



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

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| GEF ID: | 5522 | | |
| Country/Region: | Libya | | |
| Project Title: | Sustainable Land Management and Conservation of Oases Ecosystems in Libya | | |
| GEF Agency: | FAO | GEF Agency Project ID: | |
| Type of Trust Fund: | GEF Trust Fund | GEF Focal Area (s): | Land Degradation |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | LD-1; LD-3; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$136,986 | Project Grant: | \$3,972,603 |
| Co-financing: | \$13,850,000 | Total Project Cost: | \$17,959,589 |
| PIF Approval: | | Council Approval/Expected: | |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Mohamed Bakarr | Agency Contact Person: | Noureddine Nasr, FAO SNE Tunis |

| 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 ? | August 23, 2013 Yes, Libya is eligible. Cleared | |
| Resource Availability | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? | August 23, 2013 Yes, the OFP endorsement is included with the PIF submission. Cleared | |
| Resource Availability | 3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): | | |
| Resource Availability | • the STAR allocation? | August 23, 2013 | |

| | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
| | | total allocation of \$4.5 million. Libya is also a flexible country, which means the full allocation can be used for a single focal area project if necessary. Cleared | |
| | • the focal area allocation? | August 23, 2013 Yes, all three focal area allocations are available and will be utilized. Cleared | |
| | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access | N/a | |
| | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | N/a | |
| | • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund | N/a | |
| | • focal area set-aside? | August 23, 2013 No set-aside funds are being requested. Cleared | |
| Strategic Alignment | 4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <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> | August 23, 2013 The PIF indicates alignment with results framework of the BD, CCM, and LD focal areas, and direct contributions to objectives BD2, CCM5, and LD1 and LD3. However, the proposed approach lacks evidence of direct support for BD2 (despite the explicit links to Aichi Targets) and CCM5. In its current form, the project may be best considered as an SLM initiative that is best aligned with the LD focal area results framework. Given the focus on conservation agriculture and sustainable management of oases, it is unlikely that alignment with the BD and CCM can be adequately demonstrated. But should the multi-focal | |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>clarification and justification is needed for BD and CCM. please address accordingly.</p> <p>August 30, 2013</p> <p>The PIF has now been streamlined to focus solely on SLM implementation under the LD focal area. Hence, alignment with the BD and CCM strategies is no longer necessary.</p> <p>Cleared</p> | |
| | <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> | <p>August 23, 2013</p> <p>Consistency with the country's national strategies is included, but PIF requires a bit more on how the proposed project will contribute toward their implementation.</p> <p>With regard to conventions, the project provides explicit links to the UNCCD NAP, but no mention is made of NBSAP or NAMAs despite the proposed MFA approach. Please provide a more succinct explanation of links to the CBD and UNFCCC if the proposed project remains an MFA.</p> <p>For CCM specifically, Libya does not have a UNFCCC national communication and the project does not mention any specific national climate change mitigation strategy. Please address and clarify whether the proposed project addresses key strategic mitigation objectives or mitigation priorities.</p> <p>August 30, 2013</p> <p>Consistency is now clear and appropriate</p> | |

