**`GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL**

**Project Type:**

**Type of Trust Fund:**

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/10539)



**part i: project information**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: GEF SGP Sixth Operational Phase- Strategic Implementation using STAR Resources Tranche 1, mainly in LDCs and SIDs (Part III) | | | | |
| Country(ies): | 16 Countries (refer to annex 1 for the list of countries) | GEF Project ID:[[1]](#footnote-1) | | 9774 |
| GEF Agency(ies): |  | GEF Agency Project ID: | | 5475 |
| Other Executing Partner(s): | UNOPS | Submission Date: | | 10/31/2017 |
| GEF Focal Area (s): |  | Project Duration (Months) | | 48 months |
| Integrated Approach Pilot | IAP-Cities  IAP-Commodities  IAP-Food Security | | Corporate Program: SGP | |
| Name of Parent Program | [if applicable] | Agency Fee ($) | | 693,500 |

1. [**Focal Area Strategy Framework and Other Program Strategies**](http://www.thegef.org/gef/policy/gender)**[[2]](#footnote-2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Focal Area Objectives/Programs | Focal Area Outcomes | Trust Fund | (in $) | |
| GEF Project Financing | Co-financing |
| BD-1 Program 2 |  | GEFTF | 3,379,748 | 3,515,000 |
| BD-2 Program 3 |  | GEFTF | 3,379,748 | 3,515,000 |
| CCM-1 Program 1 |  | GEFTF | 2,150,801 | 2,237,000 |
| CCM-2 Program 4 |  | GEFTF | 2,150,801 | 2,237,000 |
| CCM-3 Program 5 |  | GEFTF | 2,150,800 | 2,237,000 |
| LD-1 Program 1 |  | GEFTF | 2,062,801 | 2,145,000 |
| LD-2 Program 3 |  | GEFTF | 2,062,801 | 2,145,000 |
| **Total project costs** | |  | **17,337,500** | **18,031,000** |

1. **Project description summary**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | | | | | | |
| Project Components | Financing Type[[3]](#footnote-3) | Project Outcomes | Project Outputs | Trust Fund | (in $) | |
|  |  |  |  |  | GEF Project Financing | Co-financing |
| 1.Community Landscape and Seascape Conservation | TA | 1.1 SGP country programmes improve conservation and sustainable use, and management of important terrestrial and coastal/marine ecosystems through implementation of community based landscape/seascape approaches | 50 landscapes/seascapes in support of protected areas, ICCAs, and SAPs  5 million hectares of landscapes/seascapes with improved, community-oriented conservation and sustainable use practices | GEFTF | 6,144,996 | 6,422,000 |
| 2. Climate Smart Innovative Agro-ecology | TA | 2.1 Agro-ecology practices incorporating measures to reduce CO2 emissions and enhancing resilience to climate change tried and tested in protected area buffer zones and forest corridors and disseminated widely | At least 2 farmer leaders develop their capacity to demonstrate selected typologies per landscape  At least 1 farmer association/network functioning in each landscape | GEFTF | 3,750,546 | 3,912,000 |
| 3. Low Carbon Energy Access Co-benefits | TA | 3.1 Low carbon community energy access solutions successfully deployed in alignment with larger frameworks such as SE4ALL in at least 12 countries | At least 10 typologies of innovative solutions dmonstrated and documentd  At least 5000 households achieving energy access  Co-benefits such as resilience. ecosystem management, income, health and others measured in 12 leading countries  (Note: The above are total output targets for the GEF SGP OP6, including part 1 and 2 finance. Part III finance will intensify investment in the land/seascapes) | GEFTF | 5,865,822 | 6,121,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal | | | |  | 15,761,364 | 16,455,000 |
| Project Management Cost (PMC)[[4]](#footnote-4) | | | |  | 1,576,136 | 1,576,000 |
| **Total Project Cost** | | | |  | 17,337,500 | 18,031,000 |

1. **confirmed sources of** [**Co-financing**](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/document/Public_Involvement_Policy.Dec_1_2011_rev_PB.pdf) **for the project by name and by type**

Please include evidence for [co-financing](http://www.thegef.org/gef/csos) for the project with this form.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sources of Co-financing** | **Name of Co-financier** | **Type of Co-financing** | **Amount ($)** |
| GEF Agency | UNDP | Grants | 2,000,000 |
| Donor Agency\* | TBD | Grants | 1,000,000 |
| Recipient Government\* | TBD | Grants | 1,600,000 |
| CSO\* | TBD | Grants/In-kind | 3,850,000 |
| Private Sector\* | TBD | Grants/In-kind | 700,000 |
| Beneficiaries\* | TBD | In-kind | 8,881,000 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Total Co-financing** |  |  | **18,031,000** |

\*These cofinanciers will be determined and confirmed by the successful grantees of the small grants. The average cofinancing ratio of one to one between GEF and cofinance will be maintained.

