



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

GEF ID:	5073		
Country/Region:	Egypt		
Project Title:	Mainstreaming the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity into Tourism Development and Operations in Threatened Ecosystems in Egypt		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4590 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; BD-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,574,338
Co-financing:	\$10,440,000	Total Project Cost:	\$13,014,338
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	April 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Yves de Soye

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?	8-27-12 Yes. Egypt is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	8-27-12 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP dated August 7th 2012 for \$2,884,600 including PPG and Agency Fee. Cleared	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	8-27-12 Yes. UNDP is currently implementing projects in 48 countries that work with tourism sector. Work includes developing sustainable tourism ventures, certification standards, partnerships with private sector, and local institutions. Cleared	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency	NA	

	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	8-27-12 Yes. There is a UNDP office in Cairo with two Senior Officers, a Junior Officer and an Assistant. This office is supported by the UNDP Regional Service Centers for the Arab States in Cairo and Bratislava. Cleared	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	8-27-12 Yes. Egypt is using \$2,818,600 of its \$4.5M BD allocation. Cleared	
	• the focal area allocation?	8-27-12 Yes. Egypt is using \$2,818,600 of its \$4.5M BD allocation. Cleared	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	8-27-12 Yes. Cleared	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	8-27-12 Yes. BD-1 and BD-2. Cleared	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant	8-27-12 Yes. The project is consistent with Egypt's National Development Plan, the National Sustainable Development	

	NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	NBSAP (1998). Cleared	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	8-27-12 Yes. Capacities will be developed under the following outputs: Component 1 (National policy mainstreaming committee, Strengthening the capacity at the Ministry of State for Environmental Affairs (MSEA), Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (EEAA), and other agencies). Component 2 (Institutional and technical capacities in the new and existing PAs). Cleared	
	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?	8-27-12 Yes. The baseline projects for the Mainstreaming and Protected Areas Components are described in detailed (see p.9-10). Cleared.	
Project Design			
	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?	8-29-12 Yes. Cleared	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	8-29-12	

	<p>comparable GEF eligible countries where biodiversity has been effectively mainstreamed into tourism sector as proposed in this project (Bibliographic references will be appreciated for further reading. Thanks).</p> <p>Please clarify the following:</p> <p>Component 1.</p> <p>1. If the EEAA publishes a "comprehensive set of regulations for new construction and development, prohibiting the destruction of the natural coastline, tidal flats and coral reefs (p.9)" what is the meaning of the output 1? The problem may not be of policies, laws, or regulations but of enforcement which is NOT mention at all in this component.</p> <p>Component 2.</p> <p>1) Expanding and strengthening the PA state requires Investment that are tangible and measurable on the ground. If this component is labeled TA, there is the potential of most of the financial resources to end in consultancies with very little reaching the ground.</p> <p>2) Please remove output "waste collection systems". Not eligible for BD funding.</p> <p>3) What are "community-based integrated land and resource management plans developed and implementation started". Provide</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>4) Please name the role model for the "interpretation facilities" to be build at the PAs. Is there an alternative to the "interpretation facilities"?</p> <p>5) Aren't the proposed PA financing systems an overlap with the existing GEF/UNDP project (p,15)?</p> <p>9-12-12 Outstanding issues properly addressed in the revised PIF. Please read Responses to GEF Secretariat Review for FSP (Sep 9, 2012). Cleared</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>8-29-12</p> <p>The success of this project relays on the following assumptions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That land-use planning (focusing on tourism and real estate/construction sectors) can positively affect the type and location of infrastructure projects that have the potential to negatively affect biodiversity assets. 2. That SEA and EIA are effective tools for land-use planning (meaning that can effectively affect decisions on infrastructure projects with tangible and measurable positive impacts). 3. That the "biodiversity monitoring and evaluation mechanism" is of use. 4. Those tourism operators will adopt best practice standards for sustainable tourism and NB/BTF. 	

