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

_____

| GEF ID: | **5126** | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Country/Region: | **Suriname** | | |
| Project Title: | **Mainstreaming Global Environment Commitments for Effective National Environmental Management** | | |
| GEF Agency: | **UNDP** | GEF Agency Project ID: | **4937 (UNDP)** |
| Type of Trust Fund: | **GEF Trust Fund** | GEF Focal Area (s): | **Multi Focal Area** |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | | **CD-2; CD-4; Project Mana;** | |
| Anticipated Financing  PPG: | **$20,000** | Project Grant: | **$980,000** |
| Co-financing: | **$1,400,000** | Total Project Cost: | **$2,400,000** |
| PIF Approval: | **April 08, 2013** | Council Approval/Expected: | |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | **Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey** | Agency Contact Person: | **Tom Twining-Ward, Senior Technical Advisor** |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Eligibility | 1. Is the participating country eligible? | Yes, Suriname ratified the CBD on 01/12/1996, the UNFCCC on 10/14/1997 and the UNCCD on 01/06/2000. Cleared 9/26/2012 | Yes. Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? | Yes, with letter dated August 3, 2012. Cleared 9/26/2012 | |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? | Yes. UNDP has comparative advantage in capacity development and technical and policy support and has supported Suriname in a number of CCCD issues. Cleared 9/26/2012 | Yes. Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| | 4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it? | N/A | N/A |

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement.  No need to provide response in gray cells.
[1] Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only .  Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? | Yes. However, the number of UNDP staff who will be involved in the project and their qualifications should be provided. Please provide additional information. 9/26/2012 Provided. Cleared 02/21/2013 | Yes. Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| 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 | N/A |
| | • the focal area allocation? | Resources are available within cross-cutting capacity development portfolio. Cleared 9/26/2012 | Yes. Resources are available from CCCD allocation.<br><br>Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access | N/A | N/A |
| | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | N/A | N/A |
| | • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund | N/A | N/A |
| | • focal area set-aside? | N/A | N/A |
| Project Consistency | 7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework? | Yes. The project is aligned with the Cross-Cutting Capacity Development (CCCD) strategy and results framework. Cleared 9/26/2012 | Yes. The project responds to the CCCD strategy.<br><br>Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| | 8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified? | Yes. Cleared 9/26/2012 | Yes, the project targets CD2 (To generate, access and use information and Knowledge) and CD4 (To strengthen capacities to implement and manage global convention guidelines).<br><br>Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| | 9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, | Yes. The project is aligned with Suriname's NCSA completed in 2009. Cleared 9/26/2012 | Yes. The project is consistent with various national plans and strategies as well as international agreements to which Suriname is party. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | NAPA, NCSA, or NAP? | | Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| | 10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes? | Yes. Cleared 9/26/2012 | Yes. Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| 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? | To some extent. The issues to be addressed are well explained, but no indication is made as to the investments made by the government or other agencies in the area of convention implementation, information and data gathering, etc. What programs are in place? What are the tools?. What are the existing structures and coordinations mechanisms? A better description of this baseline is requested. Please provide additional clarification.  9/26/2012<br><br>The revised PiF provided a description of the institutional map and responsibilities amongst the existing institutions. The problems are clear: lack of coordination, low levels of awareness, knowledge and skills amongst decision-makers for implementation of conventions' guidelines, and the need to develop an effective national information system. However, a clear description of the baseline project(s) is still lacking. What are the activities or projects that the GEF's project would build on? please describe for instance investments of the Government of Suriname in information systems and other that may be relevant to the GEF increment. | Yes. Cleared 05/05/2014 |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Additional information is requested. 02/21/2013<br><br>Provided. Cleared 03/27/2013 | |
| | 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? | | Yes. Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| | 13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning? | Yes. Cleared 9/26/2012 | Yes. Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| | 14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear? | Yes. Cleared 9/26/2012 | Yes. Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| | 15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate? | Yes. Cleared 9/26/2012 | Yes. Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| | 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? | Yes, provided. Cleared 9/26/2012 | Not clear. The gender dimension, although mentioned in passing, has not been explicitly addressed. Please provide impromation about how the project will include gender considerations and how the benefits derived are incremental.<br>Additional information is requested. 05/05/2014 |
| | 17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly? | Yes, an ample group of CSOs and indigenous peoples are included. However, please note that the IDB is wrongly listed as an NGO. Correction is requested. 9/26/2012<br><br>Provided. Cleared 02/21/2013 | Yes. Cleared 05/05/2014 |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 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 9/26/2012 | Yes. Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| | 19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | Yes. A number of on-going initiatives are listed and the coordination mechanisms are extablished. Cleared 9/26/2012 | Yes. Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| | 20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate? | No. Details of execution arrangements are not provided. Please send addtional information. 9/26/2012

Provided. The PPG process will allow for further definition of management, coordination and consultation mechanisms. Cleared 02/21/2013 | Yes. Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| | 21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes? | | Yes. Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| | 22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included? | | N/A |
| Project Financing | 23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate? | Yes. Cleared 9/26/2012 | Yes. Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| | 24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | Yes. However see note below #25. 9/26/2012

Cleared 02/21/2013 | Yes. Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| | 25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided. | A 1:1 cash co-financing from any source is requested. Currently the cash co-financing ratio is 25%. Please provide additional information. 9/26/2012

Provided. Cleared. 02/21/2013 | Yes. All letters of co-financing have been provided.

Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| | 26. Is the co-financing amount that the | Yes. Cleared 9/26/2012 | Yes. UNDP is contributing $185,000 in |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? | | cash co-financing and $50,000 in kind.

Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? | | Yes. Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| | 28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | | Yes. Cleared 05/05/2014 |
| 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 | **30.  Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?** | Not yet. Addtional information has been requested. If appropriate responses are provided it could be cleared. 9/26/2012.

Not yet. Additional clarification has been requested. In addition, please review the Agency fee to reflect the new policy of a cap of 9.5%. 02/21/2013.

Yes. The project has been technically cleared and is being recommended. 03/27/2013 | |
| | 31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval. | Please consider in the PPG process further definition of management, coordination and consultation mechanisms. 03/27/2013 | |
| 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? | | Yes. Cleared 05/05/2014 |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1] | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?** | | Not yet. Please address the question posed under # 16 above. |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | September 26, 2012 | May 05, 2014 |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | February 21, 2013 | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | March 27, 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. Cleared 9/26/2012 |
| | 2.Is itemized budget justified? | Yes. Cleared 9/26/2012 |
| Secretariat Recommendation | **3.Is PPG approval being recommended?** | Not yet. Until the PIF is cleared. 9/26/2012.<br><br>Yes, PPG is being recommended. 03/27/2013 |
| | 4. Other comments | |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | September 26, 2012 |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | March 27, 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.