1. **Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies) and the Programming of Funds**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GEF Agency** | **Trust Fund** | **Country**  **Name/Global** | **Focal Area** | **Programming of Funds** | **(in $)** | | |
| **GEF Project Financing** (a) | **Agency Fee** a) (b)2 | **Total**  (c)=a+b |
| UNDP | GEF TF | Please refer to Annex 1: list of 16 countries that have provided OFP Endorsement Letters, along with a FA breakdown | BD, LD, and CCM | SGP/MFA | 17,337,500 | 693,500 | 18,031,000 |
| **Total Grant Resources** | | | | | **17,337,500** | **693,500** | **18,031,000** |

a ) Refer to the [Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies](http://www.thegef.org/gef/home)

1. **Project’s Target Contributions to Global Environmental Benefits[[5]](#footnote-5)**

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Corporate Results** | **Replenishment Targets** | **Project Targets** |
| 1. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society | Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares | *5 million hectares\** |
| 1. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes) | 120 million hectares under sustainable land management | *hectares* |
| 1. Promotion of collective management of transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services | Water-food-ecosystems security and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater in at least 10 freshwater basins; | *Number of freshwater basins* |
| 20% of globally over-exploited fisheries (by volume) moved to more sustainable levels | *Percent of fisheries, by volume* |
| 1. 4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path | 750 million tons of CO2e  mitigated (include both direct and indirect) | metric tons |
| 1. Increase in phase-out, disposal and reduction of releases of POPs, ODS, mercury and other chemicals of global concern | Disposal of 80,000 tons of POPs (PCB, obsolete pesticides) | *metric tons* |
| Reduction of 1000 tons of Mercury | *metric tons* |
| Phase-out of 303.44 tons of ODP (HCFC) | *ODP tons* |
| 1. Enhance capacity of countries to implement MEAs (multilateral environmental agreements) and mainstream into national and sub-national policy, planning financial and legal frameworks | Development and sectoral planning frameworks integrate measurable targets drawn from the MEAs in at least 10 countries | *Number of Countries:* |
| Functional environmental information systems are established to support decision-making in at least 10 countries | *Number of Countries:* |
| \*This is a total target for the OP6 SGP.   1. **f. Does the project include a** [**“non-grant” instrument**](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/GEF.R.5.12.Rev_.1.pdf)**?**   (If non-grant instruments are used, provide an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF Trust Fund) in Annex D. | | | |

**part ii: project justification**

**A. describe any changes in alignment with the project design with the original pif[[6]](#footnote-6)**

A.1. *Project Description*. Elaborate on: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed; 2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects, 3) the proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area[[7]](#footnote-7) strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project, 4) [incremental](http://www.thegef.org/gef/policy/co-financing)/[additional cost reasoning](http://www.thegef.org/gef/policy/co-financing) and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and [co-financing](http://www.thegef.org/gef/policy/co-financing); 5) [global environmental benefits](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/document/gef-fee-policy.pdf) (GEFTF) and/or [adaptation benefits](https://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.Outlook/5RRT28VG/refer%20to%20the%20excerpts%20on%20GEF%206%20Results%20Frameworks%20for%20GETF,%20LDCF%20and%20SCCF.) (LDCF/SCCF); and 6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

No change has been made since PIF.

*A.2.* *Child Project?* If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

N.A.

*A.3.* [*Stakeholders*](http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1325). Elaborate on how the key stakeholders engagement, particularly with regard to [civil society](https://sgp.undp.org/index.php) and [indigenous people](http://www.thegef.org/gef/policy/non-grant_instruments), is factored in the preparation and implementation of the project.

As one of the fundamental steps in an SGP Operational phase, countries embark on an extensive national level consultation process to review past results, identify current priorities and ensure alignment with complementary programmes and initiaitives. This was carried out through wide stakeholder consultations in all countries. The process was instrumental in the development of the SGP OP6 Country Programme Strategies to guide grant programming and grantmaker+ activities in countries, as well as in the identification of priority landscape/seascape areas for more targeted focus. In many countries, further consultations were also undertaken with sub-national stakeholders at the level of the identified landscapes and/or seascapes to identify landscape level priorities, and implementation actions that could be undertaken by stakeholders.

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.

*A.4.* [*Gender Considerations*](http://www.thegef.org/gef/policy/incremental_costs)*.* Elaborate on how gender considerations were mainstreamed into the project preparation, taking into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of men and women.

As noted in detail under the SGP’s approach towards promoting social inclusion in the project document, SGP has been pioneering and highly recognized in mainstreaming gender equality and women’s empowerment in every step of the program operation: starting from the development of the country programme strategy to project proposal templates for small grants. The Joint Evaluation of SGP concluded in 2015 conducted a detailed assessment of gender aspects in SGP's programming and portfolio. The Evaluation noted that SGP's integration of gender mainstreaming "compared favorably with an analysis of 281 GEF projects, where 124 did not consider gender and were not expected to.” (SGP Evaluation 2015, para 39).

From the outset, within the Country Programme Strategy elaborated by each SGP country program to guide programming of grants, gender considerations are assessed and taken into consideration. Priority actions for gender mainstreaming may also be identified. SGP's project proposal template also includes a section on gender mainstreaming, where grantees are expected to reflect on how gender concerns impact on the design of the project and how the grant project will ensure gender mainstreaming. A gender focal point is designated within each SGP National Steering Committee to ensure review of gender considerations in project selection.

Within OP6 a specific component dedicated to promoting social inclusivity will provide direct support for enhancing knowledge, networking and exchange related to promotion of gender mainstreaming and women’s empowerment. SGP is engaging closely with GEF Secretariat, UNDP and a range of GEF Agencies and Convention Secretariats to develop a training platform for increased understanding of gender roles and considerations in environmental management and sustainable development. Similarly knowledge generated by women led projects and projects with a strong focus on gender empowerment will also be targeted for broader exchange through SGP's knowledge networks.

*A.5 Risk.* Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

While the possibility of new insurmountable risks is minimal given that the programme has been operating for 25 years and has been constantly learning and adapting during this time, 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. 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.

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 changing climate. In fact many projects which were designed to develop tools and measures to adapt to climate 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.

UNDP has also developed its Social and Environmental Standards (SES) and accompanying Social and Environmental Screening Procedures (SESP). SGP utilizes UNDP’s Social and Environmental Screening Procedures in its OP6 Project Document and in the review for approval of SGP Country Programme Strategies. 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 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.

