



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

GEF ID:	5592		
Country/Region:	Somalia		
Project Title:	Enhancing Climate Resilience of the Vulnerable Communities and Ecosystems in Somalia		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5268 (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; CCA-2; CCA-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$8,000,000
Co-financing:	\$64,820,000	Total Project Cost:	\$72,820,000
PIF Approval:	December 03, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	January 07, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Tom Twining-Ward

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. Somalia is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point and dated August 5, 2013, has been attached to the submission.	
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	YES. The proposed grant (\$8.98 million,	

*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	including Agency fees and PPG) is available from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<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? <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>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would contribute \$2.02 million and \$5.61 million towards CCA-1 and CCA-2, respectively. The breakdown of LDCF funding suggests that Component 1 would be entirely associated with CCA-1, whereas Component 2 would be associated with CCA-2. In contrast, however, the former appears to contain elements of knowledge generation and capacity build that are more in line with CCA-2, while the latter contains investment activities that are generally associated with CCA-1 or CCA-3.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please review and revise the proposed levels of LDCF funding and co-financing associated with each strategic objective in the Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A).</p> <p>10/28/2013 – YES. The Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) has been revised as recommended. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would appear to be broadly in line with Somalia's NAPA priorities, particularly</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>the priority programs on sustainable land management and watershed management while also contributing towards the priority program on disaster management. The project is consistent with Somalia's key development frameworks, and it would contribute towards the elaboration of the national policy framework on the sustainable and climate-resilient management of land and water resources.</p> <p>Still, for clarity and transparency, Section B.1 of the PIF could spell out the NAPA priorities that the proposed project seeks to address. Moreover, given the very specific mandate of the LDCF to assist LDC Parties to the UNFCCC in the preparation and implementation of NAPAs, additional benefits associated with land degradation and biodiversity need not be pursued at the expense of the overarching adaptation goal of the project. Section B.1 could be clearer in this regard.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Kindly (i) specify the NAPA priorities that the proposed project seeks to address in Section B.1 of the PIF; and (ii) clarify the nature of the additional benefits for biodiversity and reduce land degradation vis-à-vis the overarching adaptation goal of the project.</p> <p>Please refer also to Section 8 below.</p> <p>10/28/2013 – YES. The alignment of the proposed project with Somalia's</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>NAPA has been adequately clarified, as has the nature of the additional benefits the project would deliver for biodiversity and reduced land degradation.</p>	
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>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>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The baseline scenario and associated initiatives are mostly clearly described. The proposed project would build on and strengthen the resilience of (i) the UN Joint Programme for Sustainable Charcoal Production and Alternative Livelihoods; (ii) the UNDP Poverty Reduction and Environmental Protection (PREP) Programme; (iii) the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States, through federal and regional plans; (iv) the Joint Disaster Risk Management Programme for Somaliland; and (v) the EU Assistance Package.</p> <p>It is not entirely clear, however, why an indicative co-financing amount has not been provided for programs associated with the EU Assistance Package, some of which appear highly relevant, and present opportunities for scaling up successful adaptation measures. With regard to both the UNDP PREP program and the EU programs, it would be useful to learn more about what areas are targeted by these programs.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) indicate the level of co-financing that could be brought by the various EU-financed programs, or clarify why this has not been done; and (ii) provide further information regarding the areas targeted by the EU and UNDP baseline</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>initiatives.</p> <p>10/28/2013 â€™ YES. The baseline scenario has been adequately clarified and indicative co-financing from the EU has been included in the revised PIF. With respect to site selection, please refer to Section 8 below.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Components 1 and 2 are labeled as TA and INV, respectively, yet only one output (2.1.2) would seem to qualify as INV. As a result, it is difficult to assess to what extent the proposed project would support, tangible, urgent and immediate adaptation measures as opposed to scientific and technical assessments, capacity building and policy development. There may also be a degree of overlap among the outputs. Specifically, 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 2.1.1, 2.1.3 and 2.1.4 all have elements of policy, strategy or planning.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify and streamline the project framework, including a clearer distinction among TA and INV activities.</p> <p>10/28/2013 â€™ NOT CLEAR. The revised PIF and the Agency's response clarify the distinction between TA and INV activities. The response also clarifies the difference between the policy and planning activities under Component 1, which would be carried out at the national and regional levels, and the planning activities under Component 2 that would be focused on the pilot areas.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>The PIF could nevertheless be more consistent in this regard, as noted in the recommendations under Section 8 below.</p> <p>The difference between outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.3 remains somewhat unclear and the two could potentially be merged. Outputs 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 could be clarified in line with the recommendations made under Section 8.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) clarify how outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.3 are distinct and complementary, or merge the two; and ‘ upon addressing the remaining recommendations under Section 8 ‘ (ii) clarify the description of outputs 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 in Table B.