

United Nations Development Programme
Country: Global
PROJECT DOCUMENT¹



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

Project Title: 6th Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme

UNDP Strategic Plan Environment and Sustainable Development Primary Outcome: Outcome 1: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded

UNDP Strategic Plan Secondary Outcome: Outcome 2: Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance

Executing Entity/Implementing Partner: UNOPS

Brief Description The GEF Small Grants Programme is a global yet country-driven programme providing facilitative access to funding and technical support to communities and civil society organizations and enabling them through concrete actions to develop capacity and be empowered. SGP supports innovative piloting and demonstration of new methods and models at the local level for eventual scaling up, replication and mainstreaming of successes and lessons learned with other partners, government, and development agencies. This project will support the generation of global environmental benefits in line with the strategic priorities of the GEF as well as the local sustainable development objectives of participating countries. In its sixth Operational Phase (OP6), SGP will target its support towards priority landscapes and seascapes for community based conservation actions, promote sustainable energy access co-benefits, climate smart agro-ecology, and local to global chemicals coalitions. The SGP will also enhance its focus on a range of grantmaker+ services to promote capacity development and effective networking of CSOs, including policy dialogues with government, special emphasis on social inclusion, and global knowledge platforms.

Programme Period:	<u>42 months</u>
Atlas Award ID:	<u>00090372</u>
Project ID:	<u>00096172</u>
PIMS #	<u>5475</u>
Start date:	<u>09/02/2016</u>
End Date:	<u>31/12/2018</u>
Management Arrangements - Agency Execution	
PAC Meeting Date	15 January 2016

Total resources required	\$ 335,110,576
Total allocated resources:	
GEF Core	\$67,307,692
• Un-funded budget:	
GEF Core	\$67,307,692
GEF STAR	\$29,495,192
Co-financing	\$70,500,000
In-kind	\$70,500,000
Other	\$30,000,000

Agreed by (Executing Entity/Implementing Partner):

Date/Month/Year

Agreed by (UNDP):

Date/Month/Year

¹ For UNDP supported GEF funded projects as this includes GEF-specific requirements

List of acronyms

ALM	Adaptation Learning Mechanism
BAC	Budget Account Classification Code
CBO	Community-Based Organization
CCF	Country Cooperation Framework
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CO	Country Office
COA	Chart of Account (ATLAS)
COB	Country Operating Budget
COMPACT	Community Management of Protected Areas Conservation
COP	Conference of the Parties
CPMT	Central Programme Management Team
CPS	Country Programme Strategy
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
DDT	Dichloro Diphenyl Trichloroethane
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organisation
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
FSP	Full Size Project
FPIC	Free Prior Informed Consent
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
ICCAs	Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas
IOV	Inter-office Voucher
IUCN	World Conservation Union
IYB	International Year of Biodiversity
IPEN	International POPs Elimination Network
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LDC	Least Developed Country
LULUCF	Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry
MA	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MOD	Miscellaneous Obligation Document
MSC	Marine Stewardship Council
MSP	Medium Size Project
NAPAs	National Adaptation Programmes of Action
NC	National Coordinator
NFP	National Focal Person
NFG	National Focal Group
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NHI	National Host Institution
NIPs	National Implementation Plans
NPFE	GEF National Portfolio Formulation Exercise
NSC	National Steering Committee
NTEAP	Nile Transboundary Environment Action Plan
OFF	Operational Focal Point
OP	Operational Programme
PA	Programme Assistant
PO	Purchase Order (ATLAS)
POPs	Persistent Organic Pollutants
PoWPA	CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas

REDD	Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
REQ	Requisition (ATLAS)
RR	UNDP Resident Representative
SAPs	Strategic Action Programmes
SBAA	Standard Basic Assistance Agreement
SCS	South China Sea
SES	Social and Environmental Safeguards of UNDP
SFM	Sustainable Forest Management
SGP	Small Grants Programme
SIDs	Small Island Developing States
SOPs	Standard Operating Procedures
SRC	Sub-Regional Coordinator
SRSC	Sub-Regional Steering Committee
SRPS	Sub-Regional Programme Strategy
STAR	System for the Transparent Allocation of Resources
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNCBD	United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation
UNEP-WCMC	UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre
UNF	United Nations Foundation
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WHO	World Health Organization
WH-LEEP	World Heritage Local Ecological Entrepreneurship Programme

List of annexes

- Annex A. GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) Operational Guidelines
- Annex B. Small Grants Programme Roles and Responsibilities
- Annex C. Social and Environmental Screening Template
- Annex D. GEF CEO Endorsement Letter
- Annex E. List of Global SGP Programmes

Table of Contents

1	Situation analysis	5
	1.1 Global Environmental Problems, Root Causes and Barriers	5
	1.2 The Baseline Scenario.....	7
	1.3 Rationale	10
	1.4 Alignment with UN Sustainable Development Goals and UNDP Strategic Plan (2014-2017).....	11
2	Strategy.....	14
	2.1 Grant-Making Strategies	15
	2.1.1 <i>Community Landscape and Seascape Conservation</i>	15
	2.1.2 <i>Climate Smart Innovative Agro-ecology</i>	17
	2.1.3 <i>Low-Carbon Energy Access Co-benefits</i>	18
	2.1.4 <i>Local to Global Chemicals Management Coalitions</i>	18
	2.2 Grantmaker+: Roles and Functions.....	19
	2.2.1 <i>CSO-Government Policy and Planning Dialogue Platforms</i>	19
	2.2.2 <i>Promoting social inclusion</i>	20
	2.2.3 <i>Global Reach for Citizen Practice-Based Knowledge</i>	21
	2.3 Innovativeness, Sustainability and Scaling up.....	22
	2.4 Partnerships	24
	2.5 Risks and Mitigation Measures	25
3	Project Results Framework:	27
4	Total Budget and Work plan	33
5	Management Arrangements	36
6	Monitoring Framework and Evaluation.....	39
7	Legal Context.....	44
8	Annexes	45
	Annex A. GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) Operational Guidelines	45
	Annex B. Small Grants Programme Roles and Responsibilities.....	60
	Annex C. Social and Environmental Screening Template	61
	Annex D. GEF CEO Endorsement Letter.....	71
	Annex E. List of countries	72

1 Situation analysis

1.1 Global Environmental Problems, Root Causes and Barriers

The GEF 2020 Strategy highlights global environmental problems and their continuing and critical nature: 60 percent degradation of ecosystem services; biodiversity decline by 30 percent (with 60 percent occurring in tropical regions) between 1970 and 2007; 30 percent forest loss and 20 percent forest degradation; 80 percent depletion or overexploitation of fish stocks; 24 percent of land area degraded; and climate change no longer a future threat but a reality.

The GEF 20/20 Strategy further identifies population growth as one of the major factors in the causal chain of environmental degradation particularly as a rising middle class population creates increased demands that put further pressure on already fragile ecosystems. The same could be said of the rising population of poor and vulnerable communities. Taking both poverty and social exclusion into consideration, some 2.8 billion people, spread across all developing regions are at risk of falling deeper into the vicious poverty-environmental degradation cycle. Of these, about 1.5 billion rely on small farms with 500 million practicing shifting cultivation. Of the 200 million people relying on fisheries, most depend on artisanal fisheries as the sole source of livelihood. Traditional biomass is still the source for household cooking of 40% of the world's population resulting in further forest degradation, CO₂ emission, as well as being one of the top three causes of mortality for women using wood for cooking.

This linkage between poverty and the environment has created greater challenges to environmental protection and ultimately making it difficult to meet the goals of sustainable development. Many communities are in dire need to sustainably utilize their natural resources and ecosystems for livelihoods and development, yet are often located in the most degraded or sensitive areas of their countries' forest, grassland, or dryland landscapes and coastal areas. The increasing population pressure and prevailing poverty force many communities to take environmentally destructive paths such as in the case of slash-and-burn farmers, dynamite or cyanide fishermen, and mercury-using small scale gold miners. In a vicious cycle of poverty leading to environmental degradation and then to more poverty, poor communities become the victims themselves.

At the community level environmental issues are very closely inter-connected and intertwined. Loss of forests means not just the loss of biodiversity but also increased vulnerability to climate change resulting in combined negative impacts on agricultural productivity and livelihoods. Increased soil erosion eventually reaches waterbodies and destroys coral reef biodiversity, the resource which many artisanal fisherfolk are dependent on. Similarly with heavy chemicals use, toxic elements are absorbed by phytoplankton, ingested by zooplankton and fish thereby contaminating the food chain. It is at the community level, particularly in environmentally degraded and poverty-stricken areas, where the impacts of climate change will be felt first and foremost especially by poor and vulnerable sectors.

Yet it is also at the community level where solutions and effective action can emerge. Communities have shown themselves to be effective stewards of their environmental resources when provided a strong stake and empowered to undertake their management, rehabilitation and protection. In certain countries, community managed conservancies roughly equal or even exceed government managed protected areas. At least 22% of developing country forests and over half of the world's 102,000 protected areas are managed by communities. A recent CBD study reported that there may actually be more indigenous and community conserved areas, covering as much area if not more, than officially designated protected areas. Citizen advocacy groups have also been vital to create more stringent environmental policies and to strictly implement them. Consumer campaigns have traditionally been the source of pressure that shifts industry to move into more environmentally friendly practices and products.

At the very start of efforts to find a more effective solution, when the term "sustainable development" was first defined by the Brundtland Commission in preparation for the Rio Summit in 1992, it was recommended that: a larger portion of total development assistance should go to investments needed to enhance the environment and the productivity of the resource sectors, reforestation and fuelwood development, watershed protection, soil conservation, agroforestry, rehabilitation of irrigation projects, small scale

agriculture, low cost sanitation measures, conversion of crops into fuel, and the most effective efforts of this type are achieved through small projects with maximum grassroots participation. Thus the global environmental conventions, for which the GEF serves as financial mechanism, all contain provisions and decisions regarding engagement with civil society as well as with indigenous peoples, farmers, fisherfolk, women, youth and NGO sectors. The CBD, for example, in its COP6 Decision (vi/10, 29, 30) has invited the GEF to provide special consideration in funding to projects that clearly contain elements of participation of indigenous and local communities.

Twenty years later in Rio+20, the list of major civil society groups was actually expanded with a strengthened call in its outcome document for the direct involvement, not just of governments, but of major stakeholder groups and civil society in its implementation. With new global initiatives such as REDD+, a growing body of evidence gathered by the World Resources Institute has linked community forest rights with healthier forests and lower CO2 emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. This further validates GEF's own evaluation of the role of local benefits in global environmental programmes, a 2006 study that concluded that for many areas of GEF-supported activities, local and environmental benefits are interlinked. The transformation of these communities and their local CSO partners into capable actors for environmental protection rather than continuing to be part of the root problem is thus one of the most effective ways to generate global environmental benefits.

However, several important barriers to direct and meaningful involvement of major grassroots stakeholders and civil society continue to exist and constrain environmental action at all levels. One is the organizational weakness of many communities and local CSOs that prevents them from implementing strategic and collective action for sustainable development and global environmental benefits.² Communities and local CSOs need a facilitative funding mechanism that provides direct access and technical support for capacity development, community organization and networking, local enterprise development and innovation, and building resilience to socio-economic and ecological changes. Particularly affected are the communities and local civil society organizations which by the nature of their remote locations and prevailing poverty or social exclusion have not had the opportunity to interact with funders and implement projects.

A second barrier is the lack of relevant approaches and technologies that can respond to the often unique and difficult challenges faced by poor and vulnerable communities. These stakeholders need concrete, on-the-ground efforts, that are able to explore what the GEF Vision 20/20 calls "new frontiers of global environmental action" that will provide innovative models for eventual mainstreaming, replication and scaling up. Lessons learned from these innovative efforts will also contribute towards improving policy and decision-making. As many analysts have observed, relevant approaches and technologies at the grassroots level need to be developed by those who will be using them and adapted to local contexts.³ It is also noted by some that such innovation in technologies should build on indigenous knowledge where available.⁴ To do so, it is important that funding, through grants and other means flows directly to communities and CSOs to be able to test and adapt needed solutions to problems. An evaluation of the GEF's engagement with CSOs found that "the CSO-executed project volume has never reached the 15% funding" of the GEF and recommends that this should be a target, along with efforts to make such engagement with CSO more meaningful.⁵

A third barrier to grassroots action on the global environment is the lack of supportive and relevant policies. A proactive effort on this is important as OPS5 reported, despite the solid record and systematic inclusion

² Capacity and experience of selected grantees was found by the SGP Joint Evaluation of 2015, based on a survey of stakeholders in 114 countries, to be the most significant hindering factor to scaling up or broader adoption of SGP project results. 37% of all respondents identified grantee capacity as a constraint.

³ For example, J. Farrington and A. Bebington in "Reluctant Partners? Non-Governmental Organizations, the State and Sustainable Agricultural Development", 1993.

⁴ Encouraging Innovation Everywhere, by Shruthi Baskaran & Khanjan Mehta, Jan. 11, 2016, ssir.org

⁵ "Civil Society Organization's Engagement", Overall Performance Study 5, Technical Document #14, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, 2014.

of CSOs in GEF affairs, civil society engagement needs further support due to numerous dynamics including relationships between CSOs and governments and the interpretation as well as documentation of meaningful and relevant engagement. Given this, the GEF itself has recently strengthened its policies supporting indigenous peoples as well as on women's empowerment. Yet in many countries there is still need to facilitate positive working relationships between government and local CSOs, as well as to support grassroots networking, so that multi-stakeholder alliances can be developed and lead the way towards transforming policy and regulatory environments as called for in the GEF 20/20 Strategy, to create global environmental benefits at scale.

Communities and civil society, if they are to contribute effectively to achievement of global environmental objectives, must be supported to develop greater technical and organizational capacities, tested through the actual implementation of increasingly more complex on-the-ground environmental and sustainable development solutions. The enabling environment needs to be created to expand community-based action at scale through positive national policy dialogue and development planning that brings in the experience and knowledge of capable and empowered community and CSO stakeholders.

1.2 The Baseline Scenario

Since the Rio Summit (1992), countries have implemented projects and programs in line with their commitments to various environmental conventions to which the GEF is a financing mechanism. This has been in the form of government as well as CSO implemented or executed projects and programs, with government implementation and execution forming the bulk. While many governments have started to place funding resources in the hands of CSOs, particularly donor governments with international NGOs, there are still major barriers in the case of local NGOs, and much more so CBOs (Community-based Organizations). This is reflected in the way GEF funds have been utilized for CSOs. The OPS5 report noted that despite the solid record of the GEF in civil society engagement, such engagement very often stops short of being meaningful, one reason being the relationship between CSOs and governments and interpretation of meaningful engagement.⁶ A less than supportive relationship between government and CSOs can be due to lack of confidence in the capacity of CSOs, particularly of local NGOs and CBOs, difference in development philosophy, policy and approaches, and lack of capacity of both parties to work with each other.

An assessment by SGP National Coordinators of funding sources that can be used by CSOs other than SGP7 showed that:

1. Majority of the participating countries to the programme have some form of government funding mechanism to support CSO action. However, such mechanisms depend on availability of funds from donors, tend to be ad-hoc and non-predictable, government-led and with political agenda oftentimes coming up as an issue. Furthermore, the focus is more on socio-economic concerns – food security, nutrition, local development, electoral education, media and communications, water supply and sanitation, women & youth empowerment, outreach clinics, sexual & reproductive health, HIV/AIDS, agribusiness, rural infrastructure, and the like.
2. Aside from the GEF, there are other donors such as bilateral agencies, international development agencies, regional banks, embassies, big International NGOs, philanthropic foundations, as well as some CSR-related resources from the private sector that can provide funds for CSO action. Most are also more focused on socio-economic concerns although some INGOs such as WWF, CI, and IUCN continue to be in the environment field while others such as OxFam, CARE, and Red Cross are increasingly getting into the climate adaptation work. The World Bank's CIF especially its Dedicated Grants Mechanism for Indigenous Peoples which will support REDD projects is a new major source of

⁶ GEF IEO. OPS5 Final Report: At the Crossroads for Higher Impact (Section 7.5 Engagement of Civil Society Organizations, p. 57). 2014

⁷ Survey made in the period August 2014 in preparation for SGP OP6 PIF development

funding for CBOs. Requirement for fund access are however stringent and calls for built capacity, track record, registration or accreditation, and internal funds availability for advances or for co-financing.

3. There are countries that were able to set up National Environmental Funds (NEFs) but the funding available is limited for most as grantmaking is based on the interest income of their trust funds.
4. When the criteria of direct access to grants by communities and local CSOs, particularly representing poor and vulnerable sectors in more remote areas and with no built capacity, track record or registration, and governance by a multisectoral national steering committee of both government and non-government members with the non-government in majority are factored in, then there are almost no other grantmaking mechanism of this type other than GEF SGP in these countries. The closest in approach are the Global Greengrants with a much lower grant levels (at \$1,000 - \$3,500), the Small Scale Initiative Programme (SSIP) of Le Fonds Français Pour L'Environnement Mondial (FFEM) focused on biodiversity conservation in West and Central Africa and Madagascar (at 50,000 Euro maximum) and the Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund (CEPF) at higher levels (\$150,000) focused on 35 biodiversity hotspots in 65 countries.
5. The presence of other funders has become an opportunity for partnership and co-financing. In many cases, these other funds are combined with SGP's in a joint, parallel or sequential co-financing approaches, providing additional resources or to cover needed aspects that cannot be funded with GEF funds.

CSO involvement in environment and sustainable development action will continue without GEF SGP. But there would be more limited contributions from CSOs particularly by poor and vulnerable communities and local CSOs⁸. Furthermore while there have now been more than 20,750 community and CSO projects supported in the more than 20 years of SGP operation, a critical mass still has to be reached in many countries particularly those that started up later. There is also need to consolidate assets of completed projects for scaling up, mainstreaming and replication.

The many community-based and CSO-led projects that SGP has supported, as well as its development as a funding modality highly regarded by both CSOs and government in participating countries⁹, can be considered as built-up assets that can serve as foundations for expanded work in GEF-6. Except for SGP as a global funding mechanism that still need continued GEF support, completed projects of SGP, particularly with the strong ownership and sustained support of involved communities and CSOs will proceed with minimal or little support from GEF and thus also forms a "baseline".

In the biodiversity focal area, there are presently more than 8,500 community-based projects with grantees and other related stakeholders connected together. For example, in regard to the GEF's efforts to promote protected areas co-management between government and indigenous and local communities, there is now a global coalition of civil society actors in support of Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas and Territories (ICCAs) across all regions. Resulting in part from SGP's advocacy for ICCAs, the GEF has formally adopted ICCAs as part of its strategy and funding priorities for the GEF5 cycle,¹⁰ and Aichi Target 11 now includes a reference to other "effective area-based forms of conservation", including ICCAs and

⁸ OPS5 technical study (document no. 14) survey on GEF CSO engagement showed that out of the six mechanisms GEF has used to engage CSOs, the SGP was rated the most effective (2.18 out of maximum 3); rankings were given 2.83 by the GEF Secretariat respondents as compared to 2.06 for the CSOs (their highest ranking) with informants referring to the SGP as "important", "the main door for CSOs" and "the most relevant GEF mechanism".

⁹ The GEF's Overall Programme Study of GEF 4 (OPS4, 2010) observes that "The GEF provides funding through four basic modalities: full-size projects, medium-size projects, enabling activities, and small grants (through the SGP)" (p.8). It goes on to recommend, as Recommendation 8 of the study, that: "The SGP should be recognized as a GEF modality that should be available to all recipient countries." (p. 18)

¹⁰ GEF5 Focal Area Strategies 'Objective One: Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems' p.3: http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/document/GEF-5_FOCAL_AREA_STRATEGIES.pdf

private protected areas, as necessary for expanding the global coverage of protected areas (PAs) from 12% to 17%. This work together with the more focused SGP landscape approach projects (e.g. COMPACT and COMDEKS) forms a strong foundation for landscape conservation initiative of SGP OP6 and its aim to generate increased global environmental benefits¹¹.

In the international waters focal area, more than 760 projects provide working examples of community action¹² aligned with the priorities identified in regional frameworks, particularly GEF full-sized projects' regional Strategic Action Programmes (SAPs). Collaboration with the GEF FSPs in the Nile River, Niger River, the South China Sea/East Asia Seas and other waterbodies resulted in SAP implementation at the community level and community experiences and knowledge incorporated into regional management processes of transboundary waterbodies.

With SGP's work in the climate change focal area, more than 3,000 projects (33% on renewable energy and 27% on energy efficiency) are available to show innovative community low-carbon technologies that are adapted to local conditions and significantly contributing to provision of sustainable energy services and reduction of harmful GHG emissions while generating other co-benefits such as improved resilience and livelihoods¹³. While small in scale, these successful pilot initiatives can be integrated and scaled up within larger national and international frameworks such as NAMAs (Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions), LEDS (Low Emission Development Strategies), Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL), as well as in the new initiatives taking shape with potential support from the Green Climate Fund and other funders.

In the land degradation focal area there are more than 2,000 agricultural, pastoral and forest communities with improved agricultural management and implementing integrated approaches that bring in food security and poverty reduction considerations together. There are Community-Based Adaptation (CBA) pilot communities representing a variety of ecosystems in 9 countries that was supported by the GEF Special Priority for Adaptation (SPA) funds as well as in all thirty (37) SIDS with AusAID co-financing.

There are 370 projects developed through SGP POPs and chemicals portfolio providing successful examples of community-based pesticide management in agriculture, promotion of organic farming as an alternative, reduction of chemicals usage and contamination, avoidance of open burning of solid waste and capacity development, awareness raising and knowledge sharing.¹⁴ A POPs Training Module is presently

11 For example, in its 12 years of work, COMPACT directly supported over 430 projects (and, through partnerships, indirectly supported other initiatives) at eight World Heritage Sites and/or other globally significant protected areas covering a total area of some 788,000 hectares, providing over US\$10-million in small grants, and leveraging a further US\$5.5-million in co-financing (cash and in-kind support). In addition, the work contributed significantly to Target 11 of the Aichi framework on shared governance of protected areas.

12 For example, in China, SGP has supported five projects on international waters by reducing land-based pollution and restoring and protecting coastal habitats. These five projects have involved 19,770 local people and benefited 4,345 people directly. An example of the work supported by SGP is a project on investigation and control of land-based pollution in the coastal area of Dalian that ended in January 2011. The project engaged over 8,000 volunteers who contributed 22,630 hours and cleaned up 11,590kg waste along the Dalian coast. As a result, 1,906 kilometers of the Dalian coastline are now under regular monitoring and protection by the community and the achievements of this project have been acknowledged by the local government by providing US\$50,000 to continue the work started by SGP.