		<p>5. Certification standards and verification standards result in biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>While these assumptions appear to be reasonable on paper, they may not apply in Egypt. For each of the 5 assumptions listed above please confirm that they hold and are applicable in post-revolution Egypt.</p> <p>9-12-12 Outstanding issues properly addressed in the revised PIF. Please read Responses to GEF Secretariat Review for FSP (Sep 9, 2012). Cleared</p>	
	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>8-29-12 Yes. Cleared</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>8-29-12 Where CSOs and Local Communities involved in the formulation of this PIF or will be engaged if the PIF is approved?</p> <p>9-12-12 Outstanding issues properly addressed in the revised PIF. Please read Responses to GEF Secretariat Review for FSP (Sep 9, 2012). Cleared</p>	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation	<p>8-29-12</p> <p>Not clear why the risk of "Insufficient Political Support" is ranked M-H when</p>	

		<p>be involved in the design and execution of this project. What Ministry is NOT in favor of this project and can effectively blocked the proposed investments?</p> <p>Why would tourism operators and hotels adopt NB/BFT certification/verification mechanisms?</p> <p>What is the actual or potential demand for "biodiversity-friendly" tourism services and products in the PAs targeted in his project?</p> <p>Assuming certification standards are of value to Biodiversity conservation, why not use an International third-party certification scheme instead of creating one locally?</p> <p>9-12-12 Outstanding issues properly addressed in the revised PIF. Please read Responses to GEF Secretariat Review for FSP (Sep 9, 2012). Cleared</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>8-29-12 Yes Cleared</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>8-29-12 Not clear why the MoT, the ETA and the NCS are not listed as "Other Executing Partners" in the cover page.</p> <p>11-12-12 Outstanding issues properly addressed in the revised PIF. Please read Responses to GEF Secretariat Review for FSP (Sep 9, 2012).</p>	

	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	8-29-12 GEF contribution to management cost is 4.7% of the grant. Co-financing contribution to management cost is 6.5% of co-financing. Cleared	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	8-29-12 Financing and co-financing for Component 1 appears to be very low. Is it reasonable to believe that with an investment of \$1.95M [GEF\$0.8M + co-financing of \$1.15M] direct adverse impacts of tourism infrastructure can be effectively avoided, reduced or mitigated in an area of 10,000 Km2? Could the geographic scope of the project be reduced to increase the chances of delivering positive impact on the ground? 9-12-12 Outstanding issues properly addressed in the revised PIF. Please read Responses to GEF Secretariat Review for FSP (Sep 9, 2012). Cleared	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	8-29-12 Co-financing is \$10.44M and co-financing ratio is 1:4. All co-financing is in cash. Cleared	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the	8-29-12	

	line with its role?	Cleared	
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?		
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	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>8-29-12 No. Please address issues under items 14, 15, 17, 18, 20 & 24. Thanks.</p> <p>11-12-12 This PIF is technically cleared and may be included in a future Work Program.</p> <p>1-15-13 The PIF is technically cleared and will be considered for a future WP.</p>	
	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 commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 29, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 12, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 15, 2013	
	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?	<p>3-07-13 Yes. The PPG is proposing the following components and outputs:</p> <p>1. BASELINE STUDIES AND STAKEHOLDER CLARIFICATION: Assessment of i) biodiversity in targeted tourism development regions and protected areas, ii) tourism development plans and activities, iii) opportunities offered by both mainstream and sustainable tourism for biodiversity conservation and local community development, iv) mechanisms and institutions establishing tourism standards and certification in and relevant to Egypt.</p> <p>2. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY: i) Establish a multi-stakeholder platform, ii) Institutional capacity assessment, iii) Identify mechanisms that private businesses and local communities have to influence decision making</p> <p>3. PROJECT STRATEGY AND BUDGET: i) Articulation of the implementing strategy/arrangements, ii) Finalisation of the Strategic Framework, iii) Costing of the expected Outcomes and Outputs, including detailed incremental-cost analysis, iv) Formulation of monitoring strategy, v) Assessment of the alternatives, vi) Assessment of social and economic and financial sustainability, vii) Definition of the replication strategy.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>3-7-13 Yes. Local consultants are being paid \$1,000/week and international consultants \$3,000. There are reasonable allocations for workshops (\$9.6K) and Travel (\$8.4K).</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	<p>3-7-13 Yes. This PPG is recommended.</p>
	4. Other comments	

	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.