



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, Suriname, El Salvador, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Tonga, Timor Leste, Ukraine, Uganda, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, St. Vincent and Grenadines, Venezuela, Congo DR)		
Project Title:	GEF SGP Fifth Operational Phase--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:	\$73,764,729
Co-financing:	\$76,716,000	Total Project Cost:	\$150,480,729
PIF Approval:	February 20, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	April 12, 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	All countries included are eligible for GEF funding. Cleared 5/09/2013
	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 All Letters of Endorsement have been	

*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)
		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	The GEF SGP has been implemented by UNDP since 1992 and the agency has developed significant knowledge and experience in working with CBOs and CSOs in delivering global environmental benefits and local sustainable development. As the development network of the United Nations system, UNDP has country offices in the majority of countries where SGP is located. Overall SGP program management, operational guidance and support to the country programs, as well as the identification and establishment of the SGP in new countries, are conducted by the SGP Central Programme Management Team (CPMT). The United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) provides program execution services including administrative, financial, legal, operational, procurement and project management for the SGP as described in detail in the UNOPS SGP Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs). The UNOPS SGP Cluster Coordinator and his/her team work closely with the SGP Deputy Global Manager and CPMT staff. Cleared 05/092013
	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	Not applicable. Cleared 05/09/2013
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, it does. Cleared 4/04/2012	Yes. The SGP operates in a decentralized and country-driven manner through a National Coordinator

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>or Sub-regional Coordinator (NC) and a National Steering Committee or National Focal Group for those in sub-regional program modality (NSC) in each participating country, with some modification in the case of countries in a sub-regional programme modality , with financial and administrative support provided by the UNDP Country Office (CO). In some countries, a National Host Institution (NHI) or host NGO is responsible for program implementation in conjunction with the NC and NSC. While the SGP is a global program, at the country level it operates under the overall UNDP SBAA agreement. As a global programme, the SGP is not considered a part of the CCF or UNDP core functions.</p> <p>The technical capacity of the individual NSC members is an important criterion in determining its composition, and to the maximum extent possible the NSC membership should include experts in the relevant GEF focal areas of biodiversity; climate change mitigation; international waters; sustainable land management; sustainable forest management and REDD; persistent organic pollutants/chemicals; as well as capacity development. The inclusion of the government GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP) or relevant Convention Focal Point in the NSC is also recommended.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>The NSC is responsible for the review, selection and approval of projects, and for ensuring their technical and substantive quality as regards the strategic objectives of the SGP. In collaboration with the NC, the NSC contributes to the development of the Country Programme Strategy (CPS) in accordance with the relevant Operational Phase project document and national environmental priorities, and oversees its implementation. NSC members are expected to support the country program in resource mobilization and in mainstreaming SGP lessons learned and successes in national development planning and policy-making. NSC members are encouraged to participate in pre-selection project site visits and in project monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>The SGP NC has lead responsibility for managing the country or sub-regional program implementation, and ensuring that grants and projects meet GEF and SGP criteria. The NC major functions inter alia include: (i) assisting CSOs in the formulation of project proposals; (ii) serving as the ex officio secretariat for the NSC; (iii) ensuring sound programme monitoring and evaluation, including periodic project site visits; (iv) resource mobilization; (v) communication and dissemination of SGP information; and (v) global</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>reporting to CPMT, UNOPS, responding to audits, and other tasks as stipulated in their ToR.</p> <p>The UNDP CO provides management support to the SGP country program. The UNDP Resident Representative/Resident Coordinator (UNDP RR) in each UNDP CO assigns a senior staff person (typically the Sustainable Development Advisor or environment focal point) to serve as the SGP focal point. The UNDP RR participates in the NSC or may designate the focal point as his/her delegate in the NSC. Each UNDP CO also contributes to monitoring programme activities – usually through broad oversight by the designated focal point as part of NSC responsibilities; facilitates interaction with the host government; and develops links with other in-country financial and technical resources.</p> <p>The UNDP CO is also responsible for providing operational support – the RR signature of grant project MOAs (on behalf of UNOPS); appointment letters to NSC members (on behalf of SGP); local grant disbursements; HR administration; as well as assisting in audit exercises for the program. The UNDP CO also plays a fundamental role in launching a new SGP program in terms of endorsement of the government application to be a participating SGP country and in</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			helping CPMT organize the start up mission. The UNDP CO also plays a critical role in the proper closing of an SGP country program. Cleared 05/09/2013
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? 	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 Ghana provided a new Letter of Endorsement with the correct available amounts by focal area. Cleared 02/11/2013	Resources are available from STAR allocations as per endorsement letters provided by individual countries. Total funding request (inclusive of agency fee) has been increased from the original PIF requested amount by \$2,619,200. These changes resulted from receipt of new or revised endorsement letters from the following countries (Sierra Leone: \$629,200; Suriname: \$710,000; Uzbekistan: \$480,000; and Vietnam: \$1,000,000) as well as a reduction of endorsed amount from Armenia by \$200,000. Cleared 05/09/2013
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	Yes, focal area allocations from BD, LD and CC. Cleared 4/04/2012	Yes, focal area allocations from BD, LD and CC. Cleared 05/09/2013
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/A	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/A	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	N/A	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	N/A	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	Yes. The project document is consistent. Cleared 05/09/2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>	<p>Yes, identified. Cleared 4/04/2012</p>	<p>Yes. The project has the following objective: Global Environmental Benefits secured through community-based initiatives and actions. The following eleven outcomes for different focal areas have been defined:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improved sustainability of protected areas and indigenous and community conservation areas through community-based actions 2. Mainstreamed biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in production landscapes, seascapes and sectors through community initiatives and actions 3. Demonstration, development and transfer of low-GHG technologies at the community level 4. Increased energy efficient, low-GHG transport at the community level 5. Conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks through sustainable management and climate proofing of land use, land use change and forestry 6. Maintenance or improvement in flow of agro-ecosystem and forest ecosystem services to sustain livelihoods of local communities 7. Reduction of pressures at community level from competing land uses (in the wider landscapes)

