

## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS<sup>1</sup>

Country/Region: Cuba  
 Project Title: Cuba: Supporting Implementation of the Cuban National Programme to Combat Desertification and Drought (NPCDD)  
 GEFSEC Project ID: **8003**  
 GEF Agency Project ID: GEF Agency: UNEP  
 GEF Focal Area (s): Land Degradation  
 GEF-4 Strategic Program (s):  
 Anticipated Project Financing (\$): PPG:\$0 GEF Project Allocation:\$2,444,500 Co-financing:\$24,544,380 Total Project Cost:\$26,988,880  
 PIF Approval Date: Anticipated Work Program Inclusion: November 10, 2005  
 Program Manager: Mohamed Bakarr GEF Agency Contact Person: Robert Erath

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion <sup>2</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?		November 26, 2014  This project is part of the CPP Cuba "Supporting Implementation of the Cuban National Programme to Combat Desertification and Drought (NPCDD)" approved by Council in GEF-3. Hence the project draws GEF-3 funding from the LD focal area.  It is Project #2 in the sequence of investments planned under the CPP, and this is the first time the project has been submitted for GEFSec review.  Cleared
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, check if project document includes a calendar of reflows and provide comments, if any.		n/a

<sup>1</sup> Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. Please do not answer if the field is blocked with gray.

<sup>2</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of PIF of FSPs will simultaneously be considered for WPI. For MSPs, once the PIF is approved by CEO, next step will be to continue project preparation until the project is ready for CEO approval.

	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		November 26, 2014  Yes. The LoE was included in the original CPP project document approved by Council.  Cleared
	4. Which GEF Strategic Objective/ Program does the project fit into?		November 26, 2014  The Project seeks to build capacity for information coordination and monitoring systems for SLM in areas with water management problems. This is consistent with the OP15 (Sustainable Land Management), which was the GEF-3 LD Strategy considered in the CCP document.  Cleared
	5. Does the Agency have a comparative advantage for the project?		November 26, 2014  Yes. UNEP was designated as Implementing Agency of this Project #2 under the Cuba CCP.  Cleared
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed GEF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available for (if appropriate):		
	• The RAF allocation?		n/a
	• The focal areas?		November 26, 2014  Yes, this project 2 draws from a set-aside envelop for the CPP Cuba which was approved in GEF-3. The funds were set aside at time of Council approval of the CPP, and are still available.  Cleared
	• Strategic objectives?		n/a

Project Design	• Strategic program?		n/a
	7. Will the project deliver tangible global environmental benefits?		
	8. Is the global environmental benefit measurable?		<p>November 26, 2014</p> <p>The overall CPP project is designed to arrest and reverse land degradation nationally, which will contribute multiple global environment benefits. The project #2 focuses on capacity building to support implementation of actions and interventions that will improve surface and groundwater resources with increased number of people using SLM practices.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	9. Is the project design sound, its framework consistent & sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?		<p>November 26, 2014</p> <p>Yes. The project focuses on building capacity for information coordination and monitoring systems. The outcomes are consistent with project components. The results framework of the project is clear, and the indicators and targets reflect the objective to be achieved at different administrative levels.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national priorities and policies?		<p>November 26, 2014</p> <p>Yes. This Project 2 under Cuba's CCP responds directly to the country's priorities under the National Action Program (NAP) for implementation of the UNCCD. In addition, it also builds on the country's national strategies and policies for advancing sustainable land management.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

	11. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		<p>November 26, 2014</p> <p>Yes. The project builds from Project 1 under the CPP, which is still ongoing and seeks to build capacities for planning, decision-making and regulatory systems in severely degraded ecosystems. It will also coordinate with another project designed to conserve threatened mountainous ecosystems, and relevant GEF Small Grants Programs associated with sustainable land management.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	12. Is the proposed project likely to be cost-effective?		
	13. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated in project design?		<p>November 26, 2014</p> <p>Yes. The project will focus on institutional strengthening, information management system and development and implementation of an integrated management model by building on baseline activities, existing capacities and infrastructure at different administrative levels. These are key priorities for demonstrating cost-effectiveness, and the requested GEF grant is within the amounts approved by Council in GEF-3.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	14. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF?		<p>November 26, 2014</p> <p>This project is part of Cuba' CPP "Supporting Implementation of the Cuban National Programme to Combat Desertification and Drought (NPCDD)" approved by Council in GEF-3. The entire CPP was approved as a project, with temporally sequenced implementation.</p>

