEP on the participating countries. UNEP is requested to re-examine the endorsement letter from Tuvalu.</p> <p>Update April 16th 2012</p> <p>Niue has been added to the project as a participating country, and the endorsement letter issues have been resolved. The project 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**

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