



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

GEF ID:	6956		
Country/Region:	Egypt		
Project Title:	Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Egypt		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5471 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$70,000	Project Grant:	\$2,913,241
Co-financing:	\$3,957,526	Total Project Cost:	\$6,940,767
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey	Agency Contact Person:	Nick Remple

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	Yes. Egypt is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared 08/15/2014	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. With letter dated August 6, 2014. There's a small discrepancy between the distribution of the amounts amongst FAs included in the endorsement letter and those requested in the PIF. It's okay. Cleared 08/15/2014 Yes. Letter endorses a total of \$3,190,000 which is higher than the PIF requested amount. Cleared 03/25/2015	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ 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 ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)								
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):										
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">the STAR allocation?	<p>Yes. The Project requests resources from Egypt's STAR as follows:</p> <p>\$883,600 from Biodiversity \$1,601,000 from Climate Change mitigation \$705,400 from Land Degradation</p> <p>Cleared 08/15/2014</p> <p>In the resubmission, the amounts have been revised:</p> <p>\$786,790 from Biodiversity \$1,427,176 from Climate Change mitigation \$629,275 from Land Degradation</p> <p>Cleared 08/21/2014</p> <p>Revised STAR inclusive of agency fees as follows:</p> <table><tr><td>Biodiversity</td><td>\$ 861,530</td></tr><tr><td>Climate Change</td><td>\$1,562,770</td></tr><tr><td>Land Degradation</td><td>\$ 689,049</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>\$3,113,350</td></tr></table> <p>Cleared 03/25/2015</p>	Biodiversity	\$ 861,530	Climate Change	\$1,562,770	Land Degradation	\$ 689,049	Total	\$3,113,350	
	Biodiversity	\$ 861,530									
	Climate Change	\$1,562,770									
	Land Degradation	\$ 689,049									
Total	\$3,113,350										
<ul style="list-style-type: none">the focal area allocation?	N/A										
<ul style="list-style-type: none">the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A										
<ul style="list-style-type: none">the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A										

