



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\*

### THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

|  |  |                              |                            |
|--|--|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| GEF ID:                                    | <b>5186</b>  |                              |                            |
| Country/Region:                            | <b>Regional (Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, Tunisia)</b>                                 |                              |                            |
| Project Title:                             | <b>MENA - Desert Ecosystems and Livelihoods Knowledge Sharing and Coordination Project</b> |                              |                            |
| GEF Agency:                                | <b>World Bank</b>  | GEF Agency Project ID:       | <b>130343 (World Bank)</b> |
| 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): | <b>LD-3; Project Mana;</b>   |                              |                            |
| Anticipated Financing PPG:                 | <b>\$0</b>   | Project Grant:               | <b>\$1,000,000</b>         |
| Co-financing:                              | <b>\$487,500</b>   | Total Project Cost:          | <b>\$1,487,500</b>         |
| PIF Approval:                              |  | Council Approval/Expected:   |                            |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval                   |  | Expected Project Start Date: |                            |
| Program Manager:                           | <b>Mohamed Bakarr</b>  | Agency Contact Person:       | <b>Song Li</b>             |

| Review Criteria                 | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)   |
|---------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Eligibility                     | 1. Is the participating country eligible?  |   | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>Yes. This is a regional project to support implementation of the MENA-DELP, which involves Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, and Morocco. Tunisia has been included as fifth country through an existing GEF-4 project that is also addressing priorities related to MENA-DELP. This will enable the country to accommodate the Program priorities in its GEF-5 project.</p> <p>Cleared</p> |
| Agency's Comparative Advantages | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?                                   |   |  |
| Agency's Comparative Advantages | 3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? |   | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>Yes. As GEF Agency for the MENA-</p>  |

|                       |  |  |   |
|-----------------------|--|--|---|
|                       |  |  | with participating countries and regional entities will be invaluable for implementation of this regional project.<br><br>Cleared                               |
|                       | 4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?                |  | N/a   |
|                       | 5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?                           |  | October 23, 2012<br><br>Yes. The World Bank is fully engaged in all five countries and will draw on its pool of technical experts in the region.<br><br>Cleared |
| Resource Availability | 6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): |  |   |
|                       | • the STAR allocation?   |  | October 23, 2012<br><br>No STAR resources are being used for this project.<br><br>Cleared   |
|                       | • the focal area allocation?   |  | October 23, 2012<br><br>Yes. The funding for this MSP was approved as part of the Program.<br><br>Cleared   |
|                       | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access   |  | N/a   |
|                       | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?  |  | N/a   |
|                       | • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund  |  | N/a   |
|                       | • focal area not aside?  |  | October 23, 2012  |

|                     |  |  |
|---------------------|--|--|
|                     |  | Yes. The funding was secured form the LDFA set-aside funds.<br><br>Cleared   |
| Project Consistency | 7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?  | October 23, 2012<br><br>Yes, the MSP is fully aligned with the LDFA strategy.<br><br>Cleared   |
|                     | 8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?  | October 23, 2012<br><br>No. Table A indicates LD3, with specific focus on generating and disseminating information on INRM technologies and best practices; while the narrative in Part II.A clearly states that LD4 is the main focus. Please address this discrepancy to ensure consistency in the MSP.<br><br>November 28, 2012<br><br>This has been addressed - the LD4 will be the main focus.<br><br>Cleared |
|                     | 9. 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? | October 23, 2012<br><br>The MSP is fully in line with priorities of participating countries as they relate to the overall MENA-DELP. For table in the middle of page 5, please clarify if this alignment with "MENARID" or "MENA-DELP". Both are mentioned in the paragraph, but links with MENARID appear to be missing and should be highlighted especially in light of the Tunisia project.                     |

|                       |  |  |  |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|
|                       |  |  | <p>The table and paragraph are now consistent with regard to MENA-DELP and MENARID contributions.</p> <p>Cleared</p>   |
|                       | <p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>                                   |  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>Yes. The overall project approach will engage personnel and institutions across the five countries in knowledge sharing and exchange, in addition to putting in place systems for monitoring. This will help to integrate lessons and experiences for long-term sustainability of project outcomes in each of the countries as well as leveraging regionally.</p> <p>Cleared</p>  |
| <p>Project Design</p> | <p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p> |  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>The project builds on priorities and investments by individual countries under the MENA-DELP as well as existing activities related to desert ecosystems. There are a few inconsistencies in the CEO Approval Request document relative to the PAD. Specifically, please address the following:</p> <p>1) the context in Section B.1 of the CEO document lacks reference to specific regional sectoral issues that are relevant to the project, such as elaborated in Part B of the PAD. Please reconcile the CEO document with the PAD in this regard.</p> |

|  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
|  |  |  | <p>Component 1 without a clear upfront articulation as to why and how this entity is appropriate for implementation of this project, given the context in B.1. Please provide a brief justification for OSS as part of the context, including its comparative advantage relative to the GEF project.</p> <p>November 28, 2012</p> <p>These have been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>              |
|  | <p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p> |  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>Yes. By focusing on knowledge, learning, and monitoring at the regional level, the MSP offers a more cost-effective option for addressing desert ecosystems and livelihood challenges at scale. This will contribute toward harmonization and integration of efforts, including transboundary collaboration where and when appropriate.</p> <p>Cleared</p>           |
|  | <p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>   |  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>Yes. The two main components will leverage GEF financing from regional level actions that draw from and build on country-specific investments. This reasoning is consistent with the overall design of MENA-DELP. Please delete the last two paragraphs under section B.2 of the CEO document since they appear confusing and do not add value to the reasoning.</p> |