*A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination.* Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

This CEO Endorsement document seeks approval for the first tranche of STAR funds allocated for GEF Small Grants Programme in GEF6. So far, total 48 countries have allocated GEF-6 STAR resources to the SGP. Based on discussion with the GEF Secretariat, it was agreed that a tranched approach will be taken to access STAR resources for all these countries, rather than all at once. Each tranche will consider several factors including: the balance of LDC/SIDS countries; regional balance, level of commitment/delivery of GEF-6 SGP core funding; amount/percentage of STAR allocation to SGP; and GEF-6 STAR utilization. This tranche draws upon STAR resources endorsed by 16 SGP participating countries to enhance and increase impact of their SGP programmes.Among them, 11 countries are Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and Least Developing Countries (LDCs) where SGP plays an important role in building necessary capacity for conserving the global environment. This project will be implemented in full alignment with the SGP OP6 Part I and II projects that is supported by SGP Core funds of the GEF-6.

UNDP continues to implement the GEF SGP on behalf of the GEF partnership, while the executing partner is UNOPS. Program management is undertaken by the Central Programme Management Team while support is received at the country level from UNDP Country Offices. At the national level, the SGP country programme is led by a National Coordinator, often supported by a Programme Assistant. SGP country programmes are generally based in UNDP offices except in a limited number of countries in which a National Host Institution (NHI) provides hosting and administrative support. SGP Operational Guidelines which provide a standard set of policies and procedures to achieve implementation coherence across countries are presented in Annex E. The Operational Guidelines have been further strengthened to support the full implementation of new initiatives for SGP in the 6th Operational Phase (OP6) and responds to the recommendation of the 2015 SGP Evaluation to enhance the complementation of the global and upgraded country programmes.

A.7 *Benefits.* Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

SGP’s since its inception has aimed to focus on producing global environmental benefits, while promoting sustainable livelihoods, and with community and civil society empowerment. Improving livelihoods through grant activities is a core objective of SGP, as the sustainable management of land, biodiversity and other ecosystem resources for income and/or subsistence directly affects the generation of global environmental benefits. SGP is strongly aligned with the 2030 Agenda and poverty reduction goals, so potential grantees are actively encouraged to design projects that maximize positive synergies between livelihood outcomes and the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, sustainable land management, mitigation of climate change and other global environmental benefits. SGP is contributing to achievement of several Sustainable Development Goals. In addition to a primary focus on SDG 13 (climate action), SDG 14 (life below water), and SDG 15 (life on land), projects are also contributing to SDG 1 (poverty), SGP 5 (gender equality), and SDG 10 (reduced inequalities.

The SGP Annual Monitoring Reports that are prepared annually continue to show strong socio-economic benefits that the SGP is generating in the countries. SGP country programs reported last year (SGP Annual Monitoring Report 2015-2016) that more than 70% of the projects contributed to concrete improvement in livelihoods of communities. Majority of countries have supported livelihood interventions that boost food security and/or access to technology for communities. Further, 88% of all country programs supported projects that employed market-based mechanisms to achieve environment and livelihoods objectives. The most commonly used approach was the development of biodiversity and green products, but ecotourism and revolving funds were also relatively common with approximately a third of all countries using these approaches. Socio-economic benefits that are reported include: increase in access to food security and increase in nutritional value; increase in access to education; increase in access to health care; improved access to infrastructure; engagement in south-south exchanges; and reinforcement of CSO government linkages. SGP will continue to apply proven and innovative approaches improve community livelihoods while working on the goal to enhance global environmental benefits. Through these approaches, a strong degree of local ownership and commitment is built which results in greater sustainability and behavior change over time to benefit both global environment and local sustainable development.

A.8 Knowledge Management. Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and  plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

The knowledge management approach of SGP in OP6 is influenced by new strategic directions of the programme: (1) increased coherence and focus of grant-making through select landscapes and seascapes; (2) multi-focal frameworks for the design of projects, and; (3) promotion of replication, scaling up and mainstreaming. These new strategic directions require a deepening of reach to civil society stakeholders particularly in the consultations for selection of focused landscapes and seascapes as well as for creating an in-depth understanding of the inter-relationships of various GEF focal areas. A broadening of partners and champions at national and global levels is likewise needed for broader adoption of lessons learned and successful community innovations.

One of the most important results from the innovative community solutions supported by SGP is the wealth of knowledge it has produced over the years at the project, national and global level. To make this knowledge accessible and useful, SGP has developed a Knowledge Management Strategy that presents the tools that the programme use for knowledge exchange at each of these levels with the ultimate aim to inform and influence policy, replicate and upscale good practices, promote a culture of learning and innovation.

At the global level, SGP provides guidance on how to capture and disseminate knowledge and conduct knowledge exchange at the local level so that it can be aggregated at the global level; shares technical publication and provides guidance of each focal and cross cutting areas of work; organizes regional workshops to exchange knowledge and provide training to its staff; and shares good practices emerging from the portfolio at global conferences and events. SGP also establishes partnerships with a variety of partners to upscale best practices in environmental conservation and and works to capture and disseminate the lessons learned and best practices of its massive portfolio in case studies, fact sheets, publications, and new media. Knowledge platforms including the SGP website and Communities Connect (a platform to share knowledge from civil society organizations around the world that promotes solutions created by communities and civil society organization to sustainable development issues) have been created and will be updated.

