



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

GEF ID:	9522		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Global Learning, Finance, and Partnerships Project under TRI		
GEF Agency:	IUCN, FAO and UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	SFM-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$3,519,725
Co-financing:	\$3,900,000	Total Project Cost:	\$7,569,725
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Joshua Schneck

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	01/08/2018 UA: Yes.  Cleared	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	01/08/2018 UA: Yes. Within the context of the programmatic approach, in line with participating countries' strategies.  Cleared	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	01/08/2018 UA:	

<sup>1</sup> 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
	drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes. Cleared	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	01/08/2018 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	01/08/2018 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	01/08/2018 UA: Yes. Cleared	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	01/08/2018 UA: Yes. Council approved at PFD level and resources set aside. Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>July 1, 2016 UA:</p> <p>The PPG is within the allowed limits and it recommended for CEO approval.</p> <p>The parent PFD was approved by Council June 8, 2016.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	January 08, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	<p>01/08/2018 UA:</p> <p>Yes. In line with project brief provided at PFD review stage.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>01/08/2018 UA:</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>It is herewith approved, in line with</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>GEF policy (refer to GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01), that this particular child project of the program will be executed by the implementing agencies (IUCN, FAO, UNEP).</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?</p>	<p>01/08/2018 UA: No. Please address the following issues:</p> <p>1) DATA discrepancies found:</p> <p>Table A: Co-financing figures missing. Table B: Co-financing sum does not add up. Sum is different from Table A. Table D: SFM resources are provided from "Multiple Focal Areas", not from Land Degradation focal area. Please select the correct focal area from the drop down menu.</p> <p>2) The budget contains items that are not eligible and/or exceed the allowable ceiling of GEF funding: - GEF grant funding cannot be used to pay salaries of personnel of the implementing agencies. Please refer to GEF policy: GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01. The only exception that this policy states is if</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>that the implementing agency has been approved as executing agency in the particular project case. In this case, staffing costs can be charged to project management costs, but should not exceed the applicable ceiling for PMCs.</p> <p>3) Project management costs (PMC) need to be co-financed as well. Please allocate a part of the confirmed co-finance to the PMC.</p> <p>02/26/2018 UA: All issues have been adequately addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>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)</p>	<p>01/08/2018 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?</p>	<p>01/08/2018 UA: Yes. However, type of co-funding listed in Table C and the text of the confirmation letters does not fully match. The letters do not mention grant or co-financing. Please either revise letters or we need to treat all co-finance in kind.</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Furthermore, please provide additional information for which project activities the co-financing will be available.</p> <p>02/26/2018 UA: All issues have been adequately addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>01/08/2018 UA: Yes.</p> <p>In addition to the TT, the overview provided in Table 2 of the CEO ER / prodoc that summarizes all GEBs to be created by the project is very helpful. After the first round of reviews of child projects (when GEB numbers have been finalized) please update this table 2 accordingly and send as a separate update to GEFSEC.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	n/a	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>01/08/2018 UA: Yes. The project serves as the coordinating mechanism for all child projects under the TRI program.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that	<p>01/08/2018 UA: Yes.</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Cleared	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	01/08/2018 UA: Yes. The projects serves as the knowledge management platform for all child projects under the TRI program.  Cleared	
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEFSEC</li> </ul>	01/08/2018 UA: Yes, at PFD review stage.  Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP</li> </ul>	01/08/2018 UA: No. Please respond in detail to the STAP comments made at PFD level on PFD #9264 at work program inclusion. The responses need to be coordinated with all child projects as the STAP review made recommendations for all child projects.  02/26/2018 UA: Has been addressed.  Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEF Council</li> </ul>	Please respond to the Council comments made at PFD level on PFD	

<sup>3</sup> 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.

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>#9264 at work program inclusion. The responses need to be coordinated with all child projects as some Council members made recommendations that are relevant to child projects.</p> <p>Additional comments that may come in will need to be responded to after circulation to Council.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>	none received	
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>01/08/2018 UA: No. Please correct data entries in template.</p> <p>02/26/2018 UA: All issues have been adequately addressed. Program Manager clears the project for Council circulation for comments as per project cycle procedures.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	January 08, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 26, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		