



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

GEF ID:	9365		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Land Degradation Neutrality Target Setting Project		
GEF Agency:	IUCN	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-EA;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$2,752,294
Co-financing:	\$2,983,680	Total Project Cost:	\$5,735,974
PIF Approval:	March 15, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	April 19, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Jonathan Davies

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	01/14/2016 UA: Yes. This Enabling Activity is fully aligned with LD programming directions for GEF-6. Cleared	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	01/14/2016 UA: Yes. The project is fully aligned with UNCCD COP12 guidance to all parties. Cleared	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	01/14/2016 UA:	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes. The project, through addressing Land degradation Neutrality (LDN) indirectly addresses drivers of environmental degradation. Each country will tailor the implementation measures accordingly to address specific drivers. Cleared	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	01/14/2016 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	01/14/2016 UA: The following comments refer to all tables in the EA project template. Part I: Please insert the abbreviations "TSP" in brackets after the title. Table A: Please insert "Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN)" in the project objective Table B: Please select the appropriate "sources of Co-financing" from the drop down menu. Table C: Please leave "Programming of funds" blank.	

¹ 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)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Part II:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paragraph 6 should start by indicating the technical support by UNCCD and the financial support by South Korea (which follows later in paragraph 8). - Paragraph 10: The mention of 30 countries to be funded by GEF should logically move to paragraph 11. Please refer to "GEF eligible countries". In this context, the proposal does not clarify why the total number of countries is 60 and why the number of GEF supported countries is 30. What is the justification? Are there any selection criteria? What is the strategy for scaling up support to all countries and in which timeframe? - Paragraph 41 and 42: The M&E plan would need to be budgeted. Please include at least a total figure budgeted for M&E and clarify where the budget will come from. <p>Part III:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - please enter "n/a for global project" in OFP table - please enter "n/a for global project" in the Convention Participation Table under UNCCD. 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>- please enter the correct date in MM/DD/YYYY format in C. GEF Agencies Certification.</p> <p>02/03/16 UA: All comments addressed except: - Table B: Sources of Co-financing: Please check if Governments are better categorized as "Government" instead of "donor agency". - MM/DD/YYYY format in C. GEF Agencies Certification. (It's not yet August) - Please also enter GEF project ID, Agency ID in Part I. - Please enter (n/a) for "expected Report Submission to Convention" in Part I.</p> <p>02/09/16 UA: All comments addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>01/14/2016 UA: Yes. These aspects have been adequately considered at PIF stage. More details are expected at CEO endorsement stage.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
Availability of Resources			

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	n/a	
	<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"> Focal area set-aside? 	01/14/2016 UA: Yes. LD set-aside funds are available as per GEF-6 LDFA Programming Directions. Cleared	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	01/14/2016 UA: No. Please address comments in this review and resubmit. 02/08/2016 UA: No. Please correct typo's as indicated in box 5 and re-submit. 02/09/2016 UA: Yes. Program Manager recommends project for CEO clearance. Please note that this PIF is a non-expedited Enabling Activity (EA) and therefore uses the EA template. If the PIF is approved by Council, the project will need to be submitted for CEO endorsement along with a fully developed project document.	
Review Date	Review	January 26, 2016	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 08, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 29, 2016	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	07/22/2016 UA: No changes. For a global project, OFP endorsement is not applicable.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	07/22/2016 UA: Yes.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	07/22/2016 UA: Yes.	
	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	07/22/2016 UA: Yes.	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	07/22/2016 UA: Yes.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	n/a for global EA project.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	n/a	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	07/22/2016 UA: Yes.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	07/22/2016 UA: Yes.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	07/22/2016 UA: Yes.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	07/22/2016 UA: Yes.	
	• STAP	none received - EA	
	• GEF Council	07/22/2016 UA: Yes.	
	• Convention Secretariat	none received	

³ 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.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	07/22/2016 UA: Yes. The PIF is recommended for CEO endorsement.	
Review Date	Review	July 22, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		