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

GEF ID:	**9266**		
Country/Region:	**Eritrea**		
Project Title:	**Restoring Degraded Forest Landscapes and Promoting Community-based, Sustainable and Integrated Natural Resource Management in the Rora Habab Plateau, Nakfa Sub-zoba, Northern Red Sea Region of Eritrea**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5519 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$160,000**	Project Grant:	**$8,260,607**
Co-financing:	**$23,500,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$31,920,607**
PIF Approval:	**September 28, 2016**	Council Approval/Expected:	**October 27, 2016**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jaime Cavelier**	Agency Contact Person:	**Phemo Kgomotso**

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]	8-30-15 (RS, AC, JC) This project has a geographic setting (Sub-Zoba Nafka of the Northern Sea Reagion) and drivers of deforestation and land degradation to tackle, including over-grazing, collection of fuel wood, and forest clearance for agriculture.	

[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
		While the PIF provides enough information to envision the current situation and proposed alternative scenario, the content of the project requires work. The GEF suggest focusing on a clearly delineated geographic target area (using a map) and concentrate the financial resources on fewer activities to address the main barriers to overcome the drivers of deforestation and land degradation. In short, make the PIF more focus geographically and thematically and concentrate time and financial resources on matter of importance to achieve the goals. BIODIVERSITY If BD 4 Program 9 is going to be used, the project should have a better alignment with the strategy, with emphasis on the relationship between the proposed interventions in the production landscape and the system of protected areas. As stated in the Biodiversity strategy, ".....sustaining biodiversity in the production landscape and seascape which will simultaneously secure the ecological integrity and sustainability	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		of protected area systems". Also, "This program will also support ecosystem restoration in specific locations where restoration is deemed essential to help ensure the persistence of globally important biodiversity in the production landscape and seascape; particularly in areas adjacent to protected areas". 1) Elaborate on the geography of the target area and the system of Protected Areas. This will be facilitated by including a line map of the target area in the Sub-Zoba Nafka. 2) Provide relevant Aichi targets & associated SMART indicators: (e.g.# of has in component 1). 3) Please elaborate on the development and implementation for the conservation and sustainable use of species, such as African Olive and Juniper species, through on farm and off-farm conservation. CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION RS. Yes. The proposed project would contribute towards Objective 2, Program 4. SUSTAINABLE FOREST	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		MANAGEMENT The target landscape appears to be dominated by agricultural and rangelands fields. Forested areas appear to be very small. Is there an estimate of the forested land in the target area behind the 9,000 ha of existing "forest enclosures"? If the total are is 324,000 ha (Outcome 1), current forest enclosures represent 2.7% of the land cover (twice as much as the national average of 1% p.9). If this is the case, the project should not maximize the request for SFM resources, as forested cover only a small fraction of the landscape. Please reconsider. 1-27-16 1. Thanks for narrowing down the geographic scope of the project. The maps provided are of the Northern Red Sea Region (top of p. 27) and of Eritrea (bottom of p.27). While useful, they do not allow visualizing the target area which is now defined as the Rora Habab Plateau. Please provide a map of the Plateau and confirm that its area is 100,000 ha. A vegetation map of the Plateau would be ideal for the GEF Secretariat to better under understand the extent of	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		the work to be done and if the request for SFM funding is justifiable. Please also include a map of the Northern Region identifying the location of the Plateau. 2. In the map requested, please identify the intervention sites of GEF funded projects PMIS 4540 and 4816. This is important for the GEF Secretariat to understand the spatial relationship of the interventions on SLM of the Adaptation Fund and the work on Protected Areas. As this new GEF project is focusing on the restoration of degraded forest landscapes and integrated NRM, the geographic and thematic complementarity of the investments is critical as stated in the Biodiversity Strategy: "This program will also support ecosystem restoration in specific locations where restoration is deemed essential to help ensure the persistence of globally important biodiversity in the production landscape and seascape; particularly in areas adjacent to protected areas". 3. The Aichi Targets were not included in the revised PIF. 4. There is reference to the study of the Nubian Ibex. Does the project	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		have the technical and financial capacity to do an initial census for the baseline and then do the surveys for mid-term and final evaluation reports? Has someone in the national or international scientific community done a study of the population of the species that could be used as the starting point? Can this person use this project to follow-up on his/her work? That would be the most cost-efficient way of taking care of this proposed activity. While very important and emblematic, committing to the monitoring of this species may become a liability to the project when the time comes to get the job done. One thing is to monitor trees, quite another to monitor a mammal that occurs at low densities and lives in a difficult to access habitat. 