



Increased Access to Water Supply for Resilience in Comoros (IAWASuR)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11522

Countries

Comoros

Project Name

Increased Access to Water Supply for Resilience in Comoros (IAWASuR)

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

3/20/2024

Review completed by PM

3/29/2024

Program Manager

Fareeha Iqbal

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments 3/25/24:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

Noted, thanks!

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments 3/25/24:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

Noted, thanks!

3 Indicative Project Overview

- 3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?
- b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments 4/29/24:

Cleared.

3/25/24:

Further information requested.

Above Figure 2 of the PIF, please summarize in a sentence or two what the risk score is based on. Low capacity and high vulnerability to which hazards?

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

A brief explanation was added above Figure 2 to specify the vulnerabilities, hazards, and low coping capacity aspects.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments 4/29/24:

Cleared for PIF stage.

(Please see CEO endorsement stage comment to be considered during project preparation.)

3/25/24:

Not yet.

The Agency responses in the Gender section of the PIF indicate that gender equality considerations have been integrated into the component details in Section B. However, this appears to be missing. As per GEF guidance, gender equality considerations should be integrated in the project description and components, going beyond disaggregation of data by sex. Please ensure that in developing policies, legal and regulatory texts, financial mechanisms, infrastructure plans, etc., that gender considerations are taken into account (e.g. in Outputs 1.1, 1.3 and 2.1, 3.1). Under M&E, please integrate the monitoring and reporting on gender-related results and the Gender Action Plan.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

Revisions were made and gender aspects were thus further included in output 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, outcome 2, and output 3.1. Specific activities related to improving gender equity outcomes will be identified during the PPG phase. Furthermore, the M&E plan and the GAP to be developed during the PPG phase will effectively consider gender equality.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments3/25/24:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

Noted.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments3/25/24:

Yes, a solid background is presented on the baseline problems, barriers, and adverse impacts associated with climate change projections for Comoros.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

Noted.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments4/29/24:

Cleared.

3/25/24:

Further information is requested.

i) Please discuss alternative approaches to achieve the same intended outcome and why the approach laid out in the PIF was selected;

- ii) Please discuss in more detail how the proposed LDCF project will coordinate with the activities being supported by the GCF project;
- iii) Agency responses in the PIF's section on Private Sector indicate that the private sector will be engaged in the project and that details have been provided in section B. However, no information has been provided on private sector engagement -- which entities, how they will be engaged, etc. Please include this information.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

- i) Thank you, we have added the following additional details to respond to these points: An alternative approach (sea water desalination) has now been discussed under the section "Gaps and Needs". There is also added text in the activity description under each output, where relevant (i.e., where other alternatives would exist).
- ii) Coordination with the GCF project is further described under each outcome. In addition, the portfolio approach being used and integrating this LDCF project and the GCF project is mentioned in the section "Alignment with GEF-8 programming strategies and country/regional priorities". The portfolio comprises an integrated results framework, which facilitates the intended synergetic effects of both projects and other prospective initiatives.
- iii) The role of private sector has now been explicated under relevant outcomes and outputs, such as Outcome 2 and Output 3.1. At this stage, in the core indicators sheet, a tentative number of 10 was proposed, in view of a certain adjustment done during the PPG phase, when further information is gathered.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

- a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?
- b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments 4/29/24:

Cleared.

3/25/24:

Adjustment is requested.

The ToC does not capture/include the impacts of climate change in the context of resilient water supply. Please include these. Also, are there any assumptions you would like to reflect in the ToR that would affect the likelihood of achieving the intended outcomes?

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

The Impacts of Climate change on water explained in section A were added in the ToC diagram. The assumptions are also reflected in the ToC diagram.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments 3/25/24:

Yes-- the PIF discusses the need for additional measures associated with adaptation.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

Noted, thanks!

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments 4/29/24:

Cleared for PIF stage.

Please provide further detail on the knowledge sharing plan and outputs by CEO endorsement stage, including the elements, stakeholders, products and sustainability of the KM plan.

3/25/24:

Not yet.

i) Information on institutional arrangements and coordination with related initiatives appears to be missing.

ii) The information provided on knowledge management at the end of section B should include more detail on knowledge sharing and learning.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

- i) We have added further details on the proposed institutional arrangements at the end of Section B and added details on the coordination with other initiatives under the section on alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country / regional priorities.
- ii) Additional information and details on knowledge sharing, learning and management have been added to the end of section B.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments 4/29/24:

Cleared.