13 For example, in Dominican Republic, where electricity supply is a significant problem, sixteen off-grid community-managed micro hydro systems were established with SGP support. Significant environmental impacts were achieved at country level: more than 24,000 tons of CO₂ emissions per year were avoided, more than 10,000 ha of forests important for biodiversity conservation preserved and restored. From the economic perspective, these initiatives saved the import of more than 15,700 barrels of oil equivalent per year, saving 1.6 million USD per year for country's economy. Additionally, more than 1000 families, schools, microenterprises, rural health, communication and community centers have energy access. Before, each family had to spend 12-30 USD per month to buy kerosene gas, candles and batteries. Now each family pays 3-6 USD per month and has access to 4-9 times more electricity, which represents savings between 100 and 300 USD/year per family. On a policy level, GEF SGP successful experiences in rural electrification informed the process of drafting and approval of law fostering renewable energy leading to inclusion of community projects in the text.

14 For example, in Nepal, with the support of SGP and other co-sponsors, the Center for Public Health and Environmental Development (CEPHED) launched a campaign to raise public awareness about POPs and establish models to reduce POPs usage

widely used by NGO and community leaders, with about 1,000 online users and more than 10,000 offline users. Partnerships and networking with CSOs dedicated to the chemicals focal area, such as with the International Pesticide Elimination Network (IPEN), have been established with plans for expanded efforts in project implementation as well as formation of coalitions for policy advocacy.

Existing investments and assets have also resulted from SGP's work with GEF Full-Sized Projects (FSPs), in synergy as well as in a supportive role, in implementing community components of these projects¹⁵. Globally, several UNDP and donor co-financed programmes have also been implemented by SGP, such as: the Community-Based Adaptation programme funded by DFAT, the Community-Based REDD+ programme in partnership with UNREDD and with financing from Norway, the Community Development and Knowledge Management in the Satoyama Initiative (COMDEKS) funded by the Japan Biodiversity Fund and in collaboration with UNEP and UNU, the EU funded Environmental Governance and NGO Strengthening project, among others.

All these built up assets and existing investments from government, bilaterals, donor agencies and big international NGOs will be treated as "baseline" from which SGP Country Programme Strategies will develop its priorities and approaches which then feed into supporting the development (i.e. partnership and co-financing components) and selection of individual small grants projects to ensure the strategic and catalytic nature of SGP OP6 grantmaking.

1.3 Rationale

The GEF SGP provides support to achieve global environmental benefits at the community level. The SGP strengthens the capacity of communities and civil society organizations, increases their knowledge and awareness about environmental threats, and provides them financial support to overcome short-term decision-making that negatively affects environmental resources. Many SGP projects have direct links to achievement of global environmental benefits thematically when these projects focus on globally important and critical endangered species and geographically when these projects are located in critically important landscapes and seascapes. Successful innovative projects of high relevance to oftentimes neglected sectors such as indigenous peoples, women, youth and children, and the disabled provide models or examples for designing larger national efforts as well as filling in important national policy gaps. Within the GEF, UNDP, and other agencies, tested SGP approaches, lessons learned, country staff, and stakeholder networks have become resources in the design and/or implementation of larger projects. The report of Phase 1 of the recent 2013 Joint SGP Evaluation concluded that: "*The SGP remains highly relevant in terms of both the global environment and addressing local socio-economic condition. The SGP continues to be effective, particularly at the level of individual grants. Slowly, but surely, cohorts of grants are seen to be delivering cumulative and synergistic effects at the national and sub-national levels*".¹⁶

and unintentional production. Approximately 2,000 liters of PCBs contaminated transformer oil has been avoided by replacing the wet welding machines with PCBs free dry welding machines. The project successfully reduced the release of PCDD/Fs from non-burning medical waste treatment in the Kanti children hospital by 1.19 g TEQ /year. This project won the Stockholm PEN Award in April 2011.

¹⁵ These partnerships have been mutually reinforcing. GEF full-sized projects, with their larger funding and direct links to government implementation, have access to greater resources, networks and policy influence than SGP. On the other hand, SGP's knowledge and experience working with communities and CSOs at the local level help FSPs work better with these stakeholders. For example, SGP and the UNEP/GEF South China Sea project worked together to ensure the delivery of \$1 million in grants (half from SGP and half from the South China Sea project) to communities via 31 projects in support of the implementation of the South China Sea SAP. The FSP provided technical and training support as well as government networking for communities and CSOs while SGP provided its grantmaking mechanism to ensure fast and efficient funds flow to communities as well as oversee the implementation of these community-based projects. As a result 2,079 hectares of seagrass, 2,388 hectares of coral reef and 12,618 hectares of mangrove were put under sustainable management which represents 8%, 4.5% and 0.7% of the SAP targets of the FSP was met.

¹⁶ Joint GEF/UNDP Independent Evaluation of SGP, Phase 1 Report, 2013, pp. 6,9

SGP priority projects and activities for GEF-6 will show a much more enhanced set of strategies to ensure that SGP contributes to global environmental benefits. Firstly is the full alignment of SGP priorities to that of the GEF-6 Programming Directions and of its outcomes to meeting the GEF-6 replenishment targets. Secondly, is the greater attention to creating synergy among individual projects through the use of landscape or seascape approaches as well as taking all opportunities for complementation with larger projects of the GEF and other donor agencies. Thirdly, is the linking of SGP local initiatives to global initiatives such as SE4ALL as well as fostering joint efforts with global networks such as the GEF NGO Network and IPEN. Finally, there will be the formalization and more organized implementation of previously more ad-hoc support activities into a “Grantmaker+” set of roles designed to support scaling up, mainstreaming and replication that will provide higher level capacity development (i.e. IP Fellowships), networking and institutional support, knowledge sharing (i.e. South-South Technology Exchange Platform), and advocacy mechanisms at national levels (i.e. CSO-Government Dialogue Platforms), and where relevant, all these to extend to regional and global levels.

SGP operates through a multi-stakeholder approach engaging a range of stakeholders including NGOs, CBOs, indigenous people, the private sector, government, academia, and donor partners. During GEF-6, civil society organizations (CSOs) will be both beneficiaries and direct participants in GEF SGP through their inclusion in National Steering Committees (NSCs), where non-governmental members must be in the majority, as well as by taking on the role as National Host Institutions and other key roles related to knowledge sharing and policy advocacy. Although grants are targeted towards CSOs particularly community-based and non-governmental organizations, a broad range of stakeholders are engaged as active partners in program management and during grant implementation, including inter alia research institutes, local and municipal governments, international NGOs, as well as national and international volunteers. With regard to indigenous peoples and marginalized populations, GEF SGP follows a set of principles that advocate for a flexible, time sensitive, and simple project cycle in order to allow these groups to access GEF SGP support. The programme has pioneered numerous user-friendly modalities to work with poor and marginalized groups including alternative proposal formats such as participatory video, Almanario, photo stories, and community theatre, and allowances are made for concept and project submission in local and vernacular languages so long as these concepts and proposals adhere to the basic project elements. GEF SGP also allows for flexible disbursement terms to cope with indigenous peoples’ culture, customs and seasonal movements. SGP makes extra efforts to reach out people and groups that are often marginalized or disadvantaged. Empowering women and engaging youth have been two important initiatives of SGP. SGP NSC at the country program level has designated a focal point for gender and youth, respectively to ensure their voices are heard. Additionally, through stakeholder workshops, CSOs are able to learn of GEF SGP projects and activities and provide inputs on how to improve on them.

1.4 Alignment with UN Sustainable Development Goals and UNDP Strategic Plan (2014-2017)

The inter-government negotiations of the post-2015 goals have been successfully concluded with the agreement of development goals and targets to be adopted by the Heads of the States in the General Assembly in September 2015. The Outcome Document for post-2015 agenda “Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development” of the inter-governmental negotiations presents seventeen goals and 169 associated targets for which all countries should endeavour to achieve by 2030. It states “that eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, including extreme poverty, is the greatest global challenge and an indispensable requirement for sustainable development.”¹⁷ It further recognizes the need to revitalize the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development that “focussed in particular on the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable and with the participation of all countries, all stakeholders and all people.”¹⁸ UNDP Strategic Plan (2014-2017) focuses on an inclusive development approach that is much

17 General Assembly. 2015. Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Page 1.

18 Ibid. Page 2.

in alignment with the Sustainable Development Goals of 2030. The Vision of UNDP is “to help countries achieve the simultaneous eradication of poverty and significant reduction of inequalities and exclusion.”¹⁹

In alignment with UN Sustainable Development Goals and UNDP Strategic Plan of 2014-2017, SGP has taken poverty reduction as one of its three pillars in development approach: global environmental benefits, poverty reduction and community empowerment. The 2008 Joint GEF/UNDP Evaluation of SGP concluded that, “the SGP has contributed to direct global environmental benefits while also addressing the livelihood needs of local populations” and that “The SGP has made significant progress in targeting its efforts to help the poor”. Subsequently, in 2010, the UNDP Evaluation Office conducted an Evaluation of UNDP’s Contribution to Environmental Management for Poverty Reduction: the Poverty-Environment Nexus. The evaluation found that the one area of UNDP’s externally funded operations that tackles poverty-environment issues centrally is the SGP. The fifth Independent Evaluation validated SGP’s emphasis on poverty reduction, and concluded that “evidence gathered suggests that the SGP has given significant attention to community level benefits and livelihoods, and that the attention is showing positive results”²⁰

In SGP practice, sustainable livelihoods, rooted in community knowledge, practice, and innovation, constitute the basis for sustainable development at the local level. Sustainable livelihoods depend on environmental governance, natural resource management, income generation, women’s empowerment and engaging youth. SGP, as a demand-driven development program that addresses global environmental challenges coupled with local development, offers a comprehensive development package that addresses sustainable development in the three interlinked pillars. As demonstrated in its past twenty years’ experience, SGP grant making process sustainable development benefits that integrate environmental, social and economic concerns. As poor and vulnerable communities struggle for basic daily needs such as food, water, sanitation and education, it is hard for SGP to focus on effectively achieving global environmental benefits without investment in promoting these basic needs. SGP community and civil society partners have developed capacities to design and implement projects that address not only environment, but social, cultural and economic problems. SGP practices embrace the three pillars of sustainable development to produce multiple benefits for local communities and the local and global environment.

SGP is about social inclusion, equality and democratic process. In GEF-6, one of the main “Grantmaker+” functions will be to promote social inclusion and empower indigenous people, women, and youth and other social groups in the development process. The fifth Independent Evaluation of SGP noted SGP’s significant achievements in gender empowerment and mainstreaming where 52% of the sampled projects can be considered to have successfully mainstreamed gender, in comparison with the an analysis of 281 GEF projects where only 35% of the projects have successfully mainstreamed gender in their design and implementation. Noting the global challenges of increasing inequality, SGP focuses on the poorest and most vulnerable, which typically have low levels of technical and institutional capacity to adequately address global environmental problems. More than 60% of SGP grants target poor communities in participating countries, which have the greatest need for assistance.²¹ At least 15% of SGP grants target indigenous peoples (frequently amongst the poorest communities), who often have the knowledge and experience to create sustainable solutions to environmental challenges. More than a quarter of SGP grants specifically support women, who constitute another priority target group. Engaging and empowering youth will continue to be a priority in SGP’s inclusive development agenda. SGP will promote full engagement of youth in decision-making, programming and networking.

The sustainable development partnership will not be effective without the engagement of local communities, which often are the poorest and most vulnerable groups of people. SGP can serve as an effective and competent delivery mechanism to meet sustainable development challenges. Community-based approaches recognize and emerge from community stewardship of ecosystems and community reliance

19 UNDP. 2014. Changing with the World: UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017.

20 GEF. 2015. Joint GEF/UNDP Small Grants Programme Evaluation.

21 GEF. 2008. The Joint Evaluation of GEF Small Grants Programme.

on natural resources for livelihoods and cultural and social wellbeing. Empowering communities to participate in their own development and improving access to services and resources for marginal and vulnerable communities are enabling conditions for achieving sustainable development goals and targets. In this vision, communities and civil society are crucial for sustainable development process and communities are the agents of their own transformation.²²

²² UNDP. 2012. 20 Years Community Action for the Global Environment.

2 Strategy

As a GEF corporate programme, SGP has always aligned its operational phase strategies to that of the GEF with the expectation that its role is to translate such strategies to community and local CSO action and provide a testing and evidence base for further scaling up. SGP contributes to achieving GEF's strategy outcomes by supporting innovative initiatives by these important stakeholders and building on the baseline assets so far achieved. Therefore, action at the local level by civil society, indigenous and local communities is deemed vital by the GEF 20/20 Strategy (i.e. convening multi-stakeholder alliances as well as for broader participation in strengthening capacity and decision-making processes). The individual SGP projects will be small but their aggregated impacts over time in more than a hundred countries, particularly as SGP moves into more programmatic grantmaking modalities such as the landscape/seascape management approach in GEF-6, will contribute significantly to global environmental benefits²³. Along these lines, SGP submitted for incorporation into the GEF replenishment discussions its strategic directions, which resulted to an allocation of \$140 million of GEF global core funds for SGP in GEF-6. These strategic directions were then incorporated into a GEF Council document "GEF Small Grants Programme: Implementation Arrangements for GEF-6" (GEF/C.46/13) that was reviewed and approved by the GEF Council in its May 2014 meeting.

The presentation of this Project Document is thus for the whole GEF-6 implementation of the SGP with a GEF core funding total of \$140 million as well as additional GEF STAR funds²⁴ endorsed and will be endorsed to the programme. Core funds amount, however, had to be released in two tranches with an SGP OP6 Part 1 overall GEF funding of \$70 million. Endorsed STAR funds will also be released in a separate tranche.

The programme goal of SGP for GEF-6 is to "effectively support the creation of global environmental benefits and the safeguarding of the global environment through community and local solutions that complement and add value to national and global level action."

To reach this goal SGP will use a three-pronged approach: (a) focusing its work on globally recognized critical ecosystems; (b) setting-up innovative institutional and financial support mechanisms to expand the value and impact of projects nationally and globally and; (c) systematically developing the capacity of local and national civil society stakeholders, including their ability to manage larger projects and more complex national challenges, as a key factor for environmental sustainability. SGP proposes to focus grant making around clear components that are based on country and global priorities and where strategic impact can be achieved. The grant making will be focused on priority themes that are multi-focal in character and leverage SGP's ability to foster synergies among focal areas. Initial consultations with SGP country programmes have informed the development of the PIF, particularly where certain strategic components and outcomes will be prioritized. However, it is expected that the SGP country programme teams, in consultation with National Steering Committees and a broad base of country level stakeholders will be involved in consultations to elaborate and further prioritize the components and outcomes which are the most relevant to implement in their countries. These consultations will be reflected in the development of SGP OP6 Country Programme Strategies in each SGP county programme which will guide the implementation of grant making in each country.

²³ For example, in its 12 years of work, COMPACT directly supported over 430 projects (and, through partnerships, indirectly supported other initiatives) at eight World Heritage Sites and/or other globally significant protected areas covering a total area of some 788,000 hectares, providing over US\$10-million in small grants, and leveraging a further US\$5.5-million in co-financing (cash and in-kind support). In addition, the work contributed significantly to Target 11 of the Aichi framework on shared governance of protected areas.

²⁴ Strategic and Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR) funds are the funds allocated by GEF to countries for use in an operational phase. The implementation arrangements paper for SGP (GEF/C.46/13) for GEF-6 approved by the GEF Council provided for a policy by which a country with more than \$15 million in total STAR funds could endorse a maximum of \$2 million of such funds to their SGP Country Programme.

In order to effectively implement OP6, SGP will also serve as a “Grantmaker+” providing additional services and added value. The programme will set up support mechanisms based on SGP experience and assets built up over the years, which allow SGP to build value beyond grant-making. These support mechanisms are based on the understanding that individual projects are not just ends in themselves but also the means to achieving more sustainable impact when greater cumulative and synergistic effects can be leveraged through the non-grant services provided by SGP such as institution building, knowledge networking, and policy advocacy. These efforts will also sustain the efficiency of SGP despite lower grant funds while at the same time facilitating scaling up, mainstreaming and replication.

UNDP’s support will be leveraged throughout different programmatic areas at the local and community level (e.g. Poverty reduction, Inclusive Growth, Climate Change, Energy, Water Resource Management, Ecosystem Management, Disaster Risk Reduction, and Local Governance). At the global level all UNDP policies will be taken into consideration while preparing technical guidance notes for each of the integrated focal area strategies mentioned below. The policies on Climate Change, Disaster, Energy and Resilience will be included and referenced for relevant initiatives described below. UNDP global teams and Regional hubs will be consulted as needed. At the country level SGP, Country Programme Strategies will be developed to guide SGP programming. This will be done in close collaboration with UNDP offices who are represented on SGP’s National Steering Committees (NSC), and integrated with national priorities and plans, as well as aligned with UNDAF and UNDP programming at country level.

Emphasis will be placed while defining the CPS on promoting synergy with other GEF funded Full and Medium sized projects as well as relevant UNDP, government and partner initiatives in the country, in order to provide greater opportunities for scaling up and broader adoption SGP will also explore possibilities to serve as a delivery mechanism to help in implementation of specific components of larger projects, where SGP’s presence and networks can add value.

In addition, as noted by the SGP Joint Evaluation of 2015, “the SGP pilots, innovates, and contributes to knowledge about what works and what does not in different contexts”²⁵. SGP will continue to promote such testing and innovation by communities and CSOs, to find solutions to sustainable development and global environmental management. It is able to take a risk taking approach given its grassroots nature and relatively small size of its grants, as well as the flexibility in procedures and guidelines that enables such testing and adaptation to be carried out by project proponents who are usually directly impacted by environmental concerns and the direct users of such innovations. User driven innovations are often more successful as they are adapted over time to the local conditions and context. Adaptive management is also a key element of SGP’s M&E framework, to allow for lessons to be learnt and adjustments to be made both within individual projects as well as at the country and portfolio levels.

2.1 Grant-Making Strategies

In OP6 SGP will contribute to the achievement of the following four integrated focal area strategies²⁶ in portfolio development:

2.1.1 Community Landscape and Seascape Conservation

²⁵ Joint Evaluation of the Small Grants Programme, 2015, p. 44.

²⁶ These are the focal area strategies that relate to critical needs of poor and vulnerable communities as noted in Section 1: Situational Analysis: e.g. landscape/seascape approach targets more effectively the issue of biodiversity loss and the degradation of ecosystem services including the need to strengthen community conserved areas as a key solution; climate-smart innovative agroecology relates to the need to reduce land degradation as well as forest loss by helping farmers shift from land degrading practices as well as adapt to the impacts of climate change; low-carbon energy access co-benefits recognizes the importance of less pollutive and/or renewable energy for not only livelihoods but also for health and other benefits; local to global chemical management coalitions aims to utilize the power of citizen advocacy groups and consumer campaigns as source of pressure that shifts industry to move into more environmentally friendly practices and products.

During OP6, SGP will identify important ecosystems and use a community-based landscape and seascape conservation (CLSC) approach for their protection and sustainable use. Under this component, SGP will implement a truly multi-focal approach involving communities in buffer zones and corridors thus providing connectivity for complex landscape mosaics.

In the landscape approach, aside from continuing to provide direct access to GEF grants for small producer organizations, indigenous peoples' networks, peasant associations, and farmers' collectives worldwide, SGP will help federate their efforts as part of the rapidly expanding global movement in support of the conservation of agro-biodiversity, food sovereignty, and in situ plant and animal genetic resources. Priority landscapes and seascapes for the CLSC will include sites inscribed on international conventions (i.e. World Heritage, Biosphere Reserves and Ramsar sites), as well as to the increasing diversity and quality in the governance arrangements of PAs contributing to the achievement of the CBD Aichi 2020 targets (such as ICCAs and private PAs). SGP will complement existing and planned GEF investments, particularly in support of transboundary conservation efforts in the international waters focal area, in partnership with other programmes such as the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF), French GEF (FFEM), as well as grass-roots networks including the expanding global network of Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs). As such, the identification process will make use of the "GEF criteria for Defining Globally Significant Sites for Biodiversity Conservation" in Annex 3 of the GEF-6 Programming Directions. In addition, SGP will reinforce and strengthen GEF support towards the planned 10-year work programme for protected areas which was established at the World Parks Congress in November 2014 ('The Promise of Sydney').

During OP6, with additional funding from the German Ministry of the Environment (BMUB), SGP will deepen and extend a global south-south coalition of CSOs in support for the achievement of ICCAs in relation to Aichi targets 11 (protected areas), 14 (ecosystem services) and 18 (traditional knowledge, innovations and practices). SGP has previously helped shape global policy for the implementation of the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA) through the development of a global registry for ICCAs (www.iccregistry.org).²⁷ During OP6, SGP will continue to work with the GEF, bilateral donors, UNEP WCMC, IUCN and other partners to quantify and track the global results of sustained support to ICCAs across all world regions. Building on the experience of COMPACT, the Satoyama COMDEKS Initiative, and the Global ICCA Support Initiative (ICCA GSI), SGP will build up its capacity to develop multi-focal area integrated landscape/seascape strategies and conceptual models.

Seascape approaches will involve the identification and prioritization of waterbodies for intervention, coordination among key stakeholders in the identification of the root causes of environmental degradation, and the development and implementation of inter-linked activities to systematically address waterbody environmental degradation. SGP will promote a polycentric governance approach in international waters management based on the innovative model piloted in South China Sea, which involves coordinated actions and interventions from different actors, including the government, the communities, and the private sectors. The role of SGP is to join the coordinated efforts, and support community-based actions towards a shared goal as jointly identified by key stakeholders, in the area of coastal habitat management (such as mangroves, coral reefs, seagrass and other types of wetlands), fisheries management and land-based pollution, river and lake basin management, as well as integrated water resource management. The aim is for community demonstrations of integrated coastal and water resources management in select seascapes will be supported in at least 20 countries. The identification of priority seascape areas will thus strongly consider partnerships with GEF FSPs, in the Caribbean, the South China Sea/East Asian Seas, the Pacific as well as others in consultation with existing FSP interventions. In this, SGP will work with relevant GEF FSPs to enhance local capacity, link up with key stakeholders and form regional networks of communities

²⁷ CBD COP11 in Hyderabad, October 2012, reconfirmed the critical role of the ICCA Global Registry in monitoring the contributions of voluntarily conserved areas under decision XI/24 on protected areas of UNEP/CBD/COP/11/35 to: "Strengthen recognition of and support for community-based approaches to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in situ, including indigenous and local community conserved areas, other areas within IUCN governance types and initiatives led by indigenous and local communities that fulfill the objectives of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 and support the voluntary use of the Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas Registry managed by the United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre."

to deepen cooperation among stakeholders of shared waterbodies. Such approaches will address a major community barrier in international waters management, i.e. the lack of a regional coordination mechanism to ensure linkages and coherence of highly local community projects to meet regional objectives in holistic transboundary watershed management.

