



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

GEF ID:	5119		
Country/Region:	Global (Bahrain, Benin, Bhutan, Cook Islands, Eritrea, Lao PDR, Mali, Mauritius, Nauru, Seychelles, Sao Tome and Principe, Tanzania)		
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:	\$6,180,000
Co-financing:	\$1,098,000	Total Project Cost:	\$7,278,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 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?	The project is a global umbrella project. The proposed countries, Bahrain, Benin, Bhutan, Cook Islands, Eritrea, Lao PDR, Mali, Mauritius, Nauru, Seychelles, Sao Tome and Principe, and Tanzania, are eligible. RM 2012/09/17	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Letters of endorsement for countries participating in the project have been provided.	
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. RM 2012/09/17	
	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. RM 2012/09/17	
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. RM 2012/09/17	
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. RM 2012/09/17	
	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. RM 2012/09/17	
	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. RM 2012/09/17	
	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. RM 2012/09/17	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s),	The project will provide countries with	

Project Design	baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	commitments pursuant to Articles 4.1 and 12 of the UNFCCC. The baseline is sufficiently described. RM 2012/09/17	
	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. RM 2012/09/17	
	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. RM 2012/09/17	
	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/	There is a description of the socio-economic benefits. RM 2012/09/17	

	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Further information on public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, should be provided for consideration at CEO endorsement. RM 2012/09/17	
	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. RM 2012/09/17	
	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. The project will coordinate closely with the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (CGE) and will draw on their work regarding guidelines and training materials for the preparation of NC. RM 2012/09/17	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	The project implementation arrangements are adequate. Further information on the implementation /execution arrangements should be provided at CEO Endorsement. RM 2012/09/17	
	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 is appropriate. RM 2012/09/17	

	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 expected outcomes and outputs. RM 2012/09/17	
	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. RM 2012/09/17	
	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. RM 2012/09/17	
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.	
	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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*		

	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.