

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Bolivia



GEF Secretariat Review for Medium Sized Project – GEF - 7

Basic Information

GEF ID

10751

Countries

Bolivia

Project Title

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Bolivia

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP

Agency ID

UNDP: 6561

GEF Focal Area(s)

Biodiversity

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

[CEO Approval Request](#)

Part I – Project Information

1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

2. Project description summary. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

sans-serif

4. Co-financing. Are the confirmed amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment

mobilized, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

5. GEF resource availability. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

sans-serif

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

sans-serif

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

sans-serif

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

sans-serif

6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes - one-step MSP.

Agency Response

sans-serif

7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

sans-serif

8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes. It might be worth considering whether carbon benefits can be calculated and included as well especially in relation to fire prevention.

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec Comments from 4/2/2021

27/05/2021

The following text has been inserted in the ProDoc (page 51) and CEO ER (footnote, page 4):
“Carbon co-benefits will be calculated for each relevant grant project related to fire prevention. This information will be included in the PIR, monitored during project implementation and reported at Terminal Evaluation.”

9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

Part II – Project Justification

1. Project Description. Is there sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes. This project is responding to the recent increase in fire prevalence and damage that has significant biodiversity, land, and carbon impacts.

Agency Response

sans-serif

2. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

3. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there more clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

4. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

5. Project Description. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

6. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

7. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

8. Project Map and Coordinates. Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes. Please include clearer maps in the future.

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec Comments from 4/2/2021

27/05/2021

Clearer maps have been uploaded to the GEF Portal and attached to the Project Document and CEO ER.

9. Child Project. If this is a child project, an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

sans-serif

10. Stakeholders. Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

11. Gender equality and women's empowerment. Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

12. Private sector engagement. If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

13. Risk. Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

14. Coordination. Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

16. Knowledge management. Is the proposed “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

17. Monitoring and Evaluation. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

18. Benefits. Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

**19. Annexes:
Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

**20. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS):
Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

Project Results Framework

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

sans-serif

Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

sans-serif

STAP comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

sans-serif

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
NA

Agency Response

sans-serif

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
NA

Agency Response

sans-serif

CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
NA

Agency Response

sans-serif

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
NA

Agency Response

sans-serif

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

Part III – Country and Agency Endorsements

1. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

sans-serif

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

sans-serif

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

sans-serif

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
NA

Agency Response

sans-serif

GEFSEC DECISION

1. RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/2/2021

No, a few Portal related issues remain.

1. Executing Partner Type is blank in Portal, please request Agency to fill it out.
2. Expected Implementation Start date is already past. Please amend.
3. Please include the Letter of Endorsement from the OFP for this project. We note that there is a new OFP. We can also help in reaching out if that would help expedite.

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec Comments from 4/2/2021
27/05/2021

The information in the Portal has been corrected regarding Executing Partner Type and Implementation Start date. A new LOE was requested from the OFP and has been uploaded to the GEF Portal.

Review Dates

Response to Secretariat comments

First Review

Additional Review (as necessary)