



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

GEF ID:	5904		
Country/Region:	Benin		
Project Title:	Strengthening the Resilience of Rural Livelihoods and Sub-national Government System to Climate Risks and Variability in Benin		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5433 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$4,450,000
Co-financing:	\$56,496,273	Total Project Cost:	\$61,046,273
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	Benjamin Larouquette

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 ?	Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>Not clear. The letter is addressed to the Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat. The letter is not clear concerning what amount of funding is required for the project, agency fees, and preparation grant, if any.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please consider using the focal point endorsement letter template available on the GEF website.</p> <p>Update 12/17/2014: This has been done.</p>	

*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)
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	<p>No. Benin has accessed \$25.44M to-date. The amount requested for an additional project should not exceed \$5M according to the "balanced access" principle, inclusive of agency fees and PPG, if any.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please consider revising the request amount in the near term.</p> <p>Update 11/14/2014: This has been done. The total amount requested, inclusive of fees and PPG, is \$4.98 million.</p>	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
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>	Yes, the project is aligned with the LDCF results framework.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	Yes, the project appears to be consistent with the recipient country's national plans.	
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>Not clear. The baseline projects are not sufficiently described, and it is not clear whether these projects have mainstreamed adaptation or not. If they are already taking into consideration climate change, then they would not qualify as baseline projects.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide the necessary clarifications.</p> <p>Update 11/14/2014: This has been done. Further clarification has been provided on four baseline initiatives, also indicating where the LDCF would be used to generate additional value.</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>Not clear. The components, outcomes, and outputs are mostly clear. However, please note that the "Expected Outputs" column lists mostly outcomes, for component 1, for instance. Hence, it would be useful to receive additional specifics on the measurable outputs under component 1.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please specify the outputs for component 1, particularly related to 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Update 11/14/2014: This is cleared. Currently, the specifics of expected outputs are not required at this stage.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Not clear. The adaptation benefits stemming from component 1, particularly relating to 1.1, 1.2, and 1.4 are unclear, as is the baseline. In addition, please consider comment 6 in the context of clarifying adaptation benefits as well.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide clarity on the additional/adaptation benefits.</p> <p>Update 11/14/2014: This is cleared. Broadly, clarifications provided indicate that LDCF will support resilient agricultural methods, improve policy environment, and build capacity at various levels.</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>No, the role of public participation, and the explicit means for engagement of the public are not described.</p> <p>Recommended action: In section A2, please provide general plans for the engagement of the public in the design of the initiative, and possibly its implementation.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Update 11/14/2014: Cleared. The public participation plan includes consultations at the inception workshop, a broader national consultation workshop, and a validation workshop.</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>Not clear. The project describes the main risks and provides mitigation measures. However, please refer to comments under 7 and 8.</p> <p>Recommend action: Any ensuing revisions to the proposal should be adequately reflected in the "Risks/Mitigation measures" table.</p> <p>Update 11/14/2014: Cleared, as revisions did not result in changes to the Risks/Mitigation measures table.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>Not clear.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please refer to Comment 6.</p> <p>Update 11/14/2014: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency 	<p>Components 2 and 3 appear to be innovative in this context, replicable, and potentially sustainable.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	experience. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 		
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		
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?	<p>Not clear. Components 2 and 3 of the projects appear to be appropriately funded. Component 1 is not sufficiently clear, and at this version, appears costly, at \$1.2M with unclear outputs and sustainability.</p> <p>Recommended action: In addition, please address the clarification request under Comment 6, concerning the questions on the co-financing.</p> <p>Update 11/14/2014: Cleared.</p>	
	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?	<p>Not clear. This will be reassessed following the provision of clarifications for Question 6.</p> <p>Recommended action: See Section 6.</p> <p>Update 11/14/2014:</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		This is cleared.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes.	
	19. <u>At PIF</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?	Yes.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	
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?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not at this time. While the proposal on the whole has merit, in particular components 2 and 3, the design,	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>objective, and associated outputs from the first component are not clear, not justifying the request at over \$1.2 M at this time.</p> <p>Please see comments 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, and 24.</p> <p>Update 11/14/2014: The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*		
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**