</p> <p>11/21/2013 ‘ YES. The project framework has been adjusted as recommended.</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. Please refer to sections 5, 6 and 7 above.</p> <p>With respect to Component 1, there is a clear need to enhance the basic capacities of central, regional and local authorities ‘ along with the policy framework for the sustainable and resilient management of land and water resources. Still, rather than covering their full cost, the LDCF grant should focus on integrating climate change adaptation into the new policies and regulatory frameworks referred to under outputs 1.1.3 and 1.1.4. The additional reasoning supporting these outputs remains somewhat unclear,</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>particularly given that their scope would seem to considerably exceed that of the baseline, Joint UN program on which they would build.</p> <p>As for Component 2, the pilot areas and scope of the proposed investments remain unclear, as well as their relationship particularly with the EU-financed baseline initiatives.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 5, 6 and 7 above, please (i) strengthen the additional reasoning for outputs 1.1.3 and 1.1.4; (ii) clarify what pilot areas would be targeted under Component 2, or how those areas would be selected; and (iii) provide additional information regarding the scope of the investments proposed under output 2.1.2.</p> <p>10/28/2013 â€“ NOT CLEAR. The revised PIF provides useful clarifications in response to the recommendations made.</p> <p>With respect to Component 1, however, the PIF remains somewhat unclear and inconsistent. Outcome 1.1 as well as outputs 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 continue to refer to the drafting of new policies and plans. In contrast, Section A.1.4 maintains that the component would focus on mainstreaming adaptation into existing and upcoming policy frameworks and plans. This has also to some extent been reflected in outputs 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 in the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>table on p. 14, which is now inconsistent with Table B. Moreover, p. 13 refers to pilot areas and local government institutions, which seem to fall outside the scope of Component 1.</p> <p>As for Component 2, the PIF clarifies adequately the criteria for selecting pilot sites as well as the scope of the proposed investments. During project preparation, it will be crucial that the sites are selected with a view to ensuring viable pathways for sustaining and scaling up successful, climate-resilient practices and technologies; and that limited grant resources are not spread too thin across too large a number of sites in different regions.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that Component 1 and its outputs are consistently described across the PIF.</p> <p>11/21/2013 ‘ YES. The revised PIF clarifies how the proposed project would contribute towards the integration of climate change adaptation into relevant policies and plans, both existing ones and new ones. By CEO Endorsement, the proposal should clearly demonstrate that such activities are financed on the basis of additional cost.</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</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	YES. The role of public participation, including CSOs, is adequately described for this stage of project formulation.	
	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)	YES. Key risks and appropriate mitigation measures have been adequately described for this stage of project formulation.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	YES. Coordination and coherence with other relevant initiatives is adequately described for this stage of project formulation.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <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>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 5, 6, 7 and 8 above. The innovative aspects, sustainability and potential for scaling up cannot be adequately assessed at this time.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 5, 6, 7 and 8, please revisit the description of the innovative aspects, sustainability and potential for scaling up, if necessary.</p> <p>10/28/2013 â€“ NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 7 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>address the recommendations under sections 7 and 8.</p> <p>11/21/2013 â€“ YES. In the absence of a comprehensive policy and planning framework for natural resources management in Somalia, the proposed project holds the potential to guide land use and rural development towards resilience and sustainability. The project applies proven and cost-effective, eco-system based approaches to climate change adaptation.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</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>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR: Please refer to sections 5, 6, 7 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 5, 6, 7 and 8, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts in Table B, if necessary.</p> <p>10/28/2013 â€“ NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 7 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the remaining</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>recommendations under sections 7 and 8, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts in Table B, if necessary.</p> <p>11/21/2013 â€™ YES. The proposed grant and co-financing amounts are appropriate and adequate.</p>	
	<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>	<p>NOT CLEAR: Please refer to Sections 6 above.</p> <p>In line with its role, UNDP would bring \$10.50 million in indicative co-financing towards the proposed project, along with a share of the \$12.31 million UN Joint Programme for Sustainable Charcoal Production and Alternative Livelihoods.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under section 6, please revisit the co-financing amounts and sources in Table C, if necessary.</p> <p>10/28/2013 â€™ YES. The indicative co-financing figures have been adjusted as recommended.</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>YES. The proposed funding level for project management is appropriate, at \$370,000, or less than five per cent of the sub-total for project components.</p>	
	<p>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</p>	<p>YES. \$200,000 is requested, consistent with the norm for projects with grants exceeding \$6 million.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
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 YET. Please refer to sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 16 and 17. 10/28/2013 â€™ NOT YET. Please refer to sections 7, 8, 13 and 16. 11/21/2013 â€™ YES. The project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Approval	First review*	September 26, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	October 28, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 21, 2013	

* **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.**