



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	4983		
Country/Region:	Madagascar		
Project Title:	Alignment of National Action Programme to the UNCCD 10 Years Strategy and Preparation of the the Fifth Reporting and Review process		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	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:	\$150,000	Total Project Cost:	\$286,364
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Adamou Bouhari

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	UNCCD became effective in Madagascar on September 23 1997 (Date of Signature: October 14 1994; Date of Ratification: June 25 1997). Cleared.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?*	A letter of endorsement is available, in date of Feb. 5, 2012, signed by Mrs. Christine Edmee RALALAHARISOA, GEF Operational Focal Point. Cleared.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	No information is available on this point, but UNEP is definitely experimented in providing support to countries for enabling activities. Cleared.
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?*	No information is provided on this point. Please clarify the status of UNEP's activities in Madagascar. July 2, 2012 Addressed

Availability	within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the STAR allocation? 	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	<p>- We understand that the GEF support will help Madagascar to fulfill its reporting obligations and align its NAP. However, if "Madagascar is not in a position to conduct monitoring on the issues stipulated by the Convention, take responsibility on indicators at national level, and develop appropriate national reports" (Para 8), please justify the amount of \$150,000 to align the NAP and prepare the fifth report.</p> <p>- Please be aware that \$150,000 is the maximum amount for LD enabling activities under GEF5 (2010-2014). Are you sure such amount is fully justifiable in the current conditions? And please confirm that the Focal Point and you understand well that no resources will be available in case of additional obligations adopted at COP11 in 2013.</p> <p>July 2, 2012 Cleared.</p>
Project Consistency	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	Yes. the request is aligned with the focal area result framework. Please, correct the numbers for the two outputs (4.1 and 4.2).
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	Yes (table A). Cleared.
	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, the proposed EA is based on past exercises and aims to align the NAP and update the national report. Cleared.
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Partially. We take note of the activities described under the part II and the

		<p>sections A, B and C. However, it is mentioned in the para. 7 that one difficulty is the lack of information exchange between institutions and the lack of clear division of tasks and responsibilities between agencies and between the central and the local level. In addition, there is low communication between government and scientific institutions that is responsible of poor consideration of scientific findings in the decision making process. Please clarify how the current proposal will address these problems. Please, develop the sustainability of the proposed approach.</p> <p>July 2, 2012 We acknowledge the responses. Just note that there is no output 1.4.</p>
	<p>10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please use the current GEF5 template for enabling activities that is available on the GEF website (http://www.thegef.org/gef/content/gef-5-enabling-activity-template-sept-2011) . - Table A: please revise the numbers associated to the outputs (4.1 and 4.2). - The result framework is very (too?) detailed. - The section "C.1. EA activities" should aim to explain the activities that will be developed to reach the outputs proposed in the result framework. It is somehow confusing to find explanations related to outcomes and results that are not included per se in the result framework (5 national consultations are mentioned in the text and not in the outputs for instance). Some activities seem to go beyond what is required under such EA (risk atlas for instance, or a monitoring system for all conventions). Please make the text consistent with the tables, and justify the activities. - Add a point on sustainability. Explain how this project will not bring only more reports but will help to mainstream LD issues in the development agenda. Explain how the institutions will be able to include LD issues in their own planning. - Once, we will have a revised text to justify and explain the activities, we will be able to figure out whether the budget can be justified. <p>July 3, 2012 We are sorry, but the template is not the right one. We are afraid you</p>

		<p>activities. We can proceed with the information you provided, as all the information is available, but please resubmit a document using the right template (http://www.thegef.org/gef/content/gef-5-enabling-activity-template-sept-2011).</p> <p>Thanks.</p>
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	<p>Gender dimensions are mentioned in the section 19.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>Public participation, notably from CSOs and the private sector are taken into consideration in the section 6 and 19.</p> <p>We did not find any mention of indigenous people issues. Please, clarify.</p> <p>July 3, 2012 Addressed.</p>
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Addressed.
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Cleared.
Project Financing	15. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>- For a budget of \$122,728 for the technical activities, the management costs can reach up to 10 percent, or \$12,272. Please revise.</p> <p>July 3, 2012 Addressed.</p>
	16. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>- Table B: project framework: please revise the numbers (there are probably some typos with some numbers: cf. 1.2 and 1.3). And, as requested under the cell. 10, please explain in the text the activities and the costs of activities to understand the consistency and the reasoning outputs to outcomes.</p> <p>- The table D clarifies the detail of EA management costs. The annex A should provide the details of consultants covered by the GEF grant. We understand the national project manager and the national project financial and administrative assistant are covered by a national contribution. There is then a list of consultants for \$50,000 (\$500 x 100 weeks). We have difficulties to figure out the use of \$122,364 for technical activities. Please detail.</p>

		July 3, 2012 Addressed.
	17. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	There is a cofinancing ratio closed to 1:1.
	18. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	UNEP is providing \$20,000 in kind.
Agency Responses	19. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:*	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 	

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	20. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>The EA cannot be recommended yet. Please address the points above.</p> <p>July 3, 2012 (revised after the email sent July 3, 2012) We thank the Agency for the responses that mostly address the issues raised in the review. Based on this revised request and explanations given orally, the Enabling Activity approval can be recommended for clearance. However, please, provide a revised PIF using the right template and please, check the numbers in the table A, B, and C, notably the cofinancing.</p> <p>July 9, 2012 We thank the Agency for this submission using the right template and with revised numbers. The Enabling Activity approval is recommended for clearance.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review**	May 07, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	July 03, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	July 09, 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.**