



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

GEF ID:	<b>9205</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Kazakhstan</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Kazakhstan</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5045 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-2 Program 4; LD-2 Program 3; CCM-2 Program 3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$2,649,726</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$3,000,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$5,649,726</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>October 01, 2015</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Nick Remple</b>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	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 and (b) Climate Smart Innovative Agro-ecology. In addition, is in line with the BD, LD and CCM GEF-6 strategies.  Cleared 08/03/2015	
	2. Is the project consistent with the	Yes. The project is consistent with	

<sup>1</sup> 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)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Kazakhstan's national strategies and plans, including the national reports to the CBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC.  Cleared 08/03/2015	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes. Cleared 08/03/2015	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes. During PPG phase the intervention areas (the six steppe and desert landscapes) will be defined.  Cleared at PIF stage. 08/03/2015	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Yes. Cleared 08/03/2015	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes. Cleared 08/03/2015	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	Yes. Proposed grant falls within Kazakhstan's available STAR, as follows:  Biodiversity: \$ 967,150 Land degradation        \$967,150	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Climate change \$967,150  For a total of GEF Resources of \$2,901,450  Cleared 08/03/2015	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	The Program Manager recommends CEO PIF clearance. A PPG has been requested and it's within the norm.  08/05/2015	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	August 03, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	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. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> 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?		

## CEO endorsement Review

<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> 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.