



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

GEF ID:	9093		
Country/Region:	Sri Lanka		
Project Title:	Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Sri Lanka		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5529 (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; CCM-2 Program 4; LD-1 Program 1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$60,000	Project Grant:	\$2,497,078
Co-financing:	\$3,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$5,557,078
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	<p>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; and (b) Climate Smart Innovative Agro-ecology.</p> <p>The project is also aligned with the results framework of the GEF's Biodiversity, Land Degradation and Climate Change Focal Areas.</p> <p>Cleared 03/20/2015</p>
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>Yes. However, please clarify how the three selected landscapes are prioritized or included in those national strategies and plans.</p>

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
		Additional information is requested. 03/20/2015 Provided. Cleared 03/26/2015
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?	Partially. More detailed baseline assessments will be applied in each of the three selected landscapes during the PPG phase to define existing ecological, social and economic factors on which to build project activities. Detailed analysis of institutional activities in each of the three areas will be carried out to fully comprehend the current governance frameworks, institutional programs and projects and the presence and availability of strategic partnerships with the proposed project. Please make sure to include a complete baseline assessment for the selected landscapes in the endorsement document. Cleared at Pif stage 03/20/2015
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Cleared at PIF stage. Once the baseline has been furthered examined at PPG stage, components may need to be reviewed accordingly. 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):	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	<p>Yes. \$2,800,000 from Sri Lanka's STAR allocation for GEF-6 as follows: BD: \$ 1,792,000 CC: \$ 504,000 LD \$ 504,000</p> <p>All inclusive of agency fees.</p> <p>However the Letter of Endorsement from the OFP needs to be corrected as it does not correspond to the distribution of the STAR per focal area as indicated in the PIF. Also, please correct Table A and include the correct amount for BD-4 Program 9: \$1,598,130.</p> <p>Additional information is requested.</p> <p>03/20/2015</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	N/A
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>Not yet. Please address the comments above.</p> <p>03/20/2015</p> <p>Questions addressed and clarified.</p> <p>The PIF is being recommended for clearance and WP inclusion and PPG is justified.</p> <p>03/26/2015</p>
Review Date	Review	March 20, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 26, 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?	
	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?	

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

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.