| | | | |
|----------------|---|---|--|
| | | Cleared | |
| Project Design | 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>August 23, 2013</p> <p>The PIF provides a very detailed background rationale for the proposed project, with sound data and assumptions about the potential for sustainability and resilience of the oasis ecosystem in Libya. The baseline scenario is also adequately presented, although more so for the LD focal area than for BD and CCM. As a MFA, further clarification is needed on the BD and CCM aspects as follows:</p> <p>For BD - please clarify the baseline relative to species and habitat conservation needs for the oasis ecosystem. How will mainstreaming specifically build on such baseline to secure GEBs?</p> <p>For CCM - a) The PIF indicates that (i) existing dynamics have contributed to the global environmental crises of climate change, (ii) degradation of agroecosystems is a major cause of carbon emissions but does not explain or document how. The trends of GHG emissions related to agriculture are not presented. The drivers of these trends are not presented.</p> <p>b) The few elements provided on GHG emissions focus on carbon emissions or sequestration. Please clarify why there is no mention of CH4 or N2O emissions.</p> <p>August 30, 2013</p> <p>The baseline is now sufficient based on</p> | |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | | Cleared | |
| | <p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p> | <p>August 23, 2013</p> <p>Because of the apparent disconnect between focal area objectives and project components, the proposed framework is not clear or sound. While the framework is appropriately detailed with respect to outcomes and outputs for SLM, it is not clear how they will deliver on BD and CCM objectives. This needs to be addressed if the project remains an MFA, and the following specifically clarified.</p> <p>For BD - Component 1. Outputs 1.2.2 (A national platform) and 1.2.3 (Five oases ecosystem and conservation plans)] relate to BD, but further clarification is needed on the new "national platform" to support and monitor integration of BD conservation in oases management plan." Component 3. i) Output 3.1.3 and 1.2.3 appear to be the same. What are the 5 pilot sites and the "endangered species and varieties"? The description of the activities in the oases (paragraph 14) makes them the least likely places and communities to propose eco-tourism, local business development, product eco-labeling, and market access promotion. This are high-order targets that require significant infrastructure and capacity.</p> <p>For CCM - Component 1 does not explain the type of policies and regulation it will support, nor does it clarify the impact those policies may have on GHG emissions. Moreover, the PIF does not clarify if and how the</p> | |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>regulations will be supported. Component 3 and 4 do not include any activity devoted to climate change mitigation goals.</p> <p>August 30, 2013</p> <p>The revised focus on SLM is now more appropriately in line with the framework.</p> <p>Cleared</p> | |
| | <p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p> | <p>August 23, 2013</p> <p>The PIF identifies land and soil health, area under sustainable land management, and tons of carbon sequestration as GEBs. However, with conservation agriculture as the focus, these benefits are more directly linked to the LD focal area. It is not clear how these GEBs will be accounted for as BD and CCM benefits. Please clarify, particularly with regard to the following:</p> <p>Overall, the PIF needs a clear description of how estimates of the GEBs were derived relative to the total area of oases under production, and will be verified during full project development.</p> <p>For BD, while the project makes reference to 5 pilot sites, it is not possible to know what is the "return on investment" on BD \$1.2M.</p> <p>For CCM, compared to the funding requested, estimates of mitigation benefits will amount to \$56/tCO₂eq, which seems inefficient. What activities will generate mitigation benefits, why and how? Why only consider carbon</p> | |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | | <p>agriculture? How will the expected carbon sequestration or emissions benefits may be sustained over time beyond the project duration.</p> <p>The incremental reasoning is also more appropriate for the LD focal area, since the GEF financing is specifically targeted for SLM through conservation agriculture. However, there are issues of tradeoffs that must be considered given that Libya is a dryland country. For example, the PIF mentions that agricultural activities are always associated with irrigation but does not consider availability and sustainability of water resources to support such irrigation. Please clarify.</p> <p>August 30, 2013</p> <p>The GEBs and incremental reasoning are now appropriate based on the revised focus on SLM.</p> <p>Cleared</p> | |
| | <p>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?</p> | | <p>August 23, 2013</p> <p>Although farmers are a major target for the project, there is no clear description of the actual beneficiaries. Gender dimensions are mentioned but also need to be clarified in the context of beneficiaries. Please address this more succinctly in relevant sections of the PIF.</p> <p>Sustainability is noted as the primary reason for engaging national agencies through capacity development and institutional strengthening.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | | <p>August 30, 2013</p> <p>Gender dimensions have been reasonably clarified and should be elaborated during full project development.</p> <p>Cleared</p> |
| | <p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p> | <p>August 23, 2013</p> <p>The PIF indicates several consultations with key stakeholders, including a series of focused group discussions. However, it is not clear whether any of the stakeholders are CSOs or community organizations. Please clarify and describe how engagement of these key stakeholders will be assured.</p> <p>August 30, 2013</p> <p>Reference is now made to engagement of CSOs, and should be further assured during project development.</p> <p>Cleared</p> | |
| | <p>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)</p> | <p>August 23, 2013</p> <p>Several risks have been identified, but need to be clarified further. For example, why is the project considering ecotourism as a priority when political instability remains a high risk? Please provide a more detailed assessment.</p> <p>August 30, 2013</p> <p>All risks are now sufficiently clarified. However, the instability concern should be further addressed during project development.</p> | |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | | Cleared | |
| | <p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p> | <p>August 23, 2013</p> <p>It does not appear that the country has any GEF major initiatives for coordination beyond those at regional scale. Reference is made to the NCSA project, which is apparently now completed and should include plans for strengthening capacity. Several non-GEF initiatives are identified, but mainly focused on agricultural productivity. Please clarify how the proposed project will build from and complement these initiatives in a consistent and coherent manner.</p> <p>August 30, 2013</p> <p>Consistency is now clarified.</p> <p>Cleared</p> | |
| | <p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <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 | <p>August 23, 2013</p> <p>Innovativeness is considered on the basis of conservation agriculture practices being introduced. However, it is not clear why and how the GEF leverage is important in this regard if the approach can be funded from mainstream development financing. The integrated aspect is poorly demonstrated, particularly in light of failure to account for outcomes across all three GEF focal areas. The potential for upscaling exists if indeed policy and institutional barriers are removed for smallholder farmers. The</p> | |

| | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>especially given the emphasis on enabling conditions for achieving sustainability.</p> <p>August 30, 2013</p> <p>Innovativeness and sustainability aspects have been clarified.</p> <p>Cleared</p> | |
| | 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? | <p>August 23, 2013</p> <p>The breakdown of GEF funding is not appropriate for a MFA project. Please revisit the breakdown in Table B, taking into account the need for consistency between focal area resources requested and the outcomes and outputs proposed.</p> <p>For BD, although budget allocation for component 1 is appropriate, further clarification is needed on the new "national platform" and how it will support and monitor integration of BD conservation in oases management plan. Component 2 has the least justification for BD resources (\$548K) given that the focus is on LD and to some extent CC.</p> <p>For CCM - 60 % of the requested GEF</p> | |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>come from the focal area. In such cases, one would expect that the main goal of Component 2 to focus on climate change mitigation. This does not seem the case. The description of Component 3 and 4 does not include any activity devoted to climate change mitigation goals, and therefore do not justify use of the focal area resources.</p> <p>Finally, the outputs for component 4 are too costly (\$440K adding all three FAs) for what they are proposing. Please provide a more thorough justification for this in the narrative.</p> <p>August 30, 2013</p> <p>Since the PIF is now solely focused on SLM, the breakdown for financing is now adequate for the outcomes and outputs.</p> <p>Cleared</p> | |
| | <p>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?</p> | <p>August 23, 2013</p> <p>The total co-financing is adequate, with most of it (\$10 million) in cash from the government. However, the composition is very confusing. Please correct the table C to indicate names of Government Agencies associated with co-financing. Please clarify whether the funds are from Government to FAO, or vice versa. And also list FAO's contribution as a separate item in the table.</p> <p>August 30, 2013</p> <p>The co-financing through FAO is now clarified and the table corrected.</p> | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | 18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate? | August 23, 2013 Yes, PMC amount is appropriate. Cleared | |
| | 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> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund? | August 23, 2013 Yes, PPG is being requested and included in the OFP endorsement. However, not justification has been provided for the amount being requested. Please address. August 30, 2013 PPG request is now clarified and amount justified. Cleared | |
| | 20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included? | N/a | |
| 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? | | |
| | • Other GEF Agencies? | | |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | | |
| Recommendation at PIF | 24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended? | August 23, 2013 | |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>this stage. Please address all concerns highlighted in the review.</p> <p>August 30, 2013</p> <p>Yes, the PIF is now technically cleared and may be considered for a future Work Program.</p> | |
| | 25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval. | | |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended? | | |
| | First review* | August 23, 2013 | |
| Review Date (s) | Additional review (as necessary) | August 30, 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.**