



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

GEF ID:	9774		
Country/Region:	Global (Argentina, Burkina Faso, Bhutan, Belarus, Colombia, Cabo Verde, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Gambia, Jamaica, Madagascar, Mali, Malaysia, Nepal, Panama, Congo DR)		
Project Title:	GEF SGP Sixth Operational Phase- Strategic Implementation using STAR Resources Tranche 1, mainly in LDCs and SIDs (Part III)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5475 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 2; BD-2 Program 3; CCM-1 Program 1; CCM-2 Program 4; CCM-3 Program 5; LD-1 Program 1; LD-2 Program 3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$17,337,500
Co-financing:	\$18,031,000	Total Project Cost:	\$35,368,500
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2017
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey	Agency Contact Person:	Yoko Watanabe, Global Manager, GEF SGP

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	The project is aligned with GEF SGP's Strategic objectives in GEF-6, approved by the GEF Council in May 2014. In addition, this Multi-focal area project is consistent with the results framework and strategic objectives of the GEF's Biodiversity, Climate Change and Land	Thank you for the comment on the SMART indicators to be used to track project's contribution to the Aichi Targets. Key SMART indicator that the SGP will be using would be the coverage pf both terrestrial and marine protected areas.

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Degradation Focal Areas.</p> <p>For Biodiversity, the project will support the CBD's Aichi targets, in particular those related to protected areas (11), ecosystem services (14) and traditional knowledge, innovations and practices (18).</p> <p>However, there's no mention of which SMART indicators will be used to track the project's contributions to these Aichi targets.</p> <p>Revision requested 03/16/2017</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 03/27/2017</p>	<p>This will include increased management effectiveness of both new and existing protected areas, including the Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas and Territories (ICCAs).</p> <p>Another SMART indicator would be the coverage of areas that promote sustainable use and mainstreaming of biodiversity in the production land/seascapes with sound policies and practices.</p> <p>The SGP will also track and report on number of threatened species that the project contributed for conservation.</p>
	<p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>At the country level, the grant-making will be implemented based on the SGP Country Programme Strategies (CPS) for GEF-6 that have been prepared by each country to enable more strategic and integrated investments. These CPS are based on national policies and action plans, such as NBSAPs, NAPs, NIPs etc. and other national key documents and have been conducted in a consultative manner to identify SGP's value added within the priority global environmental issues.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>In addition, consistency with national priorities will be ensured by the SGP National Steering Committee, which guides implementation of the SGP in each country and which is composed of leading national government and civil society representatives in the environmental field.</p> <p>Cleared 03/16/2017</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Cleared 03/16/2017</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>Yes. The proposed project builds upon the achievements and results of the GEF SGP projects in the pertaining countries as well as upon solid partnerships and baseline investments. It's complementary to the GEF SGP 6th Operational Phase (Part I and II), by focusing on the 3 relevant thematic grantmaking components at the country level: a) Community Landscape and Seascape Conservation; b) Climate Smart Innovative Agro-ecology; and c) Low-Carbon Energy Access Co-benefits. In the respective countries, funding from the SGP Global financing Parts I and II, which was</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>approved earlier by the GEF Council, covers the following components d) Local to Global Chemicals Management Coalitions; e) CSO-Government Policy and Planning Dialogue Platforms; f) Promoting social inclusion; and g) Global Reach for Citizen Practice-Based Knowledge.</p> <p>Cleared 03/16/2017</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Cleared 03/16/2017</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Cleared 03/16/2017</p>	
	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
Availability of Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	<p>No. Please note that council decision GEF/C.51/04 - Update on GEF-6 Resource Availability requests the Secretariat to effectively and proactively manage the projected shortfall in GEF-6. At this juncture we anticipate that sufficient resources may not be available in GEF-6 for a number of countries included in the proposed project. In addition, there seem to be countries that have already endorsed STAR funding to other proposed GEF projects, which would</p>	<p>The comment is well noted. Based on upstream discussion with the GEFSEC, it was agreed that this project will take a tranced approach with 2-3 PIFs.</p> <p>The first tranche project is proposed to cover 16 countries (Argentina, Belarus, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Colombia, DR Congo, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Gambia, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mali, Nepal, Panama, and Turkey) with a total GEF grant of \$17.631m.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>"compete" for available resources.</p> <p>Taking those two issues into consideration, the following is a non-exhaustive list of such countries:</p> <p>Albania Burundi Cameroon China Ethiopia Honduras Jordan Kyrgyzstan Morocco Papua New Guinea South Africa Ukraine Zimbabwe</p> <p>We recommend to circle back with the OFPs in the countries to verify the committed STAR resources to this proposed project.</p> <p>Finally, in view of the anticipated shortfall, the GEF Secretariat is assessing the need to revise countries' endorsements for a number of GEF projects. We will inform agencies about the decision in due course.</p> <p>Revision to list of countries included in PIF is requested.</p>	<p>Countries were selected based on the following criteria: 1) LDCs/SIDS countries and regional balance; 2) high delivery rate of GEF-6 SGP core resources; 3) high interest and commitment to SGP (larger STAR allocation); and 4) lower overall GEF-6 STAR utilization.</p> <p>For other countries that have provided endorsement letters, we are checking with the OFPs to verify the committed STAR resources, and include them in the next tranche of the SGP STAR PIF that will be submitted very soon for the next work program.</p> <p>March 28, 2017</p> <p>Countries have been revised based on feedback from the GEFSEC, reflecting availability of STAR allocation</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>03/16/2017.</p> <p>Please review the list of countries further.</p> <p>03/27/2017</p> <p>List revised and appropriate.</p> <p>03/29/2017</p> <p>However, please note that the names of the OFPs in the accompanying endorsement letters do not match the current OFPs for the following countries. (Correct OFP listed next to the country name):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Burkina Faso: Mr. Pamoussa OUEDRAOGO -Operational Focal Point since 2016-09-27 b. Cape Verde: Mr. Alexandre Nevsky Medina GOMES RODRIGUES -Operational Focal Point since 2016-11-22 c. Colombia: Ms. Laura Camila Bermudez Wilches - Operational Focal Point since 2017-03-30 d. Congo DR: Mr. Leonard MUAMBA KANDA -Operational Focal Point since 2017-01-09 e. Gambia: Mr. Momodou Jama SUWAREH - Operational Focal Point since 2016-10-06 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>f. Malaysia: Mr. Jaya Singam RAJOO -Operational Focal Point since 2016-06-09</p> <p>g. Nepal: Mr. Baikuntha ARYAL -Operational Focal Point since 2016-01-31</p> <p>Please provide a written (letter or email) from the current OFPs confirming the endorsed amounts in the respective LoEs.</p> <p>04/03/2017</p> <p>The emails from current OFPs has been provided.</p> <p>Cleared - SW 4/10/2017</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 	N/A	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>Not at this stage. Please review the comments above.</p> <p>03/16/2017</p> <p>Not at this stage. Please review STAR allocation comment above.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>03/27/2017</p> <p>Not at this stage. Please provide confirmation or endorsements for countries on the list as per point #8 above.</p> <p>In addition, please review the PMC. It shouldn't exceed 10% of the subtotal amount in table B.</p> <p>04/03/2017</p> <p>All information requested has been provided. The PIF is now recommended for clearance.</p> <p>04/10/2017 SW</p>	
Review Date	Review	March 16, 2017	March 22, 2017
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 27, 2017	March 28, 2017
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 29, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	Yes.	
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council • Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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