**PRE-INVESTMENT SCREENING COMMITTEE (PISC) – ASSESSMENT**

**Country:**

**Targeted source of funds (if identified):**

**PIMS ID:**

**Project name:**

**Project grant**:

**Proposed implementing Partner:**

**Date CO Submission is received:**

**Project Description:**

**A / PISC review of CO submission**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **ASSESSMENT** |
| **PISC rating** | **PISC comments (as needed)** |
| ***1. Strategic considerations*** |
| Type of and scale of innovation | High / Medium / Low |  |
| Scale of impact (number of beneficiaries, area of impact; scalability and replication potential) | High / Medium / Low |  |
| Government ownership/ leadership and alignment to mid or long-term strategies  | High / Medium / Low |  |
| Green recovery potential (including contributions to NDC implementation) and/or potential to support MEA implementation or achievement of SDGs | Yes / No |  |
| Job creation potential (number of beneficiaries) | High / Medium / Low |  |
| Potential for leveraging private sector | Yes / No |  |
| Real Co-financing potential (that is traceable, UNDP can maintain legal obligations with co-financier and can be reported on) | Yes / No |  |
| Gender and safeguards ‘check’ | Conducted / Not conducted |  |
| Financial sustainability (what happens after the grant runs out) | Considered / Not considered |  |
| Exit strategy (ensuring the sustainability of impacts) | Considered / Not considered |  |
| Engagement: 1. Have local communities and/or other stakeholders who might be affected by the project (especially those who might have limited influence over it) been engaged in the preparation of this project idea?
2. Have women’s groups/leaders been engaged in the preparation of this project idea?
3. Is there concrete evidence that local communities and/or other stakeholders who might be affected by the project (especially those who might have limited influence over it) will want this project?
 | Noted (‘yes’) and demonstrated / Noted but not demonstrated / Not noted (‘no’) or demonstrated |  |
| Risk Context:1. What implementation challenges do you foresee?
2. What oversight challenges do you foresee?
3. Which factors do you anticipate that may increase the risks of delays or reduced delivery?
4. Does the project involve acquisition of land ownership or land rights and what hurdles (administrative, regulatory, etc.) do you see in obtaining this?
5. Does the project require permits and licenses to be obtained? If so, what hurdles do you foresee in obtaining these?
6. What specific measures will need to be considered to the project implementation arrangements to manage the implementation challenges listed above?
7. If there are security issues in the country, this is a risk for UNDP. How will these risks be mitigated for project and County Office personnel?
8. Is there a chance that project funds could end up with in-country groups/beneficiaries that donors might consider ‘terrorists’? What measures will be put in place to ensure due diligence and AML/CFT screening during design and implementation?
9. Are there any reputational risks to UNDP in implementing the project?
10. Could the project involve or support high risk sectors (such as mining, waste management, or aquaculture including from co-financing)?
11. Could the project be located in or near areas with ongoing or recent violent conflict (or similar)?
12. Does the government(s) have any known ongoing or upcoming work that could be seen as inconsistent with this project’s objective?
13. Does the country(ies) have any significant differences with international standards including UN conventions/principles/declarations related to:
	1. Human rights
	2. Labour standards (e.g. Child labour)
	3. Indigenous peoples’ rights
	4. Women’s rights
	5. LGBTQ+ rights
	6. Corruption/fraud/AMLCFT
 | Red flags but addressed / Red flags not addressed / No red flags |  |
| ***2. Capacity and Risk management considerations***  |
| Proposed Implementation Modality, Project Governance Structure and set-up | Considered / Not considered  |  |
| Implementation ArrangementsImplementing PartnerResponsible Party(ies)Oversight* 1st level oversight:
* 2nd level oversight:
* 3rd level oversight:
 | Assessed / Not assessed |  |
| CO capacity  | Assessed / Not assessed |  |
| IP capacity (including capacity on gender and safeguards):* HACT/PCAT assessment results
* Prior experience with the proposed IP
* If capacity gaps/shortfalls have been identified, what risk mitigation measures can/have been or will be put in place?
* Has an alternative IP been considered (e.g. UN Agency, CSO/NGO, etc.)
* Given the capacity assessments, what is the appropriate implementation modality proposed and why?
* If execution support is required by the IP (based on identified capacity shortfalls identified), which 3rd party entities have been considered to provide the support and are there any other alternatives that may be considered
* If UNDP is required to perform a role in execution (as a last resort and based on clearly identified justification): (i) how will UNDP ensure institutional separation of the oversight and execution functions and what are the proposed governance arrangements (ii) will costs for UNDP execution be fully covered in the project budget?
 | Assessed / Not assessed |  |
| UNDP capacity for first level oversight (PPRR and any other UNDP offices engaged in the proposed project).This should also address:* Capacities of the Lead Unit in Regional Hub or HQ (PPRR) to take on this additional project? Resourcing requirements?
* Proposed governance arrangements?
* Gender and safeguards capacity.
* Who will perform oversight and who will represent UNDP on the project board?
* If UNDP also provides execution support or the project is DIM, how will the oversight function be institutionally separated from the execution function?
* Capacity of the operations unit to perform effectively and to process fund requests quickly.
 | Assessed / Not assessed  |  |
| Risks as raised by the GEF Audit 2020 | Considered / Not considered |  |
| Risks as raised by the last OAI Audit of relevant scope/focus (if any) | Considered / Not considered  |  |
| Alignment with other UNDP practices | Considered / Not considered |  |
| Partnership with UNOs, others | Considered / Not considered |  |
| Alignment with Fund requirements | Yes / No |  |
| Has any of the Exclusionary Criteria been triggered? If yes, describe the situation (related to UNDP office that will be PPRR). | None/Yes [#] | [to be verified by the NCE MPSU and PA] |
| ***3. Budget/costing and HR considerations (level of investment required throughout the whole project cycle)*** |
| CO commitment of appropriate budget and HR resources to project development  | Yes / No |  |
| Government commitment of resources to project development and implementation | Considered / Not considered |  |
| Strategy for managing any executing support requests and/or needs (taking into account that costs related to an execution support role will need to be covered by the project budget) | Considered / Not considered |  |
| Delivery plan  | Considered / Not considered |  |
| ***4. Confirmation of NCE team resources (to be confirmed by PTA during PISC)*** |
| Availability of human resources in NCE team to support the request based on a workload analysis | Yes / No |  |

