



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9671		
Country/Region:	Egypt		
Project Title:	Effective Management of Wadi El-Rayan and Qarun Protected Areas		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$1,319,864
Co-financing:	\$9,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$10,319,864
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Jane Nimpamya

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	12-19-16 Yes. BD-1 Program 1. With emphasis on effective management of the National Infrastructure. Cleared	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	12-15-16 Yes. With NBSAP 2015-2030 and the National Development Plan. See page 17 of PIF. Cleared	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	12-15-16	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>Drivers of environmental degradation. Please only refer to those drivers directly related to the proposed project sites. Not the nation-wide analysis.</p> <p>Sustainability. None of the proposed outputs appear to be related to the financial, ecological or institutional sustainability of the project. On the contrary, the proposed interventions may lead the need of additional financial resources at the end of this project to sustain the gains obtain through this project.</p> <p>Scaling. The proposed interventions do not shed any light on how the project could be scaled-up, except by carrying out the same activities in other protected areas with new funding.</p> <p>Innovation. There is nothing innovative in this project.</p> <p>6-23-17 Cleared</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>12-19-16</p> <p>No. First, the project needs to</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>elaborate on the "Baseline Project" as defined by the GEF. That is, the series of investments, related to the project's thematic or geographic areas, that will take place whether or not the GEF grant gets approved. Please include the financial resources to be invested in this "Baseline Project(s). No need to provide the history of investments (i.e. Background). GEF projects cannot use as baseline or co-financing. If Baseline Project is coming from the Government, please elaborate on it.</p> <p>Second, once the Baseline Project(s) has been described, the PIF needs to elaborate on how the proposed investments make an incremental contributions to achieve Global Environmental Benefits. As currently write, it appears as if this PIF were a stand-alone project (no baseline project and thus, no incremental reasoning possible.</p> <p>6-23-17 Cleared</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>12-19-16</p> <p>No.</p> <p>Objective is a mouth-full and does not reflect the content of the project. The</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>GEF requests the objective (and title) to be more to the point and adjust to what is being proposed.</p> <p>Component 1 is disconnected from Component 2.</p> <p>Component 1. i) The title of the component has very little to do with the content, as described by outcomes and outputs; ii) The National Species and Ecosystem Assessments [and associated capacity building activities (1.1.2) and public awareness campaigns described on 1.2] are not eligible to be financed by the GEF. These investments are over ambitious (i.e. "a national gap analysis to assess threats, identify the most endangered ecosystems and species, and update the NPAS plan" & establishing an integrated GIS-based monitoring system and a NPAS Decision Support System (DSS) to provide reliable data on targeted endangered ecosystems & species for use in management planning and implementation") unlikely to be delivered within time and budget \$481K) and render no GEBs. iii) Investments in Outcome 1.3 needs to be justified. Why do they need to be drafted/revised? Provide elements supporting the need of additional work on PA and BD laws</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>behind the information provided on the last 6 line sof the 3rd paragraph on p. 11). The GEF strongly suggest dropping this component all together. Any species-based work (i.e. monitoring) could/should be done with target species in the proposed PAs.</p> <p>Component 2. i) The project needs to provide a proper justification on the selection of the two protected areas. While the information on the PAs is welcome (p.4-5) the PIF needs to explain why these two areas were selected among the 30 PAs in Egypt. The GEF expects to hear a compelling argument for the selection, including information on the "Baseline Projects" that will be used as building blocks for the GEF investment in this project. iii) Budget is insufficient for achieve the proposed outcomes. ii) For indicator species [Dorcas gazelle (Gazella Dorcas), Slender-billed Gull (Larus genei), Egyptian Eared Grebe (Podiceps nigricollis)], it is desirable to have the baseline information on the status of these populations at PIF stage and the name of the institutions/specialists that have the data. A single data point determined at PPG can't be used as baseline, as it will not be possible to determine if</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the observed increases are the result of the investments (Note: The population size may be have been increasing over the last few years without any intervention).</p> <p>OTHER</p> <p>1. Stakeholders (p.15). Only list those that are going to play a role in execution and do not list institutions, unless they are aware of their participation in this project. For instance, are WWF and WCS aware that they "will provide technical inputs and participate in the design of policy development activities"? What about UNDP, World Bank, UNESCO, EU and Italian Cooperation on best practices and international experience? And the "Other Relevant Ministries"? Please provide justification for the involvement in this project?</p> <p>2. Coordination (p.16). The suggested activity of " identifying new PAs in order to enhance the ecological coverage of the PA system" is not part of the Results Framework. Please eliminate it. Same with the MSB project. The project has not been approved.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		6-23-17 Cleared	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	12-19-16 The relationship between the proposed activities and the local communities needs to be furthered developed (under Component 2). It is not clear how the proposed interventions will resolve the issue of overharvesting in the two protected areas. How does Participatory Planning going to benefit communities and reduce overharvesting (of what species?). 6-23-17 Cleared	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	12-19-16 This is a BD \$1.5 M, and funding still available under STAR. Are all the co-financiers aware that they are being listed in the PIF with the corresponding \$ figures? 6-23-17 Egypt still has \$3.1 M in STAR for this project. Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? • Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>12-19-16 No. Please address outstanding issues under items 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. Thanks.</p> <p>6-23-17 This PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	December 19, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 23, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
		10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.