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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

Needs revising.

The Project is aligned with the SGP strategic directions approved for GEF-7.

However, the funding and activities under CCM2-6 ("Demonstrate mitigation options with systemic impacts for food systems, land use and restoration impact program") as presented are not eligible under the approved GEF-7 programming directions.

For GEF-7 CCM-2’s land use and restoration activities are only eligible as part of the Food Systems, Land Use, and Restoration Impact Program (FOLUR IP). This IP has not been formulated or submitted to the GEF Secretariat nor has it been approved by the Council yet, nor is it clear whether India will be part of the IP.

As detailed in the GEF 7 Programming Directions document, the Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration Impact Program will target integrated landscapes alongside supply/value chain dimensions. Landscape-scale interventions need to be centered around comprehensive land use planning necessary to foster a transformational change in food systems and land management that is more environmentally sustainable.

The GEF will seek to develop a robust and diversified portfolio of investments that cut across countries and the following themes:

- Production landscapes that remain critical for GEBs but where remaining forests are threatened by expansion of commercial commodity production
- Landscapes where production of globally important food crops or livestock creates high intensity negative externalities
- "Frontier" landscapes where opportunity exists to preempt expansion and get ahead of commercial commodity-driven forest loss
- Landscapes that are highly degraded and in need of restoration for the ecosystem services they provide to agricultural production...
Landscapes that are highly degraded and in need of restoration for the ecosystem services they provide to agricultural production.

To ensure consistency across the portfolio, countries seeking to participate in the IP must target spatially explicit geographies of importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services (e.g. carbon stocks, hydrological flows, etc.) that require implementation at scale of a suite of related strategies and interventions.

Please review.

11/06/2018

Revised. CCM1-1 (Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs for decentralized power with energy storage) is now the entry point for this Focal Area investment.

Cleared - 11/21/2018

Agency Response

Table A has been duly revised to reflect eligibility under GEF-7 Programming Directions for CCM. Project activities focus on promotion and application of renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies. References to the FOLUR IP have been dropped.

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

Please review Table 4 as per the comment above on CCM2-6, particularly outputs 1.1 and 1.2. For this, please refer to the Programming Directions under the CCM Focal Area approved for GEF-7, particularly in terms of eligibility of climate-smart agriculture activities. Outside the Impact Program investments, CCM Focal Area actions in GEF-7 are only eligible if it supports developing countries to make transformational shifts towards low emission and climate-resilient development pathways.

11/06/2018

Reviewed.

CCM1-1 is the entry point for the following outputs:
1. 3.1. - (broader adoption of successfully piloted community level renewable energy and energy efficient technologies through upscaling programs at landscape level); 1.3.2 (Community level initiatives that apply integrated RE and energy efficient technology solutions for productive use, including mills, sewing machines, etc.); and 1.3.3 (Partnerships and business models established and demonstrated for RE and clean energy)

Cleared 11/21/2018

Agency Response
Table B has been checked to confirm agreement with Table A and GEF 7 Programming Directions, in regard to CCM Objective 1.

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
Partially. Please explain how investment mobilized was identified and what it refers to (not just who participated in its identification).

To review this, please refer to the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines.

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.”

11/06/2018
Partially revised. Please indicate how the co-financing sources marked as IM align with the definition included in the co-financing policy and guidelines.

11/21/2018

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IS REQUESTED:

the description field describes the process whereby investment mobilized was identified. In addition, please describe the definition/approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures". For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf).

04/24/2019

Revised. Cleared

04/29/2019

Agency Response

Please see Table C for Indicative sources of Co-financing by name and by type.

Cofinancing sources were identified based on GEF-6 implementation results and partnerships, as well as cofinancing projected for the GEF-7 project and leveraged through discussions with project partners (CEE, the Department of Urban Development, Rural Development at both Central and state levels, Municipal Corporations and State Departments of Tribal Development). As per standard SGP practice, community organizations will provide cash and in-kind co-financing according to project objectives, financial capacities and calculation of in-kind sources (man hours and rates and institutional support).