3-16-03 Addressed in the revised PIF. See also responses. Cleared	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	8-30-15 (RS, AC, JC). Not clear for CCM. The proposed emphasis on LULUCF is consistent with the inventory carried out as part of Eritrea's Second National Communication (SNC) to the UNFCCC; but the SNC does not	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		provide much detail on the associated mitigation options. It is not clear to what extent the proposed mitigation measures are consistent with national strategies, policies and plans for land use and forestry. RECOMMENDED ACTION: In addition to the INC and SNC, please clarify how the proposed mitigation options align with relevant national strategies, policies and plans for land use and forestry. 1/20/2016. The proposed mitigation measures are consistent with Eritrea's intended nationally determined contribution (INDC) as well as the Ministry of Agriculture's Five Year Strategic Development Plan (2014-18), the Great Green Wall Initiative, and sub-national development plans. Cleared	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	8-3-15 (RS, AC, JC) DRIVERS The PIF identifies a number of drivers behind Eritrea's high rates of land	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		degradation -- including soil erosion, deforestation and forest degradation -- such as excessive land-use intensity; the unsustainable extraction of fuelwood and timber; land conversion for agriculture; overgrazing; and inadequate institutions. It is not entirely clear, however, to what extent these drivers are present in the targeted areas, and what their relative importance is vis-à-vis baseline rates of land degradation. Moreover, it is not clear how these drivers may evolve under the baseline scenario, given e.g. underlying population dynamics and changing consumption and production patterns. Please specify the principal drivers of land degradation, including deforestation, in the targeted areas, as well as the underlying population, consumption and production trends that are of relevance for the proposed project; and, upon addressing the recommendations in Section 4, describe further the proposed sustainability strategy and pathways to scaling up the expected outcomes SUSTAINABILITY For CCM.With respect to sustaining the expected global environmental	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		benefits over time, the PIF introduces the basic elements of a sustainability strategy, including sustainable agricultural intensification, alternative income-generating activities and institutional capacity development; but these do not seem commensurate with the ambitious target of implementing and sustaining INRM over the entire project area of 324,000ha, particularly given that the project does not build on clearly identified baseline investments. RISKS In the context of Eritrea, integrated NRM is challenging. Please indicate risks and how they will be addressed in the risk section. As highlighted in para. 8, Eritrea has a long history of implementing soil & water structures @ community level and the baseline programs are provided. Please include lessons learned from the following GEF projects: LD Sustainable Land Management Pilot;BD Integrated Semenawi and Debubawi Bahri-Buri-Irrori- Hawakil Protected Area System for Conservation of Biodiversity and Mitigation of Land Degradation; as well as the relevant ones from other organizations.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		1-27-16 1. Please point to sections in the revised PIF where the pathways to scaling-up the expected outcomes were further described. If not included, please elaborate. 2. The drivers of environmental degradation, and the sustainability strategy are adequately clarified in the re- submission. By CEO Endorsement, however, further details would be needed as to the baseline scenario in the targeted area, and how the baseline investments (which seem to be national in scope) would be used as the bases on which to build the outcomes proposed in the alternative scenario (this project). 3. Land tenure is presented as one of the barriers for land conservation. While the 1994 Land Proclamation "has not fully begun", please explain how the project will address this barrier to ensure sustainable impact of the on-the-ground interventions. 3-16-03 Addressed in the revised PIF. See also responses. Cleared	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	8-30-15 (RS, AC, JC) GENERAL COMMENTS Incremental reasoning is very weak. First, the project does not have a true "baseline". Instead, there is a description of the history of investments and programs for Eritrea in general rather than for the target area in particular. The Baseline project should reflect the proposed activities and investments in the target area whether or not there is a GEF project. Without a true baseline, it is not possible to build the incremental reasoning, that is, the description on how GEF investments will build on the baseline projects to deliver GEBs. The PIF does not adequately describe how the indicative sources, types and amounts of co-financing relate to the baseline scenario described. Based on pp. 10-11 it seems that two of the indicative sources of co-financing are national programs and it is not clear how these would impact the targeted areas under the baseline scenario; The estimated in-kind co-financing provided by local communities seems very high given a GNI per capita of $530 (World Bank 2014). The UNDP co-financing is not reflected in the	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		description of baseline initiatives. Clearly