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

GEF ID:	**9086**		
Country/Region:	**Indonesia**		
Project Title:	**Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Indonesia**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5499 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-4 Program 9; LD-2 Program 3; CCM-1 Program 1;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$91,325**	Project Grant:	**$3,561,644**
Co-financing:	**$6,420,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$10,072,969**
PIF Approval:	**April 28, 2015**	Council Approval/Expected:	**June 01, 2015**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey**	Agency Contact Person:	**Nick Remple**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	Yes. The proposed project is aligned with the GEF-6 strategic objectives approved for the GEF SGP, particularly with the following: (a) Community Landscape and Seascape Conservation; (b) Climate Smart Innovative Agroecology; and (c)Low-Carbon Energy Access Co-benefits The project is also aligned with the results framework of the GEF's Biodiversity, Land Degradation and Climate Change Focal Areas. Cleared 03/20/2015
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes. The SGP in Indonesia is consistent with the National Biodiversity Action Plan, 2003-2020; Law No. 11 of 2013, regarding the Ratification of the Nagoya

[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)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from Their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity; The National Development Planning: Indonesia Responses to Climate Change (Yellow Book from Bappenas) (2009) among other national priorities and plans. Cleared 03/20/2015
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes. Cleared 03/20/2015
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes. Cleared 03/20/2015
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Yes. Cleared 03/20/2015
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes. Cleared 03/20/2015
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• The STAR allocation?	Yes. $4,000,000 from Indonesia's STAR allocation for GEF-6 as follows: BD: $2,500,000 CC: $1,000,000 LD: $500,000 All inclusive of agency fees. Cleared 03/20/2015
	• The focal area allocation?	N/A
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A
	• Focal area set-aside?	N/A

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	Not Yet. The PIF does not include any co-financing from UNDP. Co-financing is encouraged from the GEF Partner Agencies, in the context of their respective country assistance/engagement strategies, to support the implementation of GEF-financed projects and achievement of their objectives. Please provide clarification. Also, there's a whole section on page 7 of the PIF regarding the Gorontalo and Wakatobi and Banggai Archipelago that is repeated. For neatness purposes, please edit the PIF and include the section only once. 03/20/2015 Information provided. The PIF is being recommended for clearance and WP inclusion. 03/25/2015
Review Date	Review	March 20, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 25, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
	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. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* 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?	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:	
	• GEFSEC	
	• STAP	
	• GEF Council	
	• Convention Secretariat	
	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	

[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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
Recommendation		
Review Date	Review	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	