



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

GEF ID:	4922		
Country/Region:	Global (Global, Argentina, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bangladesh, China, Colombia, Ecuador, Lesotho, Morocco, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uzbekistan)		
Project Title:	Decision Support for Mainstreaming and Scaling up of Sustainable Land Management		
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-1; LD-3; LD-3; LD-4; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$6,116,730
Co-financing:	\$33,263,505	Total Project Cost:	\$39,380,235
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mohamed Bakarr	Agency Contact Person:	Dominique Lantieri

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	<p>March 28, 2012</p> <p>This is a global project driven largely by demand from land degradation affected countries. The PIF therefore includes 15 countries, all of which are eligible under the UNCCD.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>March 28, 2012</p> <p>Official Endorsement letters are included for 12 countries, but there are inconsistencies with the following that need to be addressed:</p> <p>a) Uzbekistan does not include Agency Fee</p>	

Herzegovina do not include PPG amount

- c) Morocco indicates WB as GEF Agency and with a different project title
- d) Phillipines indicates "BSWM" as GEF Agency
- e) Tunisia does not include PPG and Agency Fee, and letter is accompanied by a separate MSP request
- f) Ecuador and Turkey endorsed BD focal area funds when the project is entirely LD, and neither country is "flexible" under STAR rules
- g) Endorsed amounts for China, Nigeria, Philippines, Tunisia, Turkey, and Morocco, are vastly different from what is in the PIF
- h) Colombia endorsed amount will exceed its LD allocation based on GEF records of utilization by the country

In addition, the endorsement letter for Panama is not the right template.

Please ensure that these inconsistencies are addressed with all the countries involved in order to bring the PIF template in line with actual amounts being endorsed by the OFPs.

September 6, 2012

All LOEs have now been corrected and correspond to amounts in PIF document, with PPG amounts now specified. Two remaining issues to be addressed:

- 1) Please provide LoE from Thailand, which was missing from the resubmission.
- 2) Please provide an English Translation

		<p>September 19, 2012</p> <p>Correct LoEs for all 15 participating countries are now in place.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	<p>3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?</p>	<p>March 28, 2012</p> <p>Yes. In addition, FAO was the GEF Agency that implemented the UNEP/GEF Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands project, which helped to shed light on opportunities and options for combating desertification at multiple scales. It is therefore strategically well-placed to implement the project and at the same time contribute toward strengthening the focal area agenda.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?</p>	<p>N/a</p>	
	<p>5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?</p>	<p>March 28, 2012</p> <p>Yes. The project fits very well into FAO's ten-year strategic framework, as well as planned and ongoing initiatives in multiple regions and countries.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Resource Availability	<p>6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):</p>		
	<p>• the STAR allocation?</p>	<p>March 28, 2012</p>	

		<p>The total STAR request for 13 countries amounts to \$2,799,724, which is available pending clarification of discrepancies with the individual country endorsements as indicated in #2 above. The country endorsements in most cases are not consistent with amounts in the PIF. Please address.</p> <p>September 6, 2012</p> <p>All discrepancies with country endorsements have now been addressed, and the total amount requested by countries from STAR amounts to \$4,348,153 (including project grants, fees and PPG). Endorsement from Thailand is, however, still pending</p> <p>September 19, 2012</p> <p>The LoE from Thailand is now included.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	<p>March 28, 2012</p> <p>No. Colombia will exceed its allocation. Ecuador and Turkey have exhausted LD resources and decided to endorse BD funds. Please address these with the countries.</p> <p>September 6, 2012</p> <p>Requests from Colombia, Ecuador and Turkey have been adjusted in accordance with STAR rules, including use of BD funds.</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"> • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	N/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	<p>March 28, 2012</p> <p>Yes. The PIF includes an additional request of \$2.9 million (including fees) from the focal area set-aside, which is available. The proposed project fits very well with the focal area priority on knowledge sharing and transfer for which funds were set-aside. This contribution will catalyze upscaling of SLM, especially for countries with small GEF allocations but strong commitment toward implementation of the UNCCD Ten-Year strategy.</p> <p>Cleared</p> <p>September 6, 2012</p> <p>Since the first review, availability of focal area set-aside funds changed considerably. As a result, the amount requested is no longer feasible. Please adjust the PIF to include a maximum of \$1 million from set-aside, with priority for supporting the application of decision-support tools by participating countries.</p> <p>September 19, 2012</p> <p>The Agency has adjusted the set-aside request to \$2.38 million (including fees) on the grounds that this is the minimum</p>	

		with long-term sustainability. Given that 15 countries are directly involved and with potential for an even larger number to benefit, the set-aside request is justified. Cleared	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	March 28, 2012 Yes, the project is very much aligned with the LD focal area results framework, with clear outcomes and outputs. Cleared	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	March 28, 2012 Yes, the project will contribute specifically to LD1, LD3 and LD4. Cleared	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	March 28, 2012 Yes. A brief summary is included to highlight consistencies with each country's national strategies and plans. In addition, the project is also directly aligned with the UNCCD priority for assessment and monitoring of impact indicators in the Ten-Year Strategy. Cleared	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	March 28, 2012 Yes. The project approach emphasizes the need to strengthen capacity in the context of decision-making for investment and implementation of SLM at multiple scales - from national to regional and global. Hence the	