At the national level, each country will work directly with the communities in (i) capturing their lessons; (ii) conducting knowledge exchanges; (iii) organizing training workshops; (iv) establishing and nurturing networks of NGO’s and CBO’s; (v) working with the government in achieving national environmental priorities; (vi) and helping to scale up and replicate best practices and lessons learned. Each country programme outlines a knowledge management plan as part of their Country Programme Strategy. Based on these experiences, country programmes will routinely produce knowledge materials in local languages, including project fact sheets, informational brochures and case studies, to disseminate at key national events and conferences. For example, Knowledge Fairs will be organized to feature the most innovative practices supported by the programme and allow communities to present those and connect with key stakeholders like the academia, other NGOS, the government and other development practitioners for replication, upscaling, and policy influence, as well as technical support and knowledge transfer. These Knowledge Fairs also allow communities to learn from one another and to foster networks of civil society innovators for sustainable development.

At the project level, each project needs to include a knowledge management plan with a corresponding budget that allows the programme to capture their experience as well as to access the training needed to carry out the projects. SGP will be facilitating peer-to-peer learning between local communities and SGP graGEFntees as an effective method to share knowledge, help communities learn from each other and as a tool for replication and up scaling of best practices.

SGP will further enhance access to and opportunities for 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 as desicribed in the previous sections: (1) the “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 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; (2) the “South-South Community Innovation Exchange Platform” will aim to promote knowledge exchange between SGP countries to encourage cross country/region wide replication of good practices. This platform will link mentors to emerging practitioners and set aside some funds to select a few strategic projects that can have high potential impact to facilitate knowledge exchanges in specific technologies, regions and landscapes. Currently, the existing South-South exchange platforms in UNDP, World Bank and other organizations do not target CSOs or communities. SGP has started discussions to partner with and complement other South–South initiatives wherever possible.

B. Description of the consistency of the project with:

B.1 *Consistency with National Priorities.* Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, etc.:

Most national policies and strategies such as NBSAPs, NAPs, NIPs, NAMAs, LEDS and others emphasize the importance of engaging the widest possible circle of stakeholders (including CSOs) in order to achieve their environmental protection objectives. UNDP has a strong record of supporting developing countries in the elaboration of national strategies and plans. As the GEF Agency implementing the SGP as well as having supported many GEF Enabling Activities, UNDP is well placed to ensure greater synergy in the implementation of the SGP in alignment with National strategies and planning frameworks, as well as to effectively leverage the potential of the SGP to contribute community perspectives and CSO engagement. In each of these national planning frameworks, SGP’s community-based approach targets a critical constituency of small-scale localised actions which represent a critical contribution to the implementation and achievement of these national policies and strategies.

Most national policies and strategies such as NBSAPs, NAPs, NIPs, NAMAs, LEDS and others emphasize the importance of engaging the widest possible circle of stakeholders (including CSOs) in order to achieve their environmental protection objectives. UNDP has a strong record of supporting developing countries in the elaboration of national strategies and plans. As the GEF Agency implementing the SGP as well as having supported many GEF Enabling Activities, UNDP is well placed to ensure greater synergy in the implementation of the SGP in alignment with National strategies and planning frameworks, as well as to effectively leverage the potential of the SGP to contribute community perspectives and CSO engagement. In each of these national planning frameworks, SGP’s community-based approach targets a critical constituency of small-scale localised actions which represent a critical contribution to the implementation and achievement of these national policies and strategies.

The GEF SGP country programme strategies (CPS) are the over-arching documents guiding the SGP strategic directions, programming and operations. The development and updating of the strategies are based on national policies and action plans, such as NBSAPs, NAPs, NIPs etc. and other national key documents, which are directly linked to GEF multi-focal area strategies and priorities.

The SGP operates in countries where specific requests to initiate the programme have been received from the appropriate national authorities, represented by the GEF Operational Focal Point. By first requesting and subsequently supporting implementation of the SGP, a country demonstrates that the SGP will be a country-driven and owned initiative supporting community-level and civil society environmental projects. SGP has operated in 128 countries in the past immediate phase, reflecting each of these countries’ priorities for community-driven approaches to addressing global environmental issues.

National priorities are reflected through the constitution of the SGP National Steering Committee (or National Focal Group for sub-regional programmes), which guides implementation of the SGP in each respective country. National Steering Committtee members are leading national government and civil society representatives in the environmental field, who provide strategic guidance and oversight for the programme, and ensure its focus on and coherence with national priorities as they apply to and are relevant for community-level needs and priorities. For all these countries, start-up missions supported the organization of the new country programmes to develop strategies reflecting national priorities focused on community-level actions, and created the necessary institutional structures. SGP priorities at the national level are codified in detail in the SGP Country Programme Strategy, which is linked to the country’s GEF resources allocation strategy, which in turn reflects GEF policies and strategic priorities for GEF-6. Each of these strategies draws on national priorities and strategies, in particular those that focus on civil society and community-based actions.

**C. Describe the budgeted m &e plan:**

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, attibutable, 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 and global levels. An

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 appropiate measures and adaptive management decisions. 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 crtieria 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 assesment 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, appropiate capacity development 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 as Annex A to 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 aligned 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.

