



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

GEF ID:	5048		
Country/Region:	Belize		
Project Title:	Capacity building for the strategic planning and management of natural resources in Belize		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4917 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CD-5; CD-4; CD-4; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$759,000
Co-financing:	\$914,000	Total Project Cost:	\$1,673,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey	Agency Contact Person:	Tom Twining-Ward

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?	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	
	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	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA. Cleared 8/07/2012	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes. However, please describe UNDP's technical staff in the country office that will manage and supervise the project.	

*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		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	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes, Cross-Cutting Capacity Development (CCCD) allocation. Cleared 8/07/2012	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA. Cleared 8/07/2012	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA. Cleared 8/07/2012	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA. Cleared 8/07/2012	
	• focal area set-aside?	NA. Cleared 8/07/2012	
Project Consistency	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 capacities to effectively implement the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	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	
	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	
Project Design	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	
	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?		
	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	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	No. The project framework needs to be revised to reflect the comments made under #7 above. Additional information is requested. 8/07/2012 Provided. Cleared 03/07/2013	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes. Cleared 7/08/2012	
	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	
	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	
	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	
	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	
	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	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		information is requested. 8/07/2012 Provided. Cleared 03/07/2013	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
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	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes. Cleared 7/08/2012	
	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	
	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	
	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
Project Monitoring and Evaluation			

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 07, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 07, 2013	
	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

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
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	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	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.