state the "baseline" with the associated co-financing. Ensure that all indicative sources, amounts and types of co-financing are reflected in the description of the baseline scenario and relevant baseline initiatives; In absence of further baseline investments and associated co-financing, it is not clear whether the GEF-financed TA proposed under Component 1 could bring 324,000 ha under sustained INRM, and whether the proposed alternative income-generating activities and improvements to agricultural and livestock production under Component 2 would be sufficient to safeguard the proposed enclosure areas. SPECIFIC COMMENTS It is not clear whether Outcome 1.2 would aim to establish an MRV for the proposed forest restoration activities, as opposed to merely providing training. Overall, 40 per cent of the proposed project financing, excluding project management, would support TA,	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		which is a very high ratio for a grant of this size. Both components 1 and 3 could potentially be streamlined to make more funding available for tangible investments (i.e. adjusting the ratio of TA to INV). Clarify how outcomes 1.1 and 2.1 would be achieved and sustained over time in absence of further baseline investments and co-financing, and provide further information regarding the extent of the proposed investments in alternative income-generating activities as well as improved agricultural and livestock production; Section A.5 of the PIF could describe how the proposed project would be coordinated with the LDCF-financed project 'Mainstreaming climate risk considerations in food security and IWRM in Tsilima Plain' (GEF ID: 6923). 1-27-16 1. The baseline initiatives and associated sources and amounts of co-financing have been adequately clarified for this stage of project development. For CEO Endorsement, these should be further specified for	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		the Rora Habab Plateau, and all sources, amounts and types of co-financing should be confirmed. A map of investments by the baseline projects would be desirable. No further action on this point at this time. 2. As recommended, the re-submission also clarifies Outcome 1.2; sets a scaled down target of 100,000 ha under integrated landscape management; and adjusts the ratio of TA to tangible investments. No further action on this point at this time. 3. With respect to the project 'Mainstreaming climate risk considerations in food security and IWRM in Tsilima Plain' (GEF ID: 6923), it is mentioned in the Agency's response to GEFSEC comments, but not in Section A.5 of the revised PIF. Please address this matter. 3-16-03 Addressed in the revised PIF. See also responses. Cleared	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the	8-30-15 (RS, AC, JC)	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	GEBs?	COMPONENT 1 Can the target for integrated landscape management of 324,000 ha. be achieved? This appears to be a difficult target to achieve with the proposed outcome and outputs, which all hit "soft" targets like "plans", "technical support", CSOs organizations strengthen"? This outcome call for serious Investment. Please clarify the extent and location of the "restoration" plans for the 10 administrative Kebasis. From the operational point of view, how does the project define "restoration"? Not clear how can this be delivered with only TA. Please elaborate on the targets for the two types of enclosures described in footnote 27, p. 10. They appear to be of practical use for local people as a source of ground for grazing, farming, tree cutting for fuelwood, but of little value from the point of view of biodiversity conservation, except perhaps those that are permanent (no access for multiple uses). What is the current are of both types and the targets? What percentage of the proposed 17,500 will be assigned to each category? Is this target	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		meaningful from the point of view of resolving the needs of local communities? What does it mean "Improved status of endangered African Wild Olive (Olea europaea sub-species Africana) and East African juniper (Juniperus procera) Please elaborate on the proposed activities related to African Olive and Juniper species. Is it about "planting and assisted natural regeneration" in community-managed forest enclosures? What does "off-farm" conservation strategies mean in real terms? The "Conservation Strategy" appears to be a stand alone activity without much chance of getting implemented. What resources and institutions will be in charge of the implementation of the "Conservation Strategy" (build on the results of Biodiversity Mapping and surveys)? Many of the proposed outputs under 1.2.1 are not eligible for GEF funding (i.e. research institutions, veterinary services). What does ""...transfer and adoption of ecosystem restoration and livelihoods techniques to be adopted	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		in component 2..."? Outcome 1.2 is too wide in scope. Please narrow it down by focusing on the key elements that are also GEF eligible COMPONENT 2 What is the approximate area for the target under outcome 2.1 for agricultural lands? Not clear how the project aims at "restoring" 17,500 ha. (plus other landscape restoration) over the next 5 years, when the Government itself has only been able to plant 7,230 ha (with 18 million seedlings) between 2010 and 2014 (4 years). The project is at risk of overpromising and under-delivering. Interventions on forests, with tangible and measurable Global Environmental Benefits are very limited. Please either reduce the claim for the SFM or justify the request. Outputs 2.1.1. and 2.1.2. are not eligible for GEF funding. Text of output 2.1.5 was cut-off from the table and not possible to read.