



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

GEF ID:	<b>5048</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Belize</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Capacity Building for the Strategic Planning and Management of Natural Resources in Belize</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>4917 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CD-5; CD-4; CD-4; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$25,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$759,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$643,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$1,427,000</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>June 14, 2013</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey/Mohamed Imam Bakarr</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Tom Twining-Ward, UNDP Green-LECDRS</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes. Belize ratified the CBD on 12/30/1993, the UNFCCC on 10/31/1994 and the UNCCD on 7/23/1998. Cleared 8/07/2012	Yes. Cleared. 08/04/2014
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, with letter dated 12/19/2011. Cleared 8/07/2012	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. Cleared 8/07/2012	Yes. Cleared. 08/04/2014
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA. Cleared 8/07/2012	N/A
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the	Yes. However, please describe UNDP's technical staff in the country office that	Yes. Cleared. 08/04/2014

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	country?	will manage and supervise the project. Additional information is requested 8/07/2012  Provided. Cleared. 03/07/2013	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA. Cleared 8/07/2012	N/A
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes, Cross-Cutting Capacity Development (CCCD) allocation. Cleared 8/07/2012	Yes. GEF-5 CCCD allocation. Cleared. 08/04/2014
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA. Cleared 8/07/2012	N/A
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA. Cleared 8/07/2012	N/A
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA. Cleared 8/07/2012	N/A
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?	NA. Cleared 8/07/2012	N/A
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Somewhat. However, this section contains a series of inconsistencies between the CCCD objectives and outcomes and outputs:  a) According to the expected outcomes and outputs described, the first focal area objective listed under CD2 seems to fit better under CD5 (Capacities enhanced to monitor and evaluate environmental impacts and trends).  b) Under the second objective listed as CD4, the outcome of "healthy maintenance of globally significant ecosystem goods and services" is too high an objective to fit here. Something along the lines of: Strengthened	Yes. Cleared 08/04/2014

