



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9928		
Country/Region:	Egypt		
Project Title:	Sustainable Management of Kharga Oasis Agro-Ecosystems in the Egyptian Western Desert		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1 Program 1; BD-3 Program 7;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$1,045,890
Co-financing:	\$9,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$10,045,890
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Maude Veyret-Picot

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	The generation of Global Environment Benefits from oasis ecosystem is often difficult, because of the small size of these ecosystems. However, in this specific case, and because the area is included in a Vasilov center, with the existence of Wild Crop Relatives the use of the LD1 Program 1 and the BD3 Program 7 are probably good entry points, but please, see the cell 3, to confirm the eligibility.	

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Design		November 2, 2017 Addressed.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	The project is relevant with several national strategies and plans related to the environment, including the UNCCD NAP (2005), the NBSAP (2015), the National Environmental Action Plan of Egypt 2002-2017, Egypt's Sustainable Development Strategy, and Egypt's Vision 2030. Addressed.	
	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Be careful: the GEF provides resources for sustainable land management to help smallholder farmers to fight land degradation. But if the status of degradation is too advanced (barren lands), and if the lands are abandoned, the economic cost of restoring such lands, reinstalling people, and developing social and economic mechanisms and services is often prohibitive and beyond the GEF mandate. Please, revise the document: either the lands you are targeting are abandoned and then not eligible, and we will not encourage you to develop this PIF; or there is a minimum of activities and remaining structures, an you can	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		move forward. November 2, 2017 Addressed.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Yes	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes. - However, during PPG, develop the different categories of stakeholders you include under the expression "local communities", and develop a strategy for a good local ownership. We appreciate to find mention of cooperatives, water use associations, community based organisations, private sector, local representatives... Please, confirm at CEO approval. - We would recommend the GEF Agency to take note of evaluations and lessons from past GEF projects to overcome some recurrent barriers and problems related to project implementation in Egypt.	
Availability of Resources	7. 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? 	yes. The project is financed by \$500,000 from BD and \$700,000 from LD	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		(marginal adjustment from CCM to LD). The resources are available in the remaining STAR allocations.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 	NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>The PIF is not recommended for clearance. Please address the comments raised in the cell 3.</p> <p>November 2, 2017 The PIF is recommended for clearance. Please address the following points at CEO approval.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>If the main comment in the cell 3 is addressed, then address the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confirm the agrobiodiversity of international importance (Wild Crop Relatives) at PPG. - Include a comprehensive risk analysis in the PPG. - Include a gender strategy (equitability) in the project. - Identify and characterize the "local 	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>communities".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please take note of the comments in the cell 6 and correct the table D (GEF Project Financing, a, we should read \$589,269, and not \$589,981). - Analyze past project evaluations, best practices and recommendations. 	
Review Date	Review	September 29, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	November 02, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council • Convention Secretariat 		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		