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

GEF ID:	**9651**		
Country/Region:	**Somalia**		
Project Title:	**Strengthening National Capacities for Improved Decision Making and Mainstreaming of Global Environmental Obligations**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5799 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CCCD-2; CCCD-3; CCCD-4;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$50,000**	Project Grant:	**$1,000,000**
Co-financing:	**$1,500,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$2,550,000**
PIF Approval:	**March 16, 2017**	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Susan Waithaka**	Agency Contact Person:	**Tom Twining -ward**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	The project is aligned with Cross-Cutting Capacity Development (CCCD) for GEF-6. However while the project indicates that it will address objective 1 – the outputs indicated do not align with this objective. Please revise 12/9/2016	

[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)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Revised. Cleared 1/22/2017	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	The project mentions Somalia's return into global efforts to address environmental issues after being out of it due to conflict. Strong commitment is shown from the Six Pillar Policy and the Compact that call for mainstreaming of environmental considerations into socio-economic development among others. Cleared 12/9/2016	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes it does. Cleared 12/9/2016	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes Cleared. 12/9/2016	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Not entirely. As mentioned Component 3 does not address CD-1 which deals with information management. In addition, if we follow the strategic	

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

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		objectives of GEF 6 – most of the outputs of Component 3 would be addressing CD 2. Output 3.4 – is very specific to youth and education curricula and this falls outside of activities in GEF 6. One of the main purposes of this strategy for GEF-6 is to target other than the environmental sector of the government, i.e. the ministry of finance, agriculture or industry , so that global environmental issues and MEAs commitments are understood and incorporated into the regular process of decision making. Please clarify what 3:5 Improved internet visibility of the value of protecting the global environment to socio- economic development entails. Please revise and provide additional information. 12/09/2016 Please remove CD-1 from Table A - and also from Component 3 in Table B. Engaging with the education curricula is an intensive process - that will not be done justice within the context of this small project. In addition - as the review has pointed out due to the	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		protracted conflict the education system has seized to function and it might therefore be better to focus on the youth and informal sector as suggested earlier. Revision requested 1/23/2017 Revisions provided. Cleared 2/23/2017	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes Cleared. 12/09/2016	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	N/A	
	• The focal area allocation?	Yes GEF 6 CCCD Cleared 12/09/2016	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• Focal area set-aside?	N/A	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	Not yet. Please respond to comments above. 12/09/2016	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		More revision requested. 1/23/2017 Explanations provided. Cleared 2/23/2015	
Review Date	Review	December 09, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	January 23, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 23, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	There are no changes that have not been justified. Some outputs have been reworded - Components 1 and 2 have fewer outputs in the final project document. Cleared 3/28/2018	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes Cleared 3/28/2018	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	Yes. it does. Cleared 3/28/2018	
	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)	Yes. Cleared 3/28/2018	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	Yes. However to note that the total co-financing has been reduced from US$ 2.25M to US$ 1.5 M - with UNDPs cash contribution a US$ 500,000 and reducing the government's in-kind contribution to about US 1M. Cleared 3/28/2018	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	A baseline assessment of the scorecard was prepared by national stakeholders during a focus group, and is provided as an annex. Cleared 3/28/2018	
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?	N/A	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and	The project will coordinate with relevant initiatives such as the NAP	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	process - working closely with the GCF. There is also a Capacity Development Project - (SIP) with UNDP and a World Bank Somalia capacity Injection Project. Cleared 3/28/2018	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Yes Cleared 3/28/2018	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	The project's approach to knowledge management is consistent with the International Resource Panel Report on Policy Coherence of the Sustainable Development Goals which emphasizes the need for developing widespread awareness and creating and disseminating decision support tools. Cleared 3/28/2018	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	Yes Cleared 3/28/2018	
	• STAP	N/A	
	• GEF Council	N/A	

[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.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	• Convention Secretariat	N/A	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	Yes CEO Approval is recommended 3/28/2018	
Review Date	Review	March 28, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		