23/01/2019: Further response to comment re IM, above: Investment Mobilized figures are based on discussions with government authorities and their history of co-financing SGP projects in previous GEF Operational Phases. Co-financing from private sector enterprises follows a similar pattern – initial discussions based on historical patterns of co-financing - as is the case with banks and other partners. These figures will be formally confirmed through co-financing letters identifying amounts and kinds of contributions. SGP global policy requests grant recipient CSOs to contribute to their projects in cash to the best of their abilities. The National Steering Committee will foster compliance with this policy as appropriate. These contributions will only be confirmed during project implementation as grant projects are approved.
29 April 2019: The SGP National Coordinators were instructed to differentiate cofinancing commitments between those corresponding to recurrent costs e.g. salaries of NGO or government staff, costs of premises, etc., and Investment Mobilized, corresponding to new and additional funding either directly contributed to SGP to apply to project grants, as grantee contributions in kind and in cash, or mobilized to support project objectives but not managed by SGP.

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

   Yes.

11/06/2018

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, but please see comments about eligibility of CCM FA utilization

11/06/2018
Agency Response

The CCM allocation request now focuses on eligible activities under CCM Objective 1, including promotion and application of renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies. References to the FOLUR IP have been dropped.

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
N/A

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

Yes.

11/06/2018

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

Regarding the indicator of Area of land Restored, as the sub-indicators refer to Area of degraded agricultural land restored, please revise this indicators once the CCM FA interventions have been revised.

In addition, as per the guidelines, this indicator will be reported as the aggregate total of four Sub-Indicators. To avoid double-counting, the hectares reported under each Sub-Indicator should not overlap (i.e between Area of degraded agricultural land restored and Area of landscapes under improved practices.)

Finally, once CCM2-6 interventions have been revised, please also revise indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

Please review.
12/5/2018 Thank you for the revision. In addition, please note that only those targets that are calculated using the appropriate methodology as defined in the GEF-7 Results Framework can be reported in this table. If the methodology used to measure any of the SGP results indicators does not align with the GEF-7’s methodology, they cannot be included in this table and will not be aggregated with the reported results of other GEF projects. SGP results that fall out of the methodology or that comprise other indicators not included in the GEF-7’s core indicators are valuable and may be reported separately when submitting information to the GEF Secretariat.

Please review the guidelines (ME/GN/01: Guidelines on Core Indicators and Sub-Indicators.) at: https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Results_Guidelines_MEGN01.pdf

Revised. 11/2018

FURTHER REVISION REQUESTED:

As per the new GEF results guidelines, all GEF projects are required to submit an estimate of their expected results at the PIF stage. While we understand the PIF-stage results may change, the estimate of expected results is required at PIF submission. Please provide your best estimated core indicators, as per the Guidelines.

4/24/2019

Revised. Cleared

04/29/2019

Agency Response

Table F, as well as the Core Indicator Annex, reflect reformulated CCM activities under Objective 1. Targets and indicators will be refined during project preparation and by CEO Endorsement. Note that community-led projects are to be defined in detail during Project implementation.

23/01/2019: Response to comment 12/05/2018 re Indicators, above: Given that the nature of SGP Country Programmes with their focus on participatory landscape strategy development, that includes the identification of individual community-based grant projects within these activities where differences in the level of community involvement, the nature of the project and the desired outcomes are common.
landscapes, it is difficult at this stage of project development to identify targets for the relevant indicators with any precision. While the indicators for this project are not expected to change, the targets will be carefully calculated during the PPG-financed Project Preparation Stage using the corresponding GEF-7 guidance. Note that, as such, Table F and the Core Indicator Annex have been revised to reflect this by using the term “TBD”. The figures for number of beneficiaries have been estimated initially based on knowledge of likely grantees living in the different landscapes but these figures will only be confirmed during project preparation.

29 April 2019: Estimates for core indicators have been added as requested.

These indicators were derived based on the past decades of experience with SGP grants; knowledge of the target landscapes where SGP is active; knowledge of the landscape resilience strategy which targets focal-area specific outcomes, and knowledge of the developing pipeline of community-based proposals from conversations, draft proposals, and other informal means. Using these factors, the Core Indicator targets are estimated and then questioned and vetted by UNDP GEF staff.

