

# GEF SGP 7th Operational Phase – Core (Part 1)

## *GEF Secretariat Review for Full Sized Project*

### **Basic Information**

**GEF ID**

10084

**Countries**

Global

**Project Title**

GEF SGP 7th Operational Phase – Core (Part 1)

**GEF Agency(ies)**

UNDP

**Agency ID**

UNDP: 6271

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Multi Focal Area

**Program Manager**

Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey

### **Part I – Project Information**

#### **Focal area elements**

**1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

To some extent. The proposed project includes a tranche of the global Small Grants Programme allocation (core funding of \$128 M). and it's aligned with the SGP strategic directions approved for GEF-7.

However, the funding and activities under CCM2-6 are not eligible under GEF-7 programming directions since land- based interventions related to climate mitigation are only possible as they

relate to the FOLUR IP. Therefore, this request for STAR funding under CCM-2 should be removed.

Please revise table A accordingly

Revised. Cleared 11/6/2018

Agency Response

We take note of the comments related to STAR funds that has been endorsed by respective countries. Based on upstream discussions, the table A has been revised accordingly. CCM-2 elements have been removed.

## **Indicative project/program description summary**

### **2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

To some extent.

1- Please clarify the inclusion of fisheries under the LD component.

2- In addition, please explain if there is any scope for the SGP to support the Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) agenda as this is an important aspect of the global land agenda?

Please review.

Revised. Cleared 11/6/2018

Agency Response

We agree that it is important to support the LDN agenda in SGP countries. In this regard, during the Country Program Strategy formulation, relevant information related to the LDN hotspot areas, target setting, and country priorities will be considered to determine the geographical and thematic scope of the SGP landscape and seascapes. Following that, specific activities to help the country achieve LDN targets will be supported through SGP projects. In addition, during the CPS formulation, the relevant UNCCD National Action Plans for the respective countries will be revised and alignment of SGP interventions in the LD area ensured with the priorities identified therein.

STAR request has been revised based on upstream discussions. With the aim to promote integrated approaches in priority landscapes and seascapes, the GEF-7 PIF follows the recommended “strategic initiatives” to structure the components.

## Co-financing

### **3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

No.

While, it's understood that more concrete and accurate description of co-financing will be provided at CEO Endorsement stage, the indicative information provided in Table C and in the description of how Investment Mobilized (IM) is not complete or accurate. First, in Table C, all co-financing is identified as IM. Please review that. Second, please provide a better description of which multilateral and bilateral donors have been approached in terms of potential co-financing.

Please refer to the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines and review this whole section.

The relevant Policy requirement at PIF stage is the following:

“ Agencies provide indicative information regarding the expected amounts, sources and types of Co-Financing, and the sub-set of such Co-Financing that meets the definition of Investment Mobilized (IM)”. IM is defined as the “sub-set of co-financing that excludes recurrent expenditures.”

At CEO Endorsement stage please provide greater detail about co-financing and how IM has been identified. As mentioned above, please refer to the Policy and Guidelines on Co-Financing as approved by Council.

A revision was provided, however please note that the co-financing table includes US\$13.5m in co-financing that is classified as "in-kind" and "investment mobilized". While contributions from beneficiaries may constitute an exception, where co-financing truly meets the definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized".

Please revise the table 11/15/2018

11-19-2018 Please revise the table again. There are still \$5 million of *in kind* co-financing from CSOs (TBD) classified as IM. These funds should be classified as "recurrent expenditures".

Agency Response

Table C – co-financing has been amended to respond to the comments. With regard to the sub-set of IM mobilized, these will be defined once current discussions with a number of donors and

partners are finalized. These include discussions with Governments of Australia, Japan and Germany on the next phases of our on-going partnerships; while discussions are also on-going with Conservation Trust Funds and international NGOs to leverage and align financing priorities in regions and themes of common interest and mutual benefit, including for co-financing and partnership.

UNDP Response 11/15/2018- Revised as advised.

UNDP Response 11/19/2018-CSO in-kind co-financing has been revised as recurrent expenditures.

## **GEF Resource Availability**

### **4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The project requests \$64 million (50% of total) from the SGP core funding approved by Council (total \$128 million).

For the additional STAR requests included as part of this project, please see below.

Revised. 11/6/2018

11/19/2018- Agency fee is 4%, which is in compliance with GEF's Fee Policy, that states that UNDP fee for the Small Grants Program is set at 4.0 percent.

In addition, please provide information regarding how UNDP plans to maximize the ratio of direct grants (to civil society and community based organizations) in relation to non-grant expenses.

Agency Response

Table A has been revised based on upstream discussions.

UNDP Response 11/19/2018

We thank the reviewer for the comment. UNDP agrees to explore all possible means to ensure that the grant to non-grant ration is maximized to the extent possible. It may be noted that the primary component of the non-grant portion of the budget is due to the cost of country level grant operation and delivery of technical and capacity building measures for country level partners including local NGOs and CBOs (essential for effective grant delivery). To reduce these costs, UNDP will explore several measures including undertaking comprehensive rationalization exercises for country operation budgets, implement a cost-recovery policy for non-grant

functions performed by country teams and mobilizing additional resources from donors and host country governments that can offset some of the cost of running the programme. These and other cost reduction measures identified will be discussed with the GEF Sec at the time of CEO endorsement.

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The project requests additional STAR funding from BD, LD and CCM for 7 countries. As per comments above please review the GEF-7 approved Programming Directions, and review the STAR requests.

