



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

GEF ID:	<b>4201</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Yemen</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Leopards and Landscapes: Using a Flagship Species to Strengthen Conservation in the Republic of Yemen</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>World Bank</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Biodiversity</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-1; BD-2;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$130,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$2,430,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$2,900,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$5,460,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>November 01, 2010</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jaime Cavelier</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Kanta K. Rigaud</b>

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?	9-15-10 Yemen ratified the CBD on 1996-02-21 Cleared	
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	9-15-10 Cleared	
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	9-15-10 Yes. There is a LoE for \$2,816,000 for a project with a request to the GEF of \$2,430,000. Cleared	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	9-15-10 Yes. The WB has been working on this project with the Government of Yemen since 2009. Cleared	
	5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	9-15-10 Yes. Co-financing is \$2.9M. Cleared	

	6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	9-15-10 What is the WB's in-country capacity working directly on this project?  9-21-10 This was properly addressed in the response to GEF comments submitted with the revised PIF. Cleared	
Resource Availability	7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	9-15-10 Yemen has a BD STAR of \$4,270,000. Sufficient to cover this \$2.43 M project. Cleared	
	• the focal area allocation?	9-15-10 Yemen has a BD STAR of \$4,270,000. Sufficient to cover this \$2.43 M project. Cleared	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
Project Consistency	8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	9-15-10 Yes. BD Outputs Outcomes 1.1. and 2.2. Cleared	
	9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	9-15-10 Yes. BD-1 and BD-2. Cleared	
	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?	9-15-10 Please clarify if Leopards and/or conservation of its natural habitats are explicitly mentioned in the following documents: Yemen's National Environmental Action Plan (1995), the Environment and Sustainable Development Investment Program 2003-2009, National Biodiversity and Strategy Action Plan (2004), of the National Capacity Self-Assessment Project (2007).	

		<p>9-21-10 This was properly addressed in the response to GEF comments submitted with the revised PIF. Cleared</p>	
	<p>11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>9-15-10 This project includes a component for building capacities at the Conservation Unit at the Ministry of Water and Environment as well as on the ground. Please clarify who is going to cover the recurrent costs associated with the "National Livestock Insurance". Are there similar schemes operating in the region or elsewhere?</p> <p>9-21-10 This was addressed in the response to GEF comments submitted with the revised PIF. Nonetheless, it is not clear who is going to cover the recurrent costs associated with the payments to local communities for cattle losses. This needs to be fully resolved by CEO Endorsement. Cleared</p>	
	<p>12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>9-15-10 Yes. There is significant research on the status and needs of the Arabian Leopard, particularly by the Yemeni Leopard Recovery Program. Cleared</p>	
Project Design	<p>13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>9-15-10 Yes. Cleared</p>	

	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>9-15-10  Yes. This project is structured around 4 mutually reinforcing components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strengthening of PA management and monitoring</li> <li>2. Establishment of Dhofar “Hawf Transboundary Conservation Area.</li> <li>3. Institutionalization, training and community participation.</li> <li>4. Outreach for PA with the Arabian leopard as flagship species.</li> </ol> <p>What is the approximate size of the proposed Dhofar “Hawf TBCA, and how many of the Leopards are like to have their home range within the limits of TBCA?</p> <p>9-21-10  This was addressed in the response to GEF comments submitted with the revised PIF. It is unlikely that the Dhofar “Hawf TBCA covers enough area to support a viable population of the Arabian Leopard. This implies to work outside the TBCA equally hard to protect the species. This needs to be fully developed during CEO Endorsement.  Cleared</p>	
	<p>15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?</p>	<p>9-15-10  Please further develop the Incremental Reasoning for this project. Please clearly state the extent to which the Government of Yemen is currently engaged in the creation of the Conservation Unit at the MWE, the creation and management of the TBCA  Cleared</p>	
	<p>16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>9-15-10  Yes.  Cleared</p>	
	<p>17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated</p>	<p>9-15-10  Yes. This project combines elements of</p>	

	the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?	Unit at the MWE), the creation and management of a PA (i.e. Dhofar â€“ Hawf TBCA), and community participation (i.e. National Livestock Insurance, training, outreach). Cleared	
	18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/ adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?	9-15-10  The main socio-economic benefits of this project will be derived from the National Livestock Insurance, and the engagement of members of the local communities in research, and outreach activities.  Please clarify what are the "alternative livelihoods and natural resources" that the local communities are supposed to benefit from as a result of this project?  9-21-10 This was properly addressed in the response to GEF comments submitted with the revised PIF. Cleared	
	19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?	9-15-10 Yes. See above. Cleared	
	20. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	9-15-10 Yes. Cleared	
	21. Is the provided documentation consistent?	9-15-10 Yes. Cleared	
	22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?	9-15-10 Yes. Local communities will benefit from the "National Livestock Insurance Scheme" to cover losses from predation of cattle by leopards. They will also participate in research and outreach activities	

	23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>9-15-10 What is Oman doing or going to do for the establishment and management of the Dhofar “Hawf TBCA?”</p> <p>9-21-10 This addressed in the response to GEF comments submitted with the revised PIF. Please develop this issue in full in the CEO Endorsement. Cleared</p>	
	24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>9-15-10 Yes. This project is going to be executed by the Ministry of Water and Environment and the Foundation for the Protection of the Arabian Leopard in Yemen (FPALY) a leading conservation local NGO. Cleared</p>	
	25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>9-15-10 Project Management Cost is \$240,000. Co-financing for project management is \$150,000 (1:0.6). Cleared</p>	
	28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost reasoning principle?	<p>9-15-10 Yes. Cleared</p>	
	29. Is co-financing confirmed?	<p>9-15-10 Co-financing is provided by the Government of Yemen (Ministry), the Private Sector, a bilateral agency and the GEF Agency. What is the Bilateral Agency to support the project with</p>	

		9-21-10 This was properly addressed in the response to GEF comments submitted with the revised PIF. Cleared	
	30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	9-15-10 The budget (including co-financing \$2.9M) should be sufficient to achieve the outcomes and outputs. Cleared	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	9-15-10 Not at PIF stage. Cleared	
	32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	9-15-10 Please address the issues listed under items 6, 10, 11, 14, 18, 23, and 29.  9-20-10 This PIF is recommended for clearance.	
	35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	9-15-10  Please address the following points at CEO Endorsement.  1. The latest assessment of the status of the Leopard population in Yemen, and the proposed targets for the project.  2. Clearly state who is going to cover, and for how long, the recurrent costs associated with the "National Livestock	

		<p>communities for cattle losses.</p> <p>3. Since the area of the proposed Dhofar “Hawf TBCA is unlikely to cover enough area to support a viable population of the Arabian Leopard, work must be carried out outside the TBCA to protect the species. Please address this in full in the CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>4. The investments the Government of Oman will carry out in support of the TBCA.</p> <p>5. Copy of the baseline studies funded through the PPG: i. Assessment of the PA network and gap analysis, ii. SWOT of the PA Network (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats), iii. Appraisal of the existing legal framework, including the status of the agreements with Oman for the TBCA, iv. Assessment of livestock insurance schemes. v. KAP (Knowledge, Attitude and Practices).</p>	
<b>Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval</b>	36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
<b>Review Date (s)</b>	First review*	September 16, 2010	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 20, 2010	
	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.

## 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?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. <b>Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.