



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

GEF ID:	5141		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Global Support Programme for Preparation of National Communications and Biennial Update Reports for non Annex I Parties under the UNFCCC		
GEF Agency:	UNDP and UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5164 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-6; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$6,500,000
Co-financing:	\$1,800,000	Total Project Cost:	\$8,300,000
PIF Approval:	October 01, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Chizuru Aoki	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?	This is a global project, which provide support to countries to complete their national communications and biennial update reports	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? 3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	No endorsement letters are required for this type of project. UNDP and UNEP have the comparative advantage for this type of project. UNDP and UNEP have supported more than 145 countries to prepare their national reports.	
	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 proposal fits into the Agenices programs and staff capacity. UNDP is present in 166 countries where it implements programmes in the areas of	

		adaptation. The project is consistent with the 2010-2013 medium term strategy of the United Nations Environment Programme.	
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 resources for this project are available from the focal area setaside.	
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 and biennial update reports.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	The relevant GEF 5 focal area objective, CCM -6 (support enabling activities and capacity building), is 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 provide countries with support to complete their national communications and biennial update reports. The project is thus in line with country national communications.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	The project clearly articulates how the capacities will be developed. There will be a series of training activities to assist countries with their national	

		reports	
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?	Without the GEF financing countries will be without technical support to complete their national communications and the new requirement of biennial update reports.	
	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?	National communications are financed at full cost. This project will build on the previous national communications support program.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	The framework is sound and sufficiently clear. Component 1 will strengthen the capacity of institutions in developing countries to complete national communications and biennial update reports. Component 2 will provide technical backstopping to national teams for the preparation of NCs and BURs, including the preparation and dissemination of technical and policy-relevant guidance materials, and component 3 will enhance knowledge management, best practice, communication and outreach.	

	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?		
	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, further information should be provided by CEO Endorsement.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	The key stakeholders for the project have been identified, and these are national governments, and the relevant climate change committees in the various countries.	
	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 proposal takes into account potential major risks, and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The Support Programme will work closely with the with UNEP umbrella projects for Third NCs and technology needs assessments. Linkages will also be made with other related initiatives, such as the support provided by USEPA and UNFCCC for the development of inventory systems in LULUCF sector. There be coordination with UNDP global support projects, such as the Low Emission Capacity Building Programme.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Further information on the project implementation and execution arrangements should be provided at the CEO Endorsement stage.	
	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 level of funding for program management is 7.69%. This is higher than the GEF policy of 5%, but is acceptable for this type of project which is providing global support.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The funding per objective is appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Further information on the cofinance should be provided at CEO Endorsement.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	The cofinance which the Agencies are providing is in line with their role.	
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?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.	

	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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
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 Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	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.