SGP’s M&E budget will include the following broad categories:

1. Monitoring and reviews - Travel

- Country level (110 countries total) $ 3,423,405

- Global level (CPMT) $ 600,000

1. Monitoring and Lessons learned reports $ 150,000
2. Evaluations $ 150,000
3. Impact Assessments $ 200,000
4. Technical specialists $ 750,000

Total $5,273,405

**Table 1. SGP M&E Framework**

| **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 |
| 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*[[8]](#footnote-8)*)* | 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 |
| 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 | Financial Four-In-One Report | Financial accountability and cost efficiency | NC/PA | Covered under budgeted staff time | Quarterly |
| 17 | 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 |
| 18 | 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** | | | | | |
| 19 | 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 |
| 20 | 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 |
| 21 | Global Portfolio Monitoring and Oversight | Troubleshooting; learning; adaptive management | CPMT | Covered under budgeted staff time and global operating budget | Ongoing |
| 22 | Programme Delivery Reports (GEF Financial Reporting) | Assessment of implementation efficiency | UNOPS to UNDP-GEF | Covered under UNOPS operating costs | Quarterly |
| 23 | SGP Reporting to Conventions | 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 conventions (varies by convention) |
| 24 | 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; | *Ad Hoc* |
| 25 | 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 |

**PART iII: certification by gef partner agency(ies)**

1. **GEF Agency(ies) certification**

|  |
| --- |
| **This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies[[9]](#footnote-9) and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agency Coordinator, Agency Name** | **Signature** | **Date**  **(MM/dd/yyyy)** | **Project Contact Person** | **Telephone** | **Email Address** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ms. Adriana Dinu, Executive Coordinator, UNDP/GEF |  | 10/31/2017 | Yoko Watanabe | 646 781 4383 | Yoko.watanabe@undp.org |

1. GEF\_CEOENDR\_60

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK** (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

| **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. Community Landscape and Seascape Conservation* | 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 [[10]](#footnote-10) | 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 |
| *2. Climate Smart Innovative Agro-ecology* | 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 | 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 agroecological practices | At least 2 farmer-leaders developed their capacity to demonstrate selected typologies per landscape  At least 1 farmer association/network functioning in each landscape | ACR  Annual monitoring report (AMR)  Vulnerability assessment reports as part of the Country programme report  Landscape strategy reports | All landscapes address a farming system |
| *3. Low Carbon Energy Access Co-benefits* | 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 | 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. | 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. | ACR  AMR, global database AMR, country reports, global database  Special country studies | SE4ALL continues to develop and provide opportunities for integration |
| *4. Local to Global Chemical Management Coalitions* | 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 | Number of community-based tools/approaches to avoid and reduce chemicals demonstrated, deployed and transferred  Number of coalitions and networks established or strengthened | 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 | ACR  Annual Monitoring Reports (AMR)  Global Database  Case studies and portfolio review  Monitoring and oversight by UNDP-CO, NSC and CPMT | 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 |
| *5. CSO-Government Policy and Planning Dialogue Platforms* | 5.1 SGP supports establishment of “CSO-Government Policy and Planning Dialogue Platforms”, leveraging existing and potential partnerships, in at least 50 countries | 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 | 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 | ACR  AMR  Country level specific studies | Dialogue piloted in most advanced countries and expanded based on results.  Partnership is formed with GEF CSO Network |
| *6. Promoting Social Inclusion* | 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 | 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 | 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 | ACR  AMR | 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 |
| *7. Global Reach for Citizen Practice-Based Knowledge program* | 7.1 Digital library of community innovations is established and provides access to information to communities in at least 50 countries  7.2 South-South Community Innovation Exchange Platform promotes south-south exchanges on global environmental issues in at least 20 countries | Number of knowledge products systematically collected, organized and shared across countries  Number of South-South exchanges supported that transfer capacity on new community innovations between communities, CSOs and other partners across countries | An on-line access global knowledge product sharing system for communities and CSOs on environment and sustainable development is set up  50 countries produce and share at least 1 case study and/or “how to” guidelines on an innovative SGP practice in their country portfolio  Knowledge exchange arrangements between communities and CSOs initiated in at least 20 countries | AMR | 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  Technical support and funding resources available for South –South exchanges |

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS:**

**Response to the Council Comments at PIF Approval:**

**France**

*We support the Community landscape and seascape conservation approach (p.11 and 12) which is line with the one used by FFEM’s PPI 5, which was derived from recommendations of PPI’s most recent independent evaluation. We also welcome the emphasis put on marine ecosystems (p 12).*

*Topics needing further clarification or improvement*

*i. The question of innovation is mentioned on several occasions (p; 11, 13, 18) with the leit motiv of “scaling up » and « mainstreaming »): the project detailed document could specify what concrete operating – built-in the program- modalities would pave the way to upscaling and mainstreaming*

SGP employs many proven approaches to scaling up innovative pilot approaches: through peer to peer learnings, policy linkage, and upscaling initiatives through government, GEF, UNDP and other programs and projects. These are enabled by involvement of the SGP National Steering Committee, comprised of eminent representatives of government, NGO and academia, who can serve as champions to connect grantees to additional partners and resources. SGP also connects grantees to other grantees, and to networks of CSOs. SGP National coordinators often help grantees to apply for other sources of resources, facilitate linkages with decision makers, help capture and communicate their knowledge and innovation to make a pitch for further resources and partnerships. The recent draft OPS-6 evaluation report and the SGP Joint Evaluation report (2015) recognize that scaling up, mainstreaming and replication are indeed occurring through many SGP projects through these proven approaches.

*ii. Projects selection criteria: need to be more explicit and detailed, while explain how the program takes into account local needs and priorities.*

In order to promote strategic investment and better respond to the local needs and priorities, since 2006, the SGP has prepared, in collaboration with partners on the ground, a SGP Country Programme Strategy (CPS) that describes key priorities in relation to the MEAs, GEF strategies, and national policies and strategies, as well as complementarity with other government and donor funded initiatives, including GEF FSPs and MSPs. The process for developing the CPS is highly participatory with wide stakeholder involvement in each country. The CPS also identifies and selects priority landscapes/seascapes where the majority of SGP grants will be focused. CPS also carries out baseline assessment of the selected landscapes and/or seascapes to identify priority interventions and typologies of projects, key stakeholder groups, and establish baselines and targets for grantmaking. Based on the approved CPS, a call for proposal will be initiated to assess and select the best projects that are in line with the strategic direction. In this way SGP ensures clear selection criteria and truly country driven process that takes national as well as local needs and priorities.

