

GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS¹

Country/Region: Cuba
 Project Title: Cuba: Capacity Building for Sustainable Financing Mechanisms / Sustainable Land Management in Dry Land Forest Ecosystems and Cattle Ranching Areas
 GEFSEC Project ID: **9301**
 GEF Agency Project ID: 3807 (UNDP) GEF Agency: UNDP
 GEF Focal Area (s): Land Degradation
 GEF-4 Strategic Program (s):
 Anticipated Project Financing (\$): PPG:\$75,000 GEF Project Allocation:\$1,425,000 Co-financing:\$36,050,000 Total Project Cost:\$37,550,000
 PIF Approval Date: September 01, 2015 Anticipated Work Program Inclusion:
 Program Manager: Ulrich Apel GEF Agency Contact Person: Lyes Ferroukhi,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion ²	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?		07/07/2017 UA: Yes.
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, check if project document includes a calendar of reflows and provide comments, if any.		n/a
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		
	4. Which GEF Strategic Objective/ Program does the project fit into?		07/07/2017 UA: LD-3
	5. Does the Agency have a comparative advantage for the project?		07/07/2017 UA: Yes.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed GEF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available for (if appropriate):		
	• The RAF allocation?		n/a
	• The focal areas?		07/07/2017 UA: Yes. Please see email on file with regard to

¹ Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. Please do not answer if the field is blocked with gray.

² Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of PIF of FSPs will simultaneously be considered for WPI. For MSPs, once the PIF is approved by CEO, next step will be to continue project preparation until the project is ready for CEO approval.

			funding availability based on GEF-3 remainders.
	• Strategic objectives?		n/a
	• Strategic program?		n/a
Project Design	7. Will the project deliver tangible global environmental benefits?	07/07/2017 UA: Yes.	
	8. Is the global environmental benefit measurable?		07/07/2017 UA: Yes.
	9. Is the project design sound, its framework consistent & sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?		07/07/2017 UA: Yes.
	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national priorities and policies?		07/07/2017 UA: Yes.
	11. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		07/07/2017 UA: Yes.
	12. Is the proposed project likely to be cost-effective?	07/07/2017 UA: Yes.	
	13. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated in project design?		07/07/2017 UA: Yes.
	14. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF?		07/07/2017 UA: Yes. Sufficiently close to the CPP parent program approved in 2005.
Justification for GEF Grant	15. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and includes sufficient risk mitigation measures?		07/07/2017 UA: Yes.
	16. Is the value-added of GEF involvement in the project clearly demonstrated through incremental reasoning?		07/07/2017 UA: Yes.
	17. Is the type of financing provided by GEF, as well as its level of concessionality, appropriate?		07/07/2017 UA: Yes.
	18. How would the proposed project outcomes and global environmental		07/07/2017 UA: Capacity would not be enhanced.

	benefits be affected if GEF does not invest?		
	19.Is the GEF funding level of project management budget appropriate?		07/07/2017 UA: Yes.
	20.Is the GEF funding level of other cost items (consultants, travel, etc.) appropriate?		07/07/2017 UA: Yes.
	21.Is the indicative co-financing adequate for the project?		
	22.Are the confirmed co-financing amounts adequate for each project component?		07/07/2017 UA: Yes.
	23.Has the Tracking Tool ³ been included with information for all relevant indicators?		07/07/2017 UA: Yes. A GEF-6 LD tracking tool has been completed.
	24.Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		07/07/2017 UA: Yes.
Secretariat's Response to various comments from:	STAP		n/a for MSP
	Convention Secretariat		none received
	Agencies' response to GEFSEC comments		
	Agencies' response to Council comments		none received (MSP)
Secretariat Decisions			
Recommendation at PIF	25. Is PIF clearance being recommended?		
	26.Items worth noting at CEO Endorsement.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement	27. Is CEO Endorsement being recommended?		07/07/2017 UA: Yes. Program Manager recommends MSP for CEO approval.
Review Date	1 st review		July 07, 2017
	2 nd review		

³ At present, Tracking Tools apply to Biodiversity projects only. Tracking Tools for other focal areas are currently being developed.

3 rd review		
------------------------	--	--

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?	
	3. Is the proposed GEF PPG Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available under the RAF/Focal Area allocation?	xxPPGResorcesxx
	4. Is the consultant cost reasonable?	
Recommendation	5. Is PPG being recommended?	
Other comments		
Review Date	1 st review	
	2 nd review	
	3 rd review	

wb21049
 C:\Users\wb21049\Documents\Visual Studio 2008\WebSites\WebSite9\LetterTemplates\ReviewSheetforGEFProject.rtf
 8/28/2009 4:16:00 PM