



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

GEF ID:	4383		
Country/Region:	India		
Project Title:	Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in India		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4515 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; LD-1; LD-1; CCM-2; CCM-3; CD-2; CD-5; IW-1; Others; Project Mana; LD-2; LD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,000,000
Co-financing:	\$6,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$11,000,000
PIF Approval:	February 15, 2011	Council Approval/Expected:	March 29, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Danielius Pivoriunas	Agency Contact Person:	Doley Tshering

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, India is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared 9/29/2010	Yes, India is eligible for the GEF funding. Cleared. 1/9/2012
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, endorsed, however, OFP has to be informed that only 5mln that includes also agency fee can be requested at this time. Cleared 9/29/2010	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	UNDP supported the SGP-India for the past 10 years, and has helped develop /an efficient and effective implementation approach from which this project will benefit. It is anticipated that UNOPS will also continue to play its important role supporting disbursement and financial	The UNDP has comparative advantage and extensive experience to implement this project in India. Cleared 1/8/2012

*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)
		management, in partnership with UNDP. In addition, UNDP's in-country presence through the UNDP India CO provides helpful support backstopping. UNDP has valuable experience in human resources development, civil society and institutional strengthening, and non-governmental and community participation, which are all key tenets of the SGP. However, further details have to be provided what kind of resources would be allocated to implement the project. 9/29/2010 Provided. Cleared 01/28/2011	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A Cleared 9/29/2010	N/A Cleared 1/8/2012
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, it does fit. However, further details about number of staff to be engaged in the implementation of the project. 9/29/2010 Provided. Cleared 01/28/2011	Yes, it does. In addition the project will be implemented by country office and local NGO. Cleared 1/9/2012
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, resources are available. Cleared 9/29/2010	Yes, resources are available. Cleared 1/9/2011
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes, for LD, CC and BD. Cleared 9/29/2010	Yes, LD-540,000; CC-3240,000; and BD-1620,000. Cleared 1/9/2011
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		N/A
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		N/A
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		N/A
	• focal area set-aside?	N/A Cleared 9/29/2010	N/A

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>The LD part of the project is aligned with the FA results framework. However, the examples of activities to be undertaken to achieve the expected outcomes of the LD components are described in very general terms, e.g. "improved agro-forestry practices", "community based water management". Please provide more details and/or selection criteria for participating community.</p> <p>The CC part of the project refers to the FA objective CCM-1. However, the technologies that are listed for demonstration and deployment cannot be considered innovative, but are proven and available. Also, the proposal doesn't include other necessary elements that are required for a CCM-1 intervention, such as the establishment of mechanisms for technology transfer, the purchase of technology licenses, or the identification of the technology source. Instead, according to the identified technologies, this intervention is better aligned with the CCM-2 and CCM-3 objectives.</p> <p>Capacity development objectives are not aligned to CD objectives. Please align. Please provide additional clarification why other none STAR focal areas are not considered as it has been agreed by the Steering Committee. 9/29/2010 Clarification provided and adequate adjustments have been made. Cleared 01/28/2011</p>	<p>12/28-BD: The project is aligned with the Biodiversity Results Framework. However, small grants projects should be presented with set of indicators to be used for each objective and results framework. Threat reduction indicators should be added in the component 1 of the project result framework, serving as a proxy for biodiversity status.</p> <p>Additional information is requested. 1/9/2011 Provided. Cleared 1/24/2012</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		DZ, Feb 3, 2011: CC interventions are aligned to the CC results framework. Cleared 02/09/2011	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	DZ 09-24-2010: Please see comment 9. Capacity development priorities and priorities for other none STAR focal areas are not identified. Please provide additional information. 9/29/2010 Additional information is provided. Cleared 01/28/2011 Provided. Cleared 02/09/2011	Yes, identified. Cleared 1/9/2012
	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?	UA 09-21-2010: Yes for LD. DZ 09-24-2010: Yes for CC. No information on NCSA. Please provide. 9/28/2010 Additional information for NCSA is provided. Cleared 01/28/2011	Yes, fully consistent. Cleared 1/9/2012
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	No information provided. 9/29/2010 Provided. Cleared 01/28/2011	Yes, clearly articulate. Cleared 1/9/2012
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?	UA 09-21-2010: No. The project describes the baseline situation in India in general and in 3 priority areas in particular. Please describe the baseline project for which incremental GEF funding is sought. DZ 09-24-2010: No. The project describes the baseline situation in India in general. Please describe the baseline project for which incremental GEF funding is sought. It also not clear how para 4 is related to the project proposal. Additional information is requested. 10/01/2010	12/28-BD: Examples of the type of activities that will be financed by the SGP Yes, baseline details for projects are provided. Cleared 1/9/2012