*iii. Capacity building: need to be more explicit especially on the method. Based on PPI’s experience, we recommend a) individual coaching for each NGO, with eventually a middle sized projects tranche in order to accompany NGOs that have already benefitted from SGP and would need to move up in the learning curve and b) a distribution of labor and role with on one side program administration, and on the other side on-the-ground capacity building activities which can be contracted to a different entity, with dedicated experts at the sub-regional level.*

Since GEF-5, SGP has been allocating about 10% of its grant funding to dedicated Capacity Development Projects that help address broader capacity needs of the grantees. These projects are often implemented in partnership with national NGOs that are experienced in stakeholder engagement workshops, training and guidance on project development and implementation, participatory monitoring and evaluation, and knowledge management and exchange. South-South Cooperation Grant has also been promoting peer to peer capacity development activities, which has proven to establish long term collaboration between communities and very relevant to the local context. Further, capacity development and mentoring activities have been provided directly by SGP staff at the national and sub-national levels. This includes assisting potential CSOs from the concept stage with a planning grant, to helping address NSC comments and prepare project agreements, and to supporting implementation through regular communication, site visits, and inviting grantees to workshops and exchange meetings. Recently, the SGP also launched an Indigenous Peoples Fellowship Program that supports emerging indigenous leaders, particularly women, to develop their capacity to take up leadership roles on global environmental issues at both global and local levels. SGP, through OP6, plans to further promote and implement dedicated capacity development initiatives, particularly in LDCs and SIDS, in partnership with national and sub-regional NGOs.

*iv. M&E: to be developed and spelled out in more details. How to measure program’s environmental impacts?*

SGP is undertaking M&E at three levels: the grant project level where grantees are enabled to undertake M&E and adaptively manage projects; the country level where the SGP national teams monitor projects results as they relate to the indicators and targets in the Country Program Strategies, and at the global level where the SGP CPMT gathers information from countries and reports annually to the GEF and other partners on the results achieved by projects through the Annual Monitoring Report and partnership results reports, in line with the GEF strategies and indicators. Building on the recommendations of Joint GEF-UNDP Evaluation, efforts are being made to further improve existing M&E, design more streamlined and useful M&E tools and activities that balance the need to measure both global environmental and socio-economic benefits. On environmental impact and results, SGP’s Results Framework is developed in line with the GEF-6 Focal Area Strategies. For example, in relation to biodiversity results, the SGP measures coverage of improved management of landscapes and seascapes in line with the biodiversity focal area indicator. These environmental data are monitored, generated and reported at an annual basis through the GEF’s Annual Monitoring Report.

*v. Thematic NGO Alliances/networks, for example on turtles, apes, apiculture… these are PPI-funded networks, seen as communities of practicians.*

SGP has also been supporting and participating in thematic networks and alliances at global, national, and local levels, and plans to do more through the OP6. At the global level, SGP is supporting and working with the ICCA Consortium Indigenous Peoples and Communities Conserved Territories and Areas (ICCAs), Global Snow Leopard and Ecosystem Protection Program for snow leopard conservation, and Global Tiger Initiative for tiger conservation, and other initiatives to ensure coordination and partnership in supporting relevant activities. At the country and local level, SGP has also supported and promoted thematic and knowledge networks, for example for organic farmers, honey producers, and ecotourism operators. In Mauritius for example, SGP supported coalitions of octopus fishers in Rodrigues to implement seasonal closures of octopus fisheries during the breeding season. In addition, a series of thematic networking and dialogues is undertaken and planned under the CSO-Government Dialogue initiative of the SGP. The themes and topics vary by country’s interest, but aligns with overall SGP OP6 approach and the SGP Country Programme Strategy. For example, in 2015, SGP in partnership with a Government of Norway, launched a series of Indigenous Peoples’ – Government dialogues on climate change in 20 countries to ensure communities voices are reflected in the INDC and towards the Paris Agreement. These initiatives have strengthened exchange of lessons and experiences among the communities of practitioners, and scaling up/replication of successful initiatives.

vi*. Digital library of Communitiy Innovations for the Global Environment (partie VII p.16 et 17) : we support this concrete initiative and suggest, in order to boost its performance and span, to open it to other donors small grant programs such as PPI and CEPF (as contributors and users). The question is how this could be done practically. Furthermore, we would welcome details on how this library’s maintenance will be performed and financed in the long run. The document mentions the objective of building Partnership, FFEM being mentioned: we believe the above proposal (library) could be a first to build partnerships but would be welcome further discussion on the issue.*

The Digital Library would build on the knowledge generated by the cumulative work of SGP with communities around the world by curating the most innovative publications, manuals, user guides, and other knowledge products produced by the communities it supports. It will be a dedicated section on the SGP website that will have filters to allow users to find content easily. This effort has started and the initial library is planned to be designed and uploaded by early 2018. After the library is functional, SGP will develop a module to invite other partners to add their solutions to the platform and tag them under the different filters. Discussion is ongoing with different programs of UNDP as well as with CEPF and other partners. SGP will support the development and maintenance of the site and welcomes contributions from partners to further reach out and enable additional services to the partnership such as curation services and webinars on good practices. We very much welcome and look forward to further exchange with FFEM, PPI and CEPF to partner on the Digital library of community innovations.

**United States**

1*) The United States, in light of its policies for certain development projects in countries whose governments are not addressing trafficking in persons and whose governments do not have in place a functioning and transparent military audit, opposes the GEF Small Grants Programme Sixth Operational Phase, Part II project in Eritrea and Belarus.*

The concern of US was well noted and documented at the GEF Council.

