



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	<b>10030</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Global (Azerbaijan, Cuba, Algeria, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Gambia, Cambodia, Kiribati, Lebanon, Lesotho, Morocco, Montenegro, Mauritius, Panama, Peru, Paraguay, Rwanda, Sudan, Senegal, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Samoa)</b>		
Project Title:	<b>GEF Support to UNCCD 2018 National Reporting Process - Umbrella IV</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Land Degradation</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>LD-EA;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	<b>\$1,598,174</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$300,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$1,898,174</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jean-Marc Sinnassamy</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Adamou Bouhari</b>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	Yes, This project takes benefit from the other Umbrella projects: The results framework is borrowed from the other Umbrella projects, already cleared.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes, this projects aims to support countries for the 2018 reporting process.  March 16, 2018	

<sup>1</sup> 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		25 countries are included: - Kiribati, Tuvalu, Samoa, Cambodia, - Togo, Morocco, Ethiopia, The Gambia, Uganda, Tunisia, Lesotho, Senegal, Mauritius, Algeria, Rwanda, Sudan, - Peru, Cuba, Ecuador, Panama, Paraguay, - Montenegro, Azerbaijan, Lebanon, Turkey	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	NA	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	NA	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Yes	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. 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?	The proposed grant is financed by the LD set aside.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of	NA	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	equitable access		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	The proposed grant is financed by the LD set aside.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>The text on implementation arrangements have been revised. Turkey has been added. The project targets now 25 countries. The budget has been adjusted accordingly.</p> <p>The PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 13, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 16, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	NA	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	No. Please, address the comment in the cell 9.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 13, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.