



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

GEF ID:	5041		
Country/Region:	Guinea		
Project Title:	Strengthening Decentralized Management of the Environment to Meet Rio Convention Objectives		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4963 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CD-4; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$525,000
Co-financing:	\$625,000	Total Project Cost:	\$1,150,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey	Agency Contact Person:	Tom Twining-Ward

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?	Yes, Guinea ratified the CBD on May 7, 1993, the UNFCCC on September 7, 2000 and the UNCCD on June 23, 1997. Cleared 7/27/2012	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, with letter dated March 27, 2012. Cleared 7/27/2012	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. Cleared 7/27/2012	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA. 7/27/2012	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes. However, please describe UNDP's technical staff in the country office that will manage and supervise the project.	

*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Additional information is requested 7/27/2012</p> <p>In the revised PIF, UNDP provided a more detail account of the agency's staff who will be involved in the project: the UNDP Guinea Energy and Environment Team will be supported by an advisor and a UNV specialist and the M&E Unit. Finally the team will be supported by a dedicated global Senior Technical Advisor and Project Assistant. Cleared 11/27/2012</p>	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA. 7/27/2012	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes, cross-cutting capacity development allocation. Cleared 7/27/2012	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA. 7/27/2012	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA. 7/27/2012	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA. 7/27/2012	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>No. There seems to be a big departure from the Expected outcomes and Output indicators as established in the CCCD development results framework. Some outcomes and some outputs seem to fall under different objectives than CD4 as stated in the PIF. It's recommended that a revision of the framework in the light of the CCCD strategy and results framework is done. Additional information is requested. 7/27/2012</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Information provided is not sufficient, in addition it is not clear why capacities of MEA implementation have to be funded by the GEF for local level. It is also not clear the project is focused on capacities of CSOs and CBO's. This can not be purpose of this project. Please revise. 11/27/2012</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 05/01/2013</p>	
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>	<p>Somewhat. More detail on the links to the GEF Focal Areas is requested. 7/27/2012</p> <p>Additional information provided is not sufficient. Tangible results should be identified in outputs and outcomes of the project framework. It does not seem from the information provided that capacity of institutions can be feasibly strengthened without formal engagement of different institutions who are in charge for MEAs implementation. Revisions are requested. 11/27/2012</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 05/01/2013</p>	
	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>Yes. The project is consistent with the needs identified in the Guinean Strategy and Action Plan for Capacity Development 2009-2015 and other national priorities. Cleared 7/27/2012</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability</p>	<p>Please provide a clearer indication of how many government staff will be positively influenced by the project and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	of project outcomes?	<p>explain how the outcomes will be sustained in the future. Additional information is requested. 7/27/2012</p> <p>In the revised PIF there was some clarification provided. However, institutional capacities should be also targeted by this project. So, please review the framework of the project. 11/27/2012</p> <p>Revised PIF provided clarifications. Cleared 05/01/2013</p>	
Project Design	11. 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. 7/27/2012	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>To some extent. However, a 1:1 ratio of cash co-financing is necessary. Additional information is requested. 7/27/2012</p> <p>Cash co-financing increased by \$50,000. The total cash co-financing is still less than 1:1, furthermore it's less than 50% of the total GEF grant. Perhaps the PAVC contribution could be mostly cash so that the cash co-financing is increased further? Please clarify. 11/27/2012.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Cash co-financing has been reviewed as follows: Government (in-kind): 150,000 Government (cash): 100,000 UNDP (Grant): 150,000 PACV (Grant): 225,000 Cash co-financing is : \$475,000</p> <p>Cleared 05/01/2013</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>No. Please refer to Number 7 above. Additional information is requested. 7/27/2012</p> <p>No additional information is provided. It is still unclear why to train 150 government employees we need to invest 525K? Please provide clarification. 11/27/2012</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 05/01/2013</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes. Cleared 7/27/2012	
	16. 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. Cleared 7/27/2012	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Mention of CSOs and local communities is made in the PIF, but there's no specific identification of the concrete roles they will play. Please revise. Additional information is requested. 7/27/2012	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Revised PIF provided information regarding the roles of CSOs. However please refer to point 7 above regarding training for CSOs. Revision needed 11/27/2012</p> <p>Explanation provided. Cleared 05/01/2013</p>	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Yes. Cleared 7/27/2012	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>There's mention of several ongoing initiatives and that the project will seek coordination and linkages to those. Please be more specific as to how this will be achieved. Additional information is requested. 7/27/2012</p> <p>Information provided in the revised PIF. Cleared 11/27/2012</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes. Cleared 7/27/2012	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>Yes, but please note that a revision of the budget is requested. 7/27/2012</p> <p>Please see point 13 above. 11/27/2012.</p> <p>Revision provided. Cleared 05/01/2013</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>The budget seems low for the set of activities that have been included. The outcomes and outputs established seem too ambitious for the amount of money. It's recommended that these are revised and some taken out or that the budget is substantially increased.</p> <p>Co-financing should be reviewed accordingly. 7/27/2012</p> <p>The revised PIF includes an increase in the budget of \$50,000. Please revise outputs and outcomes making them tangible and realistic in terms of results planned. Additional information is requested. 11/27/2012</p> <p>Revision provided. Cleared 05/01/2013</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>Cash co-financing should be substantially increased. Additional information/changes are requested. 7/27/2012</p> <p>Please refer to point 13 above. 11/27/2012</p> <p>Revision provided. Cleared 05/01/2013</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes. Cleared 7/27/2012	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Not yet. Additional information/clarification is requested. 7/27/2012</p> <p>Not yet. Additional information/clarification is requested. 11/27/2012</p> <p>Yes. The PIF has been technically cleared and is being recommended. 05/01/2013</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>1) The details of the decentralization approach, and how to monitor and quantify, will be determined through the PPG.</p> <p>2) During the preparation phase (PPG) a clear commitment of the decentralized authorities should be sought and formalized via letters of intent.</p> <p>3) The PPG process will be used to further define management, coordination and consultation mechanisms.</p> <p>4) The PACV has preliminarily pledged co-financing, this should be negotiated to US\$225,000 during the PPG phase.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	July 27, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 27, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	May 01, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Yes. Please ensure that CD indicators are used to assess baseline. Cleared. 7/27/2012
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes. Cleared. 7/27/2012
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Not yet, until PIF is cleared. 7/27/2012 Not yet, until PIF is cleared. 11/27/2012 Yes. The PPG is being recommended. 05/01/2013
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	October 12, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	May 01, 2013

* 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.