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

GEF ID:	**5237**		
Country/Region:	**South Africa**		
Project Title:	**Enabling South Africa to Prepare Its Third National Communication (3NC) and Biennial Update Report 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; Project Mana;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$4,006,650**
Co-financing:	**$1,351,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$5,357,650**
PIF Approval:	**February 20, 2013**	Council Approval/Expected:	**April 12, 2013**
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 [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	South Africa is eligible to receive resources.	Same as PIF stage
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	An endorsement letter from the operational focal is on file.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	UNEP has the comparative advantage for this project. UNEP has considerable experience implementing these types of projects.	Same as PIF stage
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	N/A
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity	Yes the project fits into the agency's program	Same as PIF stage

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

[1] Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	in the country?		
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	The resources are available in the STAR Allocation	Same as PIF stage
	• 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?	US$852,000 is available from the focal area set aside for this project.	Same as PIF stage
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	The project is aligned with GEF CCM results framework. The project once successfully implemented will assist South Africa to prepare its third national communications.	Same as PIF stage, the project will allow South Africa to prepare its third national communication and first biennial update report.
	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 are identified.	Same as PIF stage
	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 is consistent with the priorities of South Africa. The project fits in well with the National Climate Change Response Policy (NCCRP) which was completed in 2011. The NCCRP describes the overall strategic approach for South Africa's climate change response.	Same as PIF stage.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes. The activities of the project will allow for the collection of information to complete the development of greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories.	Same as PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		The project will allow for the establishment of a national inventory management system to ensure that GHG information will be continuously collected, and allow South Africa to generate information on GHGs.	
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?	Yes. The project responds to a requirement which countries have, to prepare national communications to the UNFCCC. The project consists of the following components (i) National Circumstances, (ii) GHG Inventories, (iii) Measures to adapt to climate change (iv) Measures to mitigate climate change (v) Other information to relevant to the Convention (vi) Biennial Update Report to the UNFCCC and (vii) Other activities.	Same as PIF stage.
	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?		Yes the project is cost effective. The project will strengthen existing human and institutional capacities to be used for current and future reporting. Information and data from previous national communications will be used as reference material for subsequent national communications reporting, avoiding duplication of effort and promoting efficient use of financial and human resources.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	The project will assist in preparing the national communications for South Africa and thus it is not necessary to demonstrate additional reasoning.	Same as PIF stage.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	There is a need for some further on some issues in the project. In component II, National GHG	The project framework is sufficiently clear.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Inventory it is noted that the GHG Emissions will be compiled and made available for the period 2000, to the latest year as far as possible on the basis of data availability. In the project matrix, the expected outcome is stated as Information of GHG Inventory and trends provided for the period 2000 to 2012. Clarification is therefore requested on the actual years for which GHG inventories will be completed, and whether inventories for the years 2010-2012 will be completed. The project will establish a national inventory management system. Clarification is requested on outcome 2.3, as to whether this component will involve the actual enhancement of institutional capacity to facilitate the establishment of the national inventory management system.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	The applied methodology for this project is appropriate.	Same as PIF stage.
	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?	Yes information is provided on the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project. Further information should be provided by CEO Endorsement.	The additional information provided on the socio-economic benefits is satisfactory.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Information on public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, has been provided. Further information should be provided by CEO	The additional information provided on public participation is satisfactory.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Endorsement.	
	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 possible mitigation measures.	Same as PIF stage.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The proposed project is to designed and implemented in coordination with other GEF strategic area projects. There will be coordination with future adaptation projects and the development of the measurable, reportable and verifiable (MRV) system.	Same as PIF stage.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	The project implementation/execution arrangements adequate.	Same as PIF stage
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		The project is close to what was presented at PIF stage. There are no major changes.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The level of funding for project management is appropriate. The Agency fee needs to be recalculated in line with guidance recently issued by the GEF Secretariat. Effective Jan. 1, 2013, all projects approved/cleared by CEO will be subject to the new fee policy as follows:	The funding for project management cost is appropriate.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		9.5% for GEF project grants up to and including $10 million; 9.0% for GEF project grants above $10 million.	
	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.	Same as PIF stage
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The proposed co-finance is adequate.	Co-finance is adequate but not required for this type of project.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	The co-finance amount that the agency is bringing to the project is in line with its role.	Same as PIF stage, although cofinance is not required for this type of project.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes this is included.
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 is not yet recommended for clearance. Please address comments in boxes 14 and 23. Please also include an indicative timeline for the submission of the BUR and the TNC.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Update February 11th 2013-RM The relevant clarifications have been provided, and the requested changes have been made in the document. The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	At CEO endorsement please provide further information on the improved technology needs assessment and technology action plan, in particular: (i) Please clarify the methodology to be used for updating the technology needs assessment. (ii) Please also clarify which sectors will be targeted for this technology needs assessment (iii) Please clarify how the project will coordinate, and exploit potential synergies with Pilot African Climate Technology Finance Center and Network (AfDB-GEF 4904)	
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?		The project is recommended for CEO endorsement. All of the relevant clarifications have been provided. South Africa has opted not to use additional resources for this project for the preparation on intended national contributions to the UNFCCC 2015 agreement.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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.