3/25/24:

Further information and/or adjustment is requested.

- i) As Comoros is included in the World Bank's FY24 List of Fragile Situations (for institutional and social fragility) please mark the relevant Meta Information indicator as "True".
- ii) The Meta-Information states that the project will not provide direct adaptation benefits to the private sector. The Private Sector section in the PIF specifies that there will be private sector engagement in the project, but no further information is provided. Please adjust and provide further information in the PIF.
- iii) The indicative values provided for Core Indicator 3 (adaptation mainstreamed in 1 policy) and Core Indicator 4 seem (306 people trained) seem quite low for a \$10 million project. The agency is requested to kindly consider revising.
- iv) Please briefly discuss how the value for Core Indicator 1 (direct beneficiaries) was determined.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

- i) This has now been edited in the core indicators sheet's meta information and reflected in GEF portal.
- ii) Information on private sector engagement is inserted into the section B, specifically under outcome 2 and output 3.1. Meta information was thus updated as true for the private sector.
- iii) The number of people trained was increased to 415, however, please note that these trainings will occur at institutional level. On core indicator 3, many of the policy changes have already been steered by the GCF project. With regards to the budget, it is worth noting that the majority portion of the USD 10 million funding will be used for infrastructure work and watershed restoration.
- iv) The number of beneficiaries is equal to the inhabitants of the project sites where water will be made available. It is based on latest census by village.

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments^{n/a}

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments^{4/29/24}:

Cleared.

^{3/25/24}:

Adjustment is requested.

A summary of key climate, institutional, execution and other operational risks has been presented in the PIF. However, there appear to be a number of diverse medium/moderate social and environmental risks associated with this project. The SES goes through these and briefly identifies some mitigation measures.

(i) For the identified risk of "significant increase in extraction and use of groundwater and surface water", the SES refers to a technical feasibility studies conducted for a GCF project that showed no environmental imbalance will be created. Will the LDCF project, which will be supporting development of water pipelines, reservoirs, etc., increase the demand on groundwater and surface water resources, over and above that of the GCF project? If so, please conduct a similar feasibility study for the proposed LDCF project.

(ii) The SES form mentions that "liquid chlorine is currently used to treat groundwater in Grande Comore", which is associated with the "risks to the health and safety of communities due to the transport, storage and use and/or disposal of hazardous materials on water purification operations and sanitation". Given this risk to community health, and despite the measures the project will take to mitigate this risk, we would like to see chlorine transport, storage and use removed as an LDCF-funded activity in this project.

(iii) The SES checklist mentions a risk (flagged "Yes") of "damage or loss due to failure of structural elements of the project". Can you please discuss this risk in further detail in the SES, and also discuss mitigation measures for this risk?

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

- (i) Additional feasibility studies will be conducted to complement the existing information on the risk, during the PPG phase.
- (ii) This is noted. Chlorine transport, storage and use is conducted by the SONEDE as part of its regular treatment, operation and maintenance of water and will not be financed by the LDCF.
- (iii) The discussion of that risk and mitigation measures in the SESP are included under Risk 8 (page 5 of the SESP). Specifically, it is noted that "The contractors will be required to produce an OHS plan up to UNDP's and international law standards. Before undertaking the work, the execution plan for each work must be validated by the technical team of the project (civil engineers and hydraulic engineer) and will be subject to monitoring and surveillance throughout the completion of the work?"

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments 3/25/24:

Yes, the project addresses a key basic need for the country, i.e., the availability of sufficient water for residential and other uses. It is aligned with Comoros' water sector policies and development vision.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

Noted.

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

- 6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments 3/25/24:

Yes, it is aligned with the GEF's Climate Change Adaptation Strategy for the LDCF/SCCF for the period 2022-2026, which identifies Water as one of four priority themes.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

Noted.

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments 3/25/24:

Yes. It is aligned with the Comoros NAPA, the 'Plan Comores ?mergent (PCE) 2030', and the African Union Agenda 2063.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

Noted; thank you.

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

4/29/24:

Cleared.

