



## 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;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$100,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$4,237,900</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$40,521,790</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$44,959,690</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>April 23, 2013</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>June 20, 2013</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jean-Marc Sinnassamy</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Phero K. Kgomotso</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	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	Addressed.
	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).	Addressed.
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.  
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>- South Africa has a LD allocation of \$5,250,000.</p> <p>- \$500,000 has been programmed under the GEF SGP.</p> <p>- \$4,750,000 are then available (project grant + PPG + fees).</p> <p>- \$261,000 are missing.</p> <p>- 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.</p> <p>- 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.</p> <p>April 3, 2012 The amount has been reduced down to \$4,750,000. Cleared.</p>	Addressed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>- Please, check the table B, the total does not match with the breakdown (\$4,439,270 versus \$4,239,270).</p> <p>April 3, 2013</p>	Addressed.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.  
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Addressed.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	NA	NA
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><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>	The project is aligned with the LD3 objective.	Addressed.
	<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>	Addressed.	Addressed.
	<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</p>	Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>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 (project justification) is 9 page long and the information is too diluted. Please focus on the question.</p> <p>- 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.</p> <p>- 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.</p> <p>- At least for this component, there is a</p>	<p>All changes have been explained and justified. The result framework is coherent with reasonable outcomes and outputs. Addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- The output 2.8 is too complex. Please revise, simplify, and provide a most focused formulation reflecting the activities you want to execute.</li> </ul> <p>April 3, 2013 Excellent. Thanks for the deep revisions. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>cf p 12.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At CEO endorsement, please develop the reasoning and the methods to calculate carbon gains. We take note of the proxi 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>).</li> <li>- Please explain what the measures are to maintain these benefits on a 30 year period once the project will be closed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- p.19 of the CEO endorsement, please remove any mention of a zero net land degradation in the CEO endorsement, as well as in the project document. You will not find any mention of such concept in the GEF6 LDFA strategy, and no GEF6 project is expected to pilot such concept.</li> <li>- p.19, section A.5., we understand the presentation of the revised result framework with revised outcomes and outputs, however we lost somehow the notion of Global Environment Benefits and the way they will be measured.</li> </ul>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Please, clarify. If needed, refer to the GEF5 strategy and the GEB that are expected from the LD focal area strategy.</p> <p>June 22, 2015 Addressed.</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>May 22, 2015 Addressed.</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>At CEO endorsement, provide a plan to involve the civil society and local communities.</p>	<p>May 22, 2015 Addressed.</p>
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>Yes. At CEO endorsement, please provide a comprehensive risk assessment and the mitigation measures.</p>	<p>May 22, 2015 Addressed.</p>
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>Addressed.</p>	<p>May 22, 2015 Addressed.</p>
	<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> </ul>	<p>Yes. this project will provide a model for South Africa to develop the green economy.</p>	<p>- With the removal of the 30-year contracts and the lack of opportunities related to the carbon market, the demonstration about the financial sustainability is not clear. Please, explain.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>		June 22, 2015 Addressed.
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		All changes are explained and justified.  May 22, 2015 Addressed.
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		May 22, 2015 Addressed.
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	no objection.	May 22, 2015 Addressed.
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	UNDP is bringing \$1,000,000 from its own resources. Please confirm this grant at CEO endorsement.	The changes in cofinancing are explained.  However, in the table C, the cofinancing from the Department of Environment is mentioned as a grant, while in the letter they provided, they mentioned a "in-kind" cofinancing. This change should be reflected in the table C. This change considerably weakens the reasoning.  June 22, 2015 Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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.	OK
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	The PPG amount is compatible with the project size.	The table in the Annex C does not inform the GEF Secretariat about the activities that were financed under the PPG. Please, detail the budget items (titles of baseline studies, amount, Nb of consultation, etc.).  June 22, 2015 Addressed.
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		May 22, 2015 Addressed.
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		May 22, 2015 Addressed.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		Yes, the comments from the STAP have been responded.
	• Convention Secretariat?		NA
	• The Council?		Yes, the comments from USA and Germany have been responded. Thanks.



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Cleared.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
<b>Recommendation at PIF Stage</b>	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>The PIF shows a high quality standard. Once reception of a revised package addressing the points above, the PIF will be recommended.</p> <p>April 3, 2013 The PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>Please address the following points at CEO endorsement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop the socio-economic benefits and gender issues;</li> <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>	
<b>Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval</b>	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		<p>No, please address the comments above (see items 8, 13, 17, and 19).</p> <p>June 22, 2015 The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	First review*	March 19, 2013	May 22, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 03, 2013	June 22, 2015
	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.**