|  |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
|  |   |  | <p>November 28, 2012</p> <p>This has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>   |
|  | 14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?  |  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>Yes. The framework is clear and consistent with expectations for the overall MENA-DELP.</p> <p>Cleared</p>   |
|  | 15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?   |  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>By building on planned investments in the participating countries, it is assumed that the MSP will strengthen regional level integration of priority actions for desert ecosystems and livelihoods through knowledge management and learning exchanges. Given that this is an MSP within the program, this assumption is appropriate.</p> <p>Cleared</p>                                     |
|  | 16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits? |  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>Although this is a regional project, there is a clear emphasis on engaging beneficiaries as part of the learning and exchange process across the five countries. Please note the following and address accordingly:</p> <p>1) Paragraph 1 under section B.3 lists four countries when the overall project will engage five countries. Please ensure consistency throughout the document.</p> |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p>2) Please clarify exactly which aspects of the proposed project components will directly involve communities, CSOs, etc., and with gender dimensions. How will their involvement be assured?</p> <p>November 28, 2012</p> <p>These have been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>   |
|  | <p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>No. Please clarify under section B.5 how CSO engagement will be assured.</p> <p>November 28, 2012</p> <p>Public participation through CSOs and CBOs is now included.</p> <p>Cleared</p>  |
|  | <p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p> | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Cleared</p>   |
|  | <p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>Relevant initiatives have been highlighted (Section B.7), but three of these (1, ii and iii) lack specific details on what aspects will benefit from effective coordination with the proposed regional project. Please highlight briefly for each specific aspects that will be amenable for coordination.</p> |

|                   |  |  |  |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
|                   |  |  | <p>This has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>   |
|                   | 20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?   |  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>Yes. The choice of OSS as lead implementing entity and host of the PMT has been fully justified. The roles and responsibilities of the PMT has been adequately described. Reference is also made to an Annex 3, which is missing from the CEO document. Please check and include the Annex.</p> <p>November 28, 2012</p> <p>This has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p> |
|                   | 21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?     |  | N/a  |
|                   | 22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?               |  | N/a  |
| Project Financing | 23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?  |  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>Yes, the PMC is appropriate.</p> <p>Cleared</p>   |
|                   | 24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? |  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>Yes, the proposed breakdown by components is appropriate and adequate.</p>  |



|  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
|  | <p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing;<br/>At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p> |  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>The co-financing amounts to \$1.75 million and is based largely on contributions from one of the five participating countries, which implies a high degree of commitment and buy-in from that country. It is expected that this will be further leveraged during project implementation. Please provide letters from the various sources of co-financing to confirm the co-financing.</p> <p>November 28, 2012</p> <p>The co-financing from Algeria could not be confirmed at this time due to ongoing institutional changes. As a result, confirmed co-financing is now \$487, more than half of which is from the Executing Agency OSS. This is appropriate given the overall purpose of the MSP to support regional level implementation of MENA-DELP.</p> <p>Cleared</p> |
|  | <p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>                          |  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>The World Bank is not contributing any co-financing. Please clarify in section C.1 how the World Bank will specifically contribute in the absence of co-financing. This section is exclusively about the World Bank's role as GEF Agency and need not include co-financing from other sources.</p> <p>November 28, 2012</p>  |

|                                   |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
|                                   |  |  | <p>GEF Agency for the overall program will mainly contribute to implementation of the MSP through technical support, including ongoing RTAs with some of the MENA-DELP Countries.</p> <p>Cleared</p> |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? |  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>No. Please include the LDFA TT with relevant sections completed as best as possible.</p> <p>November 28, 2012</p> <p>The LD TT is now included.</p> <p>Cleared</p>        |
|                                   | 28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?  |  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Cleared</p>  |
| Agency Responses                  | 29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:  |  |  |
|                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>  |  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Cleared</p>  |
|                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>  |  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>No comments on file</p>   |
|                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council comments?</li> </ul>  |  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>No comments on file</p>   |
|                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>  |  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>No comments on file</p>   |

| Secretariat Recommendation                  |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|
| Recommendation at PIF Stage                 | <b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>   |  |   |
|   | 31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.  |  |   |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG? |  | N/A   |
|   | <b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>   |  | <p>October 23, 2012</p> <p>No. MSP approval is not yet recommended. Please address all pending issues highlighted in this review.</p> <p>November 28, 2012</p> <p>Yes, MSP approval is now recommended.</p> |
| Review Date (s)                             | First review*   |  | October 23, 2012  |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  |  | November 28, 2012   |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  |  |   |
|   | 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.**

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

| Review Criteria | Decision Points   | Program Manager Comments |
|-----------------|---|--------------------------|
| PPG Budget      | 1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate? |                          |
|                 | 2. Is itemized budget justified?                                    |                          |

|                        |                                  |  |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Recommendation</b>  | <b>recommended?</b>              |  |
|                        | 4. Other comments                |  |
| <b>Review Date (s)</b> | First review*                    |  |
|                        | 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.