



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

GEF ID:	6931		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	GEF Small Grants Programme - Sixth Operational Phase		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5475 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$67,307,692
Co-financing:	\$70,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$137,307,692
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	October 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey	Agency Contact Person:	Mr. 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 that the GEF SGP will support are eligible for GEF funding. Cleared 08/15/2014	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Since this request is for core funding of a global SGP, there's no requirement for endorsement letters. Cleared 08/15/2014	
Resource Availability	3. 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? 	Resources are available from GEF-6 replenishment. Separate allocation of \$140 Million for SGP approved, of which 70 million are being requested in this first	

*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>tranche. The project is not requesting STAR resources.</p> <p>Cleared 08/15/2014</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	N/A	
	<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"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	N/A	
<p>Strategic Alignment</p>	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><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></p>	<p>The project is consistent with the Strategic objectives for the GEF SGP in GEF-6 as approved by Council. In addition, this Multi-focal area project is consistent with the results framework and strategic objectives of the GEF's Focal Areas. In addition, the project will support the CBD's Aichi targets, in particular those related to protected areas (11), ecosystem services (14) and traditional knowledge, innovations and practices (18).</p> <p>However, there are some issues that are not clear:</p> <p>1. Regarding overall chemicals management, it is not clear how to establish systems of local certification of producers/and or their products in a sector mostly dominated by informal actors. Please explain.</p> <p>2.. We support that "Work will also involve advocacy for national</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>government policies that will influence markets including chemicals import and export"</p> <p>3. Another priority area that we would recommend to consider is: to raise awareness on the health and environmental impact of open burning practices of some waste streams (acid lead batteries, copper, etc...) for recycling purposes. These are common practices for many developing countries and they are responsible for the release of large quantities of UPOPs.</p> <p>4)Finally, on page 15 we would suggest the following edit for UNDP's consideration:</p> <p>Current text: Activities will include capacity building efforts enabling the community to develop and use innovative technologies and providing catalytic financing through grants directly to CSOs and communities.</p> <p>Suggested text: Activities will include 1) capacity building efforts enabling the community to develop and use innovative technologies; and 2) working with SE4All inspired project preparation facilities, promoting new business models, and providing catalytic financing through grants directly to CSOs and communities.</p> <p>The suggestion is made because one of the major efforts on energy access in the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>next 2-3 years will be efforts to support new business models and project preparation facilities. CSO and community led models could play a big role in this effort.</p> <p>Additional revisions are requested. 08/18/2014</p> <p>Information provided and it's satisfactory. Cleared 08/21/2014</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>Yes. As a global project, it is consistent with the relevant conventions. In addition, as a result of a broad process of consultation with National Steering Committees and country level stakeholders, new Country Programme Strategies will be formulated in each SGP country program. These strategies will guide the implementation of grant making and are based on the country's priorities as included in NBSAPs, NAPs, NIPs, as well as other relevant plans and programs.</p> <p>Finally, national priorities are reflected through the constitution of the SGP National Steering Committee, which guides implementation of the SGP in each respective country and is composed of leading national government and civil society representatives in the environmental field. The committee will provide strategic guidance and oversight for the programme, and ensure its focus on and coherence with national priorities as they apply to and are relevant for community-level needs and priorities.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared 08/15/2014	
Project Design	<p>6. 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>The GEF SGP in it's 20+ year history has built a solid foundation of projects implemented by NGOS and CBOs in over 130 countries. About 50% of the country programs have over 10 years of experience and are capable of going beyond the piloting of innovations towards the development and extension of community-based project models and approaches.</p> <p>The "baseline project" refers to the investments that will take place whether or not the GEF grant is approved, rather than the history or background of specific or generic programmes. Does this definition will be enforced during the selection of the individual small-grants?</p> <p>Please clarify.</p> <p>Additional information is requested.</p> <p>08/15/2014.</p> <p>Baseline revised and adequate. Cleared 08/21/2014</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>Somewhat. Component 1: COMMUNITY LANDSCAPE AND SEASCAPE CONSERVATION. For this component, it would be desirable to define the selection criteria of "important ecosystems" where the community-based landscape and seascape conservation (CLSC) approach will be used. Since</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>there is reference to work in "involving communities in buffer zones and corridors" an important element to consider in the selection criteria is the landscapes and seascapes where the GEF has invested or will invest financial resources in the creation and management of Protected Areas. The identification of these landscapes and seascapes can also make use the "GEF Criteria for Defining Globally Significant Sites for Biodiversity Conservation" as stated in Annex 3 of the "GEF-6 PROGRAMMING DIRECTIONS". Please also consider the global standards for the identification of key biodiversity areas to be presented at the 2014 World Parks Congress in Sidney, Australia. Similar considerations should be included for the selection of seascapes. The landscape part of this component does not have a number of target countries, as do the seascapes (N=20) and Component 2 (N=30). Is that by design?</p> <p>Component 2: CLIMATE SMART INNOVATIVE AGRO-ECOLOGY. Shouldn't this component titled: "Climate-smart Agriculture"? The suffix -ecology is closely associated with the study of the relationships between organisms and the environment, rather than the design, in this case, of agricultural systems. The language of the target geographies should be tightened up; what are the "production buffer zones of its identified critical ecosystems"? Aren't the target areas for agro-ecology</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>part of the critical ecosystems, or are these ecosystems being considered only if they have native habitats only? What type of climate smart agro-ecology can be practice in "forest corridors in danger of fragmentation", if these corridors are covered by forests, impeding most forms of agriculture, expect perhaps agro-forestry?</p> <p>Additional clarifications are requested.</p> <p>08/15/2014.</p> <p>Clarifications and additional information has been provided. Cleared 08/21/2014</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Once the baseline has been reviewed as per comments above, please review the global environmental benefits (GEBs) and incremental reasoning as appropriate.</p> <p>Additional revision is requested. 08/15/2014</p> <p>Revised. GEBs identified and incremental reasoning is sound and appropriated.</p> <p>Cleared 08/21/2014</p>	