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	N/A	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</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>	<p>Yes. The project is aligned with the GEF SGP strategic objectives as approved by Council for GEF-6 and also with the FA results framework.</p> <p>Cleared 08/15/2014</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>Yes. The project is aligned with Egypt's main strategies and plans and reports to CBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC.</p> <p>Cleared 08/15/2014</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. 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>To some extent. However, there's no description of the enabling environment in Egypt, meaning the policies and legislation which may enable the implementation of the project and serve as a basis for the incremental investment. The role of the government is somewhat underestimated in the baseline and description of the project's components. In spite of this being in project for civil society organizations, a better understanding of the role of policies and legislation as well as government's intervention is necessary.</p> <p>Additional information is requested.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		08/15/2014 Baseline has been revised. Cleared 08/21/2014	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	Not clear. Some outcomes are somewhat vague and confusing. There are too many "outcomes" looped into one and in the end it's not clear what the outcome really is. With this ambiguity, it will be difficult to assess whether at the end of the project the outcome will be achieved. Furthermore, assigning indicators to those outcomes will be difficult. For instance, regarding outcome 1.1: there are at least 3 outcomes described: the effective planning and management of key landscapes; the enhancement of socio-ecological resilience; the conservation of biodiversity, sustainable land management, etc. Same with outcomes 1.3 and 2.1 and 2.3. Please be more concrete and spell out the specific outcomes that are expected at the end of the project and for which possible indicators can be tracked and reported on. Additional information and clarification is requested. 08/15/2014 Outcomes have been revised. They're clearer now. Cleared 08/21/2014	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning	Once the baseline has been reviewed according to the comments above, please review the incremental reasoning and GEBs, if appropriate. Also, please	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	sound and appropriate?	<p>describe further the likelihood of the five landscape planning and management initiatives really taking off. Why have these particular ones selected? It's not clear whether there's been any previous work at that landscape level either by the government or other project initiatives.</p> <p>Please provide additional information 08/15/2014</p> <p>GEBs identified. Incremental reasoning sound and appropriate.</p> <p>Cleared 08/21/2014</p>	
	9. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>Yes. This project is targeted to NGOs and CBOs as main beneficiaries and their roles are clear.</p> <p>Cleared 08/15/2014</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>Yes. Cleared 08/15/2014</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes. Cleared 08/15/2014	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>Scaling up: Although the PIF mentions scaling-up as one of the project's main outcomes, and that the actual potential for upscaling will be explored during the PPG, this mention of up-scaling is still vague, in particular for component 1. What are we talking about here? Up-scaling may require government's intervention in the form of policies for instance, but then again, the role of government is still not clear in the PIF. There's mention of some sectoral initiatives in rural Egypt promoted by the government, but the connection between the SGP's landscape and seascape approach to those sectoral interventions within the objective of upscaling seems vague.</p> <p>Innovativeness: Please describe how this project is innovative. Sustainability: Please describe how the project will be sustainable in the long run after the GEF's intervention.</p> <p>Additional information is requested. 08/15/2014</p> <p>Revisions provided as follows:</p> <p>Innovativeness - This project proposes to carry out participatory, multistakeholder, landscape management in rural and urban areas aimed at enhancing social and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>ecological resilience through community-based, community-driven projects to conserve biodiversity, optimize ecosystem services, manage land “ particularly agro-ecosystems “ and water sustainably, and mitigate climate change. Using the knowledge and experience gained from global and national landscape level initiatives delivered by SGP “ through its COMPACT and COMDEKS initiatives and individual Country Programme approaches such as the BioCorredores para el Buen Vivir in Ecuador and others “ this project will pilot five distinct landscape planning and management processes in Egypt “ two urban and three rural “ and, building on experience and lessons learned from previous SGP operational phases in Egypt, assist community organizations to carry out and coordinate projects in pursuit of outcomes they have identified in landscape plans and strategies. This will build community ownership of individual initiatives as well as landscape management overall. Coordinated community projects in the landscape will generate ecological, economic and social synergies that will produce greater and potentially longer-lasting global environmental benefits, as well as increased social capital and local sustainable development benefits. The capacities of community organizations will be strengthened through a learning-by-doing approach in which the project itself is a vehicle for acquiring practical</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>knowledge and organizational skills in a longer term adaptive management process. The project will also take prior years' experience and identify and implement a number of potential upscaling opportunities during this project's lifetime.</p> <p>Sustainability - The sustainability of landscape management processes and community initiatives is predicated on the principle “ based on SGP experience - that global environmental benefits can be produced and maintained through community-based sustainable development projects. Previous phases of the SGP Egypt Country Programme have identified and promoted clear win-win opportunities with community initiatives and clusters of initiatives in areas such as rural energy (biogas, solar energy), sustainable transport, energy efficiency, sustainable use of biodiversity (medicinal plants, ecotourism) and water resource management (efficient irrigation). Sustainability of landscape planning and management processes will be enhanced through the formation of multistakeholder partnerships, involving local government, national agencies and institutions, NGOs, the private sector and others at the landscape level and the adoption of multistakeholder partnership agreements to pursue specific landscape level outcomes. NGO networks will be called upon for their support to community projects and landscape planning processes, and technical</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>assistance will be engaged through government, NGOs, universities, academic institutes and other institutions.</p> <p>Upscaling potential - An essential output of this project is the upscaling of successful initiatives that have been piloted successfully during previous phases of the SGP Egypt Country Programme. The premise of upscaling in this context is that community adopters of successful SGP-supported technologies, practices and systems from previous SGP phases have been slowly acquiring critical mass to reach a tipping point of adoption by rural and urban constituencies of adaptive practice and innovation.</p> <p>Multistakeholder partnerships in the five selected rural and urban (town) landscapes will analyze the prospective critical mass of community adopters required to reach the tipping point in each of the landscapes for specific technologies, practices or systems and design and implement a program of action to reach it. Resources will be made available through the SGP strategic grant modality to finance key elements of the upscaling initiative to reduce the risk to other donors and investors. The multistakeholder partnerships will identify potential upscaling opportunities, analyze and plan upscaling processes, engage established microcredit and revolving fund mechanisms to finance upscaling components, design and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		implement the upscaling programme, and evaluate its performance and impacts for lessons learned for adaptive management, policy discussion and potential extension of the model to other areas of the country. Identification of specific potential upscaling initiatives will take place during project preparation. Cleared 08/21/2014	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		
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?	Yes. Cleared 08/15/2014	
	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?	To some extent. There's cash and in-kind co-financing from international donors and local government. However, UNDP is not bringing any co-financing. Please review and justify. 08/15/2014 UNDP is providing significant cash co-financing.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared 08/21/2014	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. Cleared 08/15/2014	
	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?	Yes. PPG of \$76,074 (inclusive of agency fees) is requested and it's within the norm. Cleared 08/15/2014 PPG revised. Agency fee should be adjusted to 8%. Additional revision is requested 08/25/2014 PPG is cleared. It was agreed that for this type of FSPs, the policy will be applied. 09/24/2014	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council? Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Not yet. Please address the comments and questions above.</p> <p>08/15/2014</p> <p>Not yet. Please revise the agency fee down to 8%. According to official communication from GEF Secretariat to UNDP dated January 28, 2011, the 8% fee was set fro GEF SGP.</p> <p>08/21/2014</p> <p>PIF approval is being recommended. It was agreed that for this type of FSPs, the policy should apply.</p> <p>10/17/2014</p> <p>PIF is recommended for WP inclusions.</p> <p>03/25/2015</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please fill out Table F as appropriate in the CEO endorsement document.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	August 15, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 21, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 25, 2014	

* 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.

