



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

GEF ID:	4616		
Country/Region:	El Salvador		
Project Title:	Climate Change Adaptation to Reduce Land Degradation in Fragile Micro-Watersheds Located in the Municipalities of Texistepeque and Candelaria de la Frontera		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Multi Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-2; Project Mana; LD-1; LD-1; LD-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,521,370
Co-financing:	\$5,800,000	Total Project Cost:	\$7,321,370
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	Thomas Lindeman,

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?	<p>For Climate Change Adaptation under the LDCF/SCCF (CCA): Yes, El Salvador is a developing country, Party to the UNFCCC, and therefore it is eligible for funding under the SCCF.</p> <p>12 September 2011 (M Bakarr for LDFA)</p> <p>El Salvador is eligible under the UNCCD.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	

*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	2.Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>CCA: Yes, the OFP has signed a letter of endorsement, for the amount of \$1,138,500 from SCCF (in addition to the \$665,500 from the GEF TF) inclusive of Agency Fees and PPG request. The letter is signed 22 August 2011.</p> <p>12 September 2011 (M Bakarr for LDFA)</p> <p>The Endorsement Letter indicates a total of \$665,500 which is more than available under the country's allocation of \$590,000 for LD in the STAR. Please revise the amount accordingly.</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	<p>CCA: Yes, FAO has a comparative advantage on natural resources conservation, rural development, and food and nutritional security, and has cooperated with the GoELS since 1978. Since 1994, FAO has been implementing projects for micro-watershed management. Through these experiences, the agency has developed expertise and working models that are replicable.</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>CCA: Yes, the project is consistent with Component 5 of the UNDAF 2012 - 2017 for El Salvador, "Environmental Sustainability and DRR". FAO is currently implementing the Family</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Agriculture Plan (FAP), and in collaboration with the Government, has implemented the National Food Security Plan since 2004, as well as other related regional and national projects. The Agency has sufficient staff capacity in El Salvador and has established substantial collaboration with national NGO's, Ministries, UN agencies, and union agencies.</p>	
Resource Availability	<p>6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	<p>12 September 2011 (M Bakarr for LDFA)</p> <p>No, the total requested for LD exceeds what is available. Please adjust the total to \$590,000 (including all fees).</p> <p>26 September 2011</p> <p>The total LD request is now \$573,500 including Agency Fees.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	<p>12 September 2011 (M Bakarr for LDFA)</p> <p>see comments on STAR allocation.</p> <p>26 September 2011</p> <p>Addressed.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		

