



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

GEF ID:	5632		
Country/Region:	Madagascar		
Project Title:	Enhancing the Adaptation Capacities and Resilience to Climate Change in Rural Communities in Analamanga, Atsinanana, Androy, Anosy, and Atsimo Andrefana		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5228 (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-2; CCA-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,877,397
Co-financing:	\$61,361,670	Total Project Cost:	\$67,239,067
PIF Approval:	January 06, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	February 10, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Fareeha Iqbal	Agency Contact Person:	Henry Diouf

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes, Madagascar is an LDC and has completed its NAPA preparation.	Yes.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Yes. A letter of endorsement from the OFP dated December 20, 2012 is attached.	Yes.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes.	Yes.

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> <li>• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</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>Yes, it is aligned with LDCF objectives CCA-2 and CCA-3.</p>	<p>Yes, same as PIF stage.</p>
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>Yes; the proposed LDCF project focuses on three priority sectors identified in Madagascar's NAPA: infrastructure, water resources management, and agriculture &amp; livestock. The adaptation options are also consistent with needs identified in the National Strategy &amp; Action Plan on Biological Diversity and the National Action Plan to Combat Desertification.</p>	<p>Yes, same as PIF stage.</p>
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>Yes. The southern, eastern and central regions of Madagascar are highly food insecure and have low access to drinking water and sanitation. Water contamination and associated health issues are common. Natural hazards and a weak economic base for these regions contribute to vulnerability and exposure. Climate change is expected to raise temperatures unfavorably (for crops) and exacerbate extreme climatic events. The</p>	<p>Yes. Projects considered as co-financing for the LDCF project are supporting measures in sustainable livelihoods, agricultural productivity, water and sanitation, zebu health and management, food security and disaster risk reduction. All have scope to include elements that will render them more resilient to adverse impacts of climate change and increased variability.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		project seeks to build a stronger agro-economic base, among other measures, thereby reducing household vulnerability in farming communities. It will do so by providing additional adaptation benefits within 6 baseline projects/initiatives spanning poverty reduction, water & sanitation, and agriculture and livestock.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>Yes. The project will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- provide trainings for government meteorological and agricultural staff to analyze climate and socio-economic information in an integrated manner;</li> <li>- install agromet/hydro-met stations in project areas;</li> <li>- pilot climate-resilient agrosylvopastoral technologies;</li> <li>- render key community infrastructure more climate resilient;</li> <li>- establish agricultural advisory support groups for climate resilience;</li> <li>- foster a public-private partnership for support for climate resilience; and</li> <li>- provide financial credit products to communities.</li> </ul> <p>By CEO endorsement (11/18/2013): Please provide more information on the 'additional' adaptation aspects of activities mentioned in Component 3.2. Dredging, de-silting etc., are not adaptation measures in and of themselves. The PIF does provide further relevant information on climate resilience aspects of these activities but only later in the document. Please ensure that the additional adaptation elements are clear also in Table B.</p>	<p>FI, 10/20/15: Adjustments are requested. 1) Please delete entries in "project target" column of Table E (GEB-related). Elements of Table B are otherwise sound and clear.</p> <p>FI, 12/21/2015: Yes, Agency has undertaken requested action. Cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes the 'additional' adaptation reasoning has been provided for each baseline project and it is sound. The LDCF project will support the following aspects of climate resilience in the baseline projects:</p> <p>1) 'Sustainable Livelihoods &amp; Fight Against Poverty': Inclusion of climate change risk reduction elements in water and sanitation master plans; advisory support to communities to manage adverse climatic impacts.</p> <p>2) 'Sustainable Mechanism for the Development of Access to Water and Sanitation in Rural Areas': Climate-proofing of small infrastructure for water and sanitation, and capacity building of communities to use climate risk management planning and management tools.</p> <p>3) 'Goal WASH Program': Analysis of how climate change could impact UNDP's WASH program and assessment of measures to ensure resilience to the impacts.</p> <p>4) 'Supporting the Strengthening of Professional Organizations and Agricultural Services': Strengthening the capacity of public and private agricultural support services on climate change adaptation techniques including climate change training modules targeting senior policy executives, regional/local technicians from relevant ministries, descision-makers, researchers and extension workers.</p> <p>5) 'Joint Program for the Reduction of Vulnerability of Population in Three</p>	<p>Yes. Adaptation support through this project is broad-based, addressing multiple regions and ecosystems of the country, and integrating adaptation measures within baseline initiatives across a range of sectors and actions.</p> <p>The project focuses on (i) building awareness and capacity of government officials and communities on climate change and how to address the risks it poses, (ii) building capacity to attain, use, and analyze hydromet data and derive advisory products for end-users, and (iii) on-the-ground adaptation investments (agro-sylvo-pastoral), climate-resilient fishery and water management, IPM, soil erosion control, agricultural improvements (including climate-resilient input supply chains) and establishment of farmer field schools (FFS). The LDCF project will also support investments to improve the climate resilience of water and sanitation infrastructure.</p> <p>Lastly, it will explore improved access to credit from microfinance institutions, and community access to markets, to strengthen income-generating opportunities that are climate resilient.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Regions in the Southern Part of Madagascar': Climate risk advisory services to guide selection and production of seeds/seedlings, agroforestry tools and products, and construction/rehabilitation of agricultural infrastructure.</p> <p>6) 'Global Funds for Social Development of the Ambatovy Project': Inclusion of climate risk mitigation measures in this community development program of the Ambatovy mining project.