



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

GEF ID:	<b>5031</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Sri Lanka</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Ensuring global environmental concerns and best practices mainstreamed in the post-conflict rapid development process of Sri Lanka through improved information management</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>4940 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CD-2; CD-3; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$800,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$1,675,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$2,475,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Tom Twining-Ward, UNDP (Green-LECDRS)</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes., Sri Lanka ratified the CBD in March, 1994. the UNFCCC in November, 1993 and the UNCCD in September, 1998. Cleared 7/10/2012	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, letter dated April 24, 2012. Cleared 7/10/2012	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. Cleared 7/10/2012	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	To some extent. However, please describe UNDP's technical staff in the country office that will manage and supervise the project, as well as their competencies. Additional information requested. 7/10/2012  The revised PIF provides adequate information. Cleared 1/17/2013	
Resource Availability	6. 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, cross-cutting capacity development allocation. Cleared. 7/10/2012	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/A	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Provided. Cleared 7/10/2012	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Identified. Cleared 7/10/2012	
	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?	Yes. The project is consistent with the NCSA and the country's development and environmental strategies. Cleared 7/10/2012	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability	To some extent. However, it's not clear how many staff will be positively influenced by the project and how the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	of project outcomes?	<p>outcomes will be sustained in the future. Additional information is requested. 7/3/2012</p> <p>The revised PIF provided sufficient and adequate information. Cleared 1/17/2013</p>	
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?	<p>To some extent. However, no illustrative data is provided. More information is requested. 7/10/2012</p> <p>Adequate data has been provided in the revised PIF. Cleared 1/17/2013</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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	Yes. Cleared 7/10/2012	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes. Cleared 7/10/2012	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>To some extent. However, the global environmental benefits (GEB) that the project will bring about are not described. Additional information/clarification is requested. 7/10/2012</p> <p>Additional information on GEBs has been provided. The project will facilitate creation of BD, CC and LD related GEBs. Cleared 1/17/2013</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	Somewhat. However, illustrative data in terms of population and extent of impact on country's economy affected by the project is not provided. Additional information is requested. 7/10/2012  The revised PIF provides adequate information. Cleared 1/17/2013	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	No specific role is identified for CSOs. Additional information is requested. 7/10/2012  Revised PIF includes appropriate additional information about the role of CSOs. Cleared 1/17/2013	
	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. Cleared 7/10/2012	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes. Cleared 7/10/2012	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	A more detailed description of the execution arrangements needs to be provided. What coordination/management and implementation arrangements/mechanisms will be used? Additional information is requested. 7/10/2012  Additional information adequately provided. Cleared 1/17/2013	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	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?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. Cleared 7/10/2012	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes. Cleared 7/10/2012	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>The cofinancing package seems robust. It would be very important that cofinancing from National Government in amount of 1mln would provided in cash. Please make necessary changes. Additional information is requested. 7/10/2012</p> <p>The revised PIF explained that co-financing will be further discussed at the PPG stage and the letter of co-financing will be attached to the CEO endorsement. Clarified. Every effort should be made to ensure at least a 1:1 ratio of cash co-financing. Cleared 1/17/2013</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>Somewhat in line with roles, however, it has to be in cash. Please make necessary changes. 7/10/2012</p> <p>The revised PIF clarifies that UNDP Co-finance will be in cash, mostly through parallel projects. Cleared 1/17/2013</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>Not yet. Some additional information is required. 7/10/2012</p> <p>Not yet. As per the new policy, the Agency fee has to be revised to a maximum of 9.5% of the GEF funding. Please adjust this percentage and resubmit. The MSP PIF has been technically cleared and will be recommended for CEO approval once the revised agency fee is submitted in the PIF. 1/17/2013</p> <p>Agency fee has been revised to 9.5% consistent with current policy. The PIF is recommended for approval. 1/24/13</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Every effort should be made to ensure at least a 1:1 ratio of cash co-financing.	
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?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	July 10, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 17, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 24, 2013	
	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.**

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Yes, appropriate. Cleared 7/10/2012
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes, justified. Cleared. 7/10/2012
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	Not yet, it will be recommended after PIF is technically cleared. 7/10/2010  Please adjust Agency fee to 9.5% and resubmit. PPG will be recommended for CEO approval upon receipt of adjusted proposal. 1/17/2013  Agency fee has been revised to 9.5% consistent with current policy. The PPG is recommended for approval 1/24/13
	4. Other comments	
	First review*	July 10, 2012
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	January 17, 2013

\* 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.