



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL SIZED PROJECT*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4329		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	5th Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme		
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; IW-3; CHEM-1; CHEM-3; CD-1; CD-2; CD-4; CD-5;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$134,615,385
Co-financing:	\$134,615,385	Total Project Cost:	\$269,230,770
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 18, 2010
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Danielius Pivoriunas	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 are eligible to receive GEF funding. Cleared 9/14/2010	
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	There is no non-grant instrument. Cleared 9/14/2010	
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Not required for global projects. Cleared 9/14/2010	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	In the GEF's modality typology, the SGP is considered a capacity development and technical assistance intervention type, which is deemed to be UNDP's comparative advantage in all GEF focal areas, as highlighted in the comparative advantage matrix of Annex 1 in the relevant GEF council paper, GEF/C.31/5 rev.1. UNDP has valuable experience in	

*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.

		human resources development, civil society and institutional strengthening, and non-governmental and community participation, which are all key tenets of the SGP. UNDP has served as the implementing agency for the global SGP since the programme's inception, playing this role on behalf of the GEF partnership. A key comparative advantage is UNDP's network of country offices, which provides helpful support and backstopping for the programme at the national level in each SGP country. Cleared 9/14/2010	
	5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Co-financing of the project is within agreed limits for SGP, however, agency's contribution to the project seems very low and not substantial. Therefore, higher contribution would be expected during project preparation phase. Cleared 9/14/2010	
	6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	The UNDP has recruited required staff in every country to implement SGP country programs. The agency also has substantial amount of staff in every country where the program will be implemented. Cleared 9/14/2010	
Resource Availability	7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Resources are available from replenishment and are not using STAR resources. Cleared 9/14/2010	
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	Yes, the project is aligned to the results framework, however reporting details need to be provided during project preparation phase for each objective and how they will be achieved. Cleared 9/14/2010	
	9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	The project has ten following objectives: 1: Improve sustainability of protected areas and indigenous and community conservation areas through community-based actions	

		<p>2: Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors through community initiatives and actions</p> <p>3: Promote the demonstration, development and transfer of low-GHG technologies at the community level</p> <p>4: Promote and support energy efficient, low-GHG transport at the community level</p> <p>5: Support the conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks through sustainable management and climate proofing of land use, land use change and forestry</p> <p>6: Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem and forest ecosystem services to sustain livelihoods of local communities</p> <p>7: Reduce pressures at community level from competing land uses (in the wider landscape)</p> <p>8: Support transboundary water body management with community-based initiatives</p> <p>9: Promote and support phase out of POPs and chemicals of global concern at the community level</p> <p>10: Enhance and strengthen capacities of CSOs (particularly community-based organizations and those of indigenous peoples) to engage in consultative processes, apply knowledge management to ensure adequate information flows, and implement convention guidelines</p> <p>The project objectives are fully in line with those adopted by the SGP Steering Committee and is fully aligned to focal area and cross-focal area objectives and results framework.</p> <p>Cleared 9/14/2010</p>	
	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?	<p>For a new SGP project cycle Country Programme Strategies (CPS) in each country will be revised and will outline the SGP priorities for the use of allocated resources, and will articulate in detail how the SGP supports national and GEF strategic priorities through local projects. Within each country a National Coordinator, supported by a programme assistant, operates the SGP Country Programme Office on a day-to-day basis. The programme will continue to operate</p>	

		under the strategic direction of the SGP project document, and in accordance with SGP operational guidelines. The voluntary National Steering Committee (NSC) of each SGP country programme, composed of government national leaders with majority non-governmental membership to reflect the programme's mandated focus for CSO capacity building, will provide overall country guidance and provide direct linkages to national policy-making and development planning. Cleared 9/14/2010	
	11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?	The project aims to build capacities of CSOs and CBOs to address global environmental issues through local initiatives and actions. The main objective is: Enhance and strengthen capacities of CSOs (particularly community-based organizations and those of indigenous peoples) to engage in consultative processes, apply knowledge management to ensure adequate information flows, and implement convention guidelines and to enhance capacities of CSOs (particularly CBOs and indigenous peoples) to monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends. However, further details on retention and indicators for tracking capacity developed should be provided in the project document. Cleared 9/14/2010	
Project Design	12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	The baseline for the project is sufficiently and clearly described and is based on SGP past experience and data generated through projects implemented. To contribute to resolving global environmental challenges, the SGP provides small-scale grants to community-based and non-governmental organizations for projects in-line with the strategic priorities of the GEF. Within the SGP portfolio, 90% of projects have achieved outcome ratings in the satisfactory range, and 80% of projects are considered to have low risks to the sustainability of outcomes. Across GEF focal areas the SGP empowers local communities to seek integrated multi-focal area solutions that can be replicated and scaled-up, and helps spark successful initiatives that grow	

