



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:	\$15,042,521	Total Project Cost:	\$20,197,087
PIF Approval:	April 23, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	June 20, 2013
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 ¹	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	1-8-16 Cleared
	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	1-8-16 Cleared
Resource Availability	3. 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? 	4-11-13 The STAR allocation is sufficient to cover this project.	1-8-16 Cleared

*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	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 assumptions?	<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 presented in the PIF. On the one hand, 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>	1-8-16 Cleared
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>4-11-13 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>	1-8-16 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>"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 place when all GEF funds are for TA and 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 his 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>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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. See also Responses to GEF comments. Cleared</p>	
	<p>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>	<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>	<p>1-8-16 Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		1-8-16 Yes Cleared
	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?		1-8-16 Cleared
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	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. 4-15-13 Issues roperly addressed in revised PIF. See also Responses to GEF comments. Cleared	1-8-16 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	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.	1-8-16 Co-financing was reduced to \$15 M.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at PIF Stage	being recommended?	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. 4-14-13 The outstanding issues of this project have been properly address. This Pif is technically cleared	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		1-8-16 Yes. This FSP is recommened for CEO Endorsement. Cleared
	First review*	April 14, 2013	January 08, 2015
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.**