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Although outcome 1.2.3 sounds good in theory, is it going to be "doable" and of use on the ground? Is the data gathering for land degradation, measurement of carbon in soils, and hydro-meteorological data of real need when the local communities are phasing immediate needs to feed their families? While this may be a requirements for GEF funding, who is really in charge of these activities on the ground? Why the focus on women? COMPONENT 3 The component, outcome and outputs are a "boilerplate". Could apply to any country and under any circumstances. Please elaborate a component that is country- and site-specific. Please address the recommendations in Section 4 above, revise Table B Accordingly and include indicative targets and indicators for CCM. Please elaborate on how the following activity will be done in practice "Climate risk information will be used to inform decision-making on land-use planning and climate-smart	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		agricultural practices". 1-27-16 1. Component 1. Outcome 1.2. The suggested "decision-support tools" appear to be good on paper, but not sure if they would be practical and cost-effective when they are diploid on the ground. For instance, is an "integrated system to monitor the impacts and benefits of landscape restoration on biodiversity and ecosystems" worth the time and funding needed? Same for the "biodiversity mapping", specially for the Nubian Ibex (see point under item 1). What is the least expensive and easier method for the MRV? 2. Component 2. The project is now mostly about restoration. In the revised PIF there is reference to specific forest restoration activities like community tree nurseries, tree planting and natural regeneration. The baseline for permanent forest enclosures is 12,490 ha (9,000 + 3,490) and the target is 17,000. Does this mean the project aims at actually restoring forest cover in 4,510 ha (the difference between the baseline and	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		target)? A stated in item No.1, it is very important that these efforts are made taking into account the geographic distribution of the protected Areas to be created and existing forest enclosures. 3. What are the alternative livelihoods and value-addition opportunities suggested under output 2.1.5? These should be identified upfront. Otherwise, it is very likely that they simply do not exist. Otherwise, someone would have taken advantage of them already. Please do not suggest identifying them at PPG stage. For CEO Endorsement, please include a map of the target area (Rora Habab Plateau) with the location of the areas that will subject to interventions (i.e. restoration). Please also include the location of other relevant areas, like PAs and Forest Enclosures, and investments of baseline projects and previous GEF projects. This would allow the GEF Secretariat to visualize the how the landscape would look like if all activities get implemented. 3-16-03 Addressed in the revised PIF. See also responses.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Cleared	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	yes	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	8-30-15 (RS, AC, JC) Yes for STAR in general and for focal areas specifically. Cleared	
	• The focal area allocation?	8-30-15 (RS, AC, JC) Yes for all focal areas. Cleared	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	8-30-15 (RS, AC, JC) Please address issues under items 1,2,3,4 and 5. Thanks. For CEO Endorsement, please include a map of the target area (Rora Habab Plateau) with the location of the areas that will subject to interventions (i.e.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		restoration). Please also include the location of other relevant areas, like PAs and Forest Enclosures, and investments of baseline projects and previous GEF projects. This would allow the GEF Secretariat to visualize the how the landscape would look like if all activities get implemented. 3-16-03 Addressed in the revised PIF. See also responses. Cleared	
Review Date	Review	September 30, 2015	January 13, 2016
	Additional Review (as necessary)	January 27, 2016	
	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?	5-31-18 Minor changes were introduced in the CEO Endorsement and they are	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		described on page 6, and Table on pages 9-12. Cleared	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	5-31-18 Yes. Cleared	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	5-31-18 Yes. Assuming the co-financing of the Government ($16M in-kind and $5 M cash) become effective during project execution. Cleared	
	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)	5-31-18 Yes. Risk and Mitigation measures are included on pages 20-23 of CEO Endorsement. Cleared	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	5-31-18 The LoC were submitted today. Cleared.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	5-31-18 The TTs were submitted today. Cleared	
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	5-31-18 Cleared	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that	5-31-18 Yes. Pages 33-35 of CEO	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Endorsement. Cleared	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	5-31-18 A new Component on KM was added to the project. Cleared	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	5-31-18 Yes. Cleared	
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council	5-31-18 Comments from Germany addressed at PIF stage. Cleared	
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	5-31-18 Yes. This project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.	
Review Date	Review	May 31, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

[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.