3/25/24:

Not yet.

i) A "Yes" response is provided for Gender, but the relevant information does not seem to have been provided in section B.

ii) A "Yes" response has been provided for Private Sector, but section B does not seem to contain the relevant information.

iii) A "Yes" response has been provided for Knowledge Management. We would like to request further detail in section B on the envisaged knowledge sharing, the form(s) it will take, etc.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

- i) Additional information related to gender inclusion in project activities was added under Section B, especially under output 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, outcome 2, and output 3.1.
- ii) Information related to private sector was added, particularly under Outcome 2 and Output 3.1.
- iii) Additional information on knowledge management is added at the end of section B.

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments 4/29/24:

Cleared for PIF stage.

Please ensure that IPLCs, CSOs/NGOs and women's groups are actively consulted during project preparation and engaged in project design and implementation to the extent possible.

3/25/24:

Further information is requested.

Please provide additional information on the role of key stakeholders, including IPLCs and CSOs related to project outcomes. In addition, please provide additional information on key stakeholders, including IPLCs and CSOs, that were consulted during PIF development.

By CEO endorsement: please provide the full list of stakeholders, their envisioned role, and when they were consulted. Please ensure that CSOs, NGOs, women's and youth groups as well as beneficiary communities are consulted and that communities will not be just passive beneficiaries of the project but are engaged meaningfully in implementation.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

Thank you. We have added details on stakeholders and consultations conducted thus far, in the section D of the PIF, as well as at the end of section B (pages 20 and 26; and similarly reflected into the GEF portal -section, project description). A full stakeholder analysis will be included at CEO endorsement and strong engagement of such groups will be considered during the CEO endorsement stage.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments3/25/24:

Yes, Comoros may access up to \$20 million in grant resources from the LDCF during the GEF-8 period.

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments 3/25/24:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments 3/25/24:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments 3/25/24:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments 3/25/24:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments4/29/24:

Cleared.

3/25/24:

Revisions are requested:

a) The template utilized for the LoE for this project does not include the footnote that conditions the selection of the executing partner to the following: "Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate". Please either submit a new LoE with the footnote included OR please upload an email from the OFP accepting this footnote to be part of the LoE (this is an alternative to request a new LoE). The email from the OFP should identify the focal area source (LDCF; climate change).

b) The LoE indicates that the project will be executed by "General Directorate of Environment and Forest". However, in the Portal there is one additional executing partner: "Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Environment and Land Use (MAPEATU)". Please either (i) modify the executing partner in Portal to exactly match the executing partner specified in the LoE ; or (ii) please obtain a new LoE, to match the information in the Portal. (Please note that the executing partner can be changed during the preparation phase).

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

a) A revised LOE has with the footnote included has been uploaded to the portal.

b) Thank you; this was an oversight, which is now corrected to reflect the General Directorate of Environment and Forest as the executing partner, consistently. The General Directorate is part of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Land Use.

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments3/25/24:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments 3/25/24:

Yes, the SES form has been uploaded to the Portal.

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments 4/29/24:

Cleared.

3/25/24:

No.

Kindly enter the value "2" for the Climate Change Adaptation Rio Marker.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

Noted and this has been fixed.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments 3/25/24:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments_{n/a}

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments_{4/29/24:}

Yes.

_{3/25/24:}

Not yet. Please address the review comments, thank you.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

Thank you for the comments made; we hope the revisions meet the expectations and looking forward to the feedback.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

1. Please provide the range of sea level rise projections for 2050.
2. By CEO endorsement, please discuss potential operational, social and environmental risks in more detail, especially the mitigation measures devised and the residual risk remaining upon application/implementation of those mitigation measures.
3. Gender: (i) Please discuss in the GAP how the project will build the resilience of

women and girls to the particular climate change related risks they face. (ii) Please ensure that in developing policies, legal and regulatory texts, financial mechanisms, infrastructure plans, etc., that gender considerations are taken into account (e.g. in Outputs 1.1, 1.3 and 2.1, 3.1). (iii) Under M&E, please integrate the monitoring and reporting on gender-related results and the Gender Action Plan.

4. Please provide further detail on the knowledge sharing plan and outputs by CEO endorsement stage, including the elements, stakeholders, products and sustainability of the KM plan.

5. Please ensure that IPLCs, CSOs/NGOs and women's groups are actively consulted during project preparation and engaged in project design and implementation to the extent possible.

[additional forthcoming]

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 25 April 2024:

These two comments are noted. We will address these fully during the PPG phase and these will be discussed at CEO endorsement

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	3/25/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/29/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		