



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

GEF ID:	4829		
Country/Region:	Vanuatu (Global)		
Project Title:	Support to GEF Eligible Parties for Alignment of National Action Programs and Reporting Process under UNCCD		
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):	LD-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,830,000
Co-financing:	\$2,750,000	Total Project Cost:	\$5,580,000
PIF Approval:	April 09, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mohamed Bakarr	Agency Contact Person:	Adamou Bouhari

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>This project was initially designed to provide a support up to 70 potentially eligible countries to fulfill their obligations under the UNCCD: 1) alignment of the national Action plan with the 10-year strategy and 2) 4th national report.</p> <p>During the ECW in Bujumbura, the CEO agreed to clear the project with the 40 countries who sent their letters of endorsement. If more countries are showing up, a new FSP will be prepared (without additional resources for the Help Desk Component).</p> <p>Please, check the names of countries in the table 1: - St Georges &amp; Grenada is not a country</p>	

		<p>Please, include the right official name for "Saint Vincent and the Grenadines".</p> <p>April 5, 2012</p> <p>This has been addressed and all countries submitting letters are eligible.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>2.Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?</p>	<p>Letters for 40 countries are available in the package:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please note that two letters for Moldova are available: one from the GEF Focal Point and one from the UNCCD Focal Point.</li> <li>- Please, check the list of countries available from the page 13 to the page 16: 39 countries are mentioned. It seems that Irak is not included.</li> <li>- Correct the name of St Vincent &amp; Grenadines.</li> <li>- Please, note that the amount of \$150,000 is mentioned in the letter from Sao Tome (up to \$150,000). Please, clarify with the OFP that an amount of \$50,000 will be provided per country.</li> <li>- The letter from CAR is in French (please, provide a unformal translation in English).</li> <li>- Some countries refer the Umbrella project, other countries refer to the two main activities (alignment with the 10-year Strategy and the national report). The Philippines mention the formulation of integrated Financing Strategy (IFS) for the National Action Plan and the 5th national reporting cycle. Please, confirm that the nature of the work has been explained to all countries: This project aims to finance 1) the alignment of the</li> </ul>	

		<p>10-year Strategy and 2) the national report. Please, confirm.</p> <p>5 April 2012</p> <p>These have been addressed and endorsement letters from 52 countries are included in the re-submission, up from the initial 40.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	<p>The UNEP's comparative advantage is described and supported (Section C). UNEP has provided a significant support to Rio Conventions and especially UNCCD in this case. UNEP-WCMC is considered as a natural partner for UNEP to implement activities related to Millenium Ecosystem Assessment implementation. Moreover, WCMC has a particular interest on drylands, having recently led an UN Environment Management Group to prepare a specific strategy on drylands.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<p>The project is in line with the UNEP's programme of work 2012-2013 and the comparative advantage of UNEP-WCMC is explained.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>	
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

Availability			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	No STAR resources are planned for this project.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>This project is actually financed by the Focal Area Set aside following the Information Document GEF/C.39/Inf.10.</p> <p>Please reduce the amount for 40 countries (40 x \$50,000) + \$230,000 = \$2,230,000.</p> <p>A new FSP will be expected if other letters of endorsement can be provided. No more resources will be added to the Help Desk Component.</p> <p>Reduce the cofinancing for 40 countries.</p> <p>5 April 2012</p> <p>The focal area request is now \$3,113,000 including fees, which is available.</p> <p>Cleared</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>Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>This project is actually financed by the Focal Area Set aside following the Information Document GEF/C.39/Inf.10.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NBIE	Yes. The focal area strategy framework is well reflected in the table A: all	

