

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Egypt

Review PIF 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

Agenices

UNDP

Date received by PM

10/9/2019

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 - Not entirely. The Project is aligned with the SGP strategic directions approved for GEF-7 and with the Climate Change and Biodiversity focal areas.

Regarding land degradation, it is not clear how the project will meet the 11,000 ha land restored target included, as there is very little information on reforestation or restoration activities in the project description. Additionally if there's a restoration target and the project is not addressing integrated management (LD1-4), then the Agency would need to select LD 1-2 or LD1-3.

Please revise

11/5/2019 Revision done. Cleared

Agency Response

The PIF has been revised to clarify Programming Directions in Table A, and further description of land restoration activities has been added on pages 15-17, as well as on page 10.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 In the table, please identify the breakdown between investment mobilized and recurrent expenditures for each source. For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf).

Please revise.

11/5/2019 Revised. Cleared

Agency Response

Table C of the PIF has been revised to reflect the breakdown between investment mobilized and recurrent expenditures.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Yes. Cleared. The PIF is requesting a PPG of \$54,750 (inclusive of Agency fees) and this is within the authorized cap.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 For component 1, please describe the components and outcomes in more detail. Currently, for that component his section replicates the information in table B.

Please revise

11/5/2019 Revised. Cleared

Agency Response

Please see revised description of outputs and activities consistent with Table B on pages 15-17.

.

Quote

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Not clear. Please describe how the proposed project is aligned with the GEF-7 strategic priorities for the climate change and land degradation focal areas. Please refer to Annex A of the document: Summary of Negotiations of the Seventh Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund (Document GEF/C.54/19/Rev.03):

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.C.54.19.Rev_.03_Replenishment.pdf

Please revise

11/5/2019 Revised. Cleared

Agency Response

The PIF has been revised to clarify alignment with GEF-7 strategic priorities for the land degradation and climate change focal areas. See pages 18-19 for highlighted text in yellow.

.

Quote

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Please explain what the business as usual scenario is, that is what would the situation be without the GEF support, with only the ongoing and planned activities in the absence of the GEF and the expected/projected loss of GEBs if left unattended.

Please revise

11/5/2019 Revised. Cleared

Agency Response

See additional text on page 19 in response to a business-as-usual scenario of GEF absence and loss of GEBs.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Please describe what is innovative about the participatory, multi-stakeholder approach. What's going to be innovative about this new cycle?

Please revise

11/5/2019 Revised. Cleared

Agency Response

The description of the innovativeness of the participatory, multi-stakeholder landscape management approach has been strengthened on page 22.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Please provide the coordinates for the 4 landscapes/seascapes.

Please revise

11/5/2019 Revised. Cleared

Agency Response

Landscape coordinates have been provided in the revised PIF on page 24.

[Normal](#)

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Please provide a description of the means of engagement in the project for each type of stakeholder.

Please revise

11/5/2019 Revised. Cleared

Agency Response

A comprehensive table listing stakeholders and their engagement in the project has been provided on pages 24-28 of the revised PIF.

[Normal](#)

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Not sufficiently. Please provide indicative information on Gender considerations relevant to the project (what are the issues to address in terms of gender equality) and any measures to address these, including the process to collect sex-disaggregated data and information on Gender.

Please revise

11/5/2019 Revised. Cleared

Agency Response

Section 3 on *Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment* has been redrafted for clarity and more detail. Please see page 29.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 To a great extent. Please consider reviewing the GEF Updated Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards that came into effect on July 1, 2019. Please review if there's a need to provide indicative information regarding any additional Environmental and Social Risks and potential Impacts associated with the proposed project and any measures to address such risks and impacts. (https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.C.55.07_ES_Safeguards.pdf)

Please revise

11/5/2019 Explanation provided. Cleared

Agency Response

After reviewing the GEF Updated Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards, no additional Environmental and Social Risks are apparent at this stage.

The UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure is aligned with the GEF Updated Policy of July 1, 2019. The social and environmental safeguards pre-screening (pre-SESP) was prepared during the PIF design phase identifying environmental and/or social risks and potential impacts of the project at this stage of project development, as well as measures to address them. During the course of project preparation, potential risks will continue to be identified and analyzed and then added to the Risk table in the Project Document if they are found to be authentic. The risk table in the PIF on pages 30 and 31 is in line with the Safeguard Pre-screening conducted as part of PIF development.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Please provide information about the management, monitoring and evaluation arrangements for the project.

Please revise

11/5/2019 Revised. Cleared

Agency Response

Section 6 of the PIF has been revised substantially to include a detailed description of the management, monitoring and evaluation arrangements of the project. Please see pages 31-32.

[Quote](#)

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/21/2019 - Not at this stage. Please address the comments above.

11/5/2019 Yes, the PIF is recommended for technical clearance and the PPG.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Please note that for CEO Endorsement, the Agency will be required to fill in a detailed budget template prepared by the GEF Secretariat. This budget template is as follows:

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		