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

GEF ID:	**9745**		
Country/Region:	**Iraq**		
Project Title:	**Sustainable Land Management for Improved Livelihoods in Degraded Areas of Iraq**		
GEF Agency:	**FAO**	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-1 Program 1;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$150,000**	Project Grant:	**$3,549,321**
Co-financing:	**$21,483,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$25,182,321**
PIF Approval:	**April 28, 2017**	Council Approval/Expected:	**May 01, 2017**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Asha Bobb-Semple**	Agency Contact Person:	**Jeffrey Griffin**

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]	2/28/2017 ABS: Yes. Aligned with LD-1.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	2/28/2017 ABS: Yes. However, Iraq has committed to voluntary setting of LDN targets. Please elaborate on how the project may contribute to achieving LDN targets. 3/27/2017 ABS:	

[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)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Cleared	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	2/28/2017 ABS: Not fully. The project has highlighted key drivers for land degradation and destruction of the marshlands. Additional details on the climate change impacts or specific drivers related to climate change would be useful. In terms of sustainability, the PIF should clarify how the interventions made at the national and institutional level will be sustained given the governments challenges with staffing and inadequate resources for implementation. For example the, policy and legislative frameworks, new Conservation Agriculture Directorate (or Unit?) and the digital land use mapping system. In terms of market transformation, the ability of farmers and local communities to access credit in order to take advantage of new market opportunities (for conservation agriculture products and new diversified means if income	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		generation) should also be explored. 3/27/2017 ABS: This has been addressed in the resubmission. Cleared	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	2/28/2017 ABS: Yes. 3/27/2017 ABS: Cleared	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	2/28/2017 ABS: Not fully. - The flow of the document could be improved by incorporating the activities geared towards strengthening the enabling environment and building capacity of national institutors and stakeholders under the one Component (Component 1) and actual on the ground interventions in a different Component. This may also assist it rectifying the differences in activities identified in Table B and in in the description of the project (Pg12-14). It is not evident where Outputs 2.1.2, 2.1.5 are mentioned in the project description and Component 3 refers to a documentation system and	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		marshland spatial plan (Pg 14) that does not appear to be mentioned as an Output (only as an indicator) under Component 3 in Table B. Please review and correct the inconsistencies. - Output 2.1.2- Please indicate where the system will be hosted and how it will be maintained. The same applies to the integrated spatial information system mentioned as an indicator under Component 3 - Outcome 2.2-One of the indicators refer to marshlands, but marshlands are not mentioned in the Outputs. Please clarify. -Output 3.1.3 refers to support to marshland ecosystem services in 5 pilot sites. Can you indicate the number of hectares? Does this means there are 3 different sets of land based interventions (Output 2.2.2, 2.2.3 and 3.1.3)? -Outcome 3.2 refers to preparation of feasibility studies, market plan and enhancing capacity of local communities (Output 3.2.3). Given the associated indicator refers to number of households benefitting from diversified incomes, is it the	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		intention to implement the market plan or use the feasibility studies to inform preparation of action plans that will be implemented? Additionally, if this is the case, access to credit by farmers and local communities is an important consideration. -In the Project Description/Coordination section, please briefly indicate if any, the alignment of activities and overlap of the project sites with those from the GEF project with UNEP on Establishment of the National Protected Areas Network. -Given the potential impact of climate variability and climate change on the results of the project in the short and long term, please also indicate if there are any parallel initiatives that are addressing climate change adaptation. - Latest during the PPG phase, please specificy what specific marshland rehabilitation actions will be implemented and how effective these are in relation to the impact of the dams (upstream) on the hydrological flow to the marshes.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		3/27/2017 ABS: All comments and queries have been addressed in the resubmission. Cleared	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	2/28/2017 ABS: Not fully. The project addresses Gender elements, however please indicate relevance or not of indigenous peoples and CSOs in this particular context. Please also indicate if available now, the number of beneficiaries disaggregated by gender. 3/27/2017 ABS: Cleared	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	2/28/2017 ABS: Yes.	
	• The focal area allocation?	2/28/2017 ABS: Yes. Iraq has an allocation of $3,550,756 for Land Degradation, which is less than the proposed budget, however	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		due to the marginal flexibility allowance, Iraq can reallocate up to $2,000,0000 to LD under the project.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	2/28/2017 ABS: N/A	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	2/28/2017 ABS: N/A	
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	2/28/2017 ABS: Not at this time. Please address the comments above. 3/27/2017 ABS: All issues have been adequately addressed in the re-submission and we have received the OFP Endorsement Letter. The project is technically cleared.	
Review Date	Review	March 01, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 27, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	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 enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

[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.