	<p>9. 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?</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes. Cleared 08/15/2014	
	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 08/15/2014	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, through the updating of the Country Programme Strategies. In addition, the GEF SGP will coordinate with other GEF SGPs and other initiatives in the countries in question. Cleared 08/15/2014	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	Innovativeness: The project will implement a series of innovative community-based tools and approaches in the implementation of single and multifocal area projects. In addition, it will set-up innovative institutional and financial support mechanisms, based on its experience across multiple countries. In this sense, specific innovations include: the digital library of community innovations that will provide access to information to communities in at least 50 countries and the South-South Community Innovation Exchange Platform which will promote south-south exchanges on global environmental issues. Sustainability: Please comment on the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>project's sustainability beyond the GEF's intervention.</p> <p>Scaling-up: One of the purposes of the GEF SGP in its sixth operational phase is to scale up its achievements by increasing cross-country learning between projects and building upon the foundations of "tried-and-tested" national delivery mechanisms established during previous SGP operational phases. Specifically, through the landscape and seascape conservation approach, the Programme aims to improve the conservation and sustainable use management of important terrestrial and coastal/marine ecosystems.</p> <p>Additional information is requested. 08/18/2014</p> <p>Additional information provided as follows:</p> <p>Achieving sustainability of project outcomes is central to SGP. According to its 4th Independent Evaluation (GEF Evaluation Office 2007), and Phase 1 of the 5th Independent Evaluation in 2014, the SGP has hitherto secured a high success rate in sustaining project results. Project proponents are required to build measures into their project design that increase the likelihood of outcome sustainability. The screening of project proposals by the National Steering Committee includes a systematic assessment of whether such measures are</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>sound and based on realistic assumptions. Project logical frameworks include outcome indicators that are monitored periodically. Project monitoring activities are designed to verify that initial assumptions hold, and that the required elements for outcome sustainability are in place. Most grants include a capacity development component and a sustainable livelihoods component to ensure that achievements will be sustained at the smallholder and resource-user level. Proactive adaptive management is applied throughout the life of the projects by the National Coordinator who works with SGP grantees to take corrective action whenever there are indications that project outcomes may be compromised or may not be sustained after the project ends. SGP does not generally support the creation of new organizations but rather strengthens existing CBOs and NGOs. Although most communities continue applying acquired skills in their day-to-day work SGP ensures retention of new skills through various means: inviting leaders or members of former grantee organizations to new training; using former SGP grantees as trainers for other communities and projects; continuing as much as possible monitoring former grantees and trouble-shooting when required; and establishing mentoring and peer-to-peer support among communities. Ultimately, the sustainability of SGP projects results from the strong ownership of the community or CSO</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>grantee-partners to the actions taken and resulting outcomes, the empowerment built in the process of implementation, and the fact that these projects are meeting their most important needs particularly for sustainable livelihoods. In GEF-6, the sustainability of SGP projects will be further enhanced as these projects gain more support from each other in the synergy created in landscape/seascape approaches, in the complementation with larger projects of the GEF, other agencies and government, and in the further support that will be derived from "Grantmaker+" activities (e.g. capacity, development, networking, knowledge sharing, policy advocacy, resource mobilization) for scaling up, mainstreaming and replication.</p> <p>Cleared 08/21/2014</p>	
	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?		
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes. Cleared 08/18/2014	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	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. Cleared 08/18/2014	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. Cleared 08/18/2014	
	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 is requested. Cleared 08/18/2014	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan 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?		

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"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Not yet. Please address the questions and comments above under: 4, 6, 7, 8 and 13.</p> <p>In addition, please take the following suggested edits into account for the PIF to be resubmitted:</p> <p>1) On page 9, the following sentence appears: "), as well as in the new initiatives taking shape with support from the Green Climate Fund and other funders. " We aren't aware that the GCF had supported any new initiatives yet. Perhaps UNDP may wish to revisit the sentence and apply appropriate words such as "potential" that show the funding is in the future.</p> <p>2) There are several references to the following: "GEF-6 Programming Directions, November 26, 2013". Although the differences are small, it would be more appropriate to refer to the final version of the programming directions document, and ensure the references still are correct. The proper reference is: GEF R.6-Rev.04, Programming Directions, March 31, 2014</p> <p>3) The term: Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL) is used several times. It would be standard practice to spell out the term once, and then use the abbreviation throughout the rest of the document.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		08/18/2014 Yes. the PIF is being recommended. Cleared 08/21/2014	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Table F: Once there's a cleared idea of the landscapes/seascapes and other project components, please fill in table F as appropriate. Further details will be provided regarding the countries where some of the components will be implemented as well as the landscapes/seascapes.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	August 15, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 21, 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.**