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>capacities to effectively implement the EIA process would be a better description. Concerning the outputs under this outcome there seems to be a mix. For instance, "web-based environmental project database" seems to be part of a monitoring component (CD5); "amended national legislation" (2.5) is in fact a whole objective on its own. It seems a bit ambitious to list it as part of a number of outputs which span other themes.</p> <p>c) In the last objective listed as CD4, the 3.4 output seems to be part of monitoring (CD5) as well. A complete revision is requested. 8/07/2012</p> <p>The revised PIF Table B as a repetition of Table A. This does not help clarify the alignment of the project to the CCCD strategy. Please review again table A as per the CCCD strategy Results Framework. Table B can remain as is, but Table A has to be consistent with the CCCD outcomes and outputs.</p> <p>Additional information is requested. 03/07/2013</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 05/09/2013</p>	
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>	<p>Somewhat. However, see No 7 above. In addition, more details on the specific links to the GEF Focal Areas are requested. 8/07/2012</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 03/07/2013</p>	<p>Yes. Cleared 08/04/2014</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Yes. The project is consistent with the NCSA completed by Belize in November, 2005 and with other national priorities. Cleared 8/07/2012	July 31, 2014  Yes, and the consistency is adequately demonstrated in the project document.  Cleared
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	No. Please provide information on how many government staff will be positively influenced by the project and explain how the outcomes will be sustained in the future. Additional information is requested. 8/07/2012  Provided. Cleared 03/07/2013	July 31, 2014  Yes, the overall approach is targeted toward long-term effectiveness of planning processes for natural resource management.  Cleared
	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?	Yes. Cleared 8/07/2012	July 31, 2014  Yes the baseline is sufficiently described based on sound data and assumptions.  Cleared
	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?		July 31, 2014  Yes, the project is cost-effective given its timeliness for the country, and the fact that a number of activities and processes are underway will ensure strong potential for long-term impact.  Cleared
Project Design	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	To some extent. However, a significant increase in cash co-financing is necessary. Additional information is requested. 8/07/2012  Provided. Cleared 03/07/2013	July 31, 2014  Yes, the baseline context with government commitment and demand clearly justifies the GEF increment for CCD.  Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>No. The project framework needs to be revised to reflect the comments made under #7 above. Additional information is requested. 8/07/2012</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 03/07/2013</p>	<p>No. The Project Framework (Table B) does not clearly demonstrates how outcomes and outputs are linked under each component. For example, Expected Outputs 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 and 3.3 read more like outcomes than outputs. Please revise the framework accordingly to address the inconsistencies.</p> <p>08/04/2014</p> <p>Issues were clarified.</p> <p>Cleared 08/26/2014</p>
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes. Cleared 7/08/2012	<p>July 31, 2014</p> <p>Given the overall project approach, the description is based on potential influence on policy processes that will lead to incremental benefits.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	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. Cleared 7/08/2012	<p>July 31, 2014</p> <p>Gender dimension is sufficiently described in terms of due consideration to important roles of women and men in decision-making for policy. Because of the focus on capacity building, however, the socio-economic benefits are based on such policy processes and therefore presented as indirect and long term. For a project of this nature, such an approach is important for supporting achievement of GEBs.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Mention of NGOs and CSOs is made in the PIF, but there's no specific identification of the concrete roles they will play. Please revise. Additional information is requested. 8/07/2012  Provided. Cleared 03/07/2013	July 31, 2014  Yes, stakeholder engagement including roles of CSOs is adequate.  Cleared
	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 7/08/2012	July 31, 2014  Yes, and the overall project approach will enable the government agencies to take into consideration consequences of climate change.  Cleared
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	There's mention of some related initiatives and that the project will seek coordination to those. Please specify how this will be achieved. Additional information is requested. 8/07/2012  Provided. Cleared 03/07/2013	July 31, 2014  Yes, especially when the overall approach is demand-driven. It is also expected that the project will draw on lessons from previous GEF initiatives to support capacity development for policy processes, including those implemented with UNDP.  Cleared
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	There's a need for more details on the execution arrangements. Mention is made of the fact that UNDP's Country Office will implement the project in partnership with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment but there's no explanation as to how the implementation will be done. Additional information is requested. 8/07/2012  Provided. Cleared 03/07/2013	July 31, 2014  Yes, and the institutional framework is clear in this regard.  Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Yes. Cleared 08/04/2014
	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?	Nearly. However, please note that project management costs allocated to the GEF funding cannot be higher than 10% of the GEF contribution. The correct amount should not be higher than \$69,000. Revision is requested. 7/08/2012  Adjusted. Cleared. 03/07/2013	Yes. Cleared 08/04/2014
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes. Cleared 7/08/2012	Yes. Cleared 08/04/2014
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	To some extent. However it is requested that the cash co-financing be increased. Additional information is requested. 7/08/2012  Provided. Cleared 03/07/2013	Yes. Letters of co-financing were provided. Cleared 08/04/2014
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	No. It seems low. A revision is requested. 7/08/2012  Provided. Cleared 03/07/2013	Yes. UNDP is contributing a \$75,000 cash co-financing. Cleared 08/04/2014
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes. Cleared 08/04/2014
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes. Cleared 08/04/2014

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Not yet. Some revisions and additional information are requested. 8/07/2012  Not yet. There are still some outstanding issues. Once they have been addressed, the PIF could be recommended. 03/07/2013  Yes. The PIF is cleared and is being recommended. 05/09/2013	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
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 08/04/2014
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		Not yet. Please address point 14 above.  08/04/2014  Yes. The CEO approval is being recommended.  08/26/2014
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 07, 2012	August 04, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 07, 2013	August 26, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	May 09, 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**

<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Decision Points</b>	<b>Program Manager Comments</b>
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Yes. Cleared 8/07/2012
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes. Cleared 8/07/2012
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	Not until PIF is cleared. 8/07/2012 Not until PIF is cleared. 03/07/2013 Not yet. The Agency fee in the PPG has to be revised to a maximum of 9.5% as per the new approved policy Please revise. 05/09/2013  Revised PPG fee. The PPG is recommended. 06/13/2013
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 07, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	May 13, 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.