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 SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	CCA: Yes, the project grant is within the resources available for SCCF-A (Adaptation).	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	12 September 2011 (M Bakarr for LDFA) N/A	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	CCA: Yes, the project is aligned with the SCCF results framework, addressing Outcomes 1.2, 1.3, 2.3; and Outputs 1.2.1, 1.3.1, and 2.3.1. 12 September 2011 (M Bakarr for LDFA) Yes, project is well aligned with LDFA strategy as indicated. Cleared	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	CCA: Yes, the project is aligned with Objectives CCA-1 and CCA-2. Component 1 addresses CCA-2; Component 3 addresses CCA-1 and Component 4 addresses both Objectives. 12 September 2011 (M Bakarr for LDFA) Yes, the project addresses LDFA objectives 2 and 3. Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	CCA: Yes, the project is consistent with the first National Communications, the Third National Report to UNCCD, the National Action Program to Combat Desertification and Drought in El Salvador (PANSAL) and the FNC to the UNCCD.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	CCA: Yes, replicability criteria have been considered in the selection of the targeted areas. In fact, FAO is currently implementing a micro-watershed project in a neighboring Department (district) of El Salvador, from which it may extract valid expertise and models to be replicated in the GEF/SCCF project. Training and capacity building of local government committees, government agencies, and households, as well as the establishment of FFSs and local development strategic alliances will contribute to the sustainability of the project. Furthermore, the implementation of monitor and surveillance systems in each targeted micro watershed will contribute to disseminate risk information on a timely basis and build risk maps, which can be utilized (and updated through the replication of the methodology) after the life of the project.	
	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?	CCA: Not entirely. As it stands in the proposal, the baseline for adaptation action under SCCF is not strong enough. The project aims to complement the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>Five-Year Development Plan (FYDP) and strengthen the Family Agriculture Plan (FAP) as baseline program which follows integrated natural resources management focused on watersheds and territoriality. However, more information is needed on the size of the FAP and its expected achievements, and what are the existing projects/activities financed under this program that need adaptation measures(both FAP and FYPD started implementation on 2010). Moreover, further information is needed on the initiatives that the GoELS is developing to support adaptation to CC (interventions from the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Public Works, the Strategy for CC Adaptation for the Rural Population in the Central Coastal Area of El Salvador). Lastly, it is not clear how the FMWMP is linked to the FAP (i.e. is FMWMP financed under the FAP?).</p> <p>The baseline problem is supported by sound data.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please elaborate on the size and achievements of the GoELS initiatives on adaptation to CC. Also, please provide information on the expected achievements and the size of the FAP and the FYDP. Finally, please clarify which baseline project is contributing co-financing for the CC Adaptation components of the project, what are its vulnerabilities to CC, and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>how the project intends to address them.</p> <p>12 September 2011 (M Bakarr for LDFA)</p> <p>No specific baseline project is highlighted for combating LD. However, the context for LD related activities are clearly articulated. The FAP offers a timely opportunity for implementing the project provided that proposed government investments are channeled accordingly. The proposed project could have a catalytic effect in this regard.</p> <p>CCA: Needs clarification. See recommended actions above.</p> <p>Update 9/26/2011: CCA: The requested clarifications have been provided. This is acceptable.</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>CCA: Not clear. The proposal does not provide the specific areas of intervention of the baseline projects. It is therefore unclear how the proposed SCCF activities will make the baseline</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>project resilient. As such, it is difficult to justify the current development activities for which the SCCF will be funding the additional adaptation costs. The target areas of intervention of the baseline must correspond to the target areas of the SCCF activities, consistent with the principle of additional cost reasoning.</p> <p>Recommended Action: please specify the target areas of intervention of the baseline projects.</p> <p>12 September 2011 (M Bakarr for LDFA)</p> <p>Yes the incremental reasoning for LD is clear, especially in light of the potential for upscaling INRM technologies.</p> <p>CCA: Needs clarification, see recommended actions above.</p> <p>Update 9/26/2011: CCA: The needed clarifications have been provided. This is satisfactory.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>CCA: Yes, the project framework is sound. It aims to mainstream adaptation (CCA) and DRR into the Fragile Micro-Watershed Management Plans, while reducing LD and unsuitable land/water use, through INRM and the participation of small-scale rural producers, in specific targeted micro-watersheds. The</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>4 project Components include corresponding outcomes and outputs, expected to be achieved in already selected and specific targeted micro-watersheds. Ownership of the project, as well as awareness of vulnerability reduction measures, are ensured through the implementation of Component 4.</p> <p>12 September 2011 (M Bakarr for LDFA)</p> <p>Yes, the project framework is sound and the LD component adequately aligned with proposed investments under the SCCF.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>CCA: Yes, the project will adopt a micro watershed approach to reinforce resilience and generate adaptation capacities to CC, while ensuring sustainability in production systems and livelihoods.</p> <p>12 September 2011 (M Bakarr for LDFA)</p> <p>Yes, the LD increment is based on a sound assumption for achieving INRM through grassroots engagement and upscaling of appropriate practices by land users.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>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?</p>	<p>CCA: Not entirely. The proposal states that socio-economic benefits to rural vulnerable sectors will be the reduction of economic losses, improved access to drinking water, generating jobs and income and providing food security. Gender mainstreaming is also considered, as well as the project's sustainability through improved governance. However, more information would be needed on the number of target beneficiaries. Recommended action: please state the number of expected beneficiaries estimated.</p> <p>12 September 2011 (M Bakarr for LDFA)</p> <p>The beneficiaries need to be better described across the watershed, including their role in delivering GEBs from investing in SLM.</p> <p>Update 9/26/2011: CCA: The requested information on the number of target beneficiaries has been provided. This is satisfactory.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>CCA: Not clearly. From the list of civil society organizations included as stakeholders, it is unclear if indigenous people have been taken into consideration for the project's interventions.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Recommended Action: please clarify if the indigenous population of El Salvador is included as relevant stakeholders and actively participate in the project's intervention.</p> <p>12 September 2011 (M Bakarr for LDFA)</p> <p>Please address same comments for LD.</p> <p>Update 9/26/2011: CCA: The requested clarifications have been provided.</p> <p>Response also addresses LDFA concerns.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>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)</p>	<p>CCA: Yes, the project takes into account major risks, including climate change risks which are expected to be mitigated with project implementation. However, conflicts among political parties constitute a serious risk which may hinder project implementation, in El Salvador. Stronger mitigation measures for creating awareness at all levels should be considered. The proposal states that further risk analysis will be conducted and mitigation measures identified at full project preparation stage.</p> <p>Recommended Action: please provide</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>more details on how this risk will be mitigated, through a sound awareness campaign at all political levels, by CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>CCA: Yes, the project is consistent with other relevant initiatives in the country. It will also coordinate efforts with the ongoing micro-watershed project in the Department of Ahuachapan (which is west of Department of Santa Ana, in which the FAO project will take place), and implement lessons learnt from this initiative.</p> <p>12 September 2011 (M Bakarr for LDFA)</p> <p>Same comments for LDFA.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>CCA: No. As it stands the proposal does not include details on the implementation or execution arrangements. Recommended Action: please provide information on the execution/implementation arrangements.</p> <p>Update 9/26/2011: CCA: The requested clarifications have been provided. The project will be implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture, in coordination with other government agencies and other organizations, with the technical support</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		of FAO. This is satisfactory.	
	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?	CCA: Yes, the project management costs do not exceed 10% of the total grant requested from SCCF and GEF TF, equivalent to \$1,590,000.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	CCA: Not yet. Funding and co-financing for each CCA objective will be considered appropriate upon clarification on baseline activities (see Section 11). 12 September 2011 (MBakarr for LDFA) The \$2 million co-financing for the LD component is adequate and should not be reduced. Cleared CCA: needs clarification (see section 11) Update 9/26/2011: CCA: The funding and co-financing per objective is sound.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	CCA: The co-financing ratio is 1:3.6, which is adequate for this project.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	CCA: Yes, FAO is bringing a grant co-financing of \$5.7 M, through the Family Agriculture Plan implemented by FAO and funded by the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock.	
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?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	CCA: Not yet. Please address the issues raised in Sections 11, 13, 16, 17, 20, and 24 above. 12 September 2011 (M Bakarr for LDFA)	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Please address also issues related to LDFA resources under the STAR.</p> <p>Update 9/26/2011: All the pending issues concerning CCA have been resolved.</p> <p>All LDFA issues have been addressed.</p> <p>PIF can now be recommended.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 13, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 26, 2011	
	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

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	

Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	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.