



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

GEF ID:	5541		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Global Support Programme: Strengthening Countries Parties for Planning and Monitoring Mechanism of the UNCCD Implementation		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	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-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,000,000
Co-financing:	\$2,460,000	Total Project Cost:	\$4,460,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Adamou Bouhari

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 ?		August 28, 2013 The request is for a global support program for UNCCD implementation, which will only support eligible countries. Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		August 28, 2013 OFP endorsement is not required since the funds are requested exclusively from set aside funds. Cleared

*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)
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 		<p>August 28, 2013</p> <p>N/a</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 		<p>August 28, 2013</p> <p>The PIF is requesting \$3,835,616 (plus an additional \$364,384 in fees) from the LD focal area set-aside. The focal area set-aside includes provision for enabling activities, which is being leveraged directly by countries. Although the amount can be accommodated, it is not adequately justified for a global investment. Please refer to comments under the focal area set-aside and address accordingly.</p> <p>March 7, 2014</p> <p>Yes. The proposal has been resubmitted as a MSP size request only requesting LD set aside funds.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		N/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		N/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		N/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		<p>August 28, 2013</p> <p>Although the full amount is being requested from the LD focal area set-</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>aside, it is not clear how the total \$3.8 million is justified based on the project design. Because the GEF has already invested close to \$10 million for enabling activities in GEF-5, we propose that the request be limited to a maximum of \$2 million (an MSP). This amount must be justified on the basis of "increment" to planned support from UNEP, the UNCCD Secretariat and the GM, as well as projected contributions from partners and other donors.</p> <p>March 7, 2014</p> <p>Yes. The proposal has been resubmitted as a MSP size request only requesting LD set aside funds.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCE/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>		<p>August 28, 2013</p> <p>Yes, the project is very much in line with the LD focal area strategy, and will contribute specifically to objective LD4 in the results framework.</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 28, 2013</p> <p>The proposed project is intended to support eligible countries meet their obligations under the UNCCD, specifically for planning and monitoring</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>implementation of the convention and its 10-Year strategy. This is directly relevant for the NAPs, which are also being aligned with GEF support.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
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>August 28, 2013</p> <p>No. The baseline context is not adequately described, particularly in light of a) support already provided by the GEF for enabling activities; and b) support provided by the UNCCD Secretariat and the Global Mechanism for country level actions. Please provide a more clear assessment of existing baseline with sound data and assumptions related to existing resources, including the nearly \$10 million already leveraged by countries from GEF for enabling activities. Given that the baseline is mostly associated with challenges at country level, how does it justify the need for a global support program?</p> <p>March 7, 2014</p> <p>Yes. Has been adequately addressed in the re-submission.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>		<p>August 28, 2013</p> <p>No. The framework includes four components, three of which are focused on supporting national level actions. Given that 144 countries are eligible</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>under the UNCCD, it is not clear how the outcomes and outputs will be delivered to support all of them. There is no substantive description of the components to determine how discrete they are relatively to other GEF investments for support to countries as identified in the PIF. Please address.</p> <p>March 7, 2014</p> <p>Yes. Has been adequately addressed in the re-submission.</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 28, 2013</p> <p>As a global support program, the focus is not on GEBs per se, but support to countries as it relates to monitoring and reporting on indicators. This is appropriate for the focal area. However, the PIF lacks incremental reasoning relative to GEF resources being requested. There is no evidence of why the amount is being requested, nor is there a clear articulation of how the UNCCD Secretariat and GM support is being leveraged. Most importantly, it is not clear how the project is incremental when most of the challenges it proposes to address are national. Please clarify, including in relation to the suggestion made in #3 above for an MSP request instead.</p> <p>March 7, 2014</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Yes. Has been adequately addressed in the re-submission.</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>March 7, 2014</p> <p>Yes. Description is provided in the re-submission.