**B / Summary of PISC assessment**

**PISC meeting date:**

**Members of PISC:**

**CO representative presenting proposal:**

**PISC recommendation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal supported** |
|  | Proposal supported: *The PISC will submit the programming recommendation to the BPPS-NCE Executive Coordinator for final decision* | Conditions/issues to be considered during PPG phase (if applicable):If request is accepted: The GEF audit checklist should be prepared by the CO, checked for compliance and quality by the RTA, signed off by the PTA, before submission of the PIF package to the GEFSEC. |
| **Proposal not supported at this stage** |
|  | Proposal requires minor changes: *Revise and resubmit for another review by the PTA and submission to the BPPS NCE Executive Coordinator for final decision when cleared by PTA* | Areas requiring revision prior to resubmission to PTA:Recommended scenario for Task Team formation:Indicate full-fledged integrated programming or stand-alone project developmentConditions/issues to be considered during PIF development (if applicable):If request is accepted: The GEF audit checklist should be prepared by the CO, checked for compliance and quality by the RTA, signed off by the PTA, before submission of the PIF package to the GEFSEC. |
|  | Proposal requires major changes: *Revise and resubmit for another review by the PISC (PISC will be reconvened)* | Areas requiring revision prior to submission to PISC: |
| **Proposal not supported** |
|  | Proposal falls well short of requirements: Do not continue  | Reasons for PISC recommendation: |