



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5736		
Country/Region:	Global (Armenia, Burundi, Cameroon, Ghana, Kyrgyz Republic, Mongolia, Maldives, Thailand, Ukraine, Vietnam, Congo DR)		
Project Title:	GEF SGP Fifth Operational Phase - Implementing the Program Using STAR Resources III		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4561 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2; CCM-1; CCM-4; CCM-5; LD-1; LD-3; IW-1; IW-2; CHEM-1; CD-2; CD-5; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$6,965,151
Co-financing:	\$7,250,000	Total Project Cost:	\$14,215,151
PIF Approval:	April 01, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	May 27, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey	Agency Contact Person:	Delfin Ganapin

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	<p>Yes. The four countries included are eligible for GEF funding. Cleared 03/11/2014.</p> <p>The project includes 11 countries now and they are all eligible for GEF funding.</p> <p>Cleared 03/24/2014</p>	<p>The CEO endorsement request includes now 12 countries, all of which are eligible for GEF funding. The countries are: Armenia, Belarus, Burundi, Cameroon, Congo DRC, Ghana, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, Mongolia, Thailand, Ukraine and Vietnam.</p> <p>Cleared 08/20/2014</p> <p>The number of countries has been revised, since this is funding from GEF-5, there cannot be any additional</p>

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			resources requested from that cycle. The total amount requested of \$6,965,151 is consistent with the amount included in the approved PIF. Cleared 11/19/2014
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. Four letters of endorsement have been included. Cleared 03/11/2014 Yes. Eleven letters of endorsement have been included. Cleared 03/24/2014	Yes. All 12 letters of endorsement have been provided. Cleared 08/20/2014 Yes. 11 letters of endorsement have been provided. Cleared 11/19/2014
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, all resources are from countries' STAR allocations. Cleared 03/11/2014	Resources from GEF-5 STAR allocations of the respective countries, Cleared 11/19/2014
	• the focal area allocation?	N/A	N/A
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	N/A
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	N/A
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/A	N/A
	• focal area set-aside?	N/A	N/A
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ?	Yes. they're aligned. Cleared 03/11/2014	Yes. This multifocal area project is aligned the GEF's FA frameworks. Cleared 08/20/2014

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>		
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	Yes, it's consistent. Further details will be required at endorsement stage Cleared 03/11/2014	As requested at PIF stage, please provide further clarification regarding the project's consistency with other relevant plans and strategies in the recipient countries. Additional information is requested. 08/20/2014 Information provided. Cleared 11/19/2014
Project Design	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Yes. Cleared 03/11/2014	Yes. Cleared 11/19/2014
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	Yes. Cleared 03/11/2014	Somewhat. Please clarify why the outcomes remain the same in terms of the number of projects as compared to the PIF. Since the CEO Endorsement requests includes one additional country, one would expect the projects in the outcomes to be increased from the PIF (11 countries) to the CEO Endorsement (12 countries). Additional information is requested. 08/20/2014

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Revised CEO endorsement includes 11 countries. Cleared 11/19/2014
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes GEB identified and incremental reasoning sound and appropriate. Cleared 03/11/2014	Yes. Cleared 08/20/2014
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		Yes. The communities targeted by SGP are often the poorest and most vulnerable, and typically have low levels of technical and institutional capacity to adequately address global environmental problems. According to the Joint Evaluation (2008), more than 60% of SGP grants target poor communities in participating countries, which have the greatest need for assistance. Indigenous peoples, who have the knowledge and experience to create sustainable solutions to environmental challenges, are also targeted by at least 15% of SGP grants. Approximately a quarter of SGP grants specifically support women, who constitute another priority target group. SGP helps utilize the full potential of women and men and transform marginal and vulnerable sectors into active actors for sustainable development. SGP will continue to apply its gender mainstreaming approach, ensuring that priority is given to women led projects and those with high participation of women, and gender specific components. SGP will provide gender disaggregated information to the extent

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			possible about project beneficiaries and participants. The National Steering Committees of SGP in each country are being strengthened to ensure designation of a gender focal point on each NSC to track grant making towards women focused projects. Cleared 08/20/2014
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes. CSOs, CBOs and indigenous peoples are both beneficiaries and direct participants of the project. Cleared 03/11/2014	Yes. Cleared 08/20/2014
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Yes. Cleared 03/11/2014	Yes. No change from PIF. Cleared 08/20/2014
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes and it plans to do so in each country. Cleared 03/11/2014	Yes. The Country Programme Strategies that guide the grant making in each country are formulated in each country taking into account other related programs and projects. Cleared 08/20/2014
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this 	Some information is provided. However, please describe what are the project's innovative aspects and what the potential for scaling up is (Section A of the PIF). Additional information is requested. 03/11/2014 Provided. Cleared 03/24/2014	No change from PIF- Cleared 08/20/2014

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	based on GEF and Agency experience. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 		
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Yes. One additional country has been added. The increase in the GEF grant request does not exceed 5% of total. Cleared 08/20/2014
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		Yes. Cleared 08/20/2014
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The indicative grant amounts in Table B and Table D (column (a)) differ. Please review and provide the corrected tables. Additional information is requested 03/11/2014 Provided. Cleared 03/24/2014	Yes. Cleared 08/20/2014
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	Yes. UNDP is bringing substantive cash co-financing. Cleared. 03/11/2014	UNDP's co-financing letter is included. However, other sources of co-financing have yet to be confirmed. Please clarify. 08/20/2014 Clarification provided. Cleared 11/19/2014
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. Although the PMC is slightly higher than customary for a global program, GEF Council paper (GEF/C.33/5, p. 1) "Small Grants Program: Follow up to the 2007 Joint Evaluation" recommended a	Yes. Cleared 08/20/2014

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		"level of management costs on the basis of services rendered and cost efficiency rather than a set percentage". The principle of determining SGP management costs on the basis of services rendered was recently reconfirmed by the GEF Secretariat and UNDP in GEF5. Cleared 03/11/2014	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	No PPG requested. Cleared 03/11/2014	N/A
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	N/A
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes. Cleared 08/20/2014
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		No. The budgeted M&E plan is missing from the document. Please revise and add the information requested. 08/20/2014 Provided. Cleared 11/19/2014
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		Yes. Cleared 08/20/2014
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not yet. Please see comments and questions above. 03/11/2014 Yes. Project is being recommended. 03/24/2014	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Further details about consistency of project with national initiatives and priorities.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Not yet. Please address the questions and comments requested above. 08/20/2014 Yes. Project is recommended for CEO endorsement. Cleared 11/19/2014
	First review*	March 11, 2014	August 20, 2014
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 24, 2014	November 19, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.