



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

GEF ID:	9759		
Country/Region:	Macedonia		
Project Title:	Promoting Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Through Strengthening Legal and Institutional Framework, Capacity Building and Restoration of Most Vulnerable Mountain Landscapes		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	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-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$91,324	Project Grant:	\$3,662,545
Co-financing:	\$24,300,000	Total Project Cost:	\$27,962,545
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Ersin Esen

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	03/02/2017 UA: Not fully. Please consider to align the project with LD-2 as well. 03/30/2017 UA: Addressed. Cleared	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies	03/02/2017 UA: No. The alignment with the UNCCD	

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
	and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>NAP may not be fully relevant for the project as the current UNCCD 10-year strategy expires. Please clarify if Macedonia will set voluntary LDN targets, and if so, how the project will contribute to its achievement. Please consider designing the project as a contribution to achieving LDN in Macedonia.</p> <p>03/30/2017 UA: Adequately addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>03/02/2017 UA: Not fully.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - While the PIF states that GEF funds "will serve as a catalyst to develop a coherent and coordinated approach to reduce pressures on land [...] from competing land uses [...]" the reviewer feels that exactly this coherent and coordinated approach needs to be better developed with regard to the project itself and in context of ongoing efforts in the relevant sectors. - In component 2, the project focuses on the implementation of a small number of SLM practices that not address all the drivers of degradation as mentioned in the project document 	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>(e.g. forest fires, illegal logging, unsustainable forestry, unclear forest tenure).</p> <p>- The project works on a small area of demonstration sites (200 ha reforestation and 10,000 ha SLM) without a clear replication strategy. The scaling up section in the PIF is described in very generic terms only.</p> <p>- It is also unclear what the role of UNEP Vienna Office is in project execution - the office is listed as executing partner. Would it not be more appropriate to involve the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Water Economy into the project execution?</p> <p>Please consider (as mentioned in box 2) to design the project in context of LDN target implementation if applicable. This would require to apply relevant LDN methodologies for planning and monitoring.</p> <p>03/30/2017 UA: Has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>03/02/2017 UA: Not fully.</p> <p>- While incremental reasoning has been applied, the PIF fails to present a solid and clear baseline on which</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>investments should be made to achieve a significant impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is unclear why the proposed project needs to work on enabling framework for SLM if SIDA, EU, GIZ, FAO and a number of national NGOs is already working on promoting sustainable agricultural practices. - For a total investment of \$28 million USD (including co-finance) the project should strive for higher impact, in particular through component 2. It would be important to mobilize sufficient co-finance to make a meaningful contribution to e.g. achieving SLM (and LDN?) in the entire selected municipalities and/or entire Zheden Massif, including addressing SFM issues. <p>03/30/2017 UA: Clarification provided.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>03/02/2017 UA: Not fully.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - project objective: how does the project "support local development". Please clarify. - Component 2: This should be Investment, not TA. Is output 2.1.1 not better included into component 1 as an enabling activity? 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>- What are the underlying calculations for budgeting > \$14 million for this component?</p> <p>03/30/2017 UA: Addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>03/02/2017 UA: Not fully.</p> <p>- PIF states that indigenous peoples are involved into the project (marked in box). Please clarify.</p> <p>- PIF states that CSO is involved but does not list them in stakeholder table. Please address.</p> <p>03/30/2017 UA: Addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
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? 	<p>03/02/2017 UA: Requested resources are currently available. Availability and exact amount will need to be re-checked at the time of actual Work Program Inclusion.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	<p>03/02/2017 UA: Requested resources are currently available. Availability and exact amount will need to be re-checked at</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		the time of actual Work Program Inclusion.	
	<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"> Focal area set-aside? 	n/a	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	03/02/2017 UA: No. Please address comments. 03/30/2017 UA: Program Manager recommends CEO clearance.	
Review Date	Review	March 02, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 30, 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?		

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.