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

GEF ID:	**9210**		
Country/Region:	**Uganda**		
Project Title:	**NAMA on Integrated Waste Management and Biogas in Uganda**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5574 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CCM-1 Program 1;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$2,170,030**
Co-financing:	**$12,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$14,170,030**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	**October 01, 2015**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Ming Yang**	Agency Contact Person:	**Faris Khader**

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]	MY 7/30/2015 Yes. It is aligned with Program 1 of Objective 1: Promote the timely development, demonstration, and financing of low-carbon technologies and mitigation options	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MY 7/30/2015 Yes. It is described on pages 19 and 20.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	MY 7/30/2015	

[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?	Yes. It is described on page 14.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MY 7/30/2015 Yes, it is described on page 14.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MY 7/30/2015 Not at this time. Component 2 consists of capital investment (INV) element (see project outputs for Component 2) on page 2. Please split the funds for Component 2 into (1) TA and (2) INV. Please revise the PIF in the text showing that the project has capital investment sub-component. MY 8/4/2015 Yes. Comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.	Component 2 has been divided into TA and investment in both Table B and the main body of the PIF.
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MY 7/30/2015 Not completed at this time. Please indicate if this project has impact on indigenous people. MY 8/4/2015 Yes. Comments were addressed.	The project is not expected to have any impact on indigenous people. This has been clarified accordingly in the Stakeholder section.

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	MY 7/30/2015 Yes. As of 7/30/2015, Uganda has a remainder of $5,999,303 in STAR.	
	• The focal area allocation?	MY 7/30/2015 Not at this time. As of 7/30/2015, Uganda has a remainder of $2,485,683 in CCM of STAR, which is not sufficient to cover the project costs. Please consider reducing the budget to make sure that the total costs of the project, including project costs, PPG, and agency fees) do not exceed $2,485,683, MY 8/4/2015 Yes. Comments were addressed and the PIF was revised.	The budget has been reduced so that the total project amount, including GEF grant, PPG and Agency fee, is equivalent to $2,485,683.
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	MY 7/30/2015 Not applicable.	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	MY 7/30/2015 Not applicable.	
	• Focal area set-aside?	MY 7/30/2015 Not applicable.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MY 7/30/2015 Not at this time. Please address the comments in boxes: 5, 6, and 7. MY 8/4/2015	All technical comments have now been addressed. We look forward to receiving CEO clearance.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Yes. All comments were addressed and issues were cleared. At the CEO ER stage, please: (1) Make a budget for the project M&E; and (2) Update Table B to explicitly state that the project will establish standardized baselines for calculating emission reductions, carry out MRV, and register the NAMA on the UNFCCC NAMA Registry. (3) In Table F on page 5, please add the figure of consequential GHG emission reductions (146,236 tonnes as estimated in the PIF). The Program Manager recommends CEO PIF/PFD clearance.	
Review Date	Review	July 30, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 04, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* 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?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		

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