



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

GEF ID:	4678		
Country/Region:	Global (Albania, Armenia, Barbados, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Bhutan, Botswana, Belarus, Cote d'Ivoire, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Cape Verde, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Micronesia, Grenada, Ghana, Gambia, Guinea, Honduras, Jamaica, Jordan, Kiribati, Lao PDR, Lebanon, St. Lucia, Sri Lanka, Liberia, Moldova, Marshall Islands, Macedonia, Mali, Mongolia, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Nicaragua, Nepal, Nauru, Panama, Palau, Paraguay, Solomon Islands, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Senegal, El Salvador, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Tonga, Timor Leste, Ukraine, Uganda, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, St. Vincent and Grenadines, Venezuela, Congo DR)		
Project Title:	Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program - Implementing the Program Using STAR Resources II		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4561 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2; CCM-1; CCM-4; CCM-5; LD-1; LD-3; IW-1; IW-2; CHEM-1; CD-2; CD-5; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$71,246,264
Co-financing:	\$74,100,000	Total Project Cost:	\$145,346,264
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	April 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey	Agency Contact Person:	Delfin Ganapin

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?	All countries included are eligible for GEF funding. Cleared 4/04/2012	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, endorsed for most of cases. However, updated endorsements are required from current OFP's for Sri Lanka, Ghana, and Zimbabwe 4/04/2012	

*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.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		All Letters of Endorsement have been provided. Cleared 02/11/2013	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	The UNDP has comparative advantage in implementing GEF SGP over 20 years and has accumulated substantial knowledge and experience for effective implementation of the program. Cleared 4/04/2012	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	Not applicable. Cleared 4/04/2012	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, it does. Cleared 4/04/2012	
Resource Availability	6. 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? 	<p>Yes, all resources are from country's STAR allocations. However, resources requested and endorsed by OFP of Ghana is not current nor resources are available from climate change focal area. Please provide additional clarification. 4/04/2012 Provided. Cleared 9/10/2012</p> <p>Ghana provided a new Letter of Endorsement with the correct available amounts by focal area. Cleared 02/11/2013</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	Yes, focal area allocations from BD, LD and CC. Cleared 4/04/2012	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/A	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	N/A		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	N/A	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes, aligned. Cleared 4/04/2012	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes, identified. Cleared 4/04/2012	
	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?	Yes, consistent and further details will be required at endorsement stage. Cleared 4/04/2012	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, it does however, capacity objective #1 seems not so relevant to identified needs for capacity development. Therefore, it would be advisable that #2 objective would be selected. Changes are requested. 4/04/2012 Changes are made. Cleared 9/13/2012	
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, baseline project is somewhat presented, however, more details relevant to the program and countries where the project will be implemented should be provided. Additional information is requested. 4/04/2012 Provided. Cleared 9/13/2012	
	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?	Yes, provided. Cleared 4/04/2012	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes, sound and sufficiently clear. Cleared 4/04/2012	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes, applied methodology and assumptions for incremental reasoning are sound and appropriate. However, it is not clear how incremental costs will be identified by individual projects and how co-financing will contribute to baseline financing. Additional information is requested. 4/04/2012 Provided. Cleared 9/13/2012	
	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, benefits are clearly described. 4/04/2012	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes, participation of CSO and community based organizations is considered. Cleared 4/04/2012	
	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)	Yes, the project takes into account major risks including climate change. Cleared 4/04/2012	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, somewhat coordinated. However, closer coordination with GEF programs and other initiatives should be indicated. Additional information is provided for example Great green Wall. 4/04/2012 Provided. Cleared 9/13/2012	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes, adequate. Cleared 4/04/2012	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	Not appropriate. They seems higher then it is agreed for global program. Please revise and provide additional clarification. 4/04/2012 Some information provided. however, more details should be provided during endorsement stage. Cleared 9/13/2012	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes, adequate. Cleared 4/04/2012	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Yes, acceptable. However, co-financing from agency should be reconsidered by significant increase. Additional information is requested 4/04/2012 Justification provided. Cleared 9/13/2012	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Somewhat not in line. Please reconsider. 4/04/2012 Cleared 9/13/2012	
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?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? • Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Not yet, additional information and clarifications are requested. 4/04/2012</p> <p>The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program 9/13/2012</p> <p>The revised PIF has been technically cleared and is being recommended for inclusion in the April 2013 Work Program. 02/11/2013</p>	
	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*	September 29, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 04, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 11, 2013	
	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.