



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

GEF ID:	10020		
Country/Region:	Lesotho		
Project Title:	Integrated Watershed Management for Improved Agro-pastoral Livelihoods in the Sepabala Sub-catchment		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	6081 (UNDP)
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:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,101,826
Co-financing:	\$4,650,000	Total Project Cost:	\$6,751,826
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2018
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Phero K. Kgomotso,

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	Yes, LD1 Objective, Program1.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes, the National Action Programme in Natural Resource Management, Combating Desertification and Mitigating the Effects of Drought as outlined in the National Action Plan (2015), but also The National Strategic Development Plan 2012/2017 (NSDP), and the Long	

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
		Term Water and Sanitation Strategy (2014).	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes, the drivers of environmental degradation are identified, as well as issues of innovation, sustainability and scaling up.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Yes, we can discuss the formulation of some outputs, but the framework is logical and the outputs are quantified, at the best. Indicators are identified. GEB are quantified. Addressed.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes, see section 36. Traditional authorities, CSO, and decentralized authorities are considered.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	Yes However, approval of PIFs at the end of the replenishment period depends on the overall availability of the trust fund and cannot be guaranteed.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	Yes	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		However, approval of PIFs at the end of the replenishment period depends on the overall availability of the trust fund and cannot be guaranteed.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 	NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	The PIF is recommended for clearance; the PPG is justified and within the norm.	
Review Date	Review	March 13, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	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?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> 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?		
		10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
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.