</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 28, 2013</p> <p>No. Although the World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies (WOCAT) is identified as a partner, it is not clear how their role was explicitly determined. And despite reference to 15 subregional and 3 regional institutions, there is no indication of engagement with CSOs. Please address these adequately, including specific representations from the UNCCD Annexes.</p> <p>March 7, 2014</p> <p>Yes. Public participation has been adequately addressed in the context of this enabling activity.</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.,</p>		<p>August 28, 2013</p> <p>Only three relevant risks are identified and all considered as medium. However, risks related to non-participation of</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	measures to enhance climate resilience)		<p>some UNCCD Annexes and/or eligible countries due to conflicts such as are not considered. What about country level limitations with respect to institutional frameworks for implementing the UNCCD? How will the project overcome such in-country limitations to significantly influence the quality and timeliness of reporting? Please address.</p> <p>March 7, 2014</p> <p>Yes. Adequate clarification made in the re-submission.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		<p>August 28, 2013</p> <p>Relevant initiatives are identified for coordination, but need to be elaborated better with respect to complementarities and potential for synergy. Please address.</p> <p>March 7, 2014</p> <p>Yes. Has been adequately addressed in the re-submission. The project is well co-ordinated with ongoing efforts of the UNCCD Secretariat in NAP alignment and reporting.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	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 		<p>August 28, 2013</p> <p>The proposed GSP is not particularly innovative because it falls short of clarifying how 144 eligible countries</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 intervention. 		<p>will benefit from implementation. The design is also inherently flawed since it does not provide an adequate indication of how sub-regional and regional entities will be linked in the context of UNCCD Annexes and Convention institutions to effectively support the countries. Please address.</p> <p>March 7, 2014</p> <p>Yes. Has been adequately addressed in the re-submission.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>March 7, 2014</p> <p>This is n/a as it is being submitted following the one-step approval procedures for MSPs.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>March 7, 2014</p> <p>Yes. Clearly demonstrated inter alia by the reduction in requested amounts.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>		<p>August 28, 2013</p> <p>No. There is not enough justification for the amount of GEF resources being requested. Most of the co-financing is presented as in-kind without a clear explanation as to how the amounts were determined. Hence it is hard to assess the level of adequacy relative to the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>proposed components and associated outcomes and outputs. A letter of support from the UNCCD also lacks a clear indication of the in-kind amount stated in the PIF, and how it is related to planned activities to support country Parties on planning, monitoring and reporting. Please address.</p> <p>March 7, 2014</p> <p>Yes. Has been adequately addressed in the re-submission. As the project has reduced its request to less than \$2.0 million the justification is now fully given.</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 28, 2013</p> <p>The adequacy is hard to determine at this stage without direct links to the the existing baseline scenario. How are the in-kind and cash contributions related to the baseline as described in the text? How is the GEF "increment" determined relative to those co-financing amounts? Please address.</p> <p>March 7, 2014</p> <p>Yes. Has been adequately addressed in the re-submission. Co-financing for EAs is not required, but has been provided. This demonstrates an adequate baseline funding and commitment by all project partners.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Cleared
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?		<p>August 28, 2013</p> <p>Yes, but should be adjusted is the PIF is changed into an MSP as suggested. Please note and adjust accordingly.</p> <p>March 7, 2014</p> <p>Yes. Has been adjusted in line with the MSP size of the EA.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	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?		<p>August 28, 2013</p> <p>Yes, but should be adjusted and adequately justified if a two-stage MSP is considered. Please note and address accordingly.</p> <p>March 7, 2014</p> <p>No PPG requested anymore in the one-step approval procedure.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	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?		n/a
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results		<p>March 7, 2014</p> <p>Yes. The fully budgeted M&E plan is</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	with indicators and targets?		provided in the project document. Cleared
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		n/a
	• Convention Secretariat?		n/a
	• The Council?		n/a
	• Other GEF Agencies?		n/a
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?		
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		August 28, 2013 No, PIF cannot be recommended at this stage. Please reconsider proposal for an MSP and address all concerns expressed in this review before resubmission. March 7, 2014 UA: Yes. The agency has adequately addressed all comments. Program Manager recommends the MSP for CEO approval.
	First review*	August 28, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 07, 2014	
Review Date (s)	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.