



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

GEF ID:	<b>5698</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Global</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Sustainable Land Management and Climate Change Mitigation Co-benefits SLM CCMC</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-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CD-4;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$20,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,804,800</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$2,200,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$4,024,800</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ulrich Apel</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Mohamed Sessay</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	n/a - this is a global project	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	n/a - this is a global project	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	n/a - LD set asides will be utilized	
	• the focal area allocation?	n/a - LD set asides will be utilized	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>2/18/2014 UA:</p> <p>MSPs cannot access the SFM/REDD+ incentive program. Please apply for LD set-asides funds only.</p> <p>3/10/2014 UA:</p> <p>Yes. has been revised.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</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>2/18/2014 UA:</p> <p>To be revised in line with LD funding.</p> <p>3/10/2014 UA:</p> <p>Yes. has been revised.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	n/a	
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>2/18/2014 UA:</p> <p>Yes.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	2/18/2014 UA: No. Please rephrase/rearrange Outcomes in component 2 - most of them would be outputs.  Please check numbering.  3/10/2014 UA:  Yes. has been revised in the re-submission.  Cleared	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	2/18/2014 UA: Yes.	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	2/18/2014 UA: Yes.	
	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)	2/18/2014 UA: The risk table is unclear. a) I do not fully agree with the usefulness of the mitigation measure of the first risk identified. b) I don't understand the second risk. I don't necessarily agree with this	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>suggestion.</p> <p>3/10/2014 UA:</p> <p>Yes. has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>2/18/2014 UA:</p> <p>Question: How about involving ADB and/or other agencies component 1?</p> <p>3/10/2014 UA:</p> <p>Yes. has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>2/18/2014 UA:</p> <p>Please address these three points briefly in the template in a separate section.</p> <p>- innovative: region-specific emissions and stock change factor values with links to the IPCC database,</p> <p>- sustainability: through capacity building,</p> <p>- Scaling-up: likely to be applied in several countries.</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>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	2/18/2014 UA: Yes.	
	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?	2/18/2014 UA: Yes.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	2/18/2014 UA: Yes.	
	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?	2/18/2014 UA: Yes. However, it is suggested to consider the 1-step approval procedure without PPG request.  3/10/2014 UA:  After consultation with GEFSEC, the two-step procedure with PPG has been selected.  Cleared	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council?</li> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. <b>Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>2/18/2014 UA: No. Please address comments and consider the option to submit a fully developed MSP for final CEO approval.</p> <p>3/10/2014 UA: Yes. The Project Manager recommends the MSP and the PPG for CEO approval.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>1) A detailed budget to be presented and justified. In this context, in particular the costs of component 3 need to be justified in view of ongoing work of other projects/initiatives. The work of Colomb et al (2013) is reference and during the PPG the project should check in as far this work can be applied/used. Based on Colomb et al, an online tool has been already developed: <a href="http://ird.t-t-web.com/">http://ird.t-t-web.com/</a></p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>that maybe be useful for this project.</p> <p>2) Component 1: It is encouraged to not limit the application of the assessment tool to a number of 5 - 7 projects but to a larger cohort of projects. The PPG is expected to provide a list of projects to participate. Further, the pro doc shall clearly specify in which project the detailed assessment tool is to be tested.</p> <p>3) Improvement of the exisiting tool should also cover technical aspects (website management, online support, browser compatibility, fixing of bugs, etc). The PPG is expected to list this measures in the pro doc.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	February 18, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 10, 2014	
	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.**