



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	<b>5327</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>South Africa</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Securing Multiple Ecosystems Benefit Through SLM in the Productive But Degraded Landscapes of South Africa</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5054 (UNDP)</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>\$100,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$4,237,900</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$20,500,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$24,837,900</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jean-Marc Sinnassamy</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Veronica Muthui</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes. Date of UNCCD Signature: January 09 1995 Date of Ratification: September 30 1997 Effective Date: December 29 1997	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	A letter of endorsement is available, signed by the OFP in charge, with the right project title, an amount of 4,961,000\$ (project + PPG + fees), and the name of the Agency (UNDP).	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
<b>Resource Availability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	- South Africa has a LD allocation of \$5,250,000.	

		<p>the GEF SGP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- \$4,750,000 are then available (project grant + PPG + fees).</li> <li>- \$261,000 are missing.</li> <li>- South Africa can use the marginal adjustment scheme to transfer some resources from the CC focal area. However, this option has already been used for a BD project at a height of \$940,503.</li> <li>- Only \$59,497 might eventually be transferred from the CC focal area. However some CC projects are also under preparation (see with UNDP!). The wisest solution will be to use the LD allocation "as is" and avoid more transaction costs. We invite the Agency to check with the OFP about how they want to program their allocations. In any case, the project amount will have to slightly decrease.</li> </ul> <p>April 3, 2012 The amount has been reduced down to \$4,750,000. Cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please, check the table B, the total does not match with the breakdown (\$4,439,270 versus \$4,239,270).</li> </ul> <p>April 3, 2013 Addressed.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	NA	
<p>4. Is the project aligned with the</p>		The project is aligned with the LD3	

	<p><b>LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</b>  <i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>		
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>Addressed.</p>	
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>The baseline situation is described in the pages 5-9. It is too long, but we get the problem described and the baseline situation.</p> <p>However, there are six main projects described the baseline with massive investments on land and water rehabilitation. In the incremental reasoning, a section is probably missing (around p. 8). Please explain what the project will be without the GEF and justify the added value of the GEF.</p> <p>April 3, 2013 Cleared.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>- The result framework, as well as the whole PIF, is too long, too detailed. A 3 page result framework does not really help. Please be more synthetic. Remove the text from the result framework and/or transfer it in the relevant sections of the document. We also remind that a PIF is a concept and is supposed to be 10 page maximum. The part II for instance</p>	

the information is too diluted. Please focus on the question.

- Component 2: Financial and policy incentives: a new methodology for small scale AFOLU and ARR projects is welcome. However, the different related outputs go beyond the definition of a method and raise some questions. There is no objection to use GEF resources for new methods and pilot projects.

However, please confirm if GEF resources will be used for credit verification. The use of public money for certification might be a concern if the credits that are generated are for the benefits of private actors.

- Please, note that there is no objection to be inspired by methods developed under the CDM. However, the GEF cannot be used to obtain credit carbon from the CDM.

- At least for this component, there is a concern about the definition of outcomes and outputs. The outcome of this second component = the output 2.1. Please, remind that we use OECD accepted definitions. Consider the outcomes as the consequence and consider the outputs as the results of activities. Numbers and concrete results are expected with outputs.

- Could you please confirm the number of outputs for this component? It seems there are 12 outputs numbered from 2.1 to 2.12. On one hand, it is probably too much. On other hand, the outputs from 2.6 to 2.7 are missing.

- The output 2.8 is too complex. Please revise, simplify, and provide a most focused formulation reflecting the

		April 3, 2013 Excellent. Thanks for the deep revisions. Cleared.	
	8. Are <b>global environmental benefits</b> adequately identified, and the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the <b>incremental/additional reasoning</b> sound and appropriate?	cf p 12. - At CEO endorsement, please develop the reasoning and the methods to calculate carbon gains. We take note of the proxy of 150-200 t CO <sub>2</sub> equ per ha. But the baseline is certainly not null. Please, refer to the explanations and examples provided in the last GEF publication on LULUCF ( <a href="http://www.thegef.org/gef/pubs/land-use-land-use-change-and-forestry-lulucf-activities">http://www.thegef.org/gef/pubs/land-use-land-use-change-and-forestry-lulucf-activities</a> ). - Please explain what the measures are to maintain these benefits on a 30 year period once the project will be closed.	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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?		OK at PIF level. At CEO endorsement, please develop the socio-economic benefits and the gender issues. And explain how these issues will be included in the project.
	10. Is <b>public participation</b> , including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	At CEO endorsement, provide a plan to involve the civil society and local communities.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential <b>major risks</b> , including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Yes. At CEO endorsement, please provide a comprehensive risk assessment and the mitigation measures.	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country	Addressed.	

	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>- Assess the project's sustainability strategy and the likelihood project outcomes will be sustained or not based on the evidence in the literature.</li> <li>- Are there measures to secure the institutional and financial stability of the project?</li> <li>- Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention strategy and critique the plan for scaling up.</li> </ul>	<p>Yes. this project will provide a model for South Africa to develop the green economy.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the <b>project structure</b> sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. Has the <b>cost-effectiveness</b> been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the <b>GEF funding and co-financing</b> per component appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>no objection.</p>	
	<p>17. At PIF: Is the amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? Any comment on the indicated amount and composition of <b>cofinancing</b>?</p>	<p>UNDP is bringing \$1,000,000 from its own resources. Please confirm this grant at CEO endorsement.</p>	

	financing been confirmed?		
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	The PMC are particularly low (4.71%).  April 3, 2013 The management costs have slightly increased, but stay low, around 5.2 percent.  Cleared.	
	19. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
<b>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	20. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	21. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	22. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
<b>Recommendation at PIF Stage</b>	<b>23. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	The PIF shows a high quality standard. Once reception of a revised package addressing the points above, the PIF will be recommended.  April 3, 2013 The PIF is recommended for clearance.	
	24. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please address the following points at CEO endorsement: - Develop the socio-economic benefits	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop a comprehensive risk assessment;</li> <li>- Confirm the participation and roles of CSO and local communities;</li> <li>- Provide the methodological information related to the carbon benefits;</li> <li>- Please explain what the measures are to maintain these benefits on a 30 year period once the project will be closed (sustainability).</li> <li>- Include a Monitoring Programme. Provide the indicators and the baseline values;</li> <li>- Confirm the cofinancing;</li> <li>- Confirm the core resources from UNDP;</li> </ul>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	25. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested and approved? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?	The PPG amount is compatible with the project size.	
	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 19, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 03, 2013	
	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.**