



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	<b>5315</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Macedonia</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Support for the Development of National Action Program Aligned to the UNCCD 10 Year Strategy and Reporting Process under UNCCD</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Land Degradation</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$136,986</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$170,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$306,986</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ulrich Apel</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Adamou Bouhari</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?*	Yes. Letter dated 11/09/2012.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	Yes
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?*	Yes
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?	Yes
	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	Yes

Project Consistency		
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	LD-4: Enabling activities
	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?	Yes
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	Yes, refer to para 31 of the application document.
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes, refer to para 31 of the application document.
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes
Project Financing	15. Is the itemized budget (including consultant fees, travel, office facilities, etc) justified?	Yes
	16. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes

	17. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes
	18. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	Yes
	19. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	Yes
	20. Comments related to adequacy of information submitted by country for financial management and procurement assessment.	
Agency Responses	21. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:*	
	• STAP?	n/a
	• Convention Secretariat?	n/a
	• Other GEF Agencies?	n/a

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	<b>22. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	28 February 2013 UA: Yes. The Enabling Activity is recommended for CEO approval.
Review Date (s)	First review**	February 28, 2013
	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.**