



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

GEF ID:	5136		
Country/Region:	Global (Barbados, Belize, Chile, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Mali, Myanmar, Mauritania, Maldives, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Rwanda, Sudan, Somalia, Swaziland, Thailand, Vietnam)		
Project Title:	Support to 20 GEF Eligible Parties for Alignment of National Action Programs and Reporting Process under UNCCD (Add-on Umbrella 2)		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,000,000
Co-financing:	\$1,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$2,000,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mohamed Bakarr	Agency Contact Person:	Adamou Bouhari

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?		Twenty eligible countries are included in this proposal.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>Yes, twenty letters of endorsement for the UNEP Umbrella Project to support enabling activities under the UNCCD are available.</p> <p>However, please confirm with the OFP from Belize that there is no misunderstanding. Actually, the letter mentions "endorsement for the Biodiversity enabling activities project. However, it is also mentioned the project aims to implement the UNCCD strategic Plan in Belize.</p> <p>October 5, 2012</p>	

Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?		Addressed.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		UNCCD related activities will soon be included in the UNEP work program. UNEP will use the UNDP country offices if needed. A Task manager and a project coordinator Assistant will lead the project, with the support of UNEP-WCMC. UNEP-WCMC will assign staff located in Cambridge.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		Addressed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		The GEF resources are actually provided by the LD Focal Area set-aside.
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?		The project is fully aligned with the LD strategy and its objective 4.  October 5, 2012 Please note, we found a typo in the table A for the outcome 4.1: it is

			implement UNCCD priorities, and not 50.  Cleared.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?		The project is fully aligned with the LD strategy and its objective 4.
	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?		This is the aim of the project: to align the national strategies with the 10-year plan and provide the national report for the 4th reporting and review process.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		Yes.
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?		NA
	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?		NA, these activities are mandatory under the convention obligations.

	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?		<p>The result framework is based on two logical components to 1) align the strategy and 2) prepare the national report. However, in the text (section 17 and following, see p.8 and 9), there is a reference of a component 3 that was accepted for the first FSP, but not for this additional MSP.</p> <p>We understand the HelpDesk support financed by the FSP will also provide support to these 20 countries, but no resources will be taken from the MSP for such support.</p> <p>Please confirm.</p> <p>October 5, 2012 Cleared.</p>
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?		NA. The project is providing a support to 20 countries to improve the enabling environment for implementation of the UNCCD obligations. No incremental reasoning is requested.
	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?		<p>Yes. see section B.3.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?		<p>Yes. see section B.5.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>
	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, p. 12 and 12.

	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		Yes. See sections B.7.  Addressed.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?		Yes, see part III. UNEP is the implementing agency. UNEP-WCMC will support the project execution. A Project Steering Committee will be composed by representatives of UNEP, UNEP-WCMC, and other relevant institutions. The steering committee will coordinate with the UNCCD Secretariat and the GM. UNCCD focal points will coordinate activities at national level, with a National Executing Agency and a National Coordinating body. UNCCD and the GM will provide guidance within their mandates. The regional coordination units established by COP9 might provide additional support.  Cleared.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		NA. This MSP has been submitted under the single step process.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?		No management costs are requested.
Project Financing			

	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		A cofinancing of 1:1 is provided.  No letters of cofinancing are provided for the In-kind or the cash cofinancing.  It is acceptable for enabling activities.  Cleared.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		The cofinancing is provided by the countries. However, we understand that UNEP provides a cofinancing for the Umbrella FSP.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		NA
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	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>		
	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		

	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		Please respond the points in the cells 2 and 14. Upon a revised document, the CEO approval will be recommended.  October 5, 2012 We thank the Agency for the clarifications. All the points are addressed. The MSP is now recommended for approval.
Review Date (s)	First review*		September 21, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)		October 05, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.