STAR requests have been excluded from the PIF

Cleared 11/6/2018

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

### **Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

### **Project Preparation Grant**

**5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

No PPG is requested.

Agency Response

### **Core indicators**

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Core indicators are included. However, targets for Terrestrial and Marine Protected Areas are lumped together. Please include a breakdown of these targets . Include an estimate if possible for the marine protected areas .

Indicators have been revised.

At CEO endorsement, please revise the indicators estimates by applying the methodology approved by Council : [http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN\\_GEF.C.54.11.Rev\\_.02\\_Results.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.C.54.11.Rev_.02_Results.pdf)

Revised, but the Agency is reporting  on core indicator 2 (100,000 hectares) in the project documentation (“core indicators offline template”), and this is not reflected in the Portal core indicators, where indicator 2 is blank.

Please revise - 11/15/2018

Revised. Cleared 11/19/2018

Agency Response

A total of 100,000 ha has been estimated for marine protected areas and this has been included in the revised PIF. This estimate will be improved during CEO endorsement and further confirmed when the country program strategies in relevant countries are formulated.

UNDP Response 11/15/2018- Indicator has been revised.

## **Project/Program taxonomy**

### **7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The taxonomy is included in a separate document as an attachment. Please include the taxonomy in the GEF Portal box (not in a separate attached document).

Provided, but please note that the proposed project aims explicitly to contribute towards mitigation and adaptation as a "significant objective", therefore, the Rio Marker for these two should be "1".

Revision requested 11/15/2018

Revised- Cleared 11/19/2018

Agency Response

The project taxonomy is included in the GEF portal as advised.

UNDP Response 11/15/2018- As advised relevant Rio Markers has been selected.

## **Part II – Project Justification**

### **1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes,

Agency Response

**4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Not entirely.

As mentioned before, the funding and activities under CCM2-6 are not eligible under GEF-7 programming directions. Land based interventions related to climate mitigation are only allowed as they relate to the FOLUR IP.

Please review.

Also, please clarify the inclusion of fisheries under the LD component.

In addition, at CEO Endorsement stage it's recommended that the Agency provides a description of the proposed articulation of SGP strategies with the Drylands Sustainable Landscapes program and others such as the Food, Land Use and Restoration Impact Program.

Revised. Cleared 11/6/2018

Agency Response

STAR funds related interventions have been revised as advised. More information will be provided at CEO endorsement stage on how the SGP strategies will align with relevant GEF impact programs including the drylands sustainable landscapes program, food, land use and restoration and sustainable cities impact programs. SGP looks forward to the close coordination



and communication with the relevant GEFSEC and GEF Agency teams on the concerned IPs, and contribute for their objectives particularly by mobilizing communities and CSOs.

**5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

**6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, however, the core indicators estimated for terrestrial protected areas, include marine as well. At this stage please provide a breakdown of the estimated targets related terrestrial and marine protected areas.

Revised. Cleared 11/6/2018

Agency Response

As advised an estimate for marine protected areas has been provided.

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

This is a global programme with 110 participating countries. Each country will work on their Country Strategy and define the priority landscape/seascapes where grants will be focused.

Agency Response

## **Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

No. The relevant section (2) of the Portal is blank. Please review and input description of the stakeholder engagement as per the approved Policy (GEF/C.53/05/Rev.01) directly into the Portal's appropriate box.

Revised. Cleared 11/6/2018

Agency Response

We apologize for the oversight. Information on stakeholder engagement has been added to the relevant section in the GEF portal.

## **Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

## **Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

Agency Response

## **Risks**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. However, during project design, please consider and explore the potential for climate change risks, once the landscapes/seascapes are determined.

Cleared 11/6/2018 with the recommendation to provide information on the potential for climate change risks, once the landscapes/seascapes are determined.

Agency Response

Noted. Listed risks will be elaborated and potential risks related to climate change impacts will be explored and reflected in the SGP Country Programme Strategies once the landscapes/seascapes are determined.

## **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Please refer to comments on potential for synergies with IPs and other GEF projects during project design.

Cleared 11/6/2018 - Please provide the requested information at CEO Endorsement stage.

Agency Response

## **Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. Country Programme Strategies in each country will ensure this consistency.

Agency Response

## **Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

## **Part III – Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The project includes endorsement letters for the additional STAR in 7 countries. However, the OFP who endorsed the STAR for Colombia is no longer in office. She was replaced in late July 2018.

Please always refer to the list of OFPs on the GEF website

[https://www.thegef.org/focal\\_points\\_list](https://www.thegef.org/focal_points_list)

Revised- STAR endorsements have not been included.

Cleared. 11/6/2018

Agency Response

We thank the reviewer for the advice on checking the GEF website to make sure that the endorsements obtained are signed by the correct GEF OFP for the country. With regard to Colombia, we will seek a revised LOE from the current OFP.

## GEFSEC DECISION

## RECOMMENDATION

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The Agency is requested to provide the following detailed information in the CEO Endorsement Request.

1- A detailed budget, with a comprehensive description of the costs classified under each budget item.

2- A detailed description of how UNDP will maximize the ratio of grants disbursed to local civil society and community based organizations in the countries, compared to the non-grant expenses, including monitoring, knowledge management, personnel, that is consistent with historical findings of the IEO.

3- A table with the planned allocation of resources to each one of the Countries, including the new ones. This allocation amounts should distinguish between actual grants to CSOs and other expenses (grant to non-grant amounts).

## Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>