With the landscape and seascape conservation approach the potential for SGP to increase cross-country learning between projects is tremendous, reflecting a modest additional cost to upscale and build upon the foundations of “tried-and-tested” national delivery mechanisms established during previous SGP operational phases. There are at least 50 SGP country programmes that stand ready and are targeted to implement a landscape/seascape approach with the aim to improve the conservation and sustainable use management of important terrestrial and coastal/marine ecosystems.

2.1.2 Climate Smart Innovative Agro-ecology

SGP’s niche under this component will focus on the production buffer zones of identified critical ecosystems, also in forest corridors in danger of fragmentation due to population pressure, often remote and unaddressed by other traditional donors. Small grants in this initiative will be applied in synergy with the GEF6 Sustainable Land Management (SLM) for Climate-Smart Agriculture programme to target geographical areas that show declining productivity as a result of human induced land degrading practices and the impact of climate change.

In OP6, newer innovative and pragmatic approaches will be employed building on both current agriculture science as well as the knowledge base of communities. The use of the term “*agro-ecology*” is to highlight the strong added element of ecological considerations to the usual short-term production oriented agriculture. This is necessitated not only by the need to rehabilitate degraded land but also to adapt to the changing climate which requires strong consideration for sustaining ecosystem services within and adjacent to farms, the growing concerns for more healthy food systems, and thus a holistic approach for sustainable farming with multiple benefits from climate resilience to farm productivity. An example of this will be the promotion of the development and uses of organic materials from natural mineralization processes, increased use of scalable good land management systems and working with communities to test and implement good land management policies.

SGP will apply principles of *climate-smart agriculture* and a landscape approach promoting use of organic based fertilizers for improving soil productivity, increasing food security and reducing emissions from land degradation. This will require close collaboration with public and private sector to help poor farmers access environmentally friendly fertilizers and to improve food security and to rehabilitate soils. SGP will focus on building the capacities of smallholder organizations and identifying specific problems and proposed solutions by these community level organizations so that their objectives can be further refined in dialogues with the NSCs for the grants and with government, the private sector and other development agencies for possible scaling up, mainstreaming, and replication. SGP will also promote time tested and proven land management systems such as agro-forestry while also focusing on building the capacities of smallholder organizations to innovate with new and more appropriate practices and systems that adaptively utilize traditional knowledge and modern technologies.

SGP’s efforts in OP6 will further focus on increase of ecological connectivity, reducing forest fragmentation and improving forest biodiversity values at landscape levels; promoting good management practices in community and smallholder forestry and farmlands, and a local level land management policy required to protect and enhance genetic pools in the wild that could form a repository of germplasm for domestication and re-introduction into degraded landscapes – all with increasing resilience to climate change in mind. In addition, as seeds are a primary resource for farmers and represent their best weapon in dealing with climate change impacts, smallholder farmers will be supported to improve food security using a conservation approach to plant and genetic resources for food and agriculture that includes improving seed quality and adopting more resilient strains in various types of landscapes. At the end of SGP OP6, agro-ecology practices which enhances not only yields from agricultural farms but also other social, economic and environmental benefits that incorporate measures to reduce CO2 emissions and enhance resilience to

climate change would have been tried out along the protected area buffer zones and forest corridors and disseminated widely in at least 30 priority countries.

2.1.3 Low-Carbon Energy Access Co-benefits

SGP will contribute to satisfying global demand for energy services for people without access to electricity and those that still rely on traditional biomass for cooking. SGP will focus on providing bottom-up energy solutions that are low-cost and provide high potential for carbon emissions reductions. Such efforts will contribute to GEF climate change objectives, which include “support for energy access initiatives at the local level, including demonstrations and piloting of renewable options”²⁸. SGP will align its efforts with the larger framework of Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL) to facilitate mainstreaming and scaling up. SGP is well positioned to meet the goals of “Sustainable Energy for All” to facilitate national and global replication as SGP’s work with CSOs is consistent with SE4ALL’s strategy emphasizing the ability of CSOs to directly assist the poor.²⁹

SGP will focus on providing bottom-up energy solutions that are low-cost and provide high potential for carbon emissions reductions including small hydro, bioenergy systems from waste and efficient stoves. Such solutions aligned with national country strategies (e.g., NAMAs, LEDS, energy access policies etc.) are a crucial part of the “decarbonization”, addressing energy service needs of rural, urban and remote communities and entrepreneurs, who cannot be served by the central grid in case of electricity or centralized distribution systems in case of cooking and heating fuels. Such bottom-up energy solutions will also use integrated approach going beyond energy sector aiming at increasing climate resilience, reducing poverty, enhancing gender equality and achieving the sustainable development goals. SGP is multifocal in nature and is uniquely positioned to promote synergy across the various GEF focal areas and corresponding conventions, according to GEF -6 programming directions, which emphasize that “coordination of clean energy policies with relevant policies in other areas, such as agriculture, rural development, health, poverty eradication, gender equality and women’s empowerment, and energy security, have the potential to generate synergistic co-benefits at the local, national, and global levels.”³⁰ These solutions would be easily replicable in similar countries and SGP will facilitate knowledge exchanges between communities potentially including programmatic regional initiatives to achieve greater impact.

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. This approach will address a major barrier to investments and financing for energy access over and above a lack of available capital or high initial purchase costs - an absence of adequate information sharing and understanding among energy sector players at various levels regarding the alternative and sustainable opportunity solutions available to them to invest in bottom-up energy enterprises. In addition to capacity building and catalytic financing, SGP will make an emphasis on knowledge management and systematization. Based on the work accomplished in the past operational phases, several countries are already well positioned to take a lead in this initiative. It is expected that low carbon community energy access solutions will be successfully deployed in 50 countries with alignment and integration of these approaches within larger frameworks such as SE4ALL initiated in at least 12 countries, as well as in relevant initiatives of the Green Climate Fund and other funds.

2.1.4 Local to Global Chemicals Management Coalitions

28 GEF Assembly Document GEF/A.5/07/Rev.01, May 22, 2014

29 Sustainable Energy for All: Technical Report of Task Force 1, April 2012

30 GEF Assembly Document GEF/A.5/07/Rev.01, May 22, 2014

SGP will focus its support in this component towards communities at the forefront of chemical threats either as users or consumers. Activities will include support for innovative, affordable and practical solutions to chemicals management in joint efforts with SGP's established partners such as the International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN), as well as new partnerships including with government agencies, research institutions, the private sector, and international agencies such as UNIDO and WHO. Efforts would include women and indigenous peoples who still do not participate in all aspects of decision-making related to the sound management of chemicals.³¹ Artisanal gold miners, responsible for 30% of global mercury emissions of 1,000 tons per year will also be a priority sector for SGP. Similarly efforts focusing on e-waste recycling would necessitate SGP expanding its work to cover urban areas to reach the informal sector involved in such recycling. Another priority area is to raise awareness on the health and environmental impact of open burning practices of some waste streams (e.g. acid lead batteries, copper) for recycling purposes.

In overall chemicals management, building on the successes in some SGP country programs in establishing the certification system of organic biodiversity products (such as the organic honey-producing business certification supported by SGP Mexico), a priority area would be to establish systems of local certification of producers and/or their products through promotion of organic production processes, the development and implementation local certification manual/guidelines, networking of producers, as well as strategic linkages and agreements between producers and consumers. Work will also involve advocacy for national government policies that will influence markets including chemicals import and export. In mercury management, SGP will focus its work on artisanal gold mining. At least one artisanal gold-mining community in each of the hotspot countries will shift their practice to the use of alternative, mercury-free gold mining techniques and serve as good practice example for similar communities as well as for policy advocacy in these countries. Another important partner for SGP in OP6 will be the private business sector, which would be most likely to have strong influence on the control of mercury in artisanal gold mining and on e-waste management. Within SGP OP6, innovative community-based tools and approaches will demonstrated, deployed and transferred, with support from newly organized or existing coalitions in at least 20 countries for managing harmful chemicals and waste in a sound manner.

2.2 Grantmaker+: Roles and Functions

In addition to grant-making activities, SGP will undertake activities to enhance the overall effectiveness of SGP portfolio through the following strategies:

2.2.1 CSO-Government Policy and Planning Dialogue Platforms

In order to effectively implement SGP objectives in OP6, support mechanisms will be set-up based on SGP experience and assets built up over the years. Many SGP country programmes have reported on past contributions and efforts to influence national local and national policy formulation. Building on the experience of trust and constructive working relationship of its multi-sectoral National Steering Committees, SGP will support the establishment of "CSO-Government Policy and Planning Dialogue Platforms" (potentially in partnership with the GEF CSO Network) in at least 50 countries. These platforms will serve to build trust and foster joint working relationships between civil society and government on key areas for environment and sustainable development policies. More specifically, they will assist governments in establishing and institutionalizing the link of SGP communities to development plans and policy reforms that may affect them. Dialogue can allow CSOs to highlight important and relevant issues, offer information to supplement official government data, and provide fresh insights. A broader understanding of what CSOs may reveal provides valuable entry points for government support and engagement in FSPs, MSPs and also leverage additional financial resources for CSO/SGP activities. In the national context positive dialogue strengthens the country ownership of present and future policies.

Potential participants of such dialogues will include GEF Operational Focal Points and Convention Focal Points, national policy makers and technical specialists, FSPs, MSP partners, potential donors, lead CSO

³¹ Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) states in paragraph 9.a.

partners. Global grantee community will be tapped for knowledge and lessons learned. The platforms will also relay on existing mechanisms of CSO involvement in the countries as well as GEF and SGP activities such as national portfolio formulation exercises and knowledge fairs. At the country level SGP has already started supporting the establishment of CSO-Government policy dialogues facilitating participation of grantee partners in government advisory bodies, connecting policy makers with the grassroots level sustainable development issues. Different types of CSO-led policy dialogue platform initiatives will be supported by SGP with the aim to influence central, regional and local government policy-making processes.

2.2.2 Promoting social inclusion

In view of supporting GEF's and UNDP's strategies for the coming four years, SGP will further undertake targeted efforts to support greater social inclusion of marginalized and affected groups, including women, indigenous peoples, youth and the disabled. Empowering these important stakeholders not only promotes sustainable environmental benefits but is also a goal in itself as it contributes to building a vibrant civil society base and reducing inequality, which is a critical component for sustainable development and growth.

In OP5 SGP efforts towards gender mainstreaming included adding gender relevant sections in all programme documents and templates. On SGP National Steering Committees were required to designate a member as a gender focal point and as a youth focal point. Relevant countries where indigenous people form a significant segment of the population were also required to ensure the representation on the NSC of an indigenous peoples' focal point. In OP6 SGP in line with the GEF Gender Mainstreaming Policy and Gender Action Plan will direct further support towards mainstreaming gender in all relevant projects, as well as through promotion of women-led projects. Opportunities for national and global networking of women grantee-leaders for knowledge-sharing and policy advocacy will be explored where relevant. SGP will review and update the gender mainstreaming requirements in its templates and strategies and ensure gender is considered as a core element of the planning and implementation tools of SGP at all levels. SGP will further promote the use of gender-sensitive indicators and collect gender-disaggregated data. Additionally, SGP will provide training tools and activities for its country programme staff, NSC members, grantees and partners that can ensure the application of gender mainstreaming considerations in all SGP country programmes. SGP will aim for an increase in the number of women led projects and projects with gender components in OP6 over the levels achieved in OP5.

SGP recognizes that numerous challenges continue to be faced by indigenous peoples who manage natural resources in ICCAs, territories, PA buffer zones, and production landscapes to ensure that their occupation of landscapes and seascapes, as well as their governance of natural resources, are appropriately recognized by local and national authorities. During OP6, SGP will work to enhance assistance to indigenous peoples to participate more fully in the relevant national, regional and international policy-making processes, such as the creation of national ICCA networks, participating in the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA), implementation of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), exploring new livelihood strategies for indigenous peoples and local communities created by the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS). SGP will develop and pilot an Indigenous fellowship to promote proactive mentoring and capacity-building of indigenous peoples at national, regional and global levels. At least 12 IP fellowships are envisioned, some designed to strengthen the capacity for leadership on global environment and sustainable development issues while some fellows will work alongside SGP national coordinators to expand and improve SGP's support for indigenous peoples. Indigenous peoples have submitted to the GEF and the UN system regular inputs and recommendations with regards to options for enhanced programming. In response to their calls to expand and improve this support, SGP will support the use of its regular and strategic projects for addressing priority areas for action. Efforts will be made to mobilize additional resources to initiate a dedicated grant-making window to support indigenous peoples on priority themes.

SGP will also aim to enhance engagement of youth and disabled. On youth engagement SGP has identified many best practices in the climate change area in particular where youth organizations have been instrumental in raising awareness and promoting advocacy, while the involvement of the disabled has been given specific attention in the AusAid/DFAT co-financed SIDS Community Based Adaptation (CBA)

programme in the context of building adaptive capacity and communities' resilience to effects of climate change. In OP6 SGP will take stock of existing experiences and efforts and work to further enhance its support to youth and disabled to further engage these socially important and often vulnerable groups.

2.2.3 Global Reach for Citizen Practice-Based Knowledge

In line with its mandate to support community action to address global environmental issues, SGP will support enhanced knowledge exchange at the global level through a Global Reach for Citizen Practice-Based Knowledge programme. Specifically this will be comprised of the following two knowledge platforms.

A “Digital Library of Community Innovations for the Global Environment” will feature tested methods and technologies, many of them original innovations, developed by SGP and other partners and CSOs. The library will be a compendium of in-depth case studies of SGP supported innovations that include background evidence and indicators of what has worked and what didn't allowing other communities to learn from past experience. These case studies will be developed in an easy to understand format that includes pictures, drawings and videos where available; and will be posted in a particular section of SGP's website that will act as the “library” and disseminated widely using social media and other channels at country level. The platform will prioritize the documentation and dissemination of practices that have the potential for replication in other countries of the south and that will also facilitate technology uptake and help transfer technical expertise from a community in one country to other communities, CSOs, policymakers and development practitioners.

A “South-South Community Innovation Exchange Platform” will aim to promote knowledge exchange between SGP countries to encourage cross country/region replication of good practices. The rationale for this is to be able to produce high impact and scaling up of the innovations and practices developed by SGP grantees, as well as other CSOs at the regional level, as currently all grantmaking and associated knowledge exchange happens at the national level. As such, this platform will link mentors to emerging practitioners and facilitate knowledge exchanges in specific technologies, regions and landscapes.

Knowledge management will also be a key element integrated in every SGP Country Programme Strategy as well as every community and CSO project, which will be linked to M&E of the country portfolio and community projects, including annual reports. SGP country programmes consolidate the information generated by projects through the SGP Global Database linked to an SGP Global website open for public access. SGP country programmes also have their own particular knowledge sharing mechanisms especially when local language or dialects are important, with many now increasingly exploring the use of the latest social media tools. Networking of SGP grantee-partners will be further strengthened with the aim to have a KM mechanism that fully fits local communication and knowledge exchange practices, in some cases, in traditional ways such as for indigenous peoples. Along these lines, the programme will support the development of KM materials designed for its priority sectors – indigenous peoples, women, and youth – for their direct use as well as for use by partners in national and global environment-cum-inclusive development advocacy.

2.2.4 Communications

SGP uses strategic communications and a multifaceted approach to promote awareness and support of SGP's results and initiatives to governments, UN agencies, the media, the private sector, and the general public. SGP is a regular contributor of stories, social media updates and blogs to the UNDP global and local websites, as well as to the GEF website. In addition, SGP has its own website www.sgp.undp.org that has had 77,425 visitors, of which 13,145 were unique visitors, accounting for 1,530,585 page views since it was revamped on 2012. Currently, the website has almost 500 resources in its online library including global and local publications. SGP also uses social and traditional media at the global and local level. To date, SGP has 3,700 followers in its global Facebook channels and many more in its local Facebook channels that are in local languages. Meanwhile, SGP country programmes reported that SGP was mentioned 1,648 times in all forms of media (TV, Radio, Print and Digital) in the last year alone.

In addition, SGP also supports Communities Connect (<http://data.communitiesconnect.net/>), a collaborative platform in partnership with the GEF CSO Network that was created to promote the solutions created by communities and civil society organization to sustainable development issues.

2.3 Innovativeness, Sustainability and Scaling up

Following the principle of “local action, global impact” and a demand-driven and “venture capital” approach to grantmaking, SGP has supported communities in developing innovations that customize local solutions to global environmental challenges. The SGP approach encourages local innovation and creativity by its bottom-up and participatory practice in the design of projects, in the recognition of the relevance and value of local or traditional knowledge, and in allowing greater flexibility and adaptive management of projects. The wide diversity of countries, local situations, and stakeholders the SGP works with creates in itself a situation requiring an openness to many new ideas and their testing.

Community innovations in SGP are manifested in the testing and ground-truthing of low-cost technologies and sustainable production methods, in new methodologies for the involvement of stakeholders, and in integrating traditional decision-making processes within the wider frameworks and action relevant meeting country commitments to international environmental agreements. Because SGP funding is modest and its interventions designed to be initially small scale, the program can readily support community-based experimentation. Once a novel idea has been tested on the ground and proven to be effective in meeting community needs, it can often take off more widely through grantee networks as well as networking with other CSOs, further resulting in more innovations and eventually attracting additional donor and or government support for wider application. In GEF-6, the innovation process will be further supported through the establishment of a digital library of community innovations, building on the tens of thousands of SGP-supported projects, as well as a South-South Community Innovation Exchange Platform to share these innovations across countries.

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 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 troubleshooting 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 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.

Most SGP innovations, if not all, have scaling up potential. For one, successful SGP projects are solutions that are relevant to a thousand-fold more communities under similar situations within its country of

implementation and also across other countries. In a lot of cases, community-based approaches are able to find ways of more cost-effective utilization of existing resources or utilization of hitherto untapped resources thereby providing a good model for larger projects concerned with efficiency and sustainability. Many large national projects that use top-to-bottom approaches also now finding increasing resistance from grassroots stakeholders (i.e. from indigenous peoples that demand prior-informed consent and their own control of projects). The highly consultative and participatory processes, including the direct access to funds, practiced in SGP projects can provide valuable lessons for larger government and donor programs. Notable too is the global reach of SGP – 126 participating countries – with 111 covered under this global project, while another 15 are expected to be funded under full sized GEF country projects as Upgraded SGP country programmes. With good sharing systems, SGP has tremendous potential to scale up, mainstream, and replicate successful community projects.

Scaling up, as well as mainstreaming and replication, however, are processes that require a proactive approach and additional resources especially for communities and CSOs that had just completed their first projects. Research and experience of major private and non-profit funders also show that the upscaling process takes time and involves various stages that require enabling environment from the government, availability of donors and addressing funding gaps³². SGP's main role in the scaling up process is to demonstrate or showcase the successful innovation to a wider set of stakeholders as well as to establish networks/linkages for pooling of effort and resources by various actors needed for scaling up. At the portfolio level, SGP has utilized its National Steering Committees, grantee-partner networks and allied CSO networks to have community innovations and successes recognized and adopted at the national level by policy-makers. The 2008 Independent Evaluation of the GEF SGP found that SGP's greatest contributions to achieving and sustaining global environmental benefits are in the realm of contributing to country change and reform through the development of local policy instruments, contribution to national policy formulation, and the facilitation of access to broader markets catalyzed by country-specific SGP initiatives. The recent Independent Evaluation of SGP in 2015 also concludes that "the SGP continues to support communities with projects that are effective, efficient, and relevant in achieving global environmental benefits while addressing livelihoods and poverty". The evaluation goes on to note that "broader adoption occurs, particularly in the form of replication and scaling-up and at a local scale; and the SGP deserves recognition for its contribution to results that extend beyond the project level."³³

During OP6, SGP will enhance the potential for scaling up through strengthened partnerships at national and global levels. For example, building on progress established during GEF-5, the SGP has an excellent foundation of collaboration with a number of international partners including the International Partnership for the Satoyama Initiative (IPSI), the ICCA Consortium, IUCN Global Programme on Protected Areas (GPAP), the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, UNEP WCMC, CBD Sec LifeWeb, and other relevant networks at the national and regional levels (i.e. International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity). To facilitate upscaling in GEF-6 SGP will also partner with national and global initiatives currently taking shape such as those of the Green Climate Fund and "Sustainable Energy for All". These larger initiatives will provide a platform for scaling up SGP work as well as possible co-financing and joint efforts in national and global planning and policy advocacy. SGP will also encourage strong partnerships with the private sector to commercialize successful projects with the aim to shift renewable energy projects from pilot innovations to the mainstream.

To further enhance innovation and scaling up, country programme grant allocations will be incentive-based³⁴. SGP country programmes that take leading roles in innovative approaches either for new or scaled-up modalities including leveraging with other partners will be provided additional resources. At the Central Programme Management Team level, regional and global level initiatives will be developed with

32 Harvey Koh, Ashish Karamchandani and Robert Katz. From Blueprint to Scale: The Case for Philanthropy in Impact Investing, April 2012

33 Joint GEF-UNDP Evaluation of the Small Grants Programme, 2015, Conclusion 1, and p. 19.

34 "GEF Small Grants Programme: Implementation Arrangements in GEF 6", GEF/C.46/13, May 2014, p 9.

the aim to spread the reach and broaden the impact of SGP successes at the local level.³⁵ To speed up delivery and further enhance efficiency, regular assessment of allocated yet unutilized grant funds shall be made, with such unutilized funds pooled for reallocation to more ready and critically urgent activities and projects.

2.4 Partnerships

SGP grants are never implemented in isolation, but are rather embedded in a web of partnerships that extend from the local to the national to the global. SGP partnerships have increased broad-based support for global environmental and sustainable development approaches and policies. They have enabled capacity development and learning at different levels; leveraged both financial and technical resources to strengthen programmatic approaches as well as individual projects; and helped to ensure the sustainability of initiatives. SGP synergies with partners have allowed them access to SGP staff, resources, methodologies, tools, knowledge, and experience, making the partnerships mutually beneficial.

Partnerships with local and national governments, other donor programs and projects, the private sector, and NGOs and CBOs contribute in-kind or financial resources that allow GEF SGP projects to fully cover sustainable development objects that are critical for their success. They have also provide financial resources for essential programmatic activities that cannot be undertaken with GEF funds. Partnerships are crucial for project sustainability, since they link grantees with governmental and nongovernmental agencies and donors that can provide support once the SGP grant ends. SGP global partnerships in GEF-6 will include SIDS-CBA, ICCA partnership, COMDEKS, EU and others. Most recently Norway funds have also been successfully utilized by SGP in facilitating nearly 20 Indigenous people's dialogues with Government in the run up to UNFCCC COP 21 last year. Additional opportunities for resource mobilization will continued to be explored in close coordination with UNDP at global, regional and country levels.

