



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

GEF ID:	5681		
Country/Region:	Regional (Jamaica, Mexico, El Salvador)		
Project Title:	Building Climate Resilience of Urban Systems through Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) in Latin America and the Caribbean.		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$6,000,000
Co-financing:	\$21,910,000	Total Project Cost:	\$28,060,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Fareeha Iqbal	Agency Contact Person:	Ermira Fida

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. El-Salvador, Jamaica and Mexico are non-Annex Parties to the UNFCCC.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. Letters of Endorsement have been provided by the GEF OFPs for El-Salvador, Jamaica and Mexico, each dated December 6, 2013.	
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		

*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)
	equitable access		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. It is aligned with SCCF strategic objectives CCA-1 (reducing vulnerability), CCA-2 (enhancing adaptation) and CCA-3 (technology transfer/adoption for adaptation).	
	<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>	Yes. It is aligned with national and regional level strategies and plans. It is consistent with El Salvador's National Five-Year Development Plan and its National Environment Policy; also with Jamaica's National Environmental Action Plan; and with Mexico's National Climate Change Strategy (2013) and General Climate Change Law (2012). At the regional level, it is in line with the Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Program of Action's, 'Integrated Management of Water and Coastal Resources', as it will restore urban catchments and build technical capacity for EbA geared at watershed restoration.	
	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and</p>	Yes. Latin American cities are growing rapidly, with populations and key sectors competing for water and placing pressure on urban ecosystems. Environmental	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>degradation is high in the potential pilot cities for the project, and is aggravated by high climatic variability and extreme climatic events. The well-being of urban populations is significantly impacted by reduced water supply and poor sanitation. Climate change is expected to exacerbate the intensity and/or frequency of extreme climatic events, and could result in long-term trend changes that worsen degradation so that current levels of urban vulnerability could significantly increase.</p> <p>The SCCF project will integrate additional adaptation benefits within the following 5 baseline projects that are addressing food and water security, disaster risk, and improved infrastructure and livelihoods of the urban poor in the LAC region: (i) Regional Biodiversity Ecosystem Services (BES) Programme (IADB); (ii) El Salvador Cooperation FUND for Water and Sanitation (AECID); (iii) Jamaica - Kingston Metropolitan Area Water Supply Improvement Project (IADB); (iv) Mexico Program for the Sustainability of Water Supply and Sanitation Services in Rural Communities (IADB); and (v) Mexico Cooperation Fund for Water and Sanitation (AECID).</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	Yes. The project will support (i) stocktaking, frameworks and strategy development for EbA; (ii) assessments/scenario exercises taking into account various parameters and risks	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>(including those posed by climate change); protocols for EbA implementation; EbA interventions at community and urban landscape/catchment levels; and alternative livelihoods based on city-specific urban EbA measures; and (iii) awareness-raising, knowledge-dissemination and research programs.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement: Please provide details on the specific climate change related risks in each pilot city, and on the specific measures that will be undertaken to build resilience to these risks.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes. A range of sound, additional adaptation benefits are envisaged as outcomes of this project. At the local level, these include improved water availability, reduction of heat stress due to improved vegetative cover, and reduction in stormwater flows due to increased water storage capacity of reforested areas. At an ecosystems level, water quality and availability will be improved through measures to restore wetlands and riparian corridors. Biodiversity is also expected to benefit. These various outcomes will build resilience to a broad spectrum of potential adverse impacts of climate change.</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</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>Yes. The project will engage local communities and create active partnerships with NGOs at local, national and regional levels. The project will target vulnerable urban populations such as recent migrants, slum-dwellers, day-wage laborers, and female-headed households.</p> <p>By CEO endorsement: Please provide more information on how communities (including vulnerable urban populations) have been engaged in consultations and will continue to be engaged in project activity selection and implementation.</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>Yes. Political, capacity, and climatic risks have been identified, as well as risks to upscaling. Mitigation measures have been proposed.</p>	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>Yes, the project will build on and coordinate with several relevant ongoing projects and initiatives, such as (i) Coastal EbA in SIDS (UNEP); (ii) Regional Gateway for Technology Transfer and Climate Change Action in Latin America and the Caribbean (UNEP and bilateral donors); (iii) TA being provided by ICLEI; (iv) Emergent and Sustainable Cities Initiative (IADB); (v)</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		UN-HABITAT Cities and Climate Change Initiative; (vi) Caribbean Biological Corridor; and others.	
	<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 experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>Innovativeness: Yes. EbA has traditionally been conducted in a rural context. However, this project will implement regional-scale urban 'green' infrastructure and low-regrets measures to build resilience to existing and expected future climatic threats.</p> <p>Sustainability: This is not fully clear; the approach is new and will require local-government buy-in and community support. However, awareness-raising and capacity-building activities have been proposed to address this.</p> <p>By CEO endorsement: While awareness-raising and capacity-building/research activities will contribute to interest from local authorities and communities, please discuss the measures will be in place to ensure that the adaptation investments continue to yield benefits over time?</p> <p>Upscaling: An upscaling strategy will be developed, but its success is likely to depend on the cost-effectiveness of the interventions. The project includes components to research cost-effective measures.</p>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	Yes. Requested GEF funding and co-financing are appropriate and adequate for achieving the expected outcomes and outputs. Over 70% of the GEF grant funding will support Component 2, which includes sub-components on implementation of EbA interventions in pilot cities at community, urban landscape and catchment levels.	
	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. Table C specifies \$21.91 M in co-financing, which is adequate.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. It stands at 4.6% of the requested SCCF grant.	
	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.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	1/8/14, FI Informal comments were provided to UNEP on draft PIF, with requests for revisions on a few counts. These were all satisfactorily addressed in their subsequent formal submission. 1/22/14, FI: Yes.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	January 22, 2014	
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.**