In estimating GHG emissions avoided, SGP National Coordinators made a number of assumptions: 1) since SGP grants will be provided for renewable energy applications the baseline can be considered as zero without the GEF contribution; 2) renewable energy applications will vary from grant project to grant project depending on the RE resource available, as well as other factors, affecting the volume of GHG emissions avoided per each Project; and 3) as such, precise calculations of GHG emissions avoided are not possible, therefore a broad estimate based on previous SGP experience with RE applications provides a figure that can be adjusted during Project implementation as an adaptive response to new information, and differences in community-based demand for RE applications during overall Project implementation.

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
Yes

11/06/2018
art 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

   11/06/2018

Agency Response

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

   Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
   Yes

   11/06/2018

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

11/06/2018

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
To some extent. Please refer to the CCM comments above.

Also, regarding Output 1.3 (Appropriate low emission, efficient and clean technologies adopted at scale in targeted landscapes) which would be eligible under CCM's Objective 1 (Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs), one key aspect of this objective is the partnership with the private sector.

Please elaborate on the engagement of private sector (beyond financial institutions) in these activities.

11/06/2018
Revised. Cleared 12/5/2018

Agency Response
The PIF has been revised to provide greater clarity and more detail on engagement with the private sector. Note that further detail will be provided as a result of project preparation financed with the PPG.
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.

11/06/2018

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

Please give a description of how indicators were devised. Please note that the methodology for calculating indicators for SGP should be consistent with the approved methodology for GEF-7. In addition, indicators need to be revised.

Please review.

12/5/2018 Further revision needed: As mentioned before, it’s expected that there is full alignment of the methodology use to calculate targets for the core indicators in table F. However, the description in the Agency’s response raises doubts about the full alignment. If there doubts at this stage, we offer a consultation with our Results team on the phone.

Revised 02/11/2019

PLEASE REVIEW FURTHER as explained above.
Agency Response

The GEF/C.54/11/Rev.02, Updated Results Architecture for GEF-7 has been consulted to identify relevant core indicators as part of PIF preparation. Project proponents have focused on estimating the direct impacts of potential and likely community-based initiatives in the selected landscapes in the context of participatory landscape strategy development, oriented primarily around building smallholder capacities to use biodiversity sustainably, reduce land degradation in mosaic landscapes and promote renewable energy and energy efficiency applications.

Table F, as well as the Core Indicator Annex, have been revised to reflect reformulated CCM activities.

23/01/2019: Further response to comment 12/05/2018 re Targets, above: Given that the nature of SGP Country Programmes with their focus on participatory landscape strategy development, that includes the identification of individual community-based grant projects within these landscapes, it is difficult at this stage of project development to identify targets for the relevant indicators with any precision. While the indicators for this project are not expected to change, the targets will be carefully calculated during the PPG-financed Project Preparation Stage using the corresponding GEF-7 methodology. Note that, as such, Table F and the Core Indicator Annex have been revised to reflect this by using the term “TBD”.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

11/06/2018

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

A general map was provided. At CEO Endorsement stage, please provide more precise maps and geo-reference data.

11/06/2018

Agency Response

Maps of each selected landscape and the corresponding geo-referenced data will be provided by CEO Endorsement.

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

Yes. All boxes were ticked for civil society and indigenous peoples and local communities and a preliminary stakeholder analysis was provided. However, please undo the ticked box "If none of the above, please explain why"

Revised

Cleared 02/11/2019

Agency Response
Revised accordingly.

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

11/06/2018

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. However, please provide more information about private sector engagement in energy efficiency interventions as per the comment above.

Revised

Cleared 02/11/2019
Agency Response

The relevant section of the PIF has been revised to provide greater clarity and more detail on engagement with the private sector. Note that further detail will be provided as a result of project preparation financed with the PPG.

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

11/06/2018

Agency Response

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
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

11/06/2018

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?
art 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
Yes

11/06/2018

Agency Response

EFSEC 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

Yes. The PIF is recommended for technical clearance. PPG is also recommended for clearance.

05/02/2019

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

view Dates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIF Review</th>
<th>Agency Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Review</strong></td>
<td>11/6/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Review (as necessary)</strong></td>
<td>11/21/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Review (as necessary)</strong></td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Review (as necessary)</strong></td>
<td>2/11/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Review (as necessary)</strong></td>
<td>4/24/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>