



## GEF-6 GEF Secretariat Review For Enabling Activity Proposal

GEF ID:	9981		
Country/Region:	Global (Angola, Burundi, Benin, Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Cameroon, Cabo Verde, Egypt, Eritrea, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Comoros, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Sao Tome and Principe, Tanzania, South Africa, Zambia, Congo DR)		
Project Title:	GEF Support to UNCCD 2018 national reporting process - Umbrella I		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1 Program 1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$1,981,737
Co-financing:	\$336,000	Total Project Cost:	\$2,317,737
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Adamou Bouhari,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	- 28 countries are considered for this Umbrella project.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	- 28 letters of endorsement are available; please note that we found a letter for Kenya (listed in the Umbrella II), but no letter for Ghana, except a possible mistake from our part. Please, correct.  February 16, 2018 Addressed.	
Project Consistency	3. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives	The project is coherent and aligned with the GEF6 LD strategy.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	and results framework?	<p>However some information/clarification is needed for the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clarify the Output 1.1.3 "National mechanisms taking into consideration" (formulation in the result framework, table B): Please clarify what these national mechanisms are. Please, note that the formulation is different in the text (p.14, 1.1.3 "28 countries are supported to develop national estimates... The formulation is in this case is not an output, and we still do not know the details of activities to reach this output).</li> <li>- In the text, p.14, please clarify the activities to reach this output (when reformulated), explain how the GEF resources are used.</li> <li>- Component 3 (Helpdesk): We understand that the HelpDesk includes the management of SSFAs, as well as monitoring and evaluation functions.</li> <li>- We suggest to reformulate this component as "HelpDesk Service and M&amp;E functions operational for 2018 reporting".</li> <li>- The outcome is not right ("3.1 Effectively managed umbrella projects"): there is one umbrella project and 28 small scale funding agreements. We suggest to use the formulation of the output 3.1.1 as the outcome 3.1 "Effective and efficient</li> </ul>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>reporting ensured through timely availability of resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The outputs under the component 3 should be revised to be specific and quantifiable:</li> <li>- The current output 3.1.1 should be removed;</li> <li>- The new output 3.1.1 should be: "28 SSFAs negotiated and administered (meaning GEF funds are disbursed to all participating countries (remove "SSFA monitored and reported by countries").</li> <li>- New output 3.1.2 "Findings of the project evaluations are available and capitalized for future reporting process".</li> </ul> <p>- See the budget implications below.</p> <p>February 16, 2018 Addressed.</p>	
	4. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	This project aims to support countries to deliver the 2018 reporting under UNCCD.	
Project Design	5. Are the components in Table A sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	NA	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>The engagement of stakeholders, as well as gender issues, are taken into account.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	7. Is the project implementation/	- We agreed with an additional	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	execution arrangement adequate?	<p>component to make operational an HelpDesk to support the 2018 reporting. This component is in addition to the country grants. We recommend to transfer the staff costs in the project management costs (\$191,781). The PMC will stay under 10 percent.</p> <p>- We understand that the budget of \$44,184 is for the evaluation of each country grant (\$1,578 x 28=44,184). We suggest to transfer this budget in the HelpDesk component, as Monitoring and Evaluation functions are included in this component.</p> <p>- So, in the table B, in front of the component 3 "HelpDesk", the budget will be \$44,184; and in front of the PMC, we will read \$191,781.</p> <p>February 16, 2018 Addressed.</p>	
	8. Is indicated cofinancing appropriate for an enabling activity?	No co-financing required for EA per GEF policies (cf. annex 6 of GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01).	
Other Comments	9. Comments related to adequacy of information submitted by country for the financial management and procurement assessment <sup>1</sup> .	NA	
Resource Availability	10. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	NA	
	• The focal area allocation?	Yes.	

<sup>1</sup> Question 9 is applicable only to direct access proposal while question 10 (on fees) is not applicable to direct access proposal.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>Yes. The budget comes from the LD set aside allocation.</p> <p>This umbrella project proposes an equitable support for 28 countries: Each country can access up to \$70,000, Agency fees included, or a grant of \$63,927. The average budget for each country is the following: Component 1 (baseline data, training): \$30,000; Component 2 (training on PRAIS, workshops/communication event, report): \$32,349; Evaluation &amp; Monitoring: \$1,578, for a total of \$63,927.</p> <p>An HelpDesk component is added to help countries to have access to the resources and the technical support (\$191,781).</p> <p>The GEF grant = \$1,981,737 + \$188,265 of Agencies fees, for a total GEF grant of \$2,170,002.</p>	
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>11. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>This EA project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above.</p> <p>February 16, 2018 All comments have been addressed. This EA request is being recommended for approval.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Review Date (s)	First review*	January 25, 2018	
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 16, 2018	
	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.**