

# Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Egypt

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10360

**Countries**

Egypt

**Project Name**

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Egypt

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

4/30/2021

**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**

Patricia Marcos Huidobro

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

## PIF ☐

### CEO Endorsement ☐

#### Part I ? Project Information

##### Focal area elements

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**No.** Please note that bike-sharing is not eligible under the GEF-7 Climate Change Mitigation strategy, and as such cannot be funded with GEF resources. However, bike-sharing activities can still be part of the project and covered with the co-financing resources. Please revise the CEO endorsement request accordingly.

##### Agency Response

##### Project description summary

**2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**No.** PMCs are in line with the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy. However, please address the following comments:

- 1- Changes to table B are not justified. Please explain and justify:
  - The addition of output 1.1.2 and why the similar 1.2.2 *?Partnership building and policy advocacy for facilitating broader adoption of renewable energy and energy efficient applications?* is different from the PIF 1.4.2 *?Partnerships and business models established and demonstrating renewable energy and clean energy applications?*. At PIF level, the establishment of business models and financial partnerships to

leverage funding were emphasized, which seems more appropriate for SGP projects than focusing on policy advocacy.

- Why PIF ?Output 2. 1.4. Typology of community level projects developed and agreed by multistakeholder groups together with eligibility criteria? has been deleted.

2- Amounts in the budget template do not correspond to table B, e.g. component 1 is \$1,693,154 in the template vs \$1,694,728 in tab B; likewise, components 2 and 3 M&E do not match. Please correct..

#### Agency Response

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

N/A

#### Agency Response

**Co-financing**

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**Yes, with suggestions.** The total co-financing for this project is relatively low and decreased compared to the PIF levels. While we understand the difficulties in raising extra-financing, especially with the COVID-19 pandemic, we would very much appreciate if you can document/justify in the proposal the efforts done to date to come up with co-financing, as well as potential co-financing sources that are being explored/under discussion.

#### Agency Response

**GEF Resource Availability**

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**Yes.**

Agency Response  
**Project Preparation Grant**

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**Yes.**

Agency Response  
**Core indicators**

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?  
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**No.** GHG emissions have been reported in the project document under "*Indicator 6.1. Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU sector*". However, from the project document it is our understanding that the 21,900 tCO<sub>2</sub> emissions avoided will come primarily from energy efficiency and renewable energy projects, which shall be considered under "*Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside the AFOLU Sector*". Please update accordingly.

Agency Response

**Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
PM&JS: 5/18/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
PM&JS: 5/18/2021

Yes, with request for clarification.

- 1- Under the baseline for the EE and RE sectors, in page 38 the CEO ER indicates that at the end of 2017 there were only 120 MW of renewable distributed energy installed in the country. Could you please provide an updated figure? The biggest distributed energy developments worldwide have taken place in the latest couple of years.

Please explain how the recommendations of the OP6 MTE have been incorporated in the design of this proposal:

#### 4.2 Recommendations

No.	Recommendation	Responsibility
1.	<b>Strengthen the landscape strategies.</b> The landscape strategies should be considered as living documents, with regular updates as additional information is available and progress is made with respect to implementation. A few recommended improvements include: (a) breaking out the consolidated landscape strategy into four separate documents, one for each landscape; (b) delineating the project interventions onto landscape level maps, showing other key features such as significant biodiversity areas, land use distribution, etc.; (c) elaborating the strategies by including stakeholder analyses, partnership opportunities, more information on local and national development strategies, etc.; and (d) facilitating validation of the landscape strategies by local government units.	CPMU, NSC, landscape stakeholders
2.	<b>Enhance the composition of the National Steering Committee.</b> The composition of the NSC should be reviewed and enhanced in order to: (a) ensure majority representation by CSOs; (b) address representation of the beneficiaries within the target landscapes; and (c) include enabling development partners, such as the Ministry of Local Development, National Council of Women, as well as donors and private sector organizations.	NSC, UNDP, CPMU

#### 4.2 Recommendations

No.	Recommendation	Responsibility
1.	<b>Strengthen the landscape strategies.</b> The landscape strategies should be considered as living documents, with regular updates as additional information is available and progress is made with respect to implementation. A few recommended improvements include: (a) breaking out the consolidated landscape strategy into four separate documents, one for each landscape; (b) delineating the project interventions onto landscape level maps, showing other key features such as significant biodiversity areas, land use distribution, etc.; (c) elaborating the strategies by including stakeholder analyses, partnership opportunities, more information on local and national development strategies, etc.; and (d) facilitating validation of the landscape strategies by local government units.	CPMU, NSC, landscape stakeholders
2.	<b>Enhance the composition of the National Steering Committee.</b> The composition of the NSC should be reviewed and enhanced in order to: (a) ensure majority representation by CSOs; (b) address representation of the beneficiaries within the target landscapes; and (c) include enabling development partners, such as the Ministry of Local Development, National Council of Women, as well as donors and private sector organizations.	NSC, UNDP, CPMU

Agency Response

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**No.** Please address the following questions:

- 1- Please clarify what is ?3.1.1.10 Prepare a sustainability plan?. What is it supposed to contain, when is it supposed to be implemented in the course of the project (development and implementation not show in the work plan in the ProDoc) and why it is not included in the project design rather than added as a separate layer.
- 2- Please clarify what is meant by ?Community-supported ecotourism? in this project and explain, in concrete terms, how support to it would translate in benefits for biodiversity of global relevance.