In this partnership approach, SGP will continue exploring opportunities to serve as a delivery mechanism for GEF full-sized projects³⁶ as well as large projects and programs of other donors, funding facilities, and national governments. SGP achieves greater impact in GEF's focal areas by incorporating and expanding the community-based approach to the design and implementation of medium-sized or full-sized projects. Building on its success in serving as a delivery mechanism to implement the regional Strategic Action Program (SAP) of international waters in the Nile River and the South China Sea, SGP has worked with UNDP and UNEP to incorporate a \$1 million community component in its jointly implemented project entitled "Implementing Integrated Land, Water & Wastewater Management in Caribbean SIDS" (IWEco project). At the national level, SGP country programs also can serve as a delivery mechanism for UNDP TRAC fund and GEF full-sized projects. For example, SGP country programmes in Thailand, Albania and several other countries have delivered UNDP TRAC funds, while SGP Cameroon has delivered a component of the UNDP implemented Africa Adaptation Programme. SGP-Iran will continue the implementation of the community component of a UNDP/GEF full-sized project Institutional Strengthening and Coherence for Integrated Natural Resource Management (MENARID). Many country programmes are serving as delivery mechanisms for other donor funds – for example, SGP Mauritania is serving as a delivery mechanism for the EU, SGP Morocco and SGP Uruguay have experience in implementing government co-funded programmes, SGP Tunisia is delivering funding from Switzerland, while SGP Cambodia is serving as the delivery mechanism for a UNDP SIDA funded project.

Partnerships among GEF SGP grantees and CSO partners over time yield networks that enable improved natural resource management, capacity development, knowledge exchange, policy advocacy, and sustainability of SGP and related initiatives. These networks expand SGP's reach, involving greater numbers of organizations and communities in activities related to SGP objectives, and lead to greater impacts through replication and policy influence.

³⁵ Annex A: SGP Operational Guidelines, SGP grants and project cycle, para 51.

³⁶ "GEF Small Grants Programme: Implementation Arrangements in GEF 6", GEF/C.46/13, May 2014, pp. 10-12.

2.5 Risks and Mitigation Measures

There are few new risks that may come into the play as SGP moves into newer disciplines. The possibility of new insurmountable risks is minimal given that the programme has been operating for more than 20 years and has been constantly learning and adapting during this time. Potential risks are known, and through the past experience of the GEF SGP, risk mitigation measures are in place for those that have been identified before. There still is the challenge of working directly with community-based and non-governmental organizations that have a low level of technical and management capacity. Past performance of the SGP portfolio has shown that 90% of SGP grants achieve outcomes in the satisfactory range. To mitigate risks, especially in the small underperforming portion of the portfolio, the SGP works with all grantees to help develop capacity by identifying appropriate rates of disbursement, linking grantee partners to learn from each other, and working in a flexible manner that responds to the strengths and comparable advantages of grantees. Risks of underperformance due to capacity limitations will also be mitigated by consistent and comprehensive oversight and monitoring of the SGP portfolio in each country by CPMT and the UNDP CO. On the financial and admin side, UNOPS as implementing partner will provide a risk advisory and management system in line with UNOPS Financial Regulations and Rules.

The SGP also reduces risk by supporting replication and re-validation of good practices that have proven to deliver on GEF strategic priorities at the community level. In each country, the National Steering Committee, with representation from civil society leaders, government institutions, and donors provides further support for effective design and implementation of SGP projects. Additional risks may be anticipated from the gradually changing geographic presence of SGP, where in each operational phase the most mature countries meeting the criteria for upgrading are being upgraded, while in the past two operational phases a significant number of LDCs and SIDs, as well as countries in post conflict situations, have been added. The potential risks of working in newer countries, countries with post conflict situations, capacity challenges, etc. will be mitigated in OP6 through the greater flexibility in SGP playing Grantmaker+ roles to complement and ensure the success of grant projects. By actively promoting CSO-government dialogue platforms, providing dedicated support to gender mainstreaming and indigenous peoples' engagement, as well as by developing and utilizing effective global knowledge exchange platforms, SGP will be better able to build the capacity of CSOs and promote community action in many of the newer countries that have joined SGP in OP4 and OP5.

SGP has had wide experience of community projects affected by and adapting to weather extremes. In fact many projects which were designed to develop tools and measures to adapt to these extremes as surrogate to what could be increased impacts of climate change have gone beyond the pilot and into the scaling up and replication stage. As such, SGP community projects will draw on lessons and tools developed through its Community-Based Adaptation projects to integrate climate change adaptation measures. The design of projects will include vulnerability assessments and the inclusion of effective measures generated by communities in similar situations. As far as social risks are concerned, it should be noted that SGP grant-making is demand-driven and community-based. As such, each project, by community design and commitment, is developed not only to meet environmental objectives but also the social, cultural and economic needs of its members, a form of prior informed consent, not only for indigenous people communities but for other local communities as well. SGP National Steering Committees that review project proposals include focal points for gender and women empowerment, for youth, and where relevant for IPs, to ensure that key concerns and needs of these sectors are fully considered.

SGP follows the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (SES) and has applied the accompanying Social and Environmental Screening Procedures (SESP) in finalizing this Project Document.³⁷ The overall impact and probability of social and environmental risks are considered to be low, given that SGP is designed to enable communities and CSOs to directly implement priority projects designed to benefit the

³⁷ Annex C: Social and Environmental Screening Template, which constitutes the full Social and Environmental Screening Report for SGP in its 6th Operational Phase is attached to this document.

environment and local sustainable development. The size of the average SGP grant is also small, at approximately \$25,000. SGP has updated its template for preparation of Country Programme Strategies in the current phase, in order to include a review and discussion of possible social and environmental risks in line with the SES and identification of mitigation measures if necessary. For ad-hoc issues that may arise in the process of grantmaking, the National Steering Committees are tasked to manage the appropriate conflict resolution measures. The use of the landscape and seascape approach allows more frequent visits to clustered projects and risks can be more regularly monitored and mitigated. The SGP in OP6 also plans to strengthen its Technical Advisory Groups to include those experts that can advise on risk assessments and management at both project design and implementation stages. The system of grantmaking will also provide for capable assisting NGOs to support first-time community and CBO implementers. Given all these, the potential risk of any negative social and environment impact of SGP projects is expected to be negligible.

Additionally, there is a risk of not mobilizing adequate additional resources, including to allow scaling up and greater impact. This risk is mitigated by the fact that SGP has a track record of raising similar levels of project level in-kind and in-cash co-financing, that add up to a 1:1 level matching the GEF funding. In prior phases SGP has always met or exceeded the 1:1 target. This would be a low risk given that SGP staff are experienced in raising such co-financing and in assisting grantee-partners to do so. Moreover, the target is flexible and may be raised at the global level over the course of the operational phase. SGP will therefore continue to track co-financing levels committed in its project management database, and work with country staff and UNDP offices to identify any areas where co-financing levels are low and identify other possibilities. It should be noted that given socio-economic and political realities, opportunities for co-financing and the sources of co-financing vary from one country and region to the next. In some regions, there is a very high level of co-financing achieved including from national governments, and private sector. At the programmatic level, SGP will work to deliver current co-financing partnership programmes and in doing so identify opportunities for seeking and leveraging additional bilateral and multilateral funding through targeted programmes. All resource mobilization efforts will be carried out in close coordination with UNDP.

Finally, as a grantmaking programme, there is also a potential risk of misuse or misappropriation of funds, especially in countries where high risks of corruption and low administrative/financial management capacity exist. SGP addresses this risk in a variety of ways. First at the programming level, SGP's project proposal template, grant review and screening procedures are designed to ensure that CSOs or CBOs proposing grants have relevant experience, strong backing from communities who will be involved, and a good track record. While SGP does encourage even low capacity CBOs to submit grant proposals, if the project idea is relevant and found to have strong merit – SGP also provides through its country level staff and active involvement of NSC members a strong support and due diligence mechanism. Site visits to projects are encouraged once a year where possible, and at least once over a projects lifetime. SGP provides funding in tranches, limiting the first tranche, provided as an advance to 50% or less. Grantees are required to submit progress reports and financial reports in order for subsequent tranches of funding to be released. While these reports are kept simple, they provide an important indication of the progress and likely successful implementation of the project. Any concerns regarding use of funds may result in early termination of a grant project. UNOPS as the Implementing Partner oversees the operational risks, and has a risk mitigation framework for SGP that entails a spectrum of control layers at different transactional levels. Risk based audits are regularly conducted in SGP country programmes on an annual basis by an internationally known audit firm. The audits focus on grant management, financials, human resources, and transactional processes. In addition to external audits, UNOPS implements a self-audit checklist which serves as the assurance tool for ensuring that country programmes' processes are aligned with the UNOPS and SGP policies. Self-audits are implemented quarterly. UNOPS SGP Standard Operating Procedures serve as the overarching guiding document on SGP operations, which are available online for staff to consult in order to ensure consistent and coherent application of policies.

3 Project Results Framework:

The SGP OP6 project will contribute to the outcomes described in the detailed Project Results Framework presented on the following page, which reflects the project specific outcomes and indicators approved as part of the technical design of the project and the GEF funding approval process. The SGP OP6 project will also contribute to the following UNDP Strategic Plan Outcomes, Outputs and Indicators as described in the table below. It is important to note that SGP is a demand driven grant-making programme, therefore relevant targets and achievement indicators will be established and tracked as grant projects are funded and implemented.

UNDP Strategic Plan Linkages

	Outcome	Outputs	Indicator
Primary Outcome	<u>Outcome 1:</u> Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded	<u>Output 1.3.</u> Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste	1.3.1 Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or sub-national level ,disaggregated by partnership type
		<u>Output 1.5.</u> Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted to achieve increased energy efficiency and universal modern energy access (especially off-grid sources of renewable energy)	1.5.1 Number of new development partnerships with funding for improved energy efficiency and/or sustainable energy solutions targeting underserved communities/groups and women
Secondary Outcome	<u>Outcome 2:</u> Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance	<u>Output 2.4.</u> Frameworks and dialogue processes engaged for effective and transparent engagement of civil society in national development	2.4.2 Number of civil society organizations/networks with mechanisms for ensuring transparency, representation and accountability

SGP will support actions that contribute to the achievement of most of the following Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), in particular the following:

- Goal 7: Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all
- Goal 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts
- Goal: 14: Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development
- Goal 15: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation, and halt biodiversity loss
- Goal 17: Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development

SGP OP6 Project Results Framework

Project Objective: To support the creation of global environmental benefits and the safeguarding of the global environment through community and local solutions that complement and add value to national and global level action

Component	Outcome	Indicators	Target	Verification Means	Assumptions
1. <i>Community Landscape and Seascape Conservation</i>	1.1 SGP country programmes improved conservation and sustainable use, and management of important terrestrial and coastal/marine ecosystems through implementation of community oriented landscape/seascape approaches in approximately 50 countries	Number of landscapes/seascapes with community-oriented approaches established, in support of critical protected areas, related productive landscapes/seascapes, and indigenous community conserved areas and territories (ICCAs) and SAPs Hectares of landscape/seascape covered under improved community conservation and sustainable use management systems	50 landscapes or seascapes in support of protected areas, ICCAs, and SAPs 5 million hectares of landscape and seascape with improved, community-oriented conservation and sustainable use practices ³⁸	Annual Country Programme Monitoring Report (ACR) Annual Monitoring Reports (AMR) Global Database	Stakeholders' support for the landscape/seascape approach (including the government, the National Steering Committee and CSOs) Adequate funding and capacity available to facilitate the landscape/seascape approaches Full-sized projects' commitment to collaborate with SGP in establishing regional NGOs/CSO's networks

³⁸ This refers to PAs, ICCAs and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs), as well as community implementation of SAPs

<p>2. <i>Climate Smart Innovative Agro-ecology</i></p>	<p>2.1 Agro-ecology practices incorporating measures to reduce greenhouse emissions and enhancing resilience to climate change tried and tested in protected area buffer zones and forest corridors and disseminated widely in at least 30 priority countries</p>	<p>Number of farmer-leaders involved in successful demonstrations of typologies of agro-ecological practices incorporating measures to reduce farm based emissions and enhance resilience to climate change. Number of farmer organizations, groups or networks disseminating improved climate-smart agro-ecological practices</p>	<p>At least 2 farmer-leaders developed their capacity to demonstrate selected typologies per landscape At least 1 farmer association/network functioning in each landscape</p>	<p>ACR Annual monitoring report (AMR) Vulnerability assessment reports as part of the Country programme report Landscape strategy reports</p>	<p>All landscapes address a farming system</p>
<p>3. <i>Low Carbon Energy Access Co-benefits</i></p>	<p>3.1 Low carbon community energy access solutions successfully deployed in 50 countries with alignment and integration of these approaches within larger frameworks such as SE4ALL initiated in at least 12 countries</p>	<p>Number of typologies of community-oriented, locally adapted energy access solutions with successful demonstrations for scaling up and replication Number of communities achieving energy access with locally adapted community solutions, with co-benefits estimated and valued.</p>	<p>At least 10 typologies of innovative solutions demonstrated and documented At least 5,000 households achieving energy access Co-benefits such as resilience, ecosystem effects, income, health and others rigorously estimated in 12 lead countries.</p>	<p>ACR AMR, global database AMR, country reports, global database Special country studies</p>	<p>SE4ALL continues to develop and provide opportunities for integration</p>

<p>4. <i>Local to Global Chemical Management Coalitions</i></p>	<p>4.1 Innovative community-based tools and approaches demonstrated, deployed and transferred, with support from newly organized or existing coalitions in at least 20 countries for managing harmful chemicals and waste in a sound manner</p>	<p>Number of community-based tools/approaches to avoid and reduce chemicals demonstrated, deployed and transferred Number of coalitions and networks established or strengthened</p>	<p>At least 3 innovative tools/approaches demonstrated, deployed and transferred At least one national coalition or network for chemicals management established or strengthened in lead countries At least three coalitions or networks established at the regional or global levels to advocate for safe chemicals management</p>	<p>ACR Annual Monitoring Reports (AMR) Global Database Case studies and portfolio review Monitoring and oversight by UNDP-CO, NSC and CPMT</p>	<p>Communities and CSOs have innovative and implementation capacity Technical support and funding resources available for national, regional and global networking for the formation of coalitions</p>
<p>5. <i>CSO-Government Policy and Planning Dialogue Platforms</i></p>	<p>5.1 SGP supports establishment of “CSO-Government Policy and Planning Dialogue Platforms”, leveraging existing and potential partnerships, in at least 50 countries</p>	<p>Number of dialogue platforms initiated and CSO and/or CSO networks strengthened to manage such dialogues Number of representatives per civil society stakeholder groups involved</p>	<p>At least 50 dialogues initiated and CSO or CSO networks in 25 lead countries strengthened At least 2 representatives from indigenous peoples, women groups, youth sector, disabled/differentially challenged, farmers and/or fisherfolks are provided meaningful participation in the dialogue platform</p>	<p>ACR AMR Country level specific studies</p>	<p>Dialogue piloted in most advanced countries and expanded based on results. Partnership is formed with GEF CSO Network</p>

<p>6. Promoting Social Inclusion</p>	<p>6.1 Gender mainstreaming considerations applied by all SGP country programmes; Gender training utilized by SGP staff, grantees, NSC members, partners 6.2 IP Fellowship programme awards at least 12 fellowships to build capacity of IPs; implementation of projects by IPs is supported in relevant countries 6.3 Involvement of special groups such as the youth and disabled is further supported in SGP projects and guidelines and best practices are widely shared with countries</p>	<p>Number of women led projects Number of indigenous leaders with higher capacities for organizing indigenous peoples projects that provide for concrete action to meet their needs as well as for strong representation in policy advocacy Number of youth organizations as well as those of the disabled that participate in SGP projects and in relevant national environment and sustainable development strategy development</p>	<p>At least 25% of projects are led by women (either the organization is a women's group or the leadership/management of the project is run by women) At least 12 fellowships programme awards implemented leading to increased quality and percentage of SGP or non-SGP projects with IPs At least one youth organization or an SGP project directed at strengthening the capacity of the youth sector supported in 50 lead countries; at least one organization of the disabled or working to support the disabled supported by an SGP project in 10 lead countries</p>	<p>ACR AMR</p>	<p>All countries are using the tools for mainstreaming gender and NSC use the screening checklist Funding available for fellowship programs and potential candidates can be identified to participate in the fellowship programs. Special groups such as the youth and the disabled people are aware of and interested in working with SGP</p>
--------------------------------------	---	--	--	-------------------------	--

<p>7. <i>Global Reach for Citizen Practice-Based Knowledge program</i></p>	<p>7.1 Digital library of community innovations is established and provides access to information to communities in at least 50 countries</p> <p>7.2 South-South Community Innovation Exchange Platform promotes south-south exchanges on global environmental issues in at least 20 countries</p>	<p>Number of knowledge products systematically collected, organized and shared across countries</p> <p>Number of South-South exchanges supported that transfer capacity on new community innovations between communities, CSOs and other partners across countries</p>	<p>An on-line access global knowledge product sharing system for communities and CSOs on environment and sustainable development is set up</p> <p>50 countries produce and share at least 1 case study and/or “how to” guidelines on an innovative SGP practice in their country portfolio</p> <p>Knowledge exchange arrangements between communities and CSOs initiated in at least 20 countries</p>	<p>AMR</p>	<p>Communities and CSOs have capacity and support to produce knowledge products of their innovations as well as access to internet connection so they can access the platform</p> <p>Technical support and funding resources available for South –South exchanges</p>
--	--	--	---	------------	---

4 Total Budget and Work plan

Award ID:	00090372	Project ID(s):	00096172, 00096297 and 00096298
Award Title:	GEF-SGP Operational Phase 6		
Business Unit:	UNDP1		
Project Title:	GEF-SGP Operational Phase 6-Country Projects-Core Funds, GEF SGP Operational Phase 6 - Global Project, and GEF SGP Operational Phase 6 - Country Projects-STAR Fund		
PIMS no.	5475		
Implementing Partner (Executing Agency)	UNOPS		

Budget Details	OP6-Y1 * 2015	OP6-Y2 2016	OP6-Y3 2017	OP6-Y4 2018	OP6 TOTAL
A. GRANTS					
GEF CORE Funds (First Tranche)	\$5,000,000	\$14,000,000	\$11,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$35,000,000
GEF CORE Funds (Second Tranche) (Un-funded)	\$0	\$14,000,000	\$16,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$35,000,000
GEF STAR Funds (Excl. 10% Mngmt Costs) (Un-Funded)	\$0	\$12,000,000	\$9,000,000	\$3,540,000	\$24,540,000
Sub-Total	\$5,000,000	\$40,000,000	\$36,000,000	\$13,540,000	\$94,540,000
B. GRANTMAKER+					
CSO-Govt Dialogue Platforms	\$100,000	\$700,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$2,000,000
Social Inclusion	\$0	\$1,300,000	\$1,300,000	\$1,300,000	\$3,900,000
Global Knowledge Platforms	\$0	\$370,000	\$360,000	\$360,000	\$1,090,000
Sub-Total	\$100,000	\$2,370,000	\$2,260,000	\$2,260,000	\$6,990,000
C. PROGRAMME MOBIL., STRATEGIC GUIDANCE AND M&E					
Regional Workshops (for country programmes)	\$0		\$600,000	\$0	\$600,000
Communication / Lessons Learned	\$10,000	\$290,000	\$290,000	\$285,000	\$875,000
Impact Assessment	\$0	\$65,000	\$70,000	\$65,000	\$200,000
Travel / M&E	\$20,000	\$190,000	\$195,000	\$195,000	\$600,000

Trouble-Shooting	\$10,000	\$65,000	\$65,000	\$60,000	\$200,000
Consultants	\$0	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$30,000	\$100,000
Audits (for country programmes)	\$0	\$135,000	\$135,000	\$130,000	\$400,000
Training	\$10,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$40,000	\$150,000
Evaluation	\$0		\$0	\$150,000	\$150,000
Sub-Total	\$50,000	\$830,000	\$1,440,000	\$955,000	\$3,275,000

D. PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT

Country Level

Personnel	\$3,294,834	\$6,787,390	\$6,991,690	\$7,200,570	\$24,274,484
Premises	\$565,234	\$1,164,384	\$1,199,258	\$1,235,290	\$4,164,166
Equipment, Operations, & Maintenance	\$425,612	\$876,760	\$903,063	\$930,155	\$3,135,590
Workshops	\$172,958	\$356,634	\$367,374	\$379,134	\$1,276,100
Travel	\$464,597	\$957,100	\$986,243	\$1,015,465	\$3,423,405
Technical Assistance	\$48,562	\$100,218	\$103,314	\$106,413	\$358,507
Outreach	\$122,884	\$253,361	\$260,972	\$268,601	\$905,818
Sundry	\$89,933	\$184,461	\$190,075	\$196,707	\$661,176
Sub-Total	\$5,184,614	\$10,680,308	\$11,001,989	\$11,332,335	\$38,199,246

Global Programme Level - HQ

Personnel	\$1,072,200	\$2,208,600	\$2,274,900	\$2,343,200	\$7,898,900
Equipment	\$1,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,500	\$7,500
Premises	\$79,000	\$154,500	\$159,000	\$164,000	\$556,500
Sundry	\$2,500	\$5,500	\$5,000	\$5,500	\$18,500
MOSS Compliance (for country programmes)	\$8,000	\$14,000	\$14,000	\$14,000	\$50,000
Sub-Total	\$1,162,700	\$2,384,600	\$2,454,900	\$2,529,200	\$8,531,400

STAR Project Management (Un-Funded)

10% Management Costs	\$0	\$1,095,000	\$1,095,000	\$1,095,653	\$3,285,653
----------------------	-----	-------------	-------------	-------------	--------------------

OPERATIONAL TOTAL (A+B+C+D)

GRAND TOTAL	\$11,497,314	\$57,359,908	\$54,251,889	\$31,712,188	\$154,821,299
TOTAL - CORE only (Partially Un-Funded)	\$11,497,314	\$44,264,908	\$44,156,889	\$27,076,535	\$126,995,646
TOTAL - STAR only (Un-Funded)	\$0	\$13,095,000	\$10,095,000	\$4,635,653	\$27,825,653
E. ADMINSTRATIVE COSTS					
UNOPS Support (6%) - GEF CORE	\$689,839	\$2,655,894	\$2,649,413	\$1,624,592	\$7,619,739
UNOPS Support (6%) - GEF STAR (Un-Funded)	\$0	\$785,700	\$605,700	\$278,139	\$1,669,539
F. TOTAL GEF FINANCING					
GEF SGP CORE Funds (First Tranche)	\$8,593,576	\$23,460,401	\$20,903,151	\$14,350,564	\$67,307,692
GEF SGP CORE Funds (Second Tranche) (Un-Funded)	\$3,593,576	\$23,460,401	\$25,903,151	\$14,350,564	\$67,307,692
GEF STAR Funds (Un-Funded)	\$0	\$13,880,700	\$10,700,700	\$4,913,792	\$29,495,192
TOTAL	\$12,187,153	\$60,801,502	\$57,507,002	\$33,614,919	\$164,110,577
G. TOTAL CO-FINANCING					
Cash Co-financing (Parallel)	\$500,000	\$20,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$70,500,000
In Kind Co-financing (Parallel)	\$500,000	\$20,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$70,500,000
Programme partnerships	\$6,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$30,000,000
TOTAL	\$7,000,000	\$48,000,000	\$58,000,000	\$58,000,000	\$171,000,000

FINANCING PLAN FOR CURRENT SUBMISSION

SGP CORE	\$67,307,692
SGP CORE (Un-Funded)	\$67,307,692
SGP STAR (Un-Funded)	\$29,495,192
Agency fee	\$6,564,424
TOTAL	\$170,675,000

* OP6-Y1 is pro-rated to 6months due to delayed receipt of OP6CORE funds. OP6 Costs for Jan-June 2015 were covered by prior SGP phases.

