



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	10040		
Country/Region:	Sri Lanka		
Project Title:	Enhancing and Bridging Knowledge Gaps in Sri Lanka's NDC Implementation of AFOLU Sector for Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF)		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CBIT-1; CBIT-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$863,242
Co-financing:	\$1,796,000	Total Project Cost:	\$2,659,242
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Akio Takemoto	Agency Contact Person:	Yurie Naito

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	AT/JDS, April 4, 2018: Yes, this project is aligned with the programming directions of the CBIT.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	AT/JDS, April 4, 2018: Yes, this project is consistent with Sri Lanka's national strategies and plans including its NDC and National Adaptation Plan.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	AT/JDS, April 4, 2018: Yes.	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>According to the PIF the Sri Lankan economy is growing rapidly, and consequently, the country's natural resource base is experiencing increased deforestation, land degradation and food insecurity. These negative externalities are further compounded by the ever-increasing negative impacts of climate change.</p> <p>Clear and robust institutional arrangements for coordinating sector specific information, regular and comprehensive reporting of GHG inventories, information to track progress, and clarity on support received are needed by Sri Lanka for the ETF to be sustainable.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>AT/JDS, April 4, 2018: Not yet.</p> <p>Page 19, Component 1 (para. 46-50.): Please describe how the project will promote institutional arrangements between AFOLU and other sectors. For example, in order to promote solar power generation and biofuel production under the NDC, the Government of Sri Lanka needs to coordinate policies and measures between MMDE, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Power and Energy, Ministry of Industry,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 47 (on page 19) has been updated according to the suggestions. • Table 6 (on page 24) updated by adding additional stakeholders • Table 8 (on page 28) updated by adding TNC project and its linkage with CBIT

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Ministry of Transport and relevant stakeholders. In Table B, Component 1 includes "other relevant sectors (than AFOLU sector)", therefore further justification is requested.</p> <p>And please add other relevant Ministries mentioned above and CSOs (if applicable) to TABLE 6 (CBIT Project stakeholders and roles).</p> <p>Likewise, please include in Table 8 additional opportunities for coordination such as Sri Lanka's TNC project that will complement the proposed project.</p> <p>At/JDS, May 17, 2018: Comments cleared.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>AT/JDS, April 4, 2018: Not yet.</p> <p>Table B: With respect to Component 2, we suggest deleting activities on adaptation because project outputs in this component are not related to adaptation. And please integrate the above adaptation-related component into Component 3 and revise the project outcome and outputs in this component as appropriate.</p> <p>Under Component 2, para. 54, please</p>	<p>Table B has been updated by removing the adaptation activities, as per the feedback.</p> <p>Component 2, para. 54 has been updated to clarify the project intension is to build capacity (technical skills) of partner institutions.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		ensure the language "investment in human resources" does not translate to staff hires. AT/JDS, May 17, 2018: Comments cleared.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	AT/JDS, April 4, 2018: Please see the comments in Boxes 4 and 5. AT/JDS, May 17, 2018: Comment cleared.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	AT/JDS, April 4, 2018: This project is requesting resources from the CBIT TF.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	AT/JDS, April 4, 2018: This project is requesting resources from the CBIT TF.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	Not at this time. Please address the comments stated in Boxes 4 and 5. And please address the error in PIF indicated below. When calculating the	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Agency Fee, please round down the figure.</p> <p>ERROR in PIF - Fee in Finance Breakdown record(s) exceeds 9.5% (limit for this project). ERROR in PIF - Finance Breakdown and Finance Overview GEF Project Grants / Fees differ.</p> <p>AT/JSD, May 17, 2018: Comments cleared (ERRORs disappeared). The project manager recommend the PIF for clearance</p>	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.