		<p>objective and the LD4.1 outcome.</p> <p>However, in the table A, please, revise the numbering of outputs (4.1 and 4.2).</p> <p>5 April 2012</p> <p>This has been addressed.</p>	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>5 April 2012</p> <p>The project will specifically deliver on LD4 with respect to supporting countries for delivering on UNCCD obligations.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	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?	<p>Yes.</p>	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>There is an outcome 3.1 associated with the reinforcement of national capacities and systems to fuel the NAP process. UNEP-WCMC will provide a HelpDesk for support to countries on NAP alignment and UNCCD reporting.</p> <p>The sustainability should be ensured by mainstreaming the National Action Plan in future government development framework. This the expected outcome 1.1. Please, provide a brief summary of the modalities, guidelines, and/or procedures established by the UNCCD Secretariat for countries to successfully deliver aligned NAPs and reports</p>	

		<p>5 April 2012</p> <p>It is now clear that UNEP through the Help Desk will engage with Parties to ensure UNCCD guidelines and modalities are applied for both NAP alignment and reporting.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Project Design	<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>5 April 2012</p> <p>Yes. The relevant COP decisions and rationale for alignment of NAPs and improvement of reporting process has been articulated.</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>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>The GEF is a financial mechanism of the UNCCD, and as such, supports enabling activities related to the obligations of the Parties to the Convention in the context of wider capacity development for SLM. In GEF-5, all eligible parties have access to GEF resources to finance activities related to alignment of National Action Programs (NAPs) with the UNCCD 10-Year Strategy and reporting process, as per obligations to the UNCCD</p>	

		Cleared	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	5 April 2012  Yes. The framework includes two main components as required for the support to countries: NAP revision and alignment; and reporting and review.  Cleared	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	NA	
	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?	5 April 2012  Yes  Cleared	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	See section B5. There is a focus on national stakeholders (national governments) and their partners as the UNCCD Secretariat and the GM. However, linkages with the other sectors and information on the way to integrate the NAPs in the development framework will be useful. There is no information on gender issues and the way to associate CSOs. Please, clarify these points and briefly describe how the UNCCD modalities will facilitate them with GEF financing.  5 April 2012	

		submission. Cleared	
	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)	5 April 2012 Yes. All major risks have been taken into consideration. Cleared	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The project will build on past experiences of the UNCCD and UNEP. However, this project might also be coordinated with other capacity building initiatives linked to UNCCD in the affected regions. See the link below: <a href="http://www.cilss.bf/spip.php?article204">http://www.cilss.bf/spip.php?article204</a> 5 April 2012 This has now been addressed in the resubmission. Cleared	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	The project implementation arrangements are clear between UNEP, UNEP-WCMC, and the national counterparts. However, in the CEO endorsement, we will expect information on the detailed arrangements to execute the activities in the countries. We have to ensure that the project will contribute to reinforce capacities and that the approach is sustainable.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		



	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	No management costs per se but the CEO agreed on a component 3 to provide Help Desk Services and liaise with executing agencies. This component is financed up to \$230,000.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	See the table B, Project framework: 1) Please include the kind of grant type for the component 2; 2) The total cofinancing (\$3,800,000) does not match with the breakdown (\$3,650,000). Please, correct. 3) Reduce the cofinancing to the number of countries (40 countries).  5 April 2012  The total co-financing has been adjusted based on expectations of in-kind and cash contribution by the 52 countries.  Cleared	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The cofinancing is around 1:1. This is acceptable for enabling activities.  5 April 2012  The ratio is still approximately 1:1, which is acceptable.  Cleared	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UNEP provides \$100,000 in kind and WCMC provide \$50,000, notably through a number of on-going projects linked to indicators and global database.	

		in line with the Agency role. Addressed.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Not yet. Please correct the PIF and address points raised in the cells 1, 2, 7, 10, 17, 19, and 24.  6 April 2012  Yes, the PIF is now recommended for CEO clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	- See cell. 20 (detail the implementation arrangements at national level, develop the sustainability and capacity development aspects). - Explain what is done to facilitate the NAP inclusion into the national development framework.	
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?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		

	Additional review (as necessary)	April 06, 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**

<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Decision Points</b>	<b>Program Manager Comments</b>
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	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.