5 Management Arrangements

UNDP implements SGP as a global GEF corporate programme for both GEF funded activities and co-financed projects delivered through SGP. In this way, UNDP provides value-added benefits as programme implementation proceeds in synergy with overall UNDP and UNDP CO programming as recommended in the 2015 SGP Evaluation. The Implementing Partner for the core GEF funded activities is UNOPS while the execution modality of other sub-projects delivered through SGP will be determined on a case-by-case basis to best support country, donor and programmatic requirements.

SGP management and implementation is governed by the SGP Operational Guidelines, updated in 2015 and approved as part of the SGP OP6 CEO Endorsement Document. The principles and practices included in the Operational Guidelines are the results of practices that have proved effective and greatly useful in SGP operations for more than a decade. The updated SGP Operational Guidelines is included in Annex 2 to this document. UNOPS execution processes, policies, guidance and templates related to all matters of SGP administration are consolidated in the UNOPS SGP Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) which are updated on an annual basis and available on the UNOPS intranet. The SGP Project Board has also approved a matrix of roles and responsibilities between UNDP and UNOPS and the programme's various management units (see Annex 3).

UNDP. UNDP provides quality assurance and oversight services for the SGP through its headquarters, regional and country office levels. As defined by the GEF Council, these services cover: (a) project cycle management services which entail quality assurance and oversight across the full project cycle of project identification, preparation of project concept, preparation of detailed project document, project approval and start-up, project implementation and supervision, and project completion and evaluation; and (b) corporate services in relation to the formulation of policy and strategy for the GEF. UNDP is represented on the SGP Steering Committee as well as the Project Board as described below.

UNOPS. UNOPS has been the executing agency since the SGP's inception and has been confirmed to fulfill the role of Implementing Partner during SGP OP6 for the core GEF funded activities as well as those donor funded sub-projects that are agreed to be similarly managed administratively and financially through UNOPS. For those instances in which an alternative modality is selected, a separate project document will be prepared. The relationship between UNOPS and UNDP (including COs) is guided by the umbrella MOU³⁹ signed by both agencies. These include the arrangements covering UNDP CO support to SGP local administration and activities. To facilitate global coherence in execution of services, organizational policies, and operating procedures, UNOPS maintains a central management team⁴⁰, which coordinates with SGP CPMT and UNDP/GEF HQ respectively. This central UNOPS team also represents UNOPS on the Project Board, which is coordinated by UNDP/GEF HQ, and includes the SGP CPMT.

A key service of UNOPS is the contracting of SGP staff as needed and required by the programme⁴¹, and once contracted, UNOPS provides guidance and supervision, together with the UNDP COs acting on behalf of UNOPS, to SGP country staff in their administrative and finance related work. UNOPS also provides other important services (as specified in the GEF Council document C.36/4) that include (1) *oversight and quality assurance*: (i) coordinate with CPMT annual workplan activities and (ii) undertake trouble-shooting and problem-solving missions; (2) *project financial management*: (i) review and authorize operating budgets; (ii) review and authorize disbursement, (iii) monitor and oversee all financial transactions, (iv) prepare semi-annual and annual financial progress reports and (v) prepare periodic status on grant allocations and expenditures; (3) *project procurement management*: (i) undertake procurement activities and (ii) management of contracts; (4) *project assets management*: (i) maintain an inventory of all capitalized assets; (5) *project risks management*: (i) prepare and implement an annual audit plan and (ii) follow up on all audit recommendations; and (6) *Grants management*: (i) administer all grants, (ii) financial grant monitoring and (iii) legal advice. Under its legal advice role, UNOPS takes the lead in investigations of UNOPS-contracted SGP staff. UNOPS services also include transactional services: (1) personnel administration, benefits and entitlements of project personnel contracted by UNOPS; (2) processing payroll of project personnel contracted by UNOPS, (3) input transaction instruction and automated processing of project personnel official mission travel and DSA; (4) input transaction instruction and automated processing of financial

39 Memorandum of Understanding For a Strategic Partnership Between the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS), signed by Ad Melkert, UNDP Associate Administrator and Jan Mattson, UNOPS Executive Director, June 5, 2009.

40 This UNOPS central management team or small grants cluster with fully dedicated staff and based in New York is critical in that the programme has new and very innovative initiatives for its OP6 requiring fast and efficient delivery as well as regular face-to-face meeting on admin and finance matters with CPMT.

41 Programme requirement includes the condition that any shift in contract modality should not unduly create additional cost burden on SGP's management budget.

transactions such as Purchase Order, Receipts, Payment Vouchers and Vendor Approval and (5) procurement in UN Web Buy. UNOPS also supports the selection and contracting of SGP National Host Institutions (NHIs) as well as the monitoring and reporting on their quality of performance as well as the timely renewal of their contracts. UNOPS will continue with a number of areas for enhancing execution services started in the previous SGP OP5, including: inclusion of co-financing below \$500,000; technical assistance to high risk/low performing countries; developing a risk-based management approach; strengthening the central structure to make it more suitable for an expanded program; resolving grant disbursement delays; enhancing country programme oversight; improving monitoring & evaluation; increasing the audit volume and quality assurance work; and optimizing programme cost-effectiveness. To facilitate global coherence in execution of services, guidance and operating procedures, UNOPS through a central management team and project board coordinates primarily with SGP CPMT and UNDP/GEF HQ respectively.

SGP Central Programme Management Team (CPMT). SGP CPMT ensures effective and efficient delivery of global environmental benefits as well as baseline local development benefits. In OP6, CPMT will continue to play a central management role for the programme funded with GEF CORE and STAR funding and its associated baseline co-financing. CPMT will play a supportive role in respect of: the individual 15 Full-Size Projects for the SGP Upgraded Country Programmes (UCPs), basically that of facilitating the sharing and consolidation of information and knowledge between the Global SGPs and UCPs as well as coordination of joint initiatives and action. In the management of SGP as a delivery mechanism of projects funded by resources mobilized by UNDP as well as other donor agencies and partners, the role of CPMT will be to ensure the integrity of the programme despite the addition of new objectives and procedures.

CPMT consists of the SGP Global Manager, SGP Deputy Global Manager, Programme Specialists responsible for matrixed country support and focal area guidance, Specialists for Knowledge Management and for M&E, and Programme Associates. CPMT manages the SGP global programme, and has overall responsibility for monitoring and supervising SGP country programme performance and for the technical and substantive quality of SGP country portfolios, while ensuring the delivery of co-financed projects. For this purpose, CPMT, in consultation with NCs and NSCs, reviews SGP Country Programme Strategies. CPMT then develops global guidelines and standards for the design of SGP projects with the objective of ensuring high project quality yet also facilitating the development of proposals by grassroots grantees themselves. CPMT supervises the SGP National Coordinators to ensure the effective delivery of targets and expected outcomes of the programme's GEF-approved operational phase. CPMT also facilitates the start-up of new country programmes as approved by the SGP Steering Committee, in close coordination with the UNDP Country Offices, country CSOs, and country GEF Operational Focal Points.

National level management. For each participating country, there is an SGP Country Programme office often consisting of the National Coordinator and Programme Assistant, or of a Subregional Coordinator supported by National Focal Persons in the case of SGP subregional programmes, for the operation of the SGP Country Programme on a day-to-day basis. The NC is responsible for all aspects of country programme operations and management, including implementation, management, partnership development, knowledge management and M&E of the programme. When fulfilling his/her functions, and in adherence to the country-driven nature of the programme, the NC seeks guidance and support from, and in a sense also reports to the National Steering Committee (NSC) on progress in programme implementation.

The voluntary NSC of each SGP country programme, composed of national government and non-government leaders, and with majority non-governmental membership to reflect the programme's mandated focus for CSO capacity building, as well as its "country-drivenness", will provide overall country programming guidance as well as direct linkages to national policy-making, development planning, knowledge dissemination, and leveraging SGP's catalytic role. The NSC is responsible for the review and endorsement of the SGP Country Programme Strategy (CPS) which sets the priority for grantmaking in the country in terms of both geographic and thematic focus. The NSC is responsible for reviewing and approving projects, and for ensuring their technical and substantive quality with support from a Technical Advisory Group that can be set up with expert volunteers. As the NC also reports to the NSC on progress of the SGP Country Programme and on the implementation of relevant NSC decisions, the NSC also has a key role in rating the NC's performance in annual Performance and Results Appraisal (PRA) exercises. In addition, NSC members are expected to support the country programme in resource mobilization and in mainstreaming SGP lessons learned and successes in national development planning, policy-making and other national contexts. NSC members are encouraged to participate in pre-selection project site visits and in project monitoring and evaluation. The technical capacity and the strong commitment to strengthening community and civic engagement of the individual NSC members are key criteria for their selection.

SGP is often hosted by UNDP Country Offices, and the UNDP Country Offices provide, as per request by and as agreed with UNOPS, any needed financial administration and oversight for the SGP Country Programme grantmaking⁴². The UNDP Resident Representative/Coordinator or delegated staff is a member of the SGP National Steering Committee. While the UNOPS-contracted NC has CPMT as primary supervisor for global technical and substantive matters and for assuring that commitments for the GEF funding are met, the NC has the UNDP RR as secondary supervisor, in particular on assuring that he/she performs according to the high professional and ethical standards of the UN. In consultations with country stakeholders, the critical value-addition of the UNDP CO is its provision of what is considered a “neutral” or “non-biased” institution for often highly competitive situations resulting from grant requests by various CSOs, its supportive representation of the programme to government and other development agencies particularly in resource mobilization, and in the strategic guidance of the NC as well as the NSC in building synergy with other sustainable development projects and programs in the country.

In a limited number of countries a National Host Institution (NHI), contracted through UNOPS, supports the administration of the programme. In country programmes using NHIs, the NC may hold an NHI contract, but the NC still reports to CPMT as the primary and UNDP RR as the secondary supervisor. SGP country programmes are expected to gradually develop their locally based comprehensive technical capacity by recruiting additional staff as necessary and as funds become available in delivering projects for complementary environmental and sustainable development benefits.

Role of the GEF SGP Steering Committee: There is at the global level a GEF SGP Steering Committee chaired by the GEF Secretariat and with the UNDP-GEF and the GEF CSO Network as members. The Committee is tasked to: (1) Provide overall strategic direction to SGP in terms of corporate programme vision and long-term strategy; (2) Provide guidance and enable linkages with the GEF, its Partner Agencies and CSO stakeholders; (3). Establish country participation policy to include start-up of new Country Programmes as well as upgrading of existing ones; (4) Strongly support SGP’s resource mobilization efforts and facilitate establishment of strategic partnerships where useful; (5) Promote strengthened linkages between SGP and GEF projects and programmes; (6) Review, strengthen, and endorse the SGP Operational Phase Strategy, and; (7) Based on the SGP Annual Monitoring Report, help address any strategic issues arising during implementation. Furthermore, as agreed with the GEF Secretariat, the programme will take all necessary measures to ensure the visibility of the GEF financing as stated in the SGP Operational Guidelines. SGP will coordinate with the GEF Secretariat and UNDP-GEF in its communication and knowledge management activities

Role of the SGP Project Board. The SGP Project Board is directed by UNDP/GEF on behalf of UNDP as the ‘Project Executive’ member of the Board, and includes participation of UNOPS as the Implementing Partner, and SGP CPMT as the Project management team. The purpose of the Project Board is to provide overall guidance, direction and oversight to the project, including its management, and is accountable for project success. The SGP Project Board usually meets twice annually to review strategic matters concerning programme implementation and oversight.

⁴² For use of UNDP CO office space and equipment, SGP pays for the agreed costs through the SGP Country Programme Country Operating Budget (COB). For other administrative and financial services rendered on behalf of UNOPS, the SGP pays through UNOPS the cost as per the Universal Price List (UPL).

6 Monitoring Framework and Evaluation

Strengthening SGP's monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system will be an important priority for SGP during the sixth operational phase (OP6). The most recent global evaluation of the SGP recognized a range of good practices in M&E across the SGP portfolio but also recommended reducing the M&E demands on the programme and streamlining the M&E system to enhance its effectiveness. SGP's M&E system has been strengthened to reflect the programme's nested structure and its approach to monitoring and adaptive management that applies relevant indicators and tools and resources at three specific levels: global programme level, country portfolio level, and grant project level.

The SGP Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system reflects the integrated set of programme functions and levels that constitute the GEF Small Grants Programme: community projects are nested within country programmes which are in turn nested within the global programme. In the SGP, the global programme provides the overall strategic programming framework with the four strategic initiatives described above and other non-grant activities that guide, enable or support programming at country and community levels. Country Programme Strategies (CPS) are developed and formulated by National Coordinators and National Steering Committees within this general framework, adapting the global programme's objectives to country level conditions and contexts, in particular to selected landscapes and seascapes for focused support. Community organizations within these landscapes, as part of the participatory landscape strategy planning process, identify community projects and strategic initiatives to be programmed in pursuit of landscape level outcomes as framed in each Country Programme Strategy.

Community and strategic projects contribute to landscape/Country Programme targets which in turn contribute to Global Programme targets. Specific indicators are identified that are consistent across the three levels so that these targets - and the contributions to them from the three levels - are specific, measurable, attributable, relevant and time-bound (SMART). The use of this small set of shared specific indicators (common across the three levels) will not preclude the identification and use of other indicators of particular relevance to community projects, strategic projects or Country Programme Strategies. These indicators will be tracked by stakeholders at the appropriate level. It is anticipated that the number of indicators will be greatest at the community level – reflecting inclusion of local level priorities for sustainable development - while the numbers of indicators at country level will fall between those of the community projects and the global programme.

Within this streamlined system appropriate guidance and templates will be developed for application at each level, while reinforcing links between the different levels to enable effective monitoring of results and reporting to the GEF and other donors and stakeholders. Under this M&E plan SGP will set realistic and measurable indicators and targets at each level and meet reporting requirements, while promoting adaptive management. The information gathered from the M&E system will contribute to the identification and effective sharing of lessons and good practices to continuously strengthen and improve SGP's contribution to the generation of global environmental benefits as well as sustainable development benefits.

At the global level, SGP will track the indicators and results outlined in the Results framework of the CEO Endorsement document. M&E tools are currently being revised, and comprehensive guidance will be provided to Country Programmes prior to the start of grantmaking in OP6. SGP will further improve its Annual Monitoring Report (AMR), which will facilitate the tracking of outcomes within each of its Strategic initiatives, drawing upon country level monitoring of results. SGP will continue its annual monitoring survey of country programme progress and results, which will feed into the AMR. The GEF SGP will continue to be evaluated periodically by the Independent Evaluation Offices of both UNDP and the GEF. The SGP global database is being updated with functions to enable accurate and comprehensive reporting at project, country programme and global levels.

At the country programme level, the Country Programme Strategy (CPS) template will be updated to include a more robust baseline assessment in line with SGP's shift to more targeted landscape/seascape grant making. Each country programme will identify appropriate indicators and targets within the CPS which will be tracked through Annual Country Reports (ACR). The ACR will allow each country programme to assess progress towards the objectives in the CPS and take appropriate measures and adaptive management decisions. As needed, grant projects related to the conduct of intensive M&E related assessments and case studies by expert individuals, groups and organizations will be implemented for the SGP country programme portfolio as well as select projects. A dedicated meeting will be held by the NSC at the end of each grant year to review progress in grant projects and achievement of results by completed projects in the framework of the CPS. This will also enable the NSC and the NC to review the overall needs and planning for the Country

Programme in the following year. An NSC checklist for project approval has been developed to further improve project review and approval processes and ensure coherence with the Global Programme strategic initiatives. The checklist will provide basic review criteria and ensure consistency with UNDP's Social and Environmental safeguards. It will be customizable by country programmes to reflect and incorporate any specific review and design elements relevant to the country context.

At the project level, SGP will continue to track progress and financial expenditure reported by grantee partners. M&E will be carried out as appropriate to the size and scope of any given project. Guidance and capacity development will be provided to grantees where needed to support participatory M&E and adaptive management. M&E site visits will be conducted by SGP country teams and NSC members at least once during implementation of the projects. SGP is designing a grantee capacity assessment tool that will allow the Country Programmes to review the needs of specific grantees in terms of their capacity to implement the project. Based on the checklist, appropriate capacity development for M&E and other project activities will be incorporated in each project implementation plan and budget. The checklist may be used at the end of the project to assess changes in capacity of CSOs through the course of the project cycle.

The SGP Results Framework is attached in section 3 of this document. The indicators identified in this results framework are the global portfolio level indicators designed to meet reporting on GEF-6 strategic objectives. Through SGP's Grantmaker + approaches, partnerships with other grant makers, foundations, academic institutions, and CSO support organizations may be explored to provide further support in M&E at country level as well as to provide a mechanism for third party assessment of results in select cases.

SGP's monitoring and evaluation system will be fully in-line with GEF and UNDP monitoring and evaluation policies and minimum standards, including consistency with UN Evaluation Group standards and norms. The SGP monitoring and evaluation plan complies with all GEF M&E minimum standards, including: SMART indicators for implementation and results, baseline information, identification of required programme reviews and evaluations, specified roles and responsibilities, and a budget allocated to support M&E activities. Activities outlined in the M&E plan will be undertaken as necessary and appropriate to ensure cost-effectiveness at each level.

M&E workplan

Item	M&E Activity	Purpose	Responsible Parties	Budget Source	Timing
Project Level					
1	Grantee Capacity Assessment	Establish baseline for later evaluation of project results	NC	Covered under country programme operating costs	At project concept planning and proposal stage
2	Baseline Data Collection	Establish baseline for later evaluation of project results	Grantee and NC	Covered under project planning grant amount or project grant amount	At project concept planning and proposal stage
3	NSC Project Review checklist	Ensure compliance with minimum project design standards and norms	NSC	N/A	At project approval
4	Project Work plans and M&E plans	Ensure compliance with minimum project design standards and norms	Grantee and NC	Covered under project grant amount	At project approval

Item	M&E Activity	Purpose	Responsible Parties	Budget Source	Timing
5	Participatory Project Monitoring	Learning; adaptive management	Grantee	Covered under project grant amount	Ongoing throughout project implementation
	Project Progress Reports	Learning; adaptive management	Grantee	Covered under project grant amount	Periodic during project implementation
6	Financial Reports (2-3 depending on agreed disbursement schedule)	Financial accountability and assessment of cost-effectiveness	Grantee	Covered under project grant amount	At each disbursement request
7	Project monitoring (as necessary / cost effective ⁴³)	Learning, troubleshooting, adaptive management	NC, NSC	Variable	On average once per year, as appropriate
8	Project Final Report	Assess project effectiveness; learning; adaptive management	Grantee	Covered under project grant amount	Upon completion of project activities
9	Project Evaluation Site Visit report (as necessary / cost effective)	Assess project effectiveness; learning	NC, NSC, third party	Variable	Upon completion of project activities, as appropriate
11	Maintain project description/results in global project database	Enable efficient reporting to CPMT, GEF, donors, others	PA and NC	Covered under country programme operating costs	At start of project, on ongoing basis, and at project completion as appropriate
Country Level					
12	Country Programme Strategy elaboration	Framework for identification of community projects	NC, NSC, country stakeholders	Covered under country programme operating costs, or under preparatory grant	At start of each operational phase
13	Annual Country Programme Strategy Review	Learning; adaptive management	NC, NSC, CPMT	Covered under country programme operating costs	At annual NSC review meeting

43 To ensure cost-effectiveness, project level monitoring and evaluation activities, including project site visits, are conducted on a discretionary basis, based on internally assessed criteria including (but not limited to) project size and complexity, potential and realized risks, and security parameters.

Item	M&E Activity	Purpose	Responsible Parties	Budget Source	Timing
14	Ongoing review of project results to NSC and analysis	Assess effectiveness of projects, portfolios, approaches; learning; adaptive management	NC, NSC, UNDP Country Office	Covered under country programme operating costs	Minimum twice per year, one dedicated to M&E and adaptive management at end of grant year
15	Annual Country Report and AMR Survey	Enable efficient reporting to NSC, CPMT and GEF; presentation of results to donor	NC presenting to NSC, and submission to CPMT	Covered under country programme operating costs	Once per year
16	Audit	Ensure compliance with project implementation/ management standards and norms	UNOPS / External Contractor	Budgeted under global operating budget	Annually for selected countries on risk-assessment basis
17	Strategic Country Portfolio Review	Learning; adaptive management for strategic development of Country Programme	NSC	Covered under country programme operating costs	Once per operational phase
Global Level					
18	SGP Database	Enable efficient reporting to donors, others; Country Programme monitoring	NCs, PAs, CPMT	Global operating budget and M&E budget, and staff time	Ongoing
19	SGP Annual Monitoring Report	Presentation of results to donor	CPMT with inputs from NCs	Global operating budget and M&E budget, and staff time	Annually
20	Global Portfolio Monitoring and Oversight	Troubleshooting; learning; adaptive management	CPMT	Covered under budgeted staff time and global operating budget	Ongoing
21	Programme Delivery Reports (GEF Financial Reporting)	Assessment of implementation efficiency	UNOPS to UNDP-GEF	Covered under UNOPS operating costs	Quarterly
22	SGP Reporting to Conventions and for the GEF AMR	Presentation of results to donor as financial mechanism for Conventions	CPMT through GEF Secretariat	Covered under budgeted staff time and global operating budget	At least one month prior to deadline for GEF Secretariat reporting to

Item	M&E Activity	Purpose	Responsible Parties	Budget Source	Timing
					conventions (varies by convention)
23	Inputs to UNDP and GEF country and thematic evaluations	Provide lessons; assess effectiveness, relevance, results and impact	NCs, CPMT, UNDP and /or GEF Evaluation Offices	Covered under budgeted staff time;	<i>Ad Hoc</i>
24	SGP Independent Evaluation	Assess effectiveness, continued relevance, cost-efficiency; learning; adaptive management	UNDP and GEF Independent Evaluation Offices	Global operating budget and M&E budget	Once per Operational Phase

7 Legal Context

This project forms part of an overall programmatic framework under which several separate associated country level activities will be implemented. When assistance and support services are provided from this Project to the associated country level activities, this document shall be the "Project Document" instrument referred to in: (i) the respective signed SBAs for the specific countries; or (ii) in the Supplemental Provisions attached to the Project Document in cases where the recipient country has not signed an SBA with UNDP.

