



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

GEF ID:	5347		
Country/Region:	Yemen		
Project Title:	Support to the Integrated Program for the Conservation and Sustainable Development of the Socotra Archipelago		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-1; BD-2; LD-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$4,854,566
Co-financing:	\$17,562,520	Total Project Cost:	\$22,567,086
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Edoardo Zandri

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	4-11-13 Yes. Yemen is eligible for funding. Cleared	
Resource Availability	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	4-11-13 Yes. There is LoE from the OFP for \$5.48M including Agency Fees and PPG. The project is for \$5.47M. Cleared	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
Resource Availability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	4-11-13 The STAR allocation is sufficient to cover this project. Cleared	

		The BD and LD under STAR allocation are sufficient to cover this project. Cleared	
	<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"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	NA	
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>4-11-13 Yes. BD-1 & 2, LD 3, and Aichi Targets 1,2,4,5,6,9,11,12,13,14,18,19 and 20. Cleared</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>4-11-13 As stated in the PIF, "the National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP, 1995), as well as the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP, 2004), both clearly underscore the biodiversity conservation priorities addressed in this project", and for LD, "the project is consistent with the priorities identified in NAPCD (2000), which are also reflected in Yemen's latest PRSP (2003-2005)". Cleared</p>	
	<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</p>	<p>4-11-13 The baseline projects (i.e. the projects and investments that will take place in BD and LD, whether or not this GEF project is approved, are not clearly</p>	

<p>Project Design</p>		<p>the PIF cites investments at the national level for \$16,500,000 for Socotra WHS (p.7) and on the other, co-financing in Table C is only \$5,227,520 when adding all government contributions. It is not clear what of the proposed GEF funded activities have a baseline and which ones do not. A better geographic and thematic focus in the BD and LD investments will allow a better estimation of the baseline projects and investments.</p> <p>4-15-13 Issues roperly addressed in revised PIF. See also Responses to GEF comments. Cleared</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>4-11-13</p> <p>The project has a very lose structure. The components appeared to be stacking one on top of each other, rather than being complementary. There is no common geographic setting for the project (except the entire Socotra WHS) and that makes very difficult to understand why these components were selected. The project will greatly benefit from a narrower geographic focus, and that will facilitate visualizing tangible and measurable Global Environmental Benefits on the ground.</p> <p>Component 1.</p> <p>1. It is not clear how the management of the PA Network in Socotra WHS will improve with the proposed activities and outputs. Please clarify what do the following terms actually mean in reality: "Updated design of the WHS PA network" and "A unified management</p>	

established". Please be more specific about "improved professional capacity of national GoY entities". These outputs are fuzzy.

2. Did the idea of a Trust Fund emerged from a preliminary scoping study or is this idea new altogether. Please elaborate. Would GEF funds be used to capitalize the fund?

3. Funding for all activities under this component may not be sufficient, unless a reduction in the geographic scope of the project is achieved.

4. Is it really possible to improve the management effectiveness of a PA System when there are no investments in the PA themselves? Please provide examples in the region where this has been achieved. What improvements in the METTs scores are expected?

Component 2.

1. It is not easy to visualize how a "community-based management framework to control IAS" can render tangible and measurable results on the ground with the proposed activities and budget allocation (\$1.3M). How can the implementation of the proposed activities (i. identification of IAS, ii. pathways for IAS are identified and strategies for prevention and control developed and implemented, iii. development of policy and institutional environment, iv. awareness raising ad prevention and control measured mainstreamed) take

		<p>none for INV?</p> <p>Component 3.</p> <p>The outcome and outputs of this component read as if nothing had been done in Socotra on SLM. This component is too wide to render tangible and measurable results on the ground within time and budget. This component needs to be framed within the context of existing initiatives, needs and priorities.</p> <p>Component 4. A very fussy component with the potential of using financial resources and rendering no GEBs. Please provide specifics. Otherwise, this component has a real change of overpromising and under delivering.</p> <p>In all. A better geographic focus is needed to improve the opportunities of delivering tangible Global Environmental Benefits.</p> <p>4-15-13 Issues properly addressed in revised PIF. See also Responses to GEF comments. Cleared</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>4-11-13</p> <p>(a) As currently presented, the GEBs of that this project aims at delivering will encompass the entire biota and renewable natural resources of the Socotra WHS, including those within the 345,350 ha of terrestrial PAs and 1,772,000 ha of marine PAs. That will be very difficult (if not impossible) to achieve within time and budget.</p> <p>(b) The incremental reasoning is very difficult to see, because the baseline</p>	

