



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	4698		
Country/Region:	Honduras		
Project Title:	Alignment of National Action Programs with the UNCCD 10-Year Strategy and reporting process		
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):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$136,364
Co-financing:	\$154,500	Total Project Cost:	\$290,864
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mohamed Bakarr	Agency Contact Person:	Ian Cherrett

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	11 October 2011 Yes, Honduras is eligible. Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? * ¹	11 October 2011 Yes, OFP endorsement letter is included in submission. Cleared
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	11 October 2011 Yes, FAO has been implementing relevant activities in the country. Cleared

¹ Questions 2, 3, 4, 18 and 19 are applicable only to EAs submitted through Agencies.
EA review template: updated June 7 2011

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?*	<p>11 October 2011</p> <p>Yes, FAO has a strong presence in the country and is well placed to provide appropriate technical support for the proposed enabling activities.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	N/A
	• the focal area allocation?	N/A
	• focal area set-aside?	<p>11 October 2011</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Cleared</p>
Project Consistency	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	<p>11 October 2011</p> <p>Yes, the proposed EA is consistent with LDFA results framework.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	<p>11 October 2011</p> <p>No. Please highlight appropriate links to the FA objective in Part II, Section B of the template.</p> <p>7 March 2012</p> <p>Link to LDFA objectives is now included.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	8. 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?	<p>11 October 2011</p> <p>Yes, the proposed EA builds on evolving plans and strategies related to the country's origina NAP.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	<p>9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>11 October 2011</p> <p>No. Please elaborate on how capacity strengthening activities will ensure sustainability of proposed outcomes, especially in relation to reporting.</p> <p>7 March 2012</p> <p>It is still not clear how the proposed activities will lead to sustainability of outcomes. While SERNA stands to benefit from training, etc. please clarify how the aligned NAP and Reporting Process be accommodated within the institution to ensure long-term effectiveness of the institutional mandate for the UNCCD.</p> <p>30 April, 2012</p> <p>The institutional sustainability is now clear.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>11 October 2011</p> <p>No. The project will specifically address the two priorities for EA: NAP alignment and reporting. However, a framework for implementing these activities (Part II, Section B) is unclear. Please provide a clear and succinct description of how these two components will be implemented, including opportunity for synergy and cost-effectiveness.</p> <p>7 March 2012</p> <p>The project framework is now sound and sufficiently clear.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?</p>	<p>11 October 2011</p> <p>No. Please clarify if and how gender dimensions will be accommodated in project implementation.</p> <p>7 March 2012</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>There is still no clear evidence of gender dimensions. Please clarify.</p> <p>30 April, 2012</p> <p>Gender dimensions are now considered in the project framework.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>11 October 2011</p> <p>No. Please provide a clear explanation of how participation of CSOs and indigenous people will be assured.</p> <p>7 March 2012</p> <p>There is still no clear explanation of how public participation, including CSOs and indigenous communities will be assured. Please provide.</p> <p>30 April 2012</p> <p>The role and engagement of CSOs and Indigenous people is now reflected in the project approach.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>11 October 2011</p> <p>No. Specific links to other related activities in the country are lacking. For example, Honduras was one of the countries supported through the GEF funded National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA) Project. Please clarify how this and other initiatives are related to the proposed EA.</p> <p>7 March 2012</p> <p>Specific links to the NCSA have been included, as well as to other planned SLM activities in the country.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>11 October 2011</p> <p>No. Please clarify specific roles of SERNA and DGRH in facilitating the delivery of project outcomes. It is not clear, for example, how activities of the consultants will be coordinated and consolidated.</p> <p>7 March 2012</p> <p>The role of SERNA and the CSLM have been clarified, and a detailed description of FAO's role as IA is now included.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
Project Financing	15. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>11 October 2011</p> <p>Project management cost is stated as US\$15,000 (Table A), and yet the total grant is \$150,000 minus fees. At the same time, Table D shows breakdown for the full grant amount rather management cost. Please clarify these amounts and correct the table accordingly.</p> <p>7 March 2012</p> <p>There is still confusion regarding EA management cost. While Table A shows no amount for management cost, Table has been completed with project amounts for EA management costs. Please do not complete Table D if EA management costs are included in Table A. Otherwise, please adjust the numbers accordingly.</p> <p>30 April 2012</p> <p>GEF resources will not be used for PMC, and the co-financing amount is appropriate. The tables have been completed accordingly to reflect this.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	16. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>11 October 2011</p> <p>No. The GEF grant amount for NAP alignment is not justified, especially based on consultant activities stated in Annex A.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>Furthermore, there is no clear link between amounts in Table A (EA Framework) and Annex A (for technical assistance). Please note that for NAP alignment, technical assistance related to socio-economic baseline and drought warning system, and to establishment of national observatory sites and monitoring and vulnerability assessment system are not justified for use of GEF resources. Please provide a more clear breakdown of costs to clarify GEF grant and co-financing amounts for the various components.</p> <p>7 March 2012</p> <p>Please provide an indicative cost breakdown for the activities for Components A and B to match proposed consultancies in Annex A. In its current form, it is difficult to assess whether the costs are appropriate and adequate, including proposed co-financing amounts. Please consider providing an explanation of cost effectiveness as suggested in the template.</p> <p>30 April 2012</p> <p>The breakdown of costs are now consistent with amounts requested for NAP alignment and reporting.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>17. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?</p>	<p>11 October 2011</p> <p>No. Co-financing amount is inadequate given the nature of activities proposed, especially in relation to baselines and establishment of early warning, monitoring, and assessment systems as noted in #16 above. Please clarify how these systems will be delivered in a consistent and sustainable manner as part of the proposed EA.</p> <p>7 March 2012</p> <p>Co-financing amounts are still inadequate. Please increase to a minimum 1:1 ratio in relation to concern raised in #16 above.</p> <p>30 April 2012</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>Co-financing amounts are now adequate.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>18. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*</p>	<p>11 October 2011</p> <p>Yes. FAO will contribute both grant and in-kind financing.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
Agency Responses	<p>19. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:*</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 	Please respond when provided.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 	Please respond when provided	

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	20. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	11 October 2011 No. EA approval is not recommended. Please address all issues raised in this review.
		7 March 2012 No, the EA request is still not ready for recommendation. Please address all issues raised and kindly provide an indication of how each issue was addressed at time of resubmission.
		30 April 2012 Yes the EA request is now recommended for CEO approval.
Review Date (s)	First review**	October 11, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 07, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 30, 2012

**** 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.**