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>DZ, Feb 3, 2011: Comment is addressed.</p> <p>Required information is provided. Cleared 02/09/2011</p>	
	<p>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?</p>		<p>Yes, somewhat demonstrated. However, it is not clear why international consultancies are planned for evaluation when local expertise is available. Additional information is requested. 1/9/2012 Requested changes are made. Cleared 1/24/2012</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>Some information is provided, however it is not supported by data. Please provide. 10/01/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/09/2011</p>	<p>Yes, activities financed will be based on incremental costs. Cleared 1/9/2012</p>
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>Yes, clear. However, further information needs to be provided concerning staff resources and operational framework under which the project will be implements. 10/01/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/09/2011</p>	<p>12/28-BD: Please, reformulate the first target of the component 1, in order to be quantifiable, and please, include biodiversity status indicators. Additional information is requested. 1/9/2012 Requested changes are made. Cleared. 1/24/2012</p>
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>UA 09-21-2010: The description of the GEBs is a mixture of implementation targets and global and local benefits, which should all be clearly distinguished. The GEBs are stated with concrete figures without providing reference on how they have been derived.</p> <p>DZ 09-24-2010:</p>	<p>Yes, appropriate. Cleared 1/9/2012</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>No. The CC-linked GEBs are stated with a concrete figure (300,000 ton of CO2) without providing reference on how they have been derived. Please also provide additional info concerning targets for capacity development and other related activities. 10/01/2010</p> <p>DZ, Feb 3, 2011: Analytical calculations regarding GEBs are provided. Provided. Cleared 02/09/2011</p>	
	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, clear. Cleared 10/01/2010	Clear description of socio-economic benefits and their impact is provided. Cleared 1/9/2012
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes, taken into consideration. Cleared 10/01/2010	Public participation including CSO's and IP is included. Cleared 1/9/2012
	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, provided. Cleared 10/01/2010	Yes, the project take into account potential major risks including climate change. Cleared 1/9/2012
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, properly coordinated. Cleared 10/01/2010	Yes, the project is consistent and properly coordinated with relevant initiatives. Cleared 1/9/2012
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Not provided. Please provide details on resources to be used and other details for project selection and etc. 10/01/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/09/2011	Yes, adequate. Cleared 1/9/2012

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Yes, sufficiently close. Cleared 1/9/2012
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		N/A. Cleared 1/9/2012
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes, appropriate. However, agency fee should be at the level of 4%. Please make necessary changes. 10/01/2010 Changes provided, agency fee is set at 8% level. Cleared 02/09/2011	Yes, funding level for management costs is appropriate. Cleared 1/9/2012
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes, appropriate. Cleared 10/01/2010	Funding and co-financing for all objectives is adequate to achieve expected outcomes. Cleared 1/9/2012
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	UA 09-21-2010: Co-financing is only indicative at this stage. In para 31`it is stated that the Ministry of Environment and Forests will provide co-financing in form of grants, however, table C only indicates in kind funds. Please clarify. 10/01/2010 Clarification is provided. Cleared 02/09/2011	All co-financing is confirmed. Cleared 1/9/2012
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes, somewhat in line. However, the agency could reconsider to provide higher co-financing if it is considered important project. 9/29/2010 Yes reconsidered raising to one million. Cleared 01/28/2011	Yes, UNDP co-financing is within agreed framework. 1/9/2012
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Tracking tools have been included with relevant indicators. Cleared 1/9/2012

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes, M&E plan is included. Cleared 1/9/2012
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>UA 09-21-2010: Clarifications requested for LD FA: the description of LD components is very general and generic and should be improved. In particular, more details are required on selection criteria for communities supported under component 3. In view of the limited funds available, a clear focus on livelihood improvement for disadvantaged communities should be pursued.</p> <p>DZ 09-24-2010: For CC FA: the relevant CCM objectives (CCM-2 and CCM-3) should be included. The CC intervention should be improved; it is limited in providing generic data for investments, without any clear activities for making these investments sustainable. Also, references should be provided on how the expected GEBs have been estimated. Not yet, additional information is requested 10/01/2010</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		DZ, Feb 3, 2011: Cleared. At CEO Endorsement request cost assumptions should be provided and justified. The PIF is recommended for CEO endorsement. 02/09/2011	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	12/28-BD: please, address issues on item 7, 11, and 14. Additional information/changes are requested. 1/9/2012 Additional information is provided and requested changes are made. The project is technically cleared and CEO clearance is recommended. 1/24/2012	
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?		N/A
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Additional information/changes are requested. 1/9/2012 Additional information is provided and requested changes are made. The project is technically cleared and CEO clearance is recommended. 1/26/2012
Review Date (s)	First review*	October 01, 2010	January 09, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)		January 26, 2012
	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.**