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

GEF ID:	**9365**		
Country/Region:	**Global**		
Project Title:	**Land Degradation Neutrality Target Setting Project**		
GEF Agency:	**IUCN**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Land Degradation**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	**$2,752,294**
Co-financing:	**$2,900,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$5,652,294**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	**April 01, 2016**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Ulrich Apel**	Agency Contact Person:	**Jonathan Davies**

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]	01/14/2016 UA: Yes. This Enabling Activity is fully aligned with LD programming directions for GEF-6.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	01/14/2016 UA: Yes. The project is fully aligned with UNCCD COP12 guidance to all parties.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,		

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

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?		
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	01/14/2016 UA: The following comments refer to all tables in the EA project template. Part I: Please insert the abbreviations "TSP" in brackets after the title. Table A: Please insert "Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN)" in the project objective Table B: Please select the appropriate "sources of Co-financing" from the drop down menu. Table C: Please leave "Programming of funds" blank. Part II: - Paragraph 6 should start by indicating the technical support by UNCCD and the financial support by South Korea (which follows later in paragraph 8). - Paragraph 10: The mention of 30 countries to be funded by GEF should logically move to paragraph 11. Please refer to "GEF eligible countries". In this context, the	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		proposal does not clarify why the total number of countries is 60 and why the number of GEF supported countries is 30. What is the justification? Are there any selection criteria? What is the strategy for scaling up support to all countries and in which timeframe? - Paragraph 41 and 42: The M&E plan would need to be budgeted. Please include at least a total figure budgeted for M&E and clarify where the budget will come from. Part III: - please enter "n/a for global project" in OFP table - please enter "n/a for global project in the Convention Participation Table under UNCCD. - please enter the correct date in MM/DD/YYYY format in C. GEF Agencies Certification. 02/03/16 UA: All comments addressed except: - Table B: Sources of Co-financing: Please check if Governments are better categorized as "Government" instead of "donor agency". - MM/DD/YYYY format in C. GEF	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Agencies Certification. (It's not yet August) - Please also enter GEF project ID, Agency ID in Part I. - Please enter (n/a) for "expected Report Submission to Convention" in Part I. 02/09/16 UA: All comments addressed. Cleared	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	01/14/2016 UA: Yes. These aspects have been adequately considered at PIF stage. More details are expected at CEO endorsement stage.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	n/a	
	• The focal area allocation?	n/a	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Focal area set-aside?	01/14/2016 UA: Yes. LD set-aside funds are available as per GEF-6 LDFA Programming Directions.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	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?		
	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)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	01/14/2016 UA: Yes. The level of co-financing is fully appropriate.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* 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		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	01/14/2016 UA: No. Please address comments in this review and resubmit.	

[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
		02/08/2016 UA: No. Please correct typo's as indicated in box 5 and re-submit. 02/09/2016 UA: Yes. Program Manager recommends project for CEO clearance.	
Review Date	Review	January 14, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 08, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 09, 2016	