



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

GEF ID:	6927		
Country/Region:	Egypt		
Project Title:	Integrated Management and Innovation in Rural Settlements		
GEF Agency:	IFAD	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$63,930	Project Grant:	\$7,812,000
Co-financing:	\$39,950,000	Total Project Cost:	\$47,825,930
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	October 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	Rami Abu Salman

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	DS, August 13, 2014: Yes. Egypt is a non-Annex I country Party to the UNFCCC.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	DS, August 13, 2014: Yes. Signed endorsement letter dated July 27, 2014, has been submitted.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	DS, August 13, 2014: Yes. The proposed grant amount is available under the SCCF.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	DS, August 13, 2014: Yes. Project alignes with CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3 objectives.	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	DS, August 13, 2014: Yes. The project is consistent with Egypt's first and second National Communications.	
Project Design	<p>6. 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?</p>	<p>DS, August 13, 2014: Partly. The proposed project will build on IFAD's Sustainable Agricultural Investment and Livelihoods (SAIL) project. However, it is unclear how targeted sites and beneficiaries would be left vulnerable to the current and projected effects of climate change in absence of additional adaptation measures.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please specify further how targeted sites and beneficiaries would be impacted</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		without the proposed intervention. DS, August 22, 2014: Yes. Additional information on how targeted sited and beneficiaries would be impacted withouth the proposed intervention has been provided. CLEARED.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	DS, August 13, 2014: Yes. The project's three proposed components comprise technical assistance and investments in mainstreaming climate change adaptation in the national land reclamation strategy, furthering efficient irrigation technology including accessible energy at farm level, and diversifying livelihoods to enhance resilience at the local level.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	DS, August 13, 2014: Unclear. Please refer to questions 6. DS, August 22, 2014: Yes. Adaptation benefits have been identified and the description of the additional reasoning is appropriate. CLEARED.	
	9. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their	DS, August 13, 2014: Yes. Public participation, including civil society has been identified as part of the project design and implementation.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	engagement explained?		
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	DS, August 13, 2014: Yes. The proposal identifies portential major risks and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	DS, August 13, 2014: Yes. The project will be coordinated with and complement other relevant initiatives in the country, including UNIDO's "Promoting Low-carbon Technologies for Cooling and Heating in Industrial Applications in Egypt" and UNDP's "Grid-Connected Small-Scale Photovoltaic Systems in order to ensure the use of the most advanced technologies in Agriculture". In addition, coordination with other relevant entities and programs will be sought.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's 	DS, August 13, 2014: Unclear. The project will generate best practices that can be mainstreamed into the wider IFAD country program and that will build on policy dialogue. However, it is unclear how the project entails potential for scaling up beyond IFAD's country program. Recommended action: Please clarify how the project's best practices, at least indicatively, could be scaled up beyond IFAD's own country program.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	intervention.	DS, August 22, 2014: Yes. Additional information on how the project's best practices can be scaled up has been included. CLEARED.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	DS, August 13, 2014: Yes.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	DS, August 13, 2014: Yes. At \$39.95 million, the indicative co-financing is adequate and in line with the Agency's role.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	DS, August 13, 2014: Yes. PMC equals 5% of the total project amount.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> ,	DS, August 13, 2014: Yes. The proposed PPG of \$70,000 is in line with the norm.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
Secretariat Recommendation	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	DS, August 13, 2014: Not yet. Please address comments on questions 6, 8 and 13. In addition, please include Project Management Costs in Table A, so that the Total Project Cost will be the same in Tables A and B. DS, August 22, 2014: Yes. PIF clearance is recommended.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	August 13, 2014	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 22, 2014	
	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.