		<p>4-15-13 Issues roperly addressed in revised PIF. See also Responses to GEF comments. Cleared</p>	
	<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?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>4-11-13 CSOs mentioned as stakeholders. The number of biodiversity conservation elements in which they are going to participate, covers pretty much everything, making difficult to believe that this is going to happen [i.e. biodiversity and ecosystem monitoring and field research (marine and terrestrial), training and capacity building, development of incentive-based mechanisms, conservation policies and legal instruments, community involvement, outreach and awareness programs; assessment and evaluation of the ecosystem services provided by the target protected areas; climate change modeling, land degradation/ soil erosion mapping, etc.]. Not clear how all these activities will be sorted out during project preparation and how the implementation of all these activities will take place through in-kind support as well as grants. If CSOs have a concrete role to play in this project, please make it explicit.</p> <p>4-15-13 Issues roperly addressed in revised PIF.</p>	

		Cleared	
	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>4-11-13 The risks and management measures are well described. Nevertheless, they are so broad in scope that it is difficult to see how a \$4.8 M project can resolve all of them. If the project had a narrower thematic and/or geographic scope, it would be easier to visualize more concrete risks and how this project could potentially contribute to overcome them.</p> <p>4-15-13 Issues roperly addressed in revised PIF. See also Responses to GEF comments. Cleared</p>	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>4-14-13 There is a comprehensive list of ongoing initiatives that this project will need to coordinate with. Given the scope of the GEF project coordination with all these initiatives will be a daunting task. As stated before, a narrower focus would make coordination easier and doable, especially considering the relatively small size of the Project Management Cost.</p> <p>4-15-13 Issues roperly addressed in revised PIF. See also Responses to GEF comments. Cleared</p>	
	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. 	<p>4-14-17 Innovation: Considering the current status of the Socotra WHS and the basic nature of the proposed interventions, innovation may an important consideration. Sustainability: It is difficult to visualize</p>	

	<p>for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>could have institutional or financial sustainability. The proposed "Socotra WHS Trust Fund" could be a much needed first step. Scaling up: Most likely to the other 220 islands along Yemen's 4,000 km coastline.</p> <p>4-15-13 Issues properly addressed in revised PIF. See also Responses to GEF comments. Cleared</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>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?</p>		
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>4-11-13 1. Some of the co-financiers (i.e. Bilateral Aid Agencies and "Others") include multitude of individual co-financiers. How was the indicative co-financing of these clusters determined? Where all these individual co-financiers consulted on their names appearing in this PIF and then becoming accountable for bringing the co-financing if the projects gets approved? Please include only those that have been approached in one way or another. Co-financing of \$17M is a high-order commitment and getting all the Letters of Co-financing from the 30+ individual co-financiers a nearly impossible task.</p>	

		Issues roperly addressed in revised PIF. See also Responses to GEF comments. Cleared	
	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?	4-14-13 It is difficult to judge if the co-financing (\$17.5M) will be sufficient to undertake a project with such a wider geographic and thematic scope. Cleared	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	4-14-13 It is 4.5%. Cleared	
	19. <u>At PIE</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?	4-11-13 Yes. Cleared	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	4-11-13 No. Cleared	
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?		

	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>4-13-14 No. Please address outstanding issues. RECOMMENDATION. PLEASE SERIOUSLY CONSIDER REDUCING THE GEOGRAPHIC AND THEMATIC SCOPE OF THE PROJECT. A NARROWER FOCUS SHOULD ALLOW STRUCTURING THE PROJECT WITH COMPLEMENTARY COMPONENTS THAT TOGETHER, HAVE A BETTER CHANCE OF DELIVERING TANGIBLE AND MEASURABLE RESULTS ON THE GROUND.</p> <p>4-14-13 The outstanding issues of this project have been properly address. This Pif is technically cleared</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	April 14, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 15, 2013	
	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.**