GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	**9209**		
Country/Region:	**Global**		
Project Title:	**GEF Small Grants Programme - Sixth Operational Phase (Part II)**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5475 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**SGP;**	
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, 2015**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey**	Agency Contact Person:	**Delfin Ganapin**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	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	

[1] 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		and practices (18). Cleared 08/04/2015	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes. This global project 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. 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.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Cleared 08/04/2015	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes. Cleared 08/04/2015	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes. Cleared 08/04/2015	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Yes. Cleared 08/04/2015	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes. Cleared 08/04/2015	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	Resources are available from GEF-6 replenishment. Separate allocation of $140 Million for SGP approved. A first trance of $70 million was approved in the June 2014 Council. $70 million are now being requested in this second tranche. The project is not requesting STAR resources. Cleared 08/4/2015	
	• The focal area allocation?	N/A	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• Focal area set-aside?	N/A	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	The Program Manager recommends PIF clearance. No PPG is being requested. 08/04/2015	
Review Date	Review	August 04, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

[3] If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.