*2) With regard to the Jamaica portion of this project, we would appreciate additional details on the projected outcomes. In addition, we recommend that the SGP activities in Jamaica consider coordinating with the following, related USAID projects:*

*a. The area of "Climate Smart Innovative Agro-ecology" may do work similar to the Jamaica Rural Economies and Ecosystems Adapting to Climate Change (JA-REACCH II).*

*b. The solutions offered under "Low-Carbon Energy Access Co-benefits" mirrors the work of the Caribbean Clean Energy Program (CARCEP).*

The SGP Jamaica Country Program has developed, based on extensive public consultations and a baseline study led by a partner institution, a Country Programme Strategy for the OP6. Jamaica prioritized the following SGP strategic initiatives:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Climate smart innovative agro-ecology (CSIA) | Climate resilient mixed agroforestry that: reduces reliance on open field, rain-fed production will generate new livelihoods, and increase production and adaptive capacities. It will also provide good practice examples which can be included in developing user interface platforms for the agriculture sector and over time can provide meaningful alternatives to unsustainable land use practices of indigenous and other vulnerable groups. |
| Community landscape/seascape conservation (CLSC) | Key National Parks (Eastern, Central, and North western Jamaica); Key Marine Ecosystems (Northern and Southern Coastal Areas and Cays): Species conservation, water conservation, habitat preservation, sustainable urban centres. Will enhance capacity development for conservation, influence revision of biodiversity strategy and action plan, land use policy and increase visibility (Knowledge management) of the SGP Country Programme. Emerging priorities from this could guide the focus new SGP projects under OP6 |
| Low carbon energy access co-benefits (LCEAC) | Use of renewable energy (wind, solar, biogas, biofuels) and more extensive use of energy efficient solutions (e.g. LED bulbs) for community-led initiatives. Training in harvesting of alternative energy will immensely benefit indigenous peoples, influence national policy and highly increase visibility of SGP nationally and regionally. |

The specific strategy for grant-making focuses on replicating and upscaling notable SGP initiatives and also includes a new focus on urban/inner-city communities (especially in the major Cities of Kingston and Montego Bay) in keeping with the Green Cities theme for Jamaica. The watersheds, riverine, corals, forest areas (valley or otherwise), low-lying areas and wetlands are the landscape/seascape typologies that will be given greater attention in planning project activities during the OP6, with integrated, multi focal area approaches encouraged, where possible. An additional important strategy for project sustainability and greater project impact is increased innovation and emphasis on livelihood/income generation. For more details, please, refer to [OP6 SGP Jamaica Country Programme Strategy](http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEB?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=626-op6-sgp-jamaica-country-programme-strategy&category_slug=country-documents&Itemid=453)

USAID is specifically identified as a key SGP partner in Jamaica country program strategy with a strong emphasis on collaboration. CARCEP is mentioned in the strategy as a key program with the potential for synergies. Broadly, in Jamaica and Eastern Caribbean, the goals of SGP energy access component and those of CARCEP are complimentary, as both are working on decarbonisation and low carbon development, but focus and target sectors are somewhat different and are very complimentary. CARCEP focuses on creating enabling legislative environment, supporting policy formulation and accelerating private sector investment in sustainable energy, while the SGP energy co-benefits program focuses on building renewable energy and energy efficient infrastructure at the community level through community driven solutions. The JA-REACCH II program also offers many opportunities for collaboration, supporting some of the similar activities such as farmer training and piloting adaptive practices such as water harvesting. SGP Jamaica will collaborate and explore opportunities to building on their experiences as well as cofinance activities under the framework of agroecology component. In Jamaica, SGP is collaborating with numerous community based programs including Government of Jamaica’s Community Renewal Program (CRP), the Social Development Commission (SDC), the Jamaica Social Investment Fund (JSIF) the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR) and others, and continue to do so under OP6.

*3) We recommend that the activities planned for Mali coordinate with existing, related projects, as well as the Ministries in charge of the sectors of environment, livestock, and agriculture to avoid duplication of efforts. For example, the Inter-State Committee to Combat Drought in the Sahel (CILSS) has a long history of working with the government on chemicals management (including the removal of obsolete pesticides).*

Building on previous SGP collaboration with CILSS in Mali, Burkina Faso and Mauritania, the SGP will continue to explore further linkages with CILSS in other members countries in the region. SGP recognizes the significant work conducted by the CILSS in combatting desertification, as well as reducing POPs and chemical waste in West Africa since its creation in 1975. The work of CILSS is becoming ever more relevant as evidence of direct linkage between climate change, desertification, insecurity and extremism is becoming more evident across the Sahel. The partnership possibilities will be explored further during the forthcoming GEF Extended Constituency Workshops (ECWs) for West Africa taking place in Ghana and in Senegal in October 2017.

*4) We would like to request additional information on how the project will ensure that newly established reforested areas, woodlots, and nurseries will continue to be used as such in the future. We would also like to request additional information on how the project implementers will mitigate the risks associated with insecure and unclear land tenure. Finally, given the described need for wood, how will the project implementers mitigate the risk of individuals cutting down new trees to meet the growing demand?*

The sustainability of new establishments such as nurseries, forests and woodlots will be maintained by village and community forest associations, who are expected not only to help in the establishment of the estates and production nurseries, but will also share the benefits accrued in terms of timber and non-timber products, forest services and other aesthetic goods. The benefit sharing arrangement will enlist the needs for a joint forest management regime based on a long term, participatory management plan within the identified landscapes that ensures that protection and sustenance of the forest estates can be realized based on community ownerships.