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>8. Communities support the implementation of Strategic Action Programmes (SAPs) in trans-boundary surface and groundwater basins;</p> <p>9. Communities support the implementation of Strategic Action Programmes (SAPs) in large marine ecosystems management</p> <p>10. Phase out of POPs and chemicals of global concern at community level</p> <p>11. Communities and CSOs are better informed via global, national and local knowledge sharing/learning, workshops and trainings about global challenges and local actions required</p> <p>12. Ability of communities and CSOs to diagnose, understand and transform information and knowledge into local actions increased and retained</p> <p>Cleared 05/09/2013</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>Yes, consistent and further details will be required at endorsement stage. Cleared 4/04/2012</p>	<p>Yes. Identified. The Country Program Strategy (CPS) in each program country is the primary mechanism by which the GEF Small Grants Programme incorporates national strategies and plans. The development of the CPS is facilitated by the SGP country team with support and eventually the endorsement of the SGP National Steering Committee (NSC), and shared with the GEF Operational Focal Point and the relevant</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Convention focal points. This document considers and integrates the relevant data from NBSAPs, NIPs, and other national communications to the conventions plus results from NCSAs.</p> <p>Cleared 05/09/2013</p>
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Yes. Cleared 05/09/2013</p>
Project Design	<p>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?</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Yes, sufficiently clear. Cleared 05/09/2013</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>The GEF Council paper (GEF/C.33/5, p. 1) "Small Grants Program: Follow up to the 2007 Joint Evaluation" recommended a "level of management costs on the basis of services rendered and cost efficiency rather than a set percentage". The principle of determining SGP management costs on the basis of services rendered was recently reconfirmed by the GEF Secretariat and UNDP in GEF5. Among the services provided by SGP which go beyond simply grant administration, are its focus on capacity building of grantees , strengthening networking of civil society organizations, learning and knowledge</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>management, partnership building and resource mobilization with a view to scaling up and strengthening sustainability of projects. In addition, SGP will further enhance the programme's and grant projects' cost efficiency by actively exploring opportunities to: 1) be utilized as delivery mechanism for community/NGO components of FSPs – whereby it would have a share of additional management budgets while providing an on-the-ground mechanism to deliver a greater volume of grants; 2) raise additional co-financing from non-GEF sources in ways that management costs are defrayed. At the project level, GEF SGP will engage voluntary NSC members to provide technical and management assistance to communities, obtain local governments and other partners' co-financing and support, ensure linkages and synergies with other ongoing activities and other proper activities to further improve projects' cost effectiveness.</p> <p>Cleared 05/09/2013</p>
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	Yes, provided. Cleared 4/04/2012	Yes. Cleared 05/09/2013
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes, sound and sufficiently clear. Cleared 4/04/2012	Yes. Project framework is sufficiently sound and clear. Cleared 05/09/2013
	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	Yes, sound and appropriate. Cleared 05/09/2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		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	Yes. Description of socio-economic benefits and gender dimension are provided. and impact will be tracked with specific indicators. Cleared 05/09/2013
	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	Yes. The project includes a clear role for CSOs, CBOs and indigenos peoples. Cleared 05/09/2013
	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	Yes. Provided. Cleared 05/09/2013
	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	Yes. Provided. Cleared 05/09/2013
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes, adequate. Cleared 4/04/2012	Yes. Cleared 05/09/2013
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Yes. The project structure has not changed from the PIF stage. Cleared 05/08/2013
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		No. There's no non-grant instrument. Cleared 05/09/2013
	23. Is funding level for project	Not appropriate. They seems higher then	Provided. The GEF Council paper