			Hence the details of project #2 are in accordance with the Council approved sequence, and this is the first time its is submitted for review by the GEFSec.  Cleared
	15.Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and includes sufficient risk mitigation measures?		November 26, 2014  Yes. Organisational, socio-economic, financial and environmental potential risks have been identified and measures to mitigate them clearly articulated.  Cleared
Justification for GEF Grant	16.Is the value-added of GEF involvement in the project clearly demonstrated through incremental reasoning?		November 26, 2014  Yes. The project document clearly highlights the GEF contribution as critical for averting land degradation. The value-added of GEF involvement is demonstrated through the emphasis on building of capacity to remove identified barriers that threaten ecosystem integrity in target areas.  Cleared
	17.Is the type of financing provided by GEF, as well as its level of concessionality, appropriate?		November 26, 2014  Yes. The resources for this Project 2 are within the amounts approved by the Council for the Cuba CPP.  Cleared
	18.How would the proposed project outcomes and global environmental benefits be affected if GEF does not invest?		November 26, 2014  The GEF incremental reasoning is fully substantiated. The document gives clear information about the business-as-usual scenario and the catalytic value of GEF resources that will affect project outcomes and global environmental benefits. Without

			<p>GEF financing, barriers to successful SLM implementation will not be adequately addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	19. Is the GEF funding level of project management budget appropriate?	n/a	<p>November 26, 2014</p> <p>Yes. The project management budget is 4.8% of the total GEF grant, and is cofinanced in the ratio 1:10.6</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	20. Is the GEF funding level of other cost items (consultants, travel, etc.) appropriate?		<p>November 26, 2014</p> <p>Yes. The GEF funding levels of other cost items are appropriate.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	21. Is the indicative co-financing adequate for the project?	n/a	
	22. Are the confirmed co-financing amounts adequate for each project component?		<p>November 26, 2014</p> <p>Yes. However, the cofinancing amounts should be consistent with the letters of endorsement from different institutions. For example, there are 13 letters of endorsement confirming cofinancing though Annex 1: project document page 1 only has 7 sources. Please address.</p> <p>16 December, 2014</p> <p>Letters of cofinancing accounted for as requested.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

	23.Has the Tracking Tool <sup>3</sup> been included with information for all relevant indicators?		November 26, 2014  This is a GEF-3 project for which Tracking Tool is not applicable.  Cleared
	24.Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		November 26, 2014  Yes. The document includes a planned and costed M&E plan.  Cleared
Secretariat's Response to various comments from:	STAP		
	Convention Secretariat		
	Agencies' response to GEFSEC comments		
	Agencies' response to Council comments		26 November, 2014  Please, respond as required  16 December, 2014  Letters of cofinancing accounted for as requested. Cleared
<b>Secretariat Decisions</b>			
Recommendation at PIF	<b>25. Is PIF clearance being recommended?</b>		
	26.Items worth noting at CEO Endorsement.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement	<b>27. Is CEO Endorsement being recommended?</b>		November 26, 2014  No. Please clarify the co-financing amounts in the letters of endorsement with details presented in the project document.

<sup>3</sup> At present, Tracking Tools apply to Biodiversity projects only. Tracking Tools for other focal areas are currently being developed.

			December 16, 2014
			The project is now technically cleared.
Review Date	1 <sup>st</sup> review		November 26, 2014
	2 <sup>nd</sup> review		December 16, 2014
	3 <sup>rd</sup> review		

### 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?	
	3. Is the proposed GEF PPG Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available under the RAF/Focal Area allocation?	xxPPGResorcesxx
	4. Is the consultant cost reasonable?	
Recommendation	<b>5. Is PPG being recommended?</b>	
Other comments		
Review Date	1 <sup>st</sup> review	
	2 <sup>nd</sup> review	
	3 <sup>rd</sup> review	

wb21049  
C:\Users\wb21049\Documents\Visual Studio 2008\WebSites\WebSite9\LetterTemplates\ReviewSheetforGEFProject.rtf  
8/28/2009 4:16:00 PM