Land tenure in many community owned landscapes are either customarily held or government owned in trust for the communities. This particular scenario also presents an opportunity for proper land management and utilization by communities, who are the implementers of the projects, to be anchored on traditional management systems supported by intergenerational knowledge. This type of system allows for user rights as well a protective role by the communities, when coupled with supportive regulations. SGP will work closely with both local government and communities, and build on the best practices to further promote traditional management systems.

The risks of cutting down trees can be mitigated by provision of alternative options and appropriate incentives, which keeps the communities away from over-cutting forests. The ownership rights of communities on forests can ensure that cutting of trees is based on silvicultural requirements for forest plantations and woodlots. If the forests or woodlots are established on community lands, then the community governance process will also continue to ensure that no undue over cutting of trees takes place but a controlled system of cutting forests can be put in place. Moreover, the removal of unwanted stocks, thinning operations and pollarding of standing trees to provide farmers with the needed wood requirements throughout the plantation growing period is possible in a controlled manner. SGP has demonstrated in many countries that such community-led governance process and model works, and further innovative and adopt these approaches in different context.

**Annex C: status of implementation of project preparation activities and the use of funds[[11]](#footnote-11)**

1. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

No PPG resources were accessed.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PPG Grant Approved at PIF: | | | |
| ***Project Preparation Activities Implemented*** | ***GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount ($)*** | | |
|  | ***Budgeted Amount*** | ***Amount Spent To date*** | ***Amount Committed*** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Total** | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**annex D: CALENDAR OF expected reflows (**if non-grant instrument is used**)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

n/a

**annex E. 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 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 utilized[[12]](#footnote-12). Within the UNDP framework, the SGP, as a global programme, is handled differently from UNDP core national or regional programmes.[[13]](#footnote-13)
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;[[14]](#footnote-14)
* 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***

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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).[[15]](#footnote-15) 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.
4. 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.
5. 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,[[16]](#footnote-16) divided as follows:

* Africa
* Arab States
* Asia
* Europe & CIS
* Pacific
* Latin America & the Caribbean

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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*

1. 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 modality[[17]](#footnote-17), with financial and administrative support provided by the UNDP Country Office (CO). In some countries, a National Host Institution (NHI) or host NGO[[18]](#footnote-18) 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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 the NC, the NSC contributes to the development of the Country Programme Strategy (CPS)[[19]](#footnote-19) 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.[[20]](#footnote-20)
7. 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.
8. 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*

1. 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 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.

1. 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).
2. 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 transferal to grant recipients remain transparent, accountable and fluid. NHIs cannot be awarded nor use SGP grant funds.

***SGP country staff roles and responsibilities***

1. 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.[[21]](#footnote-21) 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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 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

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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*

1. 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;[[22]](#footnote-22) as well as with the GEF National Portfolio Formulation Exercise (NPFE) where relevant.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.

1. 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).
2. 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.
3. 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*

1. 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.
2. 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**

1. 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 CSOs[[23]](#footnote-23), 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$50,000[[24]](#footnote-24). 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.
2. 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 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.
3. 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.
4. 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 initiatives[[25]](#footnote-25) 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

1. The NC or NSC may authorize planning grants[[26]](#footnote-26) 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.
2. 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.
3. 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

1. 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 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).
2. 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

1. The maximum amount for an SGP grant is $50,000 per project.[[27]](#footnote-27) 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 allocation[[28]](#footnote-28).
2. 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.
3. 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

1. 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 disbursements which serves to keep the UNDP abreast of SGP developments.[[29]](#footnote-29) 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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. The principles and processes governing SGP audit operations can be found in the UNOPS SGP SOPs.

1. Project ID number remains the same as the assigned PIF number. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on [*GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF*](https://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/document/GEF6%20Results%20Framework%20for%20GEFTF%20and%20LDCF.SCCF_.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. For GEF Project Financing up to $2 million, PMC could be up to10% of the subtotal; above $2 million, PMC could be up to 5% of the subtotal. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project financing amount in Table D below.  
    [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Update the applicable indicators provided at PIF stage. Progress in programming against these targets for the projects per the *Corporate Results Framework* in the [*GEF-6 Programming Directions*](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/GEF.C.46.07.Rev_.01_Summary_of_the_Negotiations_of_the_Sixth_Replenishment_of_the_GEF_Trust_Fund_May_22_2014.pdf)*,* will be aggregated and reported during mid-term and at the conclusion of the replenishment period. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF , no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project’s consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives   
    and programs, please also describe which [Aichi Target(s)](http://www.thegef.org/gef/content/did-you-know-%E2%80%A6-convention-biological-diversity-has-agreed-20-targets-aka-aichi-targets-achie) the project will directly contribute to achieving.. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, and SCCF [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. This refers to PAs, ICCAs and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs), as well as community implementation of SAPs [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities. Agencies should also report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. 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> [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. For the purpose of the SGP and its grant making, CSOs refer to national and local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) with priority on community-based organizations (CBOs), indigenous peoples, farmers, scientific community, women’s groups, and youth and children organizations. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. <https://intrafed.unops.org/ORGANIGRAMME/NAO/SGP/SGP_MANUAL/Pages/default.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. For a full list of participating SGP countries see:

    <http://www.sgp.undp.org//index.cfm?module=ActiveWeb&page=WebPage&s=contry_profile> [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. In 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. National Host Institution or NHI and host NGO are used interchangeably in this document because SGP Country Programmes commonly employ both terms. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. See full-length version of SGP NC ToRs. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. The 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. 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). [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. The allocated funds for this should not exceed 10% of the available GEF global core grant allocation for an operational phase. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. In many cases, it may however be advisable to provide smaller initial amounts when the grantee-partners have lower implementation capacity. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. The 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)