This project has UNDP as the Implementing Agency and UNOPS as Implementing Partner. The responsibility for the safety and security of the Implementing Partner and its personnel and property, and of UNDP's property in the Implementing Partner's custody, rests with the Implementing Partner. The Implementing Partner shall: (a) put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, taking into account the security situation in the country where the project is being carried out; (b) assume all risks and liabilities related to the Implementing Partner's security, and the full implementation of the security plan. UNDP reserves the right to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security plan as required hereunder shall be deemed a breach of this agreement.

The Implementing Partner agrees to undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that none of the UNDP funds received pursuant to the Project Document are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). The list can be accessed via <http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/committees/1267/1267ListEng.htm>. This provision must be included in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into under this Project Document.

UNOPS shall not make any financial commitments or incur any expenses that would exceed the budget for implementing the project as set forth in this Project Document. UNOPS shall regularly consult with UNDP concerning the status and use of funds and shall promptly advise UNDP any time when UNOPS is aware that the budget to carry out these services is insufficient to fully implement the project in the manner set out in the Project Document. UNDP shall have no obligation to provide UNOPS with any funds or to make any reimbursement for expenses incurred by UNOPS in excess of the total budget as set forth in the Project Document.

Any changes to the Project Document that would affect the work being performed by UNOPS shall be recommended only after consultation between the parties. Any amendment to this Project Document shall be effected by mutual agreement, in writing.

UNDP and UNOPS shall use their best efforts to promptly settle through direct negotiations any dispute, controversy or claim which is not settled within sixty (60) days from the date either party has notified the other party of the dispute, controversy or claim and of measures which should be taken to rectify it, shall be referred to the UNDP Administrator and the UNOPS Executive Director for resolution.

8 Annexes

Annex A. GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) Operational Guidelines

Purpose of this Document

These Operational Guidelines are intended to assist GEF SGP National Coordinators/Sub-Regional Coordinators (NCs/SRCs), National Steering Committees (NSCs), Sub-regional Steering Committees (SRSCs), National Focal Groups (NFGs), UNDP Country Offices and National Host Institution (NHI) staff as well as the SGP Central Programme Management Team (CPMT) and the Global Coordinator of the SGP Upgrading Country Programmes in programme implementation.. They are based on the experience and knowledge gained both at the country and global levels through years of GEF SGP programme implementation. They provide the basic framework for operations in relation to the structure, implementation, and administration of the programme. They also address the project cycle and grant disbursement. Programme and project monitoring, evaluation, and reporting are covered in the GEF SGP Monitoring and Evaluation Framework.

The guidelines and models set forth herein are meant to apply generally to all GEF SGP Country Programmes. It is recognized, however, that different contexts and situations will require different responses and adaptations. Any questions about the application of particular provisions of the guidelines or need for adaptation should be referred to the GEF SGP Global Manager and Central Programme Management Team (CPMT) or the Global Coordinator of the SGP Upgrading Country Programmes. On administrative and financial matters, questions may be answered by the UNOPS SGP Standard Operating Procedures and, if necessary, to the respective UNOPS SGP Portfolio Manager.

List of Acronyms

BAC	Budget Account Classification Code
CBO	Community-based Organization
CCF	Country Cooperation Framework
CO	Country Office
COA	Chart of Account (ATLAS)
COB	Country Operating Budget
CPMT	Central Programme Management Team
CPS	Country Programme Strategy
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IOV	Inter-office Voucher
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MOD	Miscellaneous Obligation Document
NC	National Coordinator
NFP	National Focal Person
NFG	National Focal Group
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NHI	National Host Institution
NPFE	GEF National Portfolio Formulation Exercise
NSC	National Steering Committee
OP	Operational Programme
PA	Programme Assistant
PO	Purchase Order (ATLAS)
REQ	Requisition (ATLAS)
SBAA	Standard Basic Assistance Agreement
SGP	GEF Small Grants Programme
SOPs	Standard Operating Procedures
SRC	Sub-Regional Coordinator

SRSC	Sub-Regional Steering Committee
SPS	Sub-Regional Programme Strategy
TOR	Terms of Reference
UCP	Upgrading Country Programme
UNCBD	United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

PART I: GEF SGP PROGRAMME STRUCTURE

1. The structure of the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP), implemented by UNDP, is decentralized and country-driven. Within the parameters established by the GEF Council and reflected in the Project Document for an Operational Phase, the programme seeks to provide for maximum country and community-level ownership and initiative. This decentralization is balanced against the need for programme consistency and accountability across the participating countries for the achievement of the GEF's global environmental objectives, and the SGP's particular benchmarks as stated in the Project Document for each Operational Phase.
2. The SGP is a global and multi-focal area GEF project, approved for funding by the GEF Council on a rolling replenishment, implemented by UNDP on behalf of the GEF partnership, and executed by UNOPS. In the case of Upgraded Country Programmes, UNOPS execution is the recommended option although a country-specific execution modality utilizing a national non-governmental organization or a consortium of non-governmental organizations, selected by UNDP through a competitive process, can be utilized⁴⁴. Within the UNDP framework, the SGP, as a global programme, is handled differently from UNDP core national or regional programmes.⁴⁵
3. The GEF Council approves SGP Project Information Form (PIF), GEF CEO Endorsement request, and SGP Project Document for the SGP Global Programme as well as for all Upgrading Country Programmes for each GEF Operational Phase. The SGP Project Document, whether for the global program or upgrading country programmes, provides the framework for SGP operations in accordance with the GEF mandate, including specific benchmarks for project achievements. It also sets forth many of the programme and financial reporting requirements for which UNDP has legal responsibility.
4. Globally, the SGP brings together country programmes of participating countries across all world regions. The key eligibility criteria for countries to participate in SGP are:
 - ✓ Existence of environmental needs and threats in GEF focal or thematic areas;
 - ✓ Ratification of at least one of the global environmental conventions including the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC); the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants; and United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD);
 - ✓ Government commitment in the participating country and support for the programme's implementation modality according to the operational guidelines;
 - ✓ Potential for strong government-NGO relations and positive support for local Civil Society Organizations;⁴⁶

⁴⁴ As per policy approved by the GEF Council Meeting (November 10-12, 2009, Washington DC) based on GEF/C.36/4 Small Grants Programme: Execution Arrangements and Upgrading Policy for GEF-5 (see para 19 and paras 52 - 53). This has been reaffirmed through the approval of the GEF Council Paper GEF/C.46/13 of April 30, 2014 "GEF Small Grants Programme: Implementation Arrangements for GEF-6.

⁴⁵ For more information about global programming, please see the UNDP Programming Manual, especially Section 8.3. The Programming Manual is available in UNDP Country Offices and at the following website: <http://www.undp.org/osg/pm/index.htm>

⁴⁶ For the purpose of the SGP and its grant making, CSOs refer to national and local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) with

- ✓ Commitment to resource mobilization: the UNDP/CO and government share available funding for SGP delivery from both GEF and non-GEF sources, and support efforts to attract other co-funding sources;
- ✓ Positive enabling environment.

SGP Headquarters Structure

5. A UNDP/GEF Unit at UNDP Headquarters in New York provides fiduciary oversight for all of its GEF activities, including the SGP. Key UNDP Headquarters staff include the UNDP GEF Executive Coordinator, and his/her Deputy, who are legally accountable to UNDP and to the GEF Council for the utilisation of GEF resources.
6. Overall management of the SGP Global Programme, including operational guidance and support to the country programmes, as well as the identification and establishment of SGP Country Programmes in new countries, are conducted by the SGP Central Programme Management Team (CPMT). The CPMT is composed of a Global Manager and Deputy Global Manager; Programme Specialists responsible for matrixed country support and focal area guidance, knowledge management, and monitoring & evaluation; Programme Associates; as well as external consultants, as needed. The SGP Upgrading Country Programmes (UCPs), given their financing modality as GEF Full-Size Projects, are managed by a UNDP-GEF UCP Global Coordinator, who provides technical assistance, strategic advice, and resource mobilization support and promotes substantive and strategic alignment and coordination of the UCPs with the Global SGP Programme.
7. The United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) provides programme execution services including administrative, financial, legal, operational, procurement and project management for the SGP as described in detail in the UNOPS SGP Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs).⁴⁷ The UNOPS SGP Cluster Coordinator and his/her team work closely with the SGP Deputy Global Manager and CPMT staff, as well as with the SGP UCP Global Coordinator.
8. The SGP Global Manager and his/her alternate, the SGP Deputy Global Manager, are ultimately responsible for the overall management, strategic direction, policy development and resource mobilization efforts of the SGP Global Programme. The Programme Specialists are primarily responsible for guidance on GEF focal areas and thematic directions, Country Programme support, regional coordination responsibilities, knowledge sharing, partnership development and networking. As necessary, the Global Manager and Deputy Global Manager may delegate certain functions to the Programme Specialists.
9. SGP regional teams, composed of at least one staff member from CPMT and from UNOPS, as well as the regional senior SGP National Coordinator as needed, may provide a range of technical advice, operational, management and administrative support to country programmes in each of the six SGP world regions,⁴⁸ divided as follows:
 - ✓ Africa
 - ✓ Arab States
 - ✓ Asia
 - ✓ Europe & CIS
 - ✓ Pacific

priority on community-based organizations (CBOs), indigenous peoples, farmers, scientific community, women's groups, and youth and children organizations.

⁴⁷https://intrafed.unops.org/ORGANIGRAMME/NAO/SGP/SGP_MANUAL/Pages/default.aspx

⁴⁸ For a full list of participating SGP countries see:

http://www.sgp.undp.org/index.cfm?module=ActiveWeb&page=WebPage&s=contry_profile

✓ Latin America & the Caribbean

10. While for the Global Programme, the CPMT regional focal point focuses primarily on GEF technical and programmatic matters, and the UNOPS regional focal point is responsible for administrative and financial issues, the SGP regional team works collaboratively in advising country programmes with regard to all substantive and operational matters. The regional teams also review the annual SGP country staff performance and recommend ratings for review by the Deputy Global Manager, and his/her counterpart in UNOPS, prior to endorsement and finalisation by the Global Manager.
11. For the Upgrading Country Programmes, the division of labour between the SGP UCP Global Coordinator and UNOPS is similar to those above, as are the collaborative arrangements between UNDP-GEF and UNOPS.
12. SGP Programme Associates are responsible for daily administration, filing and archive management; financial record-keeping and reporting to donors; human resources support; external communications; organisation of meetings; and responses to routine requests for information. The Programme Associates monitor completion of SGP work-plans, and assist in CPMT activities, correspondence, and other assigned tasks.

SGP Country Programme Structure

13. The SGP operates in a decentralized and country-driven manner through a National Coordinator or Sub-regional Coordinator (*both hereafter to be referred as **NC***) and National Steering Committee or National Focal Group for those in sub-regional programme modality (*both hereafter abbreviated to **NSC***) in each participating country, with some modification in the case of countries in a sub-regional programme modality⁴⁹, with financial and administrative support provided by the UNDP Country Office (CO). In some countries, a National Host Institution (NHI) or host NGO⁵⁰ is responsible for programme implementation in conjunction with the NC and NSC. At the country level, the SGP operates under the overall UNDP SBAA agreement, although the SGP Global Programme is not considered a part of the CCF or UNDP core functions at the country level.
14. The NSC is composed of voluntary members from NGOs, academic and scientific institutions, other civil society organizations, the UNDP CO, and government, with a majority of members coming from the non-governmental sector. The NSC provides overall guidance and direction to the Country Programme, and contributes to developing and implementing strategies for Country Programme sustainability.
15. The technical capacity of the individual NSC members is an important criterion in determining its composition, and to the maximum extent possible the NSC membership should include experts in the relevant GEF focal areas of biodiversity; climate change mitigation; international waters; sustainable land management; sustainable forest management and REDD; persistent organic pollutants/chemicals; as well as capacity development. The inclusion of the government GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP) or relevant Convention Focal Point in the NSC is also recommended.
16. The NSC is responsible for the review, selection and approval of projects, and for ensuring their technical and substantive quality as regards the strategic objectives of the SGP. In collaboration with

⁴⁹In the case of SGP Sub-regional Programmes, the Sub-Regional Coordinator (SRC) may manage the programme, while projects are reviewed and approved by a voluntary National Focal Group (NFG) with part-time facilitation by a National Focal Person (NFP). Some countries, with substantial grant making, may decide to shift to a Country Programme modality still linked to the subregional group with a full-time NC or a Community Program Officer and the SRC providing subregional coordination and technical support.

⁵⁰ National Host Institution or NHI and host NGO are used interchangeably in this document because SGP Country Programmes commonly employ both terms.

the NC, the NSC contributes to the development of the Country Programme Strategy (CPS)⁵¹ in accordance with the relevant GEF Project Document for the Operational Phase and national environmental priorities, and oversees its implementation. NSC members are expected to support the Country Programme in resource mobilization and in mainstreaming SGP lessons learned and successes in national development planning and policy-making. NSC members are encouraged to participate in pre-selection project site visits and in project monitoring and evaluation.

17. The NSC may also constitute a Technical Advisory Groups (TAG) with a pool of voluntary experts on call to serve as a technical sub-committee, for review of proposals and in relation to specific areas of programming and partnership development. The TAG can also be tasked by the NSC to provide specific technical guidance in specialised areas of work, such as carbon measurement, payments for ecosystem services, marketing and certification of products, transboundary diagnostic analysis, and other relevant fields. In addition, the TAG may also be formed in response to donor and co-financing requirements mobilised for the SGP country programme.
18. The SGP NC has lead responsibility for managing the development and implementation of the country or sub-regional programme, for ensuring that grants and projects meet GEF and SGP criteria, and for planning and implementation of upscaling strategies. The NC's primary functions include *inter alia*: (i) assisting CSOs in the formulation of project proposals; (ii) serving as the *ex officio* secretariat for the NSC; (iii) ensuring sound programme monitoring and evaluation, including periodic project site visits; (iv) resource mobilization; (v) communication and dissemination of SGP information; and (v) global reporting to CPMT, UNOPS, responding to audits, and other tasks as stipulated in their ToR.⁵²
19. The UNDP CO provides management support to the SGP Country Programme as outlined in this document. The UNDP Resident Representative/Resident Coordinator (*hereafter abbreviated to UNDP RR*) in each UNDP CO assigns a senior staff person (typically the Environment Focal Point or head of the Sustainable Development Cluster) to serve as the SGP focal point. The UNDP RR participates in the NSC or may designate the focal point as his/her delegate in the NSC. Each UNDP CO also contributes to monitoring programme activities – usually through broad oversight by the designated focal point as part of NSC responsibilities - facilitates interaction with the host government, and develops links with other in-country financial and technical resources.
20. The UNDP CO is also responsible for providing operational support – the RR signature of grant project MOAs (on behalf of UNOPS); appointment letters of NSC members (on behalf of CPMT); local grant disbursements; HR administration; as well as assisting in audit exercises for the programme. The detailed steps for each operational aspect are described in the UNOPS SGP SOPs. The UNDP CO also plays a fundamental role in launching a new SGP Country Programme in terms of endorsement of the government application to be a participating SGP country and in helping CPMT organize the start-up mission. The UNDP CO also plays a critical role in the proper closing of an SGP Country Programme.

PART II IMPLEMENTATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF SGP COUNTRY PROGRAMMES

In-country institutional arrangements

21. The SGP operates at the country level under the overall UNDP SBAA agreement, however, the SGP Global Programme remains the responsibility of the CPMT/UNOPS SGP Cluster at Headquarters and, like the Upgrading Country Programmes, is accountable to UNDP-GEF in New York, and ultimately, the GEF Council. There are two basic modalities for SGP hosting arrangements for the country programme that, in consultation with country stakeholders, will be decided by CPMT or the UCP Global Coordinator. In most countries, the programme is hosted by the UNDP CO, although this may also

⁵¹ An Upgrading Country Programme is not required to produce a Country Programme Strategy since it produces a Project Document for the Full Size Project financing their Country Programme for the relevant Operational Phase.

⁵² See full-length version of SGP NC ToRs.

mean that the SGP office is physically located outside CO premises. Where there are issues of accessibility and based on consultations with stakeholders, the programme could be hosted in a National Host Institution (NHI), which may be an NGO or academic institution.

22. In case of NHI hosting, UNOPS issues and administers a sub-contract with the NHI that outlines the technical support and administrative services to be provided, as well as the applicable operating budget. In all cases, the UNDP CO provides needed support for SGP in-country operations in coordination with the CPMT or UCP Global Coordinator and UNOPS. Whatever the hosting arrangements, all Country Programmes respond equally to the relevant Operational Phase Project Document (global or national upgrading) and the global SGP Operational Guidelines.
23. As noted above, NCs of Country Programmes in the Global SGP Programme are guided by CPMT regional focal points for the majority of operational and technical matters, whilst reporting ultimately to the SGP Global Manager. NCs of Upgrading Country Programmes are guided by the Global UCP Coordinator. NCs are also accountable to the UNDP RR for country-level programme expenditures and on matters regarding meeting the ethical and professional standards of the UNDP. The UNDP RR, in consultation with members of the NSC, is responsible for preparing the annual evaluation of NC performance and recommendation concerning contractual status for review by either CPMT or the Global UCP Coordinator, and UNOPS.
21. In keeping with the spirit and mandate of the SGP to develop and foster the capacities of CSOs in participating countries, it is expected that as individual Country Programmes mature it will be possible to transfer the hosting arrangements from the UNDP CO to NHIs. Any decision for transfer should be based on a full consultative process and analysis of key factors, and must be approved by the CPMT or Global UCP Coordinator in consultation with the UNDP RR. In certain cases, where the selected NHI does not fully meet performance expectations, and upon consultation with country stakeholders, the contract may be terminated by the CPMT or Global Coordinator, and UNOPS, and hosting will be transferred either to the UNDP CO or to another NHI.
22. The relationship with an NHI may range from the provision of physical office space, with the NC and NSC carrying full responsibility for programme management; one in which the NHI is responsible for providing specifically agreed services, such as technical advice and support; through to one where the NHI carries full responsibility for managing the SGP programme. The extent of responsibility will be clearly defined in the contract for services signed by UNOPS and the NHI and may evolve over time.
23. The identification of a pool of suitable NHIs may be carried out through a process of competitive bidding, or by gradually accumulating a list of available and interested organizations in consultation with key stakeholders. Local representation of international NGOs would not normally be eligible. The legitimacy and neutrality of potential NHIs within the national NGO community are essential qualifications to carry out SGP grant-making activities. Once a pool of organizations has been established, the following factors will be considered by the CPMT or Global UCP Coordinator, and UNDP CO to select the best candidate:
 - ✓ National stature and credibility;
 - ✓ Good working relationships with other CSOs, including participation in environment/development networks;
 - ✓ Demonstrated compatibility with the procedures, objectives, and grant-making functions of the SGP, GEF, and UNDP;
 - ✓ Significant experience in community-based, participatory environment and development;
 - ✓ Substantial involvement and technical expertise in environmental issues related to the GEF focal areas and the Rio conventions;
 - ✓ Proven programme management and administrative capacity with systems in place.
24. The NC is normally an employee of UNOPS whereas the contract is administered locally by the UNDP CO on behalf of UNOPS. In some cases, the NC contract administration can be covered under the

terms of the contract with the NHI. The selection of the NC is done through a publicly advertised and competitive selection process. As a general rule, the recruitment process for the NC is managed on behalf of UNOPS by the UNDP CO under the overall supervision of the UNDP RR. This is ordinarily the case even if the NC will be placed in an NHI; however, the NHI, as appropriate and upon approval of CPMT, may manage the NC recruitment. The selection panel submits three of the top applicants to the SGP Global Manager for final selection and decision. The recruitment process and related guidelines are described in more detail in the UNOPS SGP Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs).

25. Typically, NHIs do not normally administer grant funds. As Country Programmes evolve and/or upgrade, however, it may become desirable to include direct grants administration as part of NHI responsibilities under UNOPS-issued contracts or other mechanisms, thereby increasing the level of country ownership of, and civil society participation in, the programme. Administrative procedures will need to be devised to ensure that the administration of grant allocations and their transferral to grant recipients remain transparent, accountable and fluid. NHIs cannot be awarded nor use SGP grant funds.

SGP country staff roles and responsibilities

26. The NC is responsible for the overall functioning of the SGP in each participating country, and for the achievement of the benchmarks established for Country Programme implementation in the CPS (Global Programme) or Project Document (UCP) for the relevant Operational Phase. The NC is expected to have full-time dedication to the SGP.⁵³ The NC is responsible for ensuring sound programme and project monitoring and evaluation, and laying the foundation for programme upscaling and sustainability. In project development, the NC may work directly to assist the proponent CSO to access needed support, including the recommendation of support through planning grants. The NC, jointly with the UNDP CO, bear direct responsibility for all local programme expenditures. A critical aspect of the NC job performance is to carefully monitor and supervise these expenditures under the overall supervision of UNOPS and to ensure accountability and transparency.
27. The NC usually represents the SGP in local and national meetings, workshops, and other events, and may be accompanied by members of the NSC. However, for legal and financial purposes, only the UNDP RR or his/her Officer in Charge (OIC) may represent the SGP in-country (on behalf of UNOPS). Only the UNDP RR or his/her Officer in Charge (OIC) can sign SGP grant Memoranda of Agreement (MOAs) and for signing any co-financing arrangements on behalf of SGP. While the NC may initiate and undertake co-financing and other negotiations for the programme, s/he should never officially sign such agreements. The NC, however, may sign non-binding collaborative agreements between SGP and other projects and programs. The NC should consult the CPMT or the Global UCP Coordinator, and the UNOPS SGP Cluster if there is any doubt on signing rules and procedures.
28. The performance of NCs is evaluated annually. The evaluation is undertaken through an online Performance and Results Assessment (PRA) in two parts: a self-assessment by the NC, and a performance evaluation with NSC inputs under the charge of the UNDP RR. These two parts of the evaluation should be completed shortly after the completion of the reporting period. The completed and signed evaluations are submitted to the CPMT or the Global UCP Coordinator. The PRA evaluations are reviewed by the CPMT or Global UCP Coordinator, with UNOPS inputs, and final decisions are then taken for the Global Programme Country Programmes by the SGP Global Manager and Deputy Global Manager on contract renewal, or by the Global UCP Coordinator, as well as other actions that might need to be taken.
29. In most countries, the NC works with a Programme Assistant/Associate (PA). On behalf of UNOPS, the UNDP CO may hire a PA with technical and/or administrative skills and functions depending on

⁵³The NC should not accept any other functions unless a cost-sharing arrangement can be negotiated with the UNDP CO or host NGO and validated by CPMT/UNOPS.

local needs. The NC shall be involved in the selection process and the panel recommendation will be forwarded to CPMT and UNOPS for final approval. The NC will be in charge of the supervision and PRA for the PA. In certain cases, consultants with a technical background, especially in the GEF focal areas, may be recruited to contribute to project design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation, and can be delegated by the NC to provide these services to CSOs and SGP projects as necessary. The recruitment process and related guidelines are highlighted in detail in the UNOPS SGP SOPs.