		beyond SGP's initial support. SGP will be contributing by building of networks, and strengthens civil society to unlock local capacity for solutions to these critical environmental problems. More than 60% of SGP grants target poor communities in participating countries, which have the greatest need for assistance. Cleared 9/14/2010	
	13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Yes, sufficient information is provided for all objectives. Cleared 9/14/2010	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes, the project framework is sound and sufficiently clear. At the same time it is important that SGP operational guidelines would be updated according to the project document and reporting guidelines. Cleared 9/14/2010	
	15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?	The current baseline scenario would remain the status quo in a business-as-usual scenario without GEF support. On the one hand, community-level stakeholders in remote and marginalized areas have the least access to technical and financial resources to address global issues, and the SGP is a critical partner to assist communities tackling environmental challenges. At the same time, over many years of operations, the SGP has developed an efficient and effective system while building a growing portfolio of demonstrated community-based approaches. During each year in OP4, the SGP delivered \$40.1 million dollars on average for approximately 1,900 community-based projects addressing global environmental issues and generating incremental benefits. The program is a critical resource for civil society and community based organizations, without which their available support channels would be reduced and their ability to confront environmental degradation very limited. Cleared 9/14/2010	

	16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes, sound and appropriate. Cleared 9/14/2010	
	17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?	The cost-effectiveness has been sufficiently demonstrated, however in the project document it is expected that more details would be provided for possible saving in country programs where allocations are at lower levels and possible options for producing better results and more effectively. Cleared 9/14/2010	
	18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?	SGP is rooted in the belief that global environmental problems can best be addressed if local people are fully involved in project design and formulation, have strong ownership of the activities undertaken through a "demand-driven" approach, and that direct socioeconomic benefits will accrue to communities during project implementation. In contrast with "expert-reliant" development interventions, the emphasis in SGP is on creative problem-solving and innovation by the communities themselves, often based on the comparative strengths of an intimate understanding of local circumstances. SGP is premised on the principle that through the provision of relatively small amounts of funding, local communities can undertake cost effective activities that will make a significant socioeconomic difference in their own lives, whilst generating global environmental benefits. Cleared 9/14/2010	
	19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?	Yes, fully addressed, moreover, all SGP Country Program strategies will require to include references to gender issues. Civil society and community based organizations are main recipients of the funding therefore their role in the project implementation is fully considered. Cleared 9/14/2010	
	20. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate	All major potential risks like low capacity of project proponents, climate effects and any other impacts are considered. Cleared 9/14/2010	

	resilience)		
	21. Is the provided documentation consistent?	Yes, consistent. Cleared 9/14/2010	
	22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?	Yes, identified. National Coordination Committee does include all major stakeholders and decisions are made on basis of consensus ensuring openness, transparency and accountability. Cleared 9/14/2010	
	23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The project is consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives. However, closer coordination with Development Marketplace project of the WB is expected if possible. Please provide options for such coordination in the project document. Cleared 9/14/2010	
	24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes, adequate. At the same time SGP operational guidelines will need to be aligned to the new project document. Cleared 9/14/2010	
	25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
Project Financing	26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Project Management Budget \$13,440,000 actual 10% of project management with respect to the total grant requested. However, the project document should provide details of the basis from where all managements costs will be allocated. The issues of efficiency and effectiveness of staff managing country programs should reconsidered based on amount of allocation and grants available for certain country programs. Please provide additional clarification. 9/14/2010 Provided. Cleared 9/28/2010	

	28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost reasoning principle?	Yes, appropriate. Cleared 9/14/2010	
	29. Is co-financing confirmed?	Co-financing is not confirmed due to the nature of the Small Grants Programme. At the end of project, co-financing will be achieved at 1:1 level. However, agency's contribution has to be reconsidered and the document changed accordingly. Agency fee seems was not calculated properly. It should be 4% of the project grant. Additional information is requested. 9/14/2010 Information is provided and numbers adjusted accordingly. Additional cofinancing from the agency has increased by 5mln.Cleared 9/28/2010	
	30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes, adequate. However, funding for monitoring and evaluations seems slightly excessive and therefore further details should be provided before PIF clearance. 9/14/2010 Provided. Cleared 9/28/2010	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	Relevant information is provided, however, tracking tools will need to be fully developed and integrated into the program including indicators for results based management and capacity development. Cleared 9/14/2010	
	32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes, it does include. Cleared 9/14/2010
Agency Responses	33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Additional information is requested. 9/21/2010 CEO clearance for the PIF is recommended. 9/28/2010	
	35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	The project document will need to address and/or provide clarification/ details especially on following	

		issues: - retention and indicators for tracking capacity developed; - updating SGP operational guidelines; - efficiency and effectiveness of staff costs managing country programs with lower allocation and grants available; -tracking tools developed and integrated.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 21, 2010	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 28, 2010	
	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.