</p> <p>7) 'Project for Developing the Malagasy Zebu Industry': Integration of climate resilience aspects in pasture management and disease management measures to develop the zebu livestock industry.</p> <p>In addition, hydromet stations will be installed and relevant departmental capacities built.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of:  a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, 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>Yes. Gender considerations have been integrated across the project components. Efforts will be made to increase their participation in local decision-making processes, ensure they are beneficiaries of trainings provided through the project, and recipients of improved seeds and technologies for adaptation. At least 40% of Farmer Field School (FFS) participants will be women, and at least 40 percent of the FFS facilitators will be women.</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. Information on public participation is missing.</p> <p>Recommended action (Nov. 18, 2013): Please provide information on engagement of civil society and local</p>	<p>FI, 10/20/15:  Please provide further information on broader community-level consultations (not only with women's groups). Are indigenous communities represented in any of the target areas, and if so how</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>communities (including indigenous), and their involvement in LDCF project design and implementation.</p> <p>12/4/13: Yes for PIF stage. In Component 1, 200 stakeholders from civil society organizations will be trained across the project regions to integrate climate risk considerations in the design and implementation of their programs and initiatives. Component 3 will include establishment and operation of advisory groups to provide support to communities on how to use the outputs of the agro-forestry-pastoral models. These groups will be composed of community members who are trained and supervised by Agricultural Service Centers.</p> <p>12/4/13: By CEO Endorsement, please provide details on 2-way engagement with communities (e.g., drawing on community advice and traditional knowledge to guide project design; building capacity at community level so that they can ensure sustainability of project activities and outcomes in the long term, etc).</p>	<p>will their specific concerns (if any) be addressed? How will communities be kept engaged throughout the project? Please also discuss engagement with civil society orgs. and NGOs.</p> <p>FI, 12/21/2015: Yes. Information has been provided in the ProDoc on how the adaptation needs of the various ethnic groups at the different project sites will be taken into account in project design and activities. Information on engagement with CSOs has also been provided.</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>Yes for PIF stage.</p> <p>Recommended action by CEO endorsement (11/18/2013): The project includes several sub-components, encompassing 7 baseline projects. Please discuss risks pertaining to execution/coordination across the</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		project.	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>More information is requested. Besides the baseline projects, the only other related initiative that has been mentioned for the region is the 'Enabling Climate Resilience in Agriculture Sector in the Western Area of Madagascar' project.</p> <p>Recommended action (11/18/2013): Please provide further information on climate change adaptation work being undertaken in the project regions or nationally and discuss whether the LDCF will coordinate with these.</p> <p>12/4/13: Yes. Information has been provided on how the LDCF project will coordinate with ongoing related initiatives on execution of activities, agro-forestry-pastoral models, sharing of meteorological information, and capacity building.</p>	<p>FI, 10/20/15: The GEF also has several non-CCA projects in Madagascar in the areas of sustainable land management, watershed management, rural small hydro, and biodiversity conservation. Please discuss whether and how the LDCF project will coordinate/synergize/exchange knowledge with these.</p> <p>FI, 12/21/2015: Yes, provided explanation is adequate. UNDP will make efforts to coordinate, and has determined that the EA in Madagascar is mostly the same for the various relevant projects.</p>
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this</li> </ul>	<p>Innovation: It is difficult to comment in innovative aspects at PIF stage as project activities have yet to be fully designed.</p> <p>Sustainability: The project contains many elements/sub-components spanning several baseline projects, and many proposed activities are community-based. More information is needed by CEO Endorsement stage on how project activities will be coordinated, maintained,</p>	<p>Sustainability: The project takes several measures that will contribute to sustainability of outputs. By integrating adaptation elements within baseline initiatives, the sustainability of both baseline investments and of adaptation efforts will be improved. It will also help the DGM assume eventual responsibility for O&amp;M of hydromet equipment, support FFS to train farming communities about locally-relevant</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>and communities kept engaged.</p> <p>Scale-up: There is high potential for scale up. The activities are mostly local in nature, and can be applied to other localities if appropriate prior assessments are undertaken to identify vulnerabilities and adaptation needs -- assuming that the necessary baseline measures and institutional arrangements are already in place.</p> <p>By CEO endorsement stage (11/18/2013): Please explain more fully the measures that will be taken to ensure sustainability of project actions and outcomes.</p>	<p>climate-resilient technologies and practices, and will support integration of CCA considerations in various rural development plans.</p> <p>Replicability/scale up: Efforts this project will undertake to mainstream CCA considerations in development plans and policies will facilitate replicability, as will the capacity building activities for communities and regional authorities.</p> <p>Innovativeness: This is an innovative and ambitious project in terms of it's spatial diversity, sectoral coverage, variety of interventions (policy mainstreaming of CCA, establishment of FFS, support for hydromet services and climate information products, and investments to increase the climate resilience of water and sanitation infrastructure). It will also involve the private sector, collaborating with existing microfinance institutions to assist climate-resilient entrepreneurship in vulnerable communities.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>Yes.</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>Yes, the project strives for cost-effectiveness and seeks to achieve this through strong complementarity with and build-on with baseline and relevant initiatives. This improves long-term sustainability and relevance of the baseline initiatives in sustainable</p>