Agency Response

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**Yes, with request for clarification.** The document will benefit from a cross-reference to Annex 18 or a brief explanation on the expected projects (i.e. % of EE, % of RE, etc.) based on the consultations conducted and provided in the baseline reports under Annex 18.

Agency Response

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**No.** Please clarify how ?beekeeping? and ?agriculture waste to animal feed and organic fertilizer? would relate to global biodiversity benefits or consider moving all SLM practices to the LD section.

Agency Response

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**No.** Please address the following comments:

- 1- The document will benefit from a clarification on the innovativeness aspects of the proposed project compared to previous SGP projects in Egypt. What is different and innovative in the proposed project compared to previous SGP projects in Egypt?
- 2- Scaling up:
  - a. Only 202 k\$ are budgeted for strategic grants, which seems low for a second phase of SGP in mostly the same landscape. The focus in OP7 should be on up-scaling and ensuring sustainability without an additional SGP phase. While revising the total envelope for grants (see comment on budget further down), please in particular consider revising the amount allocated to strategic grants.
  - b. The last paragraph is incomplete in the portal entry. Please correct:

Resources have been allocated in the OP7 budget for SGP strategic grants, primarily to help facilitate upscaling. According to SGP Operational Guidelines (see *Annex 17* to the Project Document) funding can be awarded up to USD 150,000 in value per grant. Envisaged support to be received through strategic grants include mainstreaming of the landscape approach among key landscape stakeholders, advocating for policy reform and mechanisms that would strengthen the enabling environment for participatory conservation, restoration, and sustainable livelihood initiatives. calls for

Resources have been allocated in the OP7 budget for SGP strategic grants, primarily to help facilitate upscaling. According to SGP Operational Guidelines (see *Annex 17* to the Project Document) funding can be awarded up to USD 150,000 in value per grant. Envisaged support to be received through strategic grants include mainstreaming of the landscape approach among key landscape stakeholders, advocating for policy reform and mechanisms that would strengthen the enabling environment for participatory conservation, restoration, and sustainable livelihood initiatives. calls for

Agency Response  
**Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**Yes.**

Agency Response  
**Child Project**

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**N/A.**

Agency Response  
**Stakeholders**

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?  
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**Yes.**

Agency Response  
**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**



**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**Yes.**

Agency Response  
**Private Sector Engagement**

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**No.** Engagement with the private sector seems key for the sustainability of the project. Although private sector engagement is mentioned across the document, the specific section on private sector shall be further elaborated.

Agency Response  
**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**Yes.**

Agency Response  
**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**Yes.**

Agency Response  
**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**Yes.**

Agency Response  
**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**Yes.**

Agency Response  
**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**Yes, with request for clarification.** Please add a cross reference to Annex 4.

Agency Response

**Benefits**

**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

The audit response template submitted with this endorsement request has been reviewed and cleared from a technical and programmatic perspective. The financial, operational, and policy due diligence may reveal issues that may still need to be addressed by UNDP.

**No.** Please address the following comments:

1. Budget:
  - a. Components? totals do not match between table B and the budget template. Please correct.
  - b. Grants to CSO are \$1,261,400 and actually \$1,185,716 once UNOPS 6% fee is accounted for. This means that grants to CSO are 59.4% of GEF project financing and 51.7% of GEF total grant (including agency fees), which is too low, especially as this is a follow-up SGP in most landscapes. Please revise so that grants are at least 70% of GEF project financing.
  - c. Please clarify what are the \$127,000 of ?rental and maintenance? and justify why they are charged for half on components. Please notably justify why most of these costs are not covered in the 6% fee that is already attributed to UNOPS.
  - d. The budget ? Annex E is off margins in the portal. Please correct. If needed, one option is to aggregate the budget at component level, instead of outcome level, in the portal while keeping the detailed version in the attached Excel file.

Agency Response

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**Yes.** Please add a cross-reference to the exact page in UNDP Project Document where the Project Results Framework can be found.

Agency Response

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**N/A.**

Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**No.** To Germany?s comment: *?To ensure the long-term success and durability of the project activities, Germany recommends including a dedicated strategy for knowledge management and follow-up financing into the theory of change. Especially the maintenance of the governance platforms needs to be planned beyond the duration of*

*the project?*, please elaborate further on the exit strategy after the project. Is this related to the ?Sustainability Plan? briefly mentioned under Output 3.1.1?

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

N/A.

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

N/A.

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

N/A.

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

N/A.

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM & JS: 5/18/2021**

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**N/A.**

Agency Response

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**N/A.**

Agency Response

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**PM&JS: 5/18/2021**

**N/A.**

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The GEF SEC is returning the CEO Endorsement Request to the Agency to address additional comments/requests for clarifications.

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

<b>First Review</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**