		term sustainability of project outcomes.	
Project Design	11. 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>Cleared</p> <p>March 28, 2012</p> <p>The baseline provides a sufficient rationale for emphasizing decision-support as a means to catalyze the scaling-up of SLM, and builds on a range of ongoing initiatives by FAO and a wide range of partners. With improvements in the global understanding of land degradation trends, there is demand from affected countries and regions for knowledge and innovations to invest in SLM practices. Hence the need for a decision-support framework and associated technical capacity at these different levels.</p> <p>However, description of several countries (Ecuador, Lesotho, Morocco, Nigeria, Panama, and Turkey) are missing from the baseline, while others (Grenada, Nepal, Bhutan, Sri Lanka, and Somalia) are included without clear and adequate justification. Please address this inconsistency by emphasizing baselines for countries investing STAR resources and justifying inclusion of others using alternative resources.</p> <p>September 6, 2012</p> <p>The baselines have now been adequately described for all participating countries, including activities of the GEF Agency and partners.</p>	

	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Yes. The GEF increment builds on a number of existing initiatives, networks, and partnerships at global, regional and national levels to catalyze the mainstreaming and scaling-up of SLM through effective decision-support. This will then lead to application of innovative and cost-effective SLM practices, including potential for mobilizing investments at country-level.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>The framework includes two main components for 1) national and 2) global level activities, and a separate component on M&E. It is, however, not very clear on specific outcomes to be achieved, especially in light of proposed emphasis on "mainstreaming" and "scaling-up" of SLM. Please provide a more clearer picture of expected outcomes based on these, and demonstrate clear links to the focal area outcomes in Table A. In addition, please clarify how the expected benefits (development and GEBs) and potential beneficiaries are aligned with the outcomes.</p> <p>September 6, 2012</p>	

		<p>The project framework is now consistent with the proposed approach for supporting delivery of GEBs in participating countries. These will need to be further elaborated for each country during project development, and based on their respective priorities to apply decision-support tools for investing in SLM.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>No. Because this is largely a global project with national level activities, it is not clear what the basis was for targeting 500,000 hectares and proportional increases in productivity (10%), vegetation cover (25%), and carbon sequestration (20%). How realistic are these estimates? What assumptions are associated with them and how are they related to the priorities and needs of countries?</p> <p>September 6, 2012</p> <p>This has been clarified, but as noted in #14 above, will need to further elaborated during project development.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>16. 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 29, 2012</p> <p>Yes. The PIF also provides a clear description of how socio-economic benefits and gender benefits will be emphasized during implementation.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	

	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Yes. The project includes an exclusive focus on mobilizing networks and partnerships that include CSOs, and through which public participation will be pursued.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>The risks need to be elaborated further especially for climate change. Given the growing evidence of climate risks in agricultural systems, it is not clear why the risk is considered low when the project is emphasizing scaling-up. Please clarify how the project approach to mainstreaming and scaling-up will take into consideration projected impacts of climate change.</p> <p>September 6, 2012</p> <p>This has been clarified.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>The PIF is not clear on "initiatives" or "stakeholders" for coordination (section B.6). Please clarify how the project will specifically engage with each of the initiatives included (and use separate bullets for those listed on top of page 15). Drynet, LandCare, and Universities are only vaguely described, and it is not clear how or why they are included here as "initiatives". Please consider moving these to section B.5 in the template if</p>	

		<p>with specific roles for the proposed project.</p> <p>September 6, 2012</p> <p>This has been clarified.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>No. While the GSC and TAG are clear for global level activities, there is still a lot of uncertainty about how countries will be engaged. Please provide a more clear explanation of how the global project coordination unit will relate to the participating countries beyond just a "secretariat service". A conceptual model of how the various entities are linked will be very useful at this PIFstage.</p> <p>September 6, 2012</p> <p>The arrangements for engaging participating countries are now included, and adequate for project execution.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>March 29, 2012</p>	

Project Financing		5% of the GEF grant. Cleared	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>The breakdown of GEF grant by focal area objectives is appropriate, and co-financing levels are adequate and consistent with the overall framework for delivering outcomes and outputs. There are, however, discrepancies in the financing totals between Tables A, B and D that need to be addressed. Please ensure that the sums across all these tables are accurate.</p> <p>September 6, 2012</p> <p>The proposed financing breakdown will need to be adjusted in light of concern raised about set-aside funds in #6 above. Please adjust the breakdown accordingly for further consideration.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>The total indicative co-financing is \$29,007,870, almost a 1:6 ratio with the GEF grant. In addition to country commitments, the total indicative co-financing includes \$5.1 million in grants to be leveraged from the Agencies own sources and through strategic partners including the European Union and Swiss Development Cooperation. Please note that co-financing letters will be required from these important partners if the project is approved.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the	March 29 2012	

	line with its role?	Yes. FAO is bringing a total of \$4,539,356 through new and existing grants associated with baseline initiatives. This is very much in line with its role for the proposed global project. Cleared	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	September 19, 2012 Please address when received	
	• Convention Secretariat?	September 19, 2012 Please address when received	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	September 19, 2012 Please address when received	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	March 29, 2012 No. The PIF cannot be recommended at this stage. Please address all the concerns and issues raised in the review. September 6, 2012 No. There are still issues to be resolved before the PIF can be recommended. Please note #2, 6 (focal area set-aside	

		by objectives). September 19, 2012 The PIF is now technically cleared and may be included in a future Work Program.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 29, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 06, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 19, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.