



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

GEF ID:	5724		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Participatory Assessment of Land Degradation and Sustainable Land Management in Grassland and Pastoral Systems		
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-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,639,726
Co-financing:	\$6,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$8,739,726
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Caterina Batello

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> ?	NA	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	NA	
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?	NA	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes, the proposed amount is within the resources available for the LD focal area.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Please, note that this project is financed by the GEF Trust Fund, not the LDCF. Please update the "type of trust fund" in	

\*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)
		the head of the template.  March 24, 2014 Addressed.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	Yes, the proposed amount is within the resources available for the LD focal area set-aside.	
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>No.</p> <p>The project mentions the LD1 and 3 objectives. However, the projects developed under these LD objectives are expected to produce Global Environment Benefits. It is not the case for this analytical project. Such project focusing on methods and tools to enhance monitoring of LD issues should be developed under the LD4 objective on adaptive management. Please, correct.</p> <p>March 24, 2014 Addressed.</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>	NA	
	<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>Two main problems are identified (1) lack of process that transfers LD and SLM information to appropriate policies and legal instruments, 2) lack of coherent indicators on multiple ecosystem benefits in grassland and pastoral areas). The baseline scenario includes a long list of</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		<p>projects, mainly managed by FAO, IUCN, IFAD, and their partners on the considered issues.</p> <p>- At CEO endorsement, reinforce the problem analysis and focus on a smaller(?) number of projects to describe the baseline scenario.</p> <p>March 24, 2014 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>The result framework is concise and clear. However, please address the two comments below:</p> <p>In the first component, we do not see how the first problem that is identified will be fully addressed (= lack of comprehensive process that assesses and transfers LD and SLM information to appropriate policies and legal instruments to sustainably manage grasslands areas). In this component, the two outputs mention the local level, but we do not see how the transfer of SLM information will be improved at national level. Please, explain and adjust.</p> <p>- In the third component, please revise the formulation of the outcome 3.1. The outcome "facilitate project implementation based on results-based management" may wrongly be understood as a duplication with the management costs. This third component is supposed to focus on KM, monitoring, and evaluation, out of the project management costs.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		March 24, 2014 Addressed.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	This GEF project should be developed under the LD4 objective: methods and tools are expected, not GEB per se. However there is a project reasoning that is fully acceptable. The project is addressing two real problems encountered within the LD focal area: 1) the lack of process to transfer SLM into policies and legal instruments that affect pastoral lands and 2) the lack of tools to assess the multiple ecosystem benefits in projects dealing with grasslands and pastoral areas.  March 24, 2014 Addressed.	
	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?	FAO works with various networks involving NGOs/CSOs (WISP, WAMIP, for instance). However at CEO endorsement, please include universities and research/training centers in the considered countries. This kind of project is a unique opportunity to empower national and local scientific partners.  March 24, 2014	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Addressed.	
	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)	Provide a comprehensive risk assessment at CEO endorsement.  March 24, 2014 Addressed.	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The project is consistent and coordinated with other initiatives involving mainly FAO and IUCN. Other agencies as IFAD and some initiatives supported by bilateral partners are also mentioned. At CEO endorsement, please, confirm the way this project will coordinate with these initiatives. For instance, the PRAPS and the Regional Sahel Pastoralism Support Project are mentioned in the PIF: during the PPG, please explore the best ways to coordinate and associate them (steering committee?).  March 24, 2014 Addressed.	
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <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> </ul>	No. Please, describe the innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.  March 24, 2014 Addressed.	

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>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>		
	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>The explanations provided on the GEF funding and the cofinancing are acceptable.</p> <p>- Please, confirm these elements at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>March 24, 2014 Addressed.</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>The project reasoning is built on cofinancing brought up by FAO and IUCN. The cofinancing amount is acceptable.</p> <p>- Please, confirm the cofinancing at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>- If possible, bring other partners to increase the cofinancing (WB, UNDP, UNEP, IFAD, AfDB, for instance).</p> <p>March 24, 2014 Addressed.</p>	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	<p>- The management costs are reasonable.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	The PPG is in the norm.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
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:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council? • Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. <b>Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Not yet. Please address the comments above.  March 24, 2014 The PIF is recommended for clearance.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	- Provide a comprehensive risk assessment. - Reinforce the project reasoning: notably	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>focus more the baseline scenario on a small number of projects to better show the additionality of the GEF project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Confirm the cofinancing.</li> <li>- Confirm the partnerships for implementation, including national and local research/training centers.</li> <li>- Confirm the countries that will be committed (the number of 9 is announced, but only eight countries are listed).</li> </ul>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	March 10, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 24, 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.**