



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	5890		
Country/Region:	Seychelles		
Project Title:	Support to Alignment of Seychelles National Action Programme to the UNCCD Ten-Year Strategy and Reporting 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:	\$136,986
Co-financing:	\$150,000	Total Project Cost:	\$286,986
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?	Yes. Seychelles signed in October 14, 1994 and the convention became effective on September 24, 1997.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? * ¹	There is a letter of endorsement signed by Didier Dogley, GEF OFP for Seychelles.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	Addressed.
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? *	No objection.
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	NA
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes.
	• focal area set-aside?	Yes

¹ Questions 2, 3, 4, 18 and 19 are applicable only to EAs submitted through Agencies.
EA review template: updated June 7 2011

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Project Consistency	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	Addressed
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	Addressed
	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?	Addressed
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Addressed
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Addressed
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	Addressed
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Addressed
	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?	Addressed
Project Financing	15. Is the itemized budget (including consultant fees, travel, office facilities, etc) justified?	<p>- Table D: The costs of local consultants for management costs reach \$8,453. A different information is provided in the annex A (two consultants for 47 weeks = \$11,750). Please make the information coherent.</p> <p>- Annex A: The sum of consultants + monitoring costs + overheads in the management costs is above the total amount. Please correct.</p> <p>June 13, 2014 Addressed</p>
	16. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. 10 percent, including \$8453 of local consultants and \$4,000 of overheads (office facilities, transports, etc).

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	17. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	No objection
	18. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	No objection
	19. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	No objection
	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?	
	• Convention Secretariat?	
	• Other GEF Agencies?	

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	22. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	Not Yet. Please correct the annex A following the comments made in the cell 15. June 13, 2014 All points have been addressed. The EA is recommended for approval.
Review Date (s)	First review**	June 11, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 13, 2014
	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.**