



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

GEF ID:	5736		
Country/Region:	Global (Armenia, Burundi, Cameroon, Ghana, Kyrgyz Republic, Mongolia, Maldives, Thailand, Ukraine, Vietnam, Congo DR)		
Project Title:	GEF SGP Fifth Operational Phase--Implementing the Program Using STAR Resources III		
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:	\$6,965,151
Co-financing:	\$7,250,000	Total Project Cost:	\$14,215,151
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2014
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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1.Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes. The four countries included are eligible for GEF funding. Cleared 03/11/2014.  The project includes 11 countries now and they are all eligible for GEF funding.  Cleared 03/24/2014	
	2.Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Yes. Four letters of endorsement have been included.  Cleared 03/11/2014	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Yes. Eleven letters of endorsement have been included. Cleared 03/24/2014	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, all resources are from countries' STAR allocations.  Cleared 03/11/2014	
	• the focal area allocation?	N/A	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/A	
	• focal area set-aside?	N/A	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b> ? <i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	Yes. they're aligned. Cleared 03/11/2014	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE,	Yes, it's consistent. Further details will be required at endorsement stage Cleared 03/11/2014	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?		
Project Design	6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b> , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Yes. Cleared 03/11/2014	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	Yes. Cleared 03/11/2014	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes. GEB identified and incremental reasoning sound and appropriate. Cleared 03/11/2014	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes. CSOs, CBOs and indigenous peoples are both beneficiaries and direct participants of the project. Cleared 03/11/2014	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Yes. Cleared 03/11/2014	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes and it plans to do so in each country.  Cleared 03/11/2014	
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	Some information is provided. However, please describe what are the project's innovative aspects and what the potential for scaling up is (Section A of the PIF).  Additional information is requested. 03/11/2014  Provided. Cleared 03/24/2014	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The indicative grant amounts in Table B and Table D (column (a)) differ. Please review and provide the corrected tables.  Additional information is requested 03/11/2014	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Provided. Cleared 03/24/2014	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	Yes. UNDP is bringing substantive cash co-financing.  Cleared. 03/11/2014	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	Yes. Although the PMC is slightly higher than customary for a global program, 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.  Cleared 03/11/2014	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	No PPG requested.  Cleared 03/11/2014	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Not yet. Please see comments and questions above.  03/11/2014  Yes. Project is being recommended. 03/24/2014	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Further details about consistency of project with national initiatives and priorities.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	March 11, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 24, 2014	
	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.**