National Steering Committee procedures

30. The NSC is a central element of the SGP and provides the primary substantive contribution and oversight to the programme, in coordination with the NC. While staffing and operational management of the SGP is undertaken through UNDP/UNOPS structures, no SGP project may be undertaken at the country level without the approval of the NSC. As such, the NSC must do its best to ensure the technical and substantive quality of SGP grants, and the administrative and financial capacity, either actual or potential, of the CSO grant recipients. The UNDP RR, or his/her delegate, as well as other members of the NSC, are encouraged to provide any relevant information about these concerns, especially the financial and organizational integrity of CSOs. Operationally, the decisions of the NSC are considered final provided they are consistent with these operational guidelines, the SGP Project Document for the GEF Operational Phase and the Country Programme Strategy (or UCP Project Document). However, neither the NSC nor its individual members as programme volunteers, hold any legal or fiduciary responsibility for the SGP or its activities.
31. The selection of NSC members is normally done by the NC in consultation with the UNDP RR. For new country programmes, the NSC is often established as a result of a preparatory mission or in the initial stages of launching the programme. NSC members should have an abiding interest and commitment to working with communities and share a vision of what sustainable development and "*thinking globally, acting locally*" might mean in terms of linking the GEF focal areas with community needs and concerns. NSC non-governmental members must have high credibility and wide experience working with local communities and CSOs in the country and thus can represent their needs and interests in committee discussions. Strong, experienced, and technically competent civil society representation on the NSC is crucial as a means of keeping the SGP responsive to its mandate to work with CSOs, CBOs and indigenous peoples. These members must also have the requisite knowledge of GEF Focal Areas and/or specific themes such as gender, sustainable livelihoods, and knowledge management. Governmental and donor agency members should hold positions relevant to the work of the SGP and at a level where they could make decisions on behalf of their agencies, particularly when assessing proposals which they are being asked to fund. NSC members on the whole must be able and willing to discuss constructively and develop consensus decisions. The NSC, with the NC, are responsible for ensuring participatory, democratic, impartial, and transparent procedures for project review and approval, as well as all other aspects of programme implementation at the country level in accordance with the SGP Project Document for the relevant Operational Phase.
32. The composition of a newly established NSC is subject to ratification by the SGP Global Manager or the Global UCP Coordinator while subsequent appointments can be ratified by the responsible CPMT Regional Focal Point for global programme countries and by the Global UCP Coordinator for upgrading country programmes. In general, only one government representative on the NSC is required. However, depending on the circumstances, country programmes can have additional government representatives such as Convention focal points, although whatever the case, the majority of members must be non-governmental. The UNDP RR provides the appointment letters on behalf of the SGP.
33. NSC members usually serve for a period of three years. Each country or sub-regional programme must decide whether this term is renewable, and how eligibility for renewal is determined. In general, periodically inviting new members is a sound and healthy policy that brings new ideas and expertise

to programme implementation, and roughly one quarter of NSC members may rotate in any given year. Changing the entire membership at any one time should be avoided.

34. Participation in the NSC is without monetary compensation. Travel expenses for project site visits or to NSC meetings can be covered by the SGP country operational budget.
35. NSCs adopt decisions under the principle of consensus and rarely resort to voting to determine whether a project is approved or a particular course of action is taken. To facilitate meetings, the NSC may decide to select its Chairperson(s) in the following way: (i) one of the most committed expert members to Chair for a particular period of time; (ii) members to chair meetings on a rotating basis to enhance each member's participation; and (iii) on a co-chair approach with government and non-government representation to promote civil society leadership and CSO-government collaboration which are institutional objectives of the programme.
36. The NC serves ex officio on the NSC, participating in deliberations, but not in decisions in the project selection process. The NC usually convenes the NSC and functions as its secretariat, including preparing minutes of meetings and maintaining a historical record of programme decisions and implementation. A copy of NSC minutes, signed by the members, and other pertinent material should be filed at the UNDP CO.
37. In as wide a consultation as possible with country stakeholders, the NC shall prepare a long list of possible volunteers to the NSC. From this, the NC in consultation with the UNDP RR prepares the list of NSC members to be nominated for approval by the SGP Global Manager by considering both the expertise and qualifications of the individual candidates, and the overall composition and balance of the committee. While certain institutions (the UNDP, and appropriate governmental ministry or agencies, the NHI) must be represented in the NSC, members should also be chosen who as individuals, including from the private sector and donor community, would contribute significantly to the committee and the programme's various expertise needs (e.g. on GEF focal areas, sustainable livelihoods, gender considerations, communications, resource mobilization, capacity development). The NC, after due consultation with other NSC members of good standing and the UNDP RR, may recommend changes in the composition of the committee to CPMT if it becomes clear that a particular member's participation is not contributing to the programme.
38. The objectivity, transparency and credibility of the NSC is of paramount importance to the success of the Country Programme, and to maintaining good relations among stakeholders. As a general rule, Country Programmes cannot consider proposals associated with organizations of sitting NSC members. A CSO may nonetheless submit proposals when its representative has finished the term of service and is no longer on the Committee. On an exceptional basis, and under specified conditions pre-approved by CPMT or the UCP Global Coordinator, CSOs with members in the NSC can submit proposals.

Country Programme Strategy

39. Before any grant-making or other programme activities may take place, each SGP participating country must have an approved Country Programme Strategy or Sub-regional Programme Strategy (abbreviated here to **CPS**). The development/revision of the CPS is designed to ensure congruence with the SGP Project Document for the relevant Operational Phase; the strategic planning frameworks associated with the relevant Rio Conventions;⁵⁴ as well as with the GEF National Portfolio Formulation Exercise (NPFE) where relevant.

⁵⁴ These include the GEF National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) process; the CBD National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs); the UNFCCC National Communications; the UNCCD National Actions Programmes (NAPs); and the Stockholm Convention National Implementation Plans (NIPs).

40. For Upgrading Country Programmes, a standard UNDP-GEF Project Document is produced that reflects the Country Program strategy that is broadly coherent with the SGP Global strategic initiatives announced at the commencement of each Operational Phase. The Project Document is formulated after approval of the corresponding PIF and is approved by UNDP and the GEF CEO as per standard GEF and UNDP procedures. In the development of the Project Document, the same multistakeholder, participatory approach is followed as that of Country Program Strategy development.
41. For new SGP Country Programmes, the development of a CPS is one of the first tasks to be undertaken by the NC and newly-formed NSC. In both new and continuing SGP Country Programmes, it is important to involve key stakeholders in the CPS revision/elaboration process, and to fully engage and involve the NSC. In this regard, the CPS may be considered a living document, and shall be revised or updated in every operational phase of SGP, or as deemed necessary by the NSC, to align country programme priorities with GEF policies and priorities, and those included in the relevant SGP Project Document.
42. As described in the CPS Guidance framework, the development or revision of the CPS serves several broad purposes to:
 - ✓ Identify the national circumstances and priorities of the country vis-à-vis the Project Document for the relevant Operational Phase;
 - ✓ Provide stakeholders with a framework document to understand the priorities for SGP funding for strengthened country relevance and ownership;
 - ✓ Provide a strategic framework for allocating resources, especially selection of SGP projects, through a bio-geographic and/or thematic focus;
 - ✓ Serve as the framework for Country Programme operations and guiding programme implementation;
 - ✓ Constitute the basis for the assessment of country programme achievements and impact.
43. The development/revision of the CPS (or UCP Project Document) should be undertaken as a participatory process that engages the full range of non-governmental and government stakeholders in the country. The CPS preparation should be seen not only as a document to satisfy global programmatic requirements, but as a country-led process which has value in its own right. The key players in the process are the NC (who facilitates the process, and is responsible for the majority of the drafting), and the NSC (which provides input and guidance throughout the process, and endorses the end product).
44. The CPS should contain: (a) background situation of the country which the SGP country programme has to consider; (b) key objectives vis-a-vis the country situation and the objectives of the global SGP Prodoc for the operational phase; (c) geographic (with maps) and/or thematic focal areas; (d) priority activities to be supported by grantmaking; and (e) expected outcomes, indicators, and M&E plan. For formulation of a UCP Project Document (ProDoc), the standard UNDP-GEF format is followed.
45. Recommended steps to developing the CPS or ProDoc are as follows:
 - ✓ NC prepares an initial CPS or ProDoc draft for consultation with the NSC based on the current SGP Project Document or the approved PIF in the case of UCPs;
 - ✓ Wide stakeholder consultations held with key CSO, government, academic and other concerned parties to discuss relevant issues (where possible, these consultations to be linked to the National Portfolio Formulation Exercise (NPFE) of the GEF in the country);
 - ✓ Incorporation of stakeholder inputs into the draft CPS or ProDoc by the NC, and initial approval of the document by the NSC;
 - ✓ Submission of the draft CPS to the CPMT Regional Focal Point for comment and review; draft ProDoc submitted to the UCP Global Coordinator for comment and review;
 - ✓ Further CPS or ProDoc revision as necessary based on comments and recommendations by the CPMT or UCP Global Coordinator, respectively;
 - ✓ Submission of the revised CPS or ProDoc by the NC for formal endorsement by the NSC;

- ✓ Final approval of the endorsed CPS by the SGP Global Manager, or delegated CPMT Regional Focal Point; final approval of the endorsed ProDoc by the UCP Global Coordinator and submission to the GEF for CEO Endorsement and to UNDP for approval;
- ✓ Posting and circulation of the final version of the CPS as a public document; posting of ProDoc on GEF Website.

Country Operating Budget

46. The Country Operating Budget or Sub-regional Operating Budget (abbreviated here to COB) is the financial provision for country, or sub-regional, programme implementation. The COB is prepared by the NC, and reviewed and approved by the CPMT and UNOPS. The COB should allow the effective operation of the country or sub-regional programme in implementing activities in support of the objectives of the Project Document, as well as to be responsive to specific country circumstances and needs, as reflected in the CPS. In countries where a NHI hosts the SGP, the COB is generally covered by the terms of the contract for services between the organization and UNOPS. The COB process and related guidelines are highlighted in detail in the UNOPS SGP SOPs.
47. The budget for operations of Upscaling Country Programmes is approved as part of the Project Document and is subject to revision on an annual basis along with approval of Annual Work Plans and requests for annual Authorized Spending Limits. UNOPS, as executing agency, manages the budget in direct contact with the National Coordinator and in collaboration with the relevant UNDP Country Office.

PART III IMPLEMENTATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF SGP GRANTS

SGP grants and project cycle

48. Each SGP Country Programme should, after adopting or revising its CPS or Project Document, prepare and issue an SGP programme announcement. Information in the call for proposals should clearly state that the SGP makes grants to eligible CSOs⁵⁵, or to individuals, as in the case of fellowships, with priority for the poor and vulnerable in the GEF focal areas, with a maximum grant amount for a project of US\$50,000⁵⁶. The subsequent process of developing an SGP grant project should then take place in a transparent manner covering the: (i) project preparation guidelines setting forth the eligibility criteria; (ii) application/proposal review process and calendar; (iii) formats for project concept and proposal development, and; (iv) co-financing requirements in cash and/or in-kind.
49. Project concepts from eligible CSOs may be screened by the NC or jointly with the NSC. Each country programme should determine which screening modality it will follow, and periodically review this decision to make sure that the modality chosen is working well. In both cases, project concept selection should be done on the basis of established eligibility and selection criteria in accordance with the CPS or UCP Project Document. At the very least, project concepts should be relevant to one or several of

55 The term civil society organization (CSO) herein refers to the definition of major groups agreed by Governments at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992 to include non-governmental organizations (NGOs), farmers, women, the scientific and technological community, youth and children, indigenous peoples and their communities, business and industry, workers and trade unions and local authorities. For SGP, their eligibility for grants follows the practice of the GEF (for the purpose of CSOs attending/observing Council meetings) which defines them as ‘non-profit organizations’. Local authorities shall include traditional or indigenous governance units and their proposals to be eligible should refer to meeting the needs of communities under their jurisdiction. Furthermore, international NGOs and for-profit business and industry groups are not directly eligible for SGP support, but may co-finance the Programme’s grant projects. Priority grant-making should also be directed at grassroots groups such as community-based organizations (CBOs), indigenous peoples, farmers, women, youth and children, and workers. Those that are especially vulnerable because of poverty, social exclusion, or disability should also be provided priority.

56 The SGP Country Programme could provide grants above this maximum amount for “Strategic Grants” that can be up to \$150,000 under a special provision for this category of grants and following guidance from CPMT or the Global UCP Coordinator as relevant.

the GEF focal areas and reflect the needs of the community or communities and/or stakeholders that would be involved. Once the concepts have been selected, the proponent organizations will be notified of this decision and asked to develop complete project proposals.

50. It is critical for all project proposals to meet the GEF and SGP criteria. While it is an important part of the NC responsibilities to assist CSOs in proposal development, sometimes additional assistance is nonetheless required. In such cases, two options may be considered: (i) a local consultant may be hired or a capable “assisting NGO” may be contacted to help the CSO/CBO/communities according to terms of reference that the NC elaborates in coordination with the proponent organization; and (ii) the SGP planning grant modality may be used.
51. In support of regional or global scaling up, mainstreaming, replication, and broader adoption of SGP successes and lessons learned, as well as to leverage resources and utilize strategic opportunities at these levels, grants for regional or global initiatives⁵⁷ can be provided. For the Global SGP, guidance for proactive or responsive modalities as well as procedures for this will come from the SGP CPMT in consultation with involved SGP Country Programmes and/or relevant Programme stakeholders and partners.

Planning Grants

52. The NC or NSC may authorize planning grants⁵⁸ once project concepts have been selected. CSOs such as CBOs, indigenous peoples’ organisations and communities with little experience in project design and management receive priority to benefit from this assistance. Hence, the planning grant has an important capacity-building function which in itself is an important SGP objective. The NC makes recommendations to the NSC about which proponent organizations would require a planning grant.
53. A planning grant can be used by an eligible CSO to organize stakeholder workshops or meetings to design the project in a participatory manner. The planning grant can be used to contract an experienced NGO or local consultant to work with the project proponents to elaborate the project, to undertake baseline assessments, develop a business plan (for projects with strong sustainable livelihood elements), and through learning-by-doing, build capacity in proposal design including the development of indicators and a monitoring and evaluation plan.
54. Administratively, a planning grant is a grant like any other SGP grant, and therefore can only be made to eligible CSOs. The project document for the planning grant specifies the activities to be undertaken, and the responsibilities of the parties concerned. The NSC generally approves the planning grant, although the NSC can in certain instances also delegate approval to the NC for certain exceptional cases (e.g. time-sensitive activities, smaller amounts). The process follows the modus operandi of SGP facilitative grant-making and is explained in detail in the UNOPS SGP SOPs.

Project proposals

55. SGP provides grants to support activities that help achieve the programme objectives outlined in the CPS and the global SGP project document or the UCP Project Document for the Operational Phase. In terms of helping achieve global environmental benefits, the SGP’s starting point is to ensure that each project proposal fits the GEF criteria and that each proposal clearly articulates how project objectives and activities would have a positive effect in the relevant GEF focal areas. To create sustainability and impact beyond the project, SGP projects can combine demonstration, capacity-building, network building, awareness raising, and dissemination of lessons learned as integral

⁵⁷ The allocated funds for this should not exceed 10% of the available GEF global core grant allocation for an operational phase.

⁵⁸ Planning grants are usually in the range of \$2,000 to \$5,000 depending on the capacity of the proponent and additional work that has to be done. The NSC should decide how to make the provision of planning grants in the most facilitative way such as allowing the NC to make planning grant decisions and reporting on these in NSC meetings.

components. Given this comprehensive approach, while a logical framework is not formally required, it would be advisable to include a Monitoring and Evaluation work plan in each proposal (see SGP M&E Framework).

56. As a demand-driven programme, SGP projects endeavour to address both the GEF criteria, as well as community needs and initiatives. The SGP usually works with communities and localities that confront a multitude of social and economic development problems that impact on concerns related to global environmental conventions. For SGP interventions to have relevance and utility at the community level, these non-GEF circumstances are taken into account in project design. A key guiding philosophy of the programme has been to reach the marginalized poor and vulnerable communities, especially when there are no other donors present, and where development baseline conditions have not been met. Typically, the SGP will therefore need to mobilize additional resources to help provide the co-financing, technical assistance, capacity-building, gender training, income-generation component, or whatever non-GEF element may be necessary for a project's success. These project components are vital to achieving local acceptance, ownership, and sustainability of SGP interventions.

Funds disbursement

57. The maximum amount for an SGP grant is \$50,000 per project.⁵⁹ In special cases, grants for "strategic projects" that consolidate efforts of several communities and CSOs could be provided at a maximum of \$150,000. SGP grants generally only cover a portion of project costs, with other components provided by the CSO partner, the community itself, or by other donors. Since SGP grants fund activities that are directly relevant to the GEF criteria, co-financing must be sought for community baseline or sustainable development needs. However, since it would be unrealistic to require a baseline/incremental cost exercise for each individual project, each country should instead endeavour to mobilize enough funding in cash or in kind to "match" the GEF country grant allocation⁶⁰.
58. Once the NSC has approved a project for SGP funding support, a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) is signed on behalf of UNOPS between the grantee and the UNDP CO. SGP projects normally have a duration of between one and three years. The amounts and schedules may differ, contingent upon the nature and length of project activities, but in no case should the first disbursement be more than 50% of the total project grant amount (except when justified and prior approval from UNOPS has been received). The MOA and grant disbursement process, the applicable templates, and all related guidelines are found in detail in the UNOPS SGP SOPs.
59. A grantee may submit another proposal upon successful completion of an initial project but no grantee can receive funds exceeding US\$50,000 in a given operational phase. Any grantee which has received the maximum \$50,000 in one Operational Phase, may however submit another funding request in the following Operational Phase if the evaluation of project outcomes are positive. .

PART IV REPORTING AND COMMUNICATIONS

60. The NC has lead responsibility for communications between the Country Programme and the CPMT or UCP Global Coordinator. In general, the NC reports on substantive and technical matters to the CPMT or UCP Global Coordinator, and on administrative and financial issues to the UNOPS portfolio manager. The NC should keep the UNDP CO informed of progress in programme implementation, usually through the RR and SGP focal point in the UNDP CO. In particular, the NC and PA are expected to maintain a close working relationship with the UNDP CO regarding the COB and grants

⁵⁹ In many cases, it may however be advisable to provide smaller initial amounts when the grantee-partners have lower implementation capacity.

⁶⁰The matching of GEF funds with co-financing is finally reckoned at the global programme level so as not to disadvantage new country programmes or those in difficult situations.

disbursements which serves to keep the UNDP abreast of SGP developments.⁶¹ The NC should also endeavour to share relevant SGP reports with the GEF Operational and Political Focal Points as well as global environmental convention focal points.

61. Communications among Country Programmes are facilitated through the global, regional, and sub-regional list servers, the SGP global database and workspace, and the SGP website. Recurring global reporting requirements, such as annual reports, are complemented by periodic requests by the CPMT, UCP Global Coordinator and/or UNOPS for information on specific subjects, such as reports under preparation for the GEF Council, or for the relevant global environmental conventions. Full guidance on all project and programme reporting is provided in the SGP Monitoring & Evaluation Framework.
62. SGP country teams are responsible for entering detailed information for all prior and current Operational Phases into the SGP database, including the upload of grant project MOAs. Since the database is the foundation for all reporting and communications at the global level, it is imperative that NCs and PAs input the database as soon as projects are approved by the NSC, and keep it regularly updated on the progress of projects. The SGP database and website also includes visual documentation of SGP projects and Country Programmes, accounts of lessons learned, and case studies. Project briefs should be stored in the files of every project for easy use and sharing.
63. The NC is required to report on technical and substantive project and programme progress through the Annual Country Report (GEF Project Implementation Review for UCPs). The ACR complements the information that is entered in the SGP database and should cover progress in meeting the year's deliverables as well as other important information including: (i) assessment of the overall progress for the country programme portfolio; (ii) results of project monitoring and evaluation; (iii) key outcomes of SGP-sponsored events; (iv) progress in strengthening working relationships with CSOs, as well as with government agencies and donors; (v) results of resource mobilization efforts; (vi) development of SGP visibility as a GEF programme and activities to share lessons learned and influence policy; and (vii) any special challenges and difficulties faced.
64. The NC shall take all necessary measures to ensure the visibility of the GEF financing. Such measures shall be in accordance with the need to give adequate publicity to the action being implemented as well as to the support from the GEF. A communication and visibility plan shall be outlined in each project document. This should include, *inter alia*, the compulsory use of the GEF logo on all material, publications, leaflets, brochures and newsletters, websites, business cards, signage, vehicles, supplies and equipment, display panels, commemorative plaques, banners, promotional items, photographs, audiovisual productions, public events and visits and information campaigns. The plan should also include press releases, press conferences and press visits to project sites.
65. The Programme Review is an overall assessment of the Country Programme performance to be undertaken by the NC and the NSC, in consultation with SGP grantees and other stakeholders, at the completion of an SGP Operational Phase. The purpose of the Programme Review is to assess the cumulative progress of the Country Programme in a particular Operational Phase and provide strategic recommendations on the direction for the programme in the next Operational Phase. Once finalized, the Programme Review should be shared by the SGP country team with the country GEF Operational and Political Focal Points and also the relevant Rio Convention focal points.
66. Audits of SGP Country Programmes will be conducted in accordance with the internationally accepted auditing standards, and applicable financial rules and regulations. The SGP audit exercises are designed to improve the transparency, accountability and quality of SGP country and global operations. The audits will cover management, financial, and administrative issues as they relate to the country programme as a whole, and will not normally include provisions for project-level inspection.

⁶¹ SGP Country Programmes are required to monitor the funds (grants and COB amounts) and expenditures allocated to them. Reporting tools and relevant guidelines are provided by the UNOPS SGP SOPs.

The principles and processes governing SGP audit operations can be found in the UNOPS SGP SOPs.

Annex B. Small Grants Programme Roles and Responsibilities

[Small Grant Programme Roles and Responsibilities](#)

Annex C. Social and Environmental Screening Template

The completed template, which constitutes the Social and Environmental Screening Report, must be included as an annex to the Project Document. Please refer to the [Social and Environmental Screening Procedure](#) for guidance on how to answer the 6 questions.]