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			livelihoods, agriculture, water and sanitation, zebu management, and disaster risk reduction.
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?	Yes. Over 80% of the LDCF funding will support investment components and associated capacity building measures. The proposed breakdown of co-financing is also appropriate.	Yes.
	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?	Yes. Grant financing of \$34.2 M is being provided. The amount that UNDP is bringing (\$4.3 M) is in line with its role.	Yes. Letters confirming co-financing have been submitted. Of the total co-financing of \$61.36 million, UNDP is providing \$5 million in grant financing.
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	Yes, at 4.7% of total LDCF project cost.	Yes, at 4.7% of the project grant amount.
	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, PPG has been requested and is within the norm.	Yes, Agency has provided a breakdown of PPG resources used and those remaining, and has discussed the studies that PPG has been used to support thus far.
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	N/A
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes, the AMAT has been submitted.  FI, 12/21/2015: Please resolve: CCA objectives listed in Table A are CCA-2 and CCA-3. Yet

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			AMAT is tracking progress on objectives CCA-1 and CCA-2. Please ensure consistency in use of GEF-5 or GEF-6 indicators across Table A and the Tracking Tool.  FI, 01/07/2016: Yes, cleared.
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		Yes.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Not yet. Clearance is pending response to Items 10 and 12.  12/4/13 Yes, the project is recommended for clearance/approval.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Items 7, 10, 11 and 13.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		FI, 10/26/15: Not yet. Agency is requested to address comments for items 7, 10 and 12.  FI, 12/21/2015: Not yet. Substantive comments have all been addressed. However, the Agency is requested to resolve the discrepancy identified in Comment 21 and kindly resubmit the revised Datasheet and

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			AMAT. FI, 01/07/2016: Yes, cleared.
	First review*	November 18, 2013	October 20, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 04, 2013	December 21, 2015
<b>Review Date (s)</b>	Additional review (as necessary)		January 07, 2016

\* **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.**