



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

GEF ID:	6925		
Country/Region:	Global (Afghanistan, Antigua And Barbuda, Angola, Burkina Faso, Bahrain, Dominica, Eritrea, Fiji, Guinea, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Cambodia, Comoros, Lao PDR, St. Lucia, Liberia, Lesotho, Madagascar, Myanmar, Mauritius, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Senegal, Somalia, South Sudan, Sao Tome and Principe, Uganda, Zambia, Congo DR)		
Project Title:	Umbrella Programme for Biennial Update Report to the United National Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$12,936,000
Co-financing:	\$1,252,500	Total Project Cost:	\$14,188,500
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	October 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Rawleston Moore	Agency Contact Person:	George Manful

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?	<p>Yes the participating countries are eligible with the exception of South Sudan. South Sudan appears to be an observer to UNFCCC and not a full party to UNFCCC.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please check the status of South Sudan as a party to the UNFCCC</p>	

*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.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Update August 26th 2014</p> <p>South Sudan will no longer participate in the project. Kiribati will replace South Sudan.</p>	
	<p>2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?</p>	<p>The operational focal points have endorsed the project. Letters are on file. The signatures on the endorsement letters from Madagascar and Uganda do not match the names in the GEF database.</p> <p>Update August 26 2014</p> <p>Updated letters have been provided</p>	
Resource Availability	<p>3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the STAR allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund • focal area set-aside? 	<p>The resources are available from the focal area set-aside.</p>	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help</i></p>	<p>The project is aligned with the focal area strategic objectives.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<i>achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>		
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	Further information should be provided at CEO endorsement.	
Project Design	6. 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?	The project will allow the countries to prepare their first biennial update reports to the UNFCCC.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	The components and outcomes in table b are sound.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	These types of projects are financed at full cost.	
	9. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes the role of public participation has been identified. Please provide further information at CEO Endorsement.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Yes the project takes into consideration potential risk.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The project is consistent with related initiatives. Please provide additional information at CEO Endorsement.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	The project will allow 35 countries to complete biennial update reports.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The funding is appropriate to achieve the expected outcome and outputs	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	Co-financing is not required for this type of project.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The level funding for PMC is appropriate.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	A PPG is requested. Please provide some information for the justification of the PPG, as a PPG is not usually requested for this type of project. Update August 26 2014 The PPG has been removed from the project	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	The project is not recommended for PIF clearance. Please address issues in boxes 1,2 and 19. Update August 26th 2014 The relevant changes have been made and the project is recommended for PIF clearance.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	August 21, 2014	
Review Date (s)	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.**