Project Information

Project Information	
1. Project Title	Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme (GEF/SGP OP6)
2. Project Number	Tbd
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Global

Part A. Integrating Overarching Principles to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability

QUESTION 1: How Does the Project Integrate the Overarching Principles in order to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?

Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams the human-rights based approach

The global GEF Small Grants Programme, which will be active in 111 countries worldwide during its 6th Operational Phase (2015-2018), provides up to USD 50,000 in funding and technical assistance to civil society and community organizations for design and implementation of projects. Grant projects are developed by CSOs and CBOs themselves in a demand driven manner, and responding to their own objectives, while being consistent with the overall SGP Country Programme Strategy elaborated in each country through a multi-stakeholder consultative process. Within OP6, SGP grant-making will be further focused within selected priority landscape/seascape conservation areas, in order to meet strategic objectives identified in a participatory manner with CSOs and communities in these areas. Sustainable use of environment and natural resources is a key principle, along with efforts to ensure social sustainability of approaches that are piloted and applied by communities. Experts specializing in the key focal areas, such as biodiversity, climate change, sustainable land and forest management, international waters and chemicals are represented in the SGP National Steering Committees in countries. Prior to and during the implementation of grant projects, CSOs and CBOs receive training on project implementation, monitoring and adaptive management methods and tools. In line with SGP's operational guidelines and its OP6 project document, grant funding and technical support are preferentially provided to poor and marginalized groups in the landscapes it works in. One of the criteria for selection of landscapes/seascapes, in addition to their environmental characteristics and potential for multiple benefits, will include the presence of poor and vulnerable communities. These communities will be involved in the design of landscape strategies and management plans and will design and choose the projects they wish to implement as part of these strategies. These communities will also participate in landscape governance initiatives aimed at empowering them to take collective action in regulating resource use with the aim of achieving social and ecological resilience. The SGP operational guidelines clearly lay out the SGP principles with regard to community and civil society ownership, country drivenness, and transparency. A Grievance mechanisms are available both locally at country level as well as at the global level directly through CPMT and the GEF.

Briefly describe in the space below how the Project is likely to improve gender equality and women's empowerment

Gender will be considered throughout the design and implementation of activities within SGP’s 6th operational phase. Building on its past experience in promoting gender mainstreaming and gender empowerment, SGP will prioritize work with women’s groups, particularly those involving poorer and more vulnerable women. The SGP Central Programme Management Team (CPMT) will continue to issue gender mainstreaming guidance, and gender checklists which will be used by National Steering Committees at project approval stage. CPMT will also monitor gender mainstreaming by country programmes on an annual basis as part of its Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) preparation. SGP Country Programme teams during the elaboration of their Country Programme Strategies (CPS), will formulate a specific strategy to mainstream gender approaches, and engage women as primary actors in landscape and resource management and micro and small enterprise development. Each SGP Country programme will annually review gender mainstreaming within its projects as part of its Annual Country Review (ACR) process.

In OP6 SGP will focus grantmaking within more defined landscape and seascape areas. As part of the landscape/seascape selection and strategy formulation process, consultations with community groups and NGOs will take place in ways that ensure women’s comfortable participation, depending on their preference for mixed or separate groups, and specific to the context and issues of women within these landscapes.

SGP requires each National Steering Committee (NSC) to have a designated Gender focal point responsible for screening selected grant projects in terms of their gender considerations and to ensure women’s participation during implementation. During OP6 the role of the Gender focal point will be further enhanced and targeted training will be developed to train and orient NSC members, grantees and SGP staff on gender issues. Women led and Gender-sensitive NGOs will also be engaged where required to support involvement of women/girls groups in defining grant project objectives and designing grant project activities.

Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams environmental sustainability

The premise of the GEF Small Grants Programme is that communities will adopt environmentally sustainable practices if they do not imply additional costs or risks to their current production and livelihood systems. The SGP finances community organizations to design and implement sustainable development projects that produce global environmental benefits while also supporting local development and sustainable livelihoods.

Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks

<p>QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?⁶² <i>Note: Describe briefly potential social and environmental risks identified in Attachment 1 – Risk Screening Checklist (based on any “Yes” responses). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Questions 5 and 6 not required for Low Risk Projects</i></p>	<p>QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i></p>	<p>QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?</p>		
<p>Risk Description</p>	<p>Impact and Probability (1-5)</p>	<p>Significance</p>	<p>Comments</p>	<p>Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required</p>

62 SGP by its design provides small grant funding directly to communities to undertake priority actions for environment and sustainable development. As such the potential for

		(Low, Moderate, High)		<i>note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.</i>
Risk 1: Project may potentially reproduce discriminations against women based on gender	I = 2 P = 1	Low		Project will prioritize work with women's groups, particularly poorer and more vulnerable women, as well as girls' groups; team will formulate strategy to engage women/girls groups as primary actors in landscape and resource management and micro and small enterprise development. All GEF SGP proposals are reviewed and approved by a National Steering Committee comprised of experts in different fields, including a gender focal point.
Risk 2: Project activities within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas	I = 1 P = 1	Low	Note: the scale of GEF Small Grants projects is small with the average funding around USD 22,000. A small number of projects taking place within or adjacent to critical habitats or sensitive areas will be designed and implemented based on successful experience and lessons learned from previous SGP phases.	All GEF SGP proposals are reviewed and approved by a National Steering Committee (NSC) comprised of experts in different fields, including biodiversity conservation, ecosystem service, sustainable resource management, and others. Project implementation is monitored by the SGP Country programme team, as well as NSC members who often accompany monitoring visits. Expert NGOs may be contracted to provide an additional layer of technical assistance and support.
Risk 3: harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation	I = 2 P = 1	Low	Note: the scale of GEF Small Grants projects is small with the average funding around USD 22,000. A small number of sustainable forest management projects will be financed based on successful experience and lessons learned from previous SGP phases.	All GEF SGP proposals are reviewed and approved by a National Steering Committee (NSC) comprised of experts in different fields, including biodiversity conservation, ecosystem service, sustainable resource management, and others. Project implementation is monitored by the Country programme team, as well as NSC members who often accompany monitoring visits. Expert NGOs may be contracted to provide an additional layer of technical assistance and support.
Risk 4: Production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species?	I = 1 P = 2	Low	Note: the scale of GEF Small Grants projects is small with the average funding around USD 22,000. A small number of aquaculture projects will be financed based on successful	All GEF SGP proposals are reviewed and approved by a National Steering Committee (NSC) comprised of experts in different fields, including biodiversity conservation, ecosystem service, sustainable resource management, and others. Project implementation is monitored by the Country programme team, as well as NSC members who often

environmental or social risks is low. However, each Country Programme Strategy will include identification of risks, including potential social and environmental risks as well as identification of possible mitigation measures.

			experience and lessons learned from previous SGP phases.	accompany monitoring visits. Expert NGOs may be contracted to provide an additional layer of technical assistance and support.
Risk 5: Significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water	I = 1 P = 1	Low	Note: the scale of GEF Small Grants projects is small with the average funding around USD 22,000. A small number of land and water management projects will be designed and implemented based on successful experience and lessons learned from previous SGP phases.	All GEF SGP proposals are reviewed and approved by a National Steering Committee (NSC) comprised of experts in different fields, including biodiversity conservation, ecosystem service, sustainable resource management, and others. Project implementation is monitored by the Country programme team, as well as NSC members who often accompany monitoring visits. Expert NGOs may be contracted to provide an additional layer of technical assistance and support.
Risk 6: Utilization of genetic resources (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)	I = 1 P = 2	Low	Note: the scale of GEF Small Grants projects is small with the average funding around USD 22,000. A small number of plant genetic resources projects will be designed and implemented based on successful experience and lessons learned from previous SGP phases.	All GEF SGP proposals are reviewed and approved by a National Steering Committee (NSC) comprised of experts in different fields, including biodiversity conservation, ecosystem service, sustainable resource management, and others. Project implementation is monitored by the Country programme team, as well as NSC members who often accompany monitoring visits. Expert NGOs may be contracted to provide an additional layer of technical assistance and support.
Risk 7: A progressively drier and warmer climate may enhance the possibility of catastrophic weather events in part due to potentially increased frequency and intensity of rainfall in mountain ecosystems.	I = 2 P = 2	Low		The risk of climate change is one of several reasons that the project has chosen to emphasize landscape-level management and coordination in productive landscapes. The project will promote a variety of adaptive biodiversity and land resource planning and management actions in forests, pastures and other agroecosystems. The project will build on SGP's experience with the Community Based Adaptation (CBA) project which has piloted and tested approaches to enable communities to adapt to climate impacts and to build resilience and enhance food security. These lessons will be assessed and more broadly adopted within SGP programming in OP6.
	QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?			
	Select one (see <u>SESP</u> for guidance)		Comments	
	<i>Low Risk</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Project categorized as Low Risk based on risk screening and SGP monitoring systems.	
	<i>Moderate Risk</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	<i>High Risk</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?		
Check all that apply ⁶³		Comments
<i>Principle 1: Human Rights</i>		
<i>Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</i>		See the second section under Question 1.
<i>1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management</i>		The SGP expressly finances projects to conserve and use biodiversity sustainably. As part of project preparation, consistency of activities with biodiversity standards will be ensured. The SGP National Steering Committees possess high level biodiversity conservation expertise in their membership; the NSCs review all proposals for eligibility. Proposals are approved for funding if found eligible. In some cases planning grants are approved where a project proposal has merit but needs to be further studied in order to clarify and elaborate its approach. SGP is standardizing review criteria in OP6, in order to ensure quality assurance and to screen any potential specific biodiversity-related risks at individual project level.
<i>2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</i>		Project promotes adaptive biodiversity and landscape-level resource planning/management to counter potential effects of climate change. The SGP National Steering Committees possess high level climate change expertise in their membership; the NSCs review all proposals for eligibility. Proposals are approved for funding if found eligible. In some cases planning grants are approved where a project proposal has merit but needs to be further studied in order to clarify and elaborate its approach. SGP is standardizing review criteria in OP6, in order to ensure quality assurance and to screen any potential specific climate –related risks at individual project level.
<i>3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions</i>		
<i>4. Cultural Heritage</i>		
<i>5. Displacement and Resettlement</i>		
<i>6. Indigenous Peoples</i>		SGP prioritizes work with indigenous peoples' organizations, with the aim to empower and build capacity of such groups,

63 The applicability of Standards at global level does not need to be specified for Low Risk rating. Risk based applicability would be determined at individual project level.

		and to help them to protect traditional knowledge especially regarding environmental and natural resource management issues. In OP6 SGP will continue to prioritize grants for indigenous peoples' organizations as relevant within SGP Country Programme Strategies (CPS) and within selected landscape/seascape conservation areas. SGP will also support a small number of IP Fellowships at the global level to help build capacity of indigenous leaders and to support them in addressing their community's social and environmental needs and objectives. SGP is standardizing review criteria in OP6, in order to ensure quality assurance and to screen any potential specific risks related to indigenous peoples at individual project level.
	7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency	.

Final Sign Off

<i>Signature</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
QA Assessor – Delfin Ganapin		UNDP staff member responsible for the Project, typically a UNDP Programme Officer. Final signature confirms they have “checked” to ensure that the SESP is adequately conducted.
QA Approver – Stephen Gold		UNDP senior manager, typically the UNDP Deputy Country Director (DCD), Country Director (CD), Deputy Resident Representative (DRR), or Resident Representative (RR). The QA Approver cannot also be the QA Assessor. Final signature confirms they have “cleared” the SESP prior to submittal to the PAC.
PAC Chair		UNDP chair of the PAC. In some cases PAC Chair may also be the QA Approver. Final signature confirms that the SESP was considered as part of the project appraisal and considered in recommendations of the PAC.

SESP Attachment 1. Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist

Checklist Potential Social and Environmental Risks		
Principles 1: Human Rights		Answer (Yes/No)
1.	Could the Project lead to adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups?	No
2.	Is there a likelihood that the Project would have inequitable or discriminatory adverse impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups? ⁶⁴	No
3.	Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups?	No
4.	Is there a likelihood that the Project would exclude any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups, from fully participating in decisions that may affect them?	No
5.	Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project?	No
6.	Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	No
7.	Have local communities or individuals, given the opportunity, raised human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process?	No
8.	Is there a risk that the Project would exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals?	No
Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment		
1.	Is there a likelihood that the proposed Project would have adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls?	No
2.	Would the Project potentially reproduce discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits?	No
3.	Have women's groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process and has this been included in the overall Project proposal and in the risk assessment?	No
4.	Would the Project potentially limit women's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services? <i>For example, activities that could lead to natural resources degradation or depletion in communities who depend on these resources for their livelihoods and well being</i>	No
Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability: Screening questions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below		
Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management		
1.1	Would the Project potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services? <i>For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes</i>	No
1.2	Are any Project activities proposed within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities?	Yes
1.3	Does the Project involve changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods? (Note: if restrictions and/or limitations of access to lands would apply, refer to Standard 5)	No
1.4	Would Project activities pose risks to endangered species?	No
1.5	Would the Project pose a risk of introducing invasive alien species?	No

64 Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, gender, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, religion, political or other opinion, national or social or geographical origin, property, birth or other status including as an indigenous person or as a member of a minority. References to "women and men" or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated against based on their gender identities, such as transgender people and transsexuals.

1.6	Does the Project involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation?	Yes
1.7	Does the Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species?	Yes
1.8	Does the Project involve significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water? <i>For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction</i>	No
1.9	Does the Project involve utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)	Yes
1.10	Would the Project generate potential adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns?	No
1.11	Would the Project result in secondary or consequential development activities which could lead to adverse social and environmental effects, or would it generate cumulative impacts with other known existing or planned activities in the area? <i>For example, a new road through forested lands will generate direct environmental and social impacts (e.g. felling of trees, earthworks, potential relocation of inhabitants). The new road may also facilitate encroachment on lands by illegal settlers or generate unplanned commercial development along the route, potentially in sensitive areas. These are indirect, secondary, or induced impacts that need to be considered. Also, if similar developments in the same forested area are planned, then cumulative impacts of multiple activities (even if not part of the same Project) need to be considered.</i>	No
Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation		
2.1	Will the proposed Project result in significant ⁶⁵ greenhouse gas emissions or may exacerbate climate change?	No
2.2	Would the potential outcomes of the Project be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change?	Yes
2.3	Is the proposed Project likely to directly or indirectly increase social and environmental vulnerability to climate change now or in the future (also known as maladaptive practices)? <i>For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population's vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding</i>	No
Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions		
3.1	Would elements of Project construction, operation, or decommissioning pose potential safety risks to local communities?	No
3.2	Would the Project pose potential risks to community health and safety due to the transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)?	No
3.3	Does the Project involve large-scale infrastructure development (e.g. dams, roads, buildings)?	No
3.4	Would failure of structural elements of the Project pose risks to communities? (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)	No
3.5	Would the proposed Project be susceptible to or lead to increased vulnerability to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding or extreme climatic conditions?	No
3.6	Would the Project result in potential increased health risks (e.g. from water-borne or other vector-borne diseases or communicable infections such as HIV/AIDS)?	No
3.7	Does the Project pose potential risks and vulnerabilities related to occupational health and safety due to physical, chemical, biological, and radiological hazards during Project construction, operation, or decommissioning?	No
3.8	Does the Project involve support for employment or livelihoods that may fail to comply with national and international labor standards (i.e. principles and standards of ILO fundamental conventions)?	No
3.9	Does the Project engage security personnel that may pose a potential risk to health and safety of communities and/or individuals (e.g. due to a lack of adequate training or accountability)?	No
Standard 4: Cultural Heritage		

65 In regards to CO₂, 'significant emissions' corresponds generally to more than 25,000 tons per year (from both direct and indirect sources). [The Guidance Note on Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation provides additional information on GHG emissions.]

4.1	Will the proposed Project result in interventions that would potentially adversely impact sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: Projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts)	No
4.2	Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes?	No
Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement		
5.1	Would the Project potentially involve temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement?	No
5.2	Would the Project possibly result in economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)?	No
5.3	Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions? ⁶⁶	No
5.4	Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?	No
Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples		
6.1	Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)?	Yes
6.2	Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	Yes
6.3	Would the proposed Project potentially affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the Project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)? <i>If the answer to the screening question 6.3 is “yes” the potential risk impacts are considered potentially severe and/or critical and the Project would be categorized as either Moderate or High Risk.</i>	No
6.4	Has there been an absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned?	No
6.5	Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No
6.6	Is there a potential for forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources?	No
6.7	Would the Project adversely affect the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them?	No
6.8	Would the Project potentially affect the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples?	No
6.9	Would the Project potentially affect the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices?	No
Standard 7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency		
7.1	Would the Project potentially result in the release of pollutants to the environment due to routine or non-routine circumstances with the potential for adverse local, regional, and/or transboundary impacts?	No
7.2	Would the proposed Project potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)?	No
7.3	Will the proposed Project potentially involve the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous chemicals and/or materials? Does the Project propose use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs? <i>For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Stockholm Conventions on Persistent Organic Pollutants or the Montreal Protocol</i>	No

66 Forced evictions include acts and/or omissions involving the coerced or involuntary displacement of individuals, groups, or communities from homes and/or lands and common property resources that were occupied or depended upon, thus eliminating the ability of an individual, group, or community to reside or work in a particular dwelling, residence, or location without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protections.

7.4	Will the proposed Project involve the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health?	No
7.5	Does the Project include activities that require significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water?	No

Annex D. GEF CEO Endorsement Letter



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

Naoko Ishii
CEO and Chairperson

July 09, 2015

Ms. Adriana Dinu
GEF Executive Coordinator
United Nations Development Programme
One United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017

Dear Ms. Dinu:

I am pleased to inform you that I have endorsed the full-sized project proposal detailed below:

Decision Sought:	CEO Endorsement of Full-sized Project
GEFSEC ID:	6931
Agency(ies):	UNDP
Agency ID:	5475 (UNDP)
Focal Area:	Multi Focal Area
Project Type:	Full Size Project
Country(ies):	Global
Name of Project:	GEF Small Grants Programme - Sixth Operational Phase (Part I)
GEF Project Grant:	\$67,307,692
Agency Fee:	\$2,692,308
Funding Source:	GEF Trust Fund

Break-down of Indicative Agency Fee				
Agency	Trust Fund	Fees committed at Council Approval	Fees to be committed at CEO Endorsement	Total (US\$)
UNDP	GET	\$1,076,923	\$1,615,385	\$2,692,308

I am endorsing this project on the understanding that the GEF Agency will have its internal approval of the project no later than four months after the CEO endorsement.

This endorsement is subject to the comments made by the GEF Secretariat in the attached document. It is also based on the understanding that the project is in conformity with GEF focal areas strategies and in line with GEF policies and procedures.

Sincerely,

Naoko Ishii
Chief Executive Officer and Chairperson

Attachment: GEFSEC Project Review Document
Copy to: Country Operational Focal Point, GEF Agencies, STAP, Trustee

1818 H Street, NW • Washington, DC 20433 • USA
Tel: +1 (202) 473 3202 - Fax: +1 (202) 522 3240
E-mail: gefoeo@thegef.org
www.thegef.org

Annex E. List of countries

Country	Grant making year started	LDC	SIDS	Country	Grant making year started	LDC	SIDS
Afghanistan	2013	LDC		Lesotho	2008	LDC	
Albania	1999			Liberia	2009	LDC	
Algeria	2012			Macedonia	2006		
Antigua & Barbuda	2013		SIDS	Madagascar	2008	LDC	
Argentina	2006			Malawi	2009	LDC	
Armenia	2009			Malaysia	2001		
Bahamas	2011		SIDS	Maldives	2010		SIDS
Barbados	2012		SIDS	Mali	1994	LDC	
Belarus	2006			Marshall Islands	2014		SIDS
Belize	1993		SIDS	Mauritania	2002	LDC	
Benin	2007	LDC		Mauritius	1996		SIDS
Bhutan	1999	LDC		Moldova	2013		
Botswana	1993			Mongolia	2003		
Burkina Faso	1994	LDC		Morocco	2000		
Burundi	2010	LDC		Mozambique	2005	LDC	
Cambodia	2005	LDC		Namibia	2003		
Cameroon	2007			Nepal	1998	LDC	
Cape Verde	2010		SIDS	Nicaragua	2004		
Central African Republic	2010	LDC		Niger	2004	LDC	
Chad	2007	LDC		Nigeria	2009		
China	2010			Palau	2014		SIDS
Colombia	2015			Palestinian Authority	1999		
Comoros	2007	LDC	SIDS	Panama	2007		
Congo (Brazzaville)	start-up			Papua New Guinea	1994		SIDS
Congo, DR	2010	LDC		Paraguay	2011		
Cote d'Ivoire	1993			Rwanda	2006	LDC	
Cuba	2005		SIDS	Samoa sub-region-Cook Islands	2005		SIDS
Djibouti	2014	LDC		Samoa sub-region-Niue	2005		SIDS
Dominica	1995		SIDS	Samoa sub-region-Samoa	2005		SIDS
Dominican Republic	1994		SIDS	Samoa sub-region-Tokelau	2005		

EI Salvador	2003			Senegal	1994	LDC	
Eritrea	2009	LDC		Seychelles	2010		SIDS
Ethiopia	2006	LDC		Sierra Leone	2013	LDC	
Federated States of Micronesia	2005		SIDS	Solomon Islands	2009	LDC	SIDS
Fiji sub-region- Fiji	2005		SIDS	South Africa	2003		
Fiji sub-region -Kiribati	2005	LDC	SIDS	St. Kitts and Nevis	2014		SIDS
Fiji sub-region -Nauru	2005		SIDS	St. Lucia	2012		SIDS
Fiji sub-region -Tonga	2005		SIDS	St. Vincent & the Grenadines	2014		SIDS
Fiji sub-region -Tuvalu	2005	LDC	SIDS	Suriname	1997		SIDS
Gambia	2009	LDC		Tajikistan	2010		
Georgia	2013			Tanzania	1997	LDC	
Ghana	1993			Timor-Leste	2013	LDC	SIDS
Grenada	2013		SIDS	Togo	2010	LDC	
Guatemala	1997			Trinidad & Tobago	1995		SIDS
Guinea Bissau	2011	LDC	SIDS	Tunisia	1993		
Guinea-Conakry	2010	LDC		Turkey	1993		
Guyana	2013		SIDS	Uganda	1998	LDC	
Haiti	2008	LDC	SIDS	Ukraine	2010		
Honduras	2002			Uruguay	2006		
Iran	2001			Uzbekistan	2008		
Jamaica	2005		SIDS	Vanuatu	2008	LDC	SIDS
Jordan	1993			Venezuela	2010		
Kyrgyzstan	2002			Vietnam	1999		
Lao PDR	2009	LDC		Yemen	2006	LDC	
Lebanon	2006			Zambia	2008	LDC	
				Zimbabwe	1994		