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	management cost appropriate?	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	(GEF/C.33/5, p. 1) "Small Grants Program: Follow up to the 2007 Joint Evaluation" recommended a "level of management costs on the basis of services rendered and cost efficiency rather than a set percentage". The principle of determining SGP management costs on the basis of services rendered was recently reconfirmed by the GEF Secretariat and UNDP in GEF5. Among the services provided by SGP which go beyond simply grant administration, are notably its focus on capacity building of grantees (working with some of the poorest and low capacity groups who are at the same time more vulnerable to environmental challenges), strengthening networking of civil society organizations, learning and knowledge management, partnership building and resource mobilization with a view to scaling up and strengthening sustainability of projects. In addition, SGP will further enhance the programme's and grant projects' cost efficiency by actively exploring opportunities to: 1) be utilized as delivery mechanism for community/NGO components of FSPs whereby it would have a share of additional management budgets while providing an on-the-ground mechanism to deliver a greater volume of grants; 2) raise additional co-financing from non-GEF sources in ways that management costs are defrayed. At the project level, GEF SGP will engage voluntary NSC

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>members to provide technical and management assistance to communities, obtain local governments and other partners' co-financing and support, ensure linkages and synergies with other ongoing activities and other proper activities to further improve projects' cost effectiveness.</p> <p>The GEF and UNDP agreed in November 2012 to get away from the focus on the project management cost ratio which had resulted in an overall deficit in SGP OP5 budget in covering the necessary non-grant costs for the functioning of the program through December 2014</p> <p>Cleared 05/09/2013</p>
	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	Yes. Cleared 05/09/2013
	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	Co-financing from UNDP is confirmed, however other co-financing is not confirmed nor it can be at this stage because the actual projects to be funded in each country are yet to be identified. Co-financing requirement of 1:1 will be ensured. Cleared 05/09/2013
	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	Yes. Cleared 05/09/2013
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes, tracking tools have been identified and relevant indicators defined. Cleared 05/09/2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes. Provided. Cleared 05/09/2013
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	Yes. Addressed. Cleared 05/09/2013	
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not yet, additional information and clarifications are requested. 4/04/2012 The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program 9/13/2012 The revised PIF has been technically cleared and is being recommended for inclusion in the April 2013 Work Program. 02/11/2013	
	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)	May 08, 2013	
	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.