



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

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|------------------|
| GEF ID: | 4383 | | |
| Country/Region: | India | | |
| Project Title: | 5 th 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-2; CCM-2; CCM-3; CD-2; CD-5; IW-3; Others; Project Mana; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$0 | Project Grant: | \$4,629,630 |
| Co-financing: | \$6,000,000 | Total Project Cost: | \$10,629,630 |
| PIF Approval: | | Council Approval/Expected: | March 01, 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 | |
| | 2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it? | N/A Cleared 9/29/2010 | |
| | 3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? | Yes, endorsed. Cleared 9/29/2010 | |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 4. 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 management, in partnership with UNDP. In addition, UNDP's in-country presence | |

*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 9-8-2010

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| | | 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 | |
| | 5. 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 increasing co financing to one million. Cleared 01/28/2011 | |
| | 6. 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 | |
| Resource Availability | 7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF 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 | |
| | • the focal area allocation? | Yes, for LD, CC and BD. Cleared 9/29/2010 | |
| | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access? | | |
| | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | | |
| | • focal area set-aside? | N/A Cleared 9/29/2010 | |
| Project Consistency | 8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework? | 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. The CC part of the project refers to the FA | |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>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. 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>DZ, Feb 3, 2011: CC interventions are aligned to the CC results framework. Cleared 02/09/2011</p> | |
| | <p>9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?</p> | <p>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</p> | |
| | <p>10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?</p> | <p>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</p> | |
| | <p>11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of</p> | <p>No information provided. 9/29/2010 Provided. Cleared 01/28/2011</p> | |

| | | | |
|----------------|--|--|--|
| | project outcomes? | | |
| Project Design | 12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions? | <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>DZ, Feb 3, 2011: Comment is addressed.</p> <p>Required information is provided. Cleared 02/09/2011</p> | |
| | 13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions? | | |
| | 14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear? | <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</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 02/09/2011</p> | |
| | 15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem? | <p>Some information is provided, however it is not supported by data. Please provide. 10/01/2010</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 02/09/2011</p> | |
| | 16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate? | <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: 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 DZ, Feb 3, 2011: Analytical calculations regarding GEBs are provided. Provided. Cleared 02/09/2011</p> | |
| | 17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits? | <p>Not provided. Please provide. 10/01/2010 Yes provided. Cleared 02/09/2011</p> | |
| | 18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/ adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)? | <p>Yes, clear. Cleared 10/01/2010</p> | |
| | 19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately? | <p>Yes, taken into consideration. Cleared 10/01/2010</p> | |
| | 20. 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) | <p>Yes, provided. Cleared 10/01/2010</p> | |
| | 21. Is the provided documentation consistent? | <p>Yes, consistent. Cleared 10/01/2010</p> | |
| | 22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified? | <p>Yes, identified but their roles are not clear. Please provide clarification. 10/01/2010</p> | |

| | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| | 23. 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 | |
| | 24. 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 | |
| | 25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes? | | |
| | 26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included? | | |
| Project Financing | 27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF 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 are provided. Agency fee is set at 8% level. Cleared 02/09/2011 | |
| | 28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost reasoning principle? | Yes, appropriate. Cleared 10/01/2010 | |
| | 29. Comment on indicated cofinancing at PIF. At CEO endorsement, indicate if cofinancing is confirmed. | 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 Provided. Cleared 02/09/2011 | |
| | 30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | UA 09-21-2010: Yes for LD. DZ 09-24-2010: This cannot be assessed, since there is no clear information about the capacity of the proposed installations. 10/01/2010 DZ, Feb 3, 2011: More information is provided. Funding seems more adequate | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | to achieve the specific targets. At the CEO Endorsement stage cost assumptions should be provided and justified. Also, since the CC activities have specific investment outcomes (stoves, RE systems) they should be described as investment activities, and not as TA activities. Cleared 02/09/2011 | |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? | No information is provided. Please provide. 10/01/2010 | |
| | 32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | | |
| Agency Responses | 33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from: | | |
| | • STAP? | | |
| | • Convention Secretariat? | | |
| | • Council comments? | | |
| | • Other GEF Agencies? | | |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | | |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage | 34. 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</p> | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| | | <p>estimated. Not yet, additional information is requested 10/01/2010</p> <p>DZ, Feb 3, 2011: Cleared. At CEO Endorsement request cost assumptions should be provided and justified.</p> <p>Clarification has been provided. The PIF is recommended for CEO clearance. 02/09/2011</p> | |
| | 35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval. | | |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG? | | |
| | 37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended? | | |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | October 01, 2010 | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | February 09, 2011 | |
| | 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.