



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

GEF ID:	4960		
Country/Region:	Zimbabwe		
Project Title:	Scaling up Adaptation in Zimbabwe, with a Focus on Rural Livelihoods, by Strengthening Integrated Planning Systems		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4713 (UNDP)
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; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,980,000
Co-financing:	\$58,480,000	Total Project Cost:	\$62,460,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	Jessica Troni

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible? 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. A letter signed by the Zimbabwe OFP has been supplied. However, the funding amount endorsed by the OFP has not been specified. Recommended Action: The OFP endorsement letter needs to specify the source and amount of funding requested, as per template available online at http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1713 Update 4/24/2012: The OFP endorsement letter has been provided.	
Agency's Comparative	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly	Yes, the UNDP has extensive experience in integrated policy	

		institutional strengthening, and non-governmental and community participation.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes. The project is aligned with the UNDP Country Programme and UNDAF Zimbabwe, with their focus on governance reforms, sustainable livelihoods, community livelihoods, management of land & natural resources towards food security, etc. At least two professional staff in Harare office are running the Environment and Energy portfolio, and the UNDP/GEF RTA dedicated to Climate Change Adaptation is based in Pretoria.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA	
	• the focal area allocation?	NA	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	Yes.	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes, namely CCA-1 and CCA-2, with outcomes including "Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development	

		targeted vulnerable areas" and "strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses."	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Yes, namely with Zimbabwe's Second National Communications, Medium Term Plan (2011-2015), the Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme, and the water sector-based Southern Africa Climate Change Adaptation - SADC - Strategy.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	The proposal places emphasis on capacity building and community-drivenness, as well as on the reform and regulatory framework-based interventions. If successful, there is a reasonable likelihood of sustainability of project outcomes, beyond the life of the project.	
Project Design	11. 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?	The baseline problems and projects have been adequately described, and backed up with relevant data.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		

	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>Yes, the project is incorporating resilience measures in a number of relevant baseline interventions, including UNDP's program in Zimbabwe in the amount of USD 21.48 million over 4 years, namely interventions in the local government and agriculture aspects of the Medium Term Plan, the Irrigation rehabilitation, expansion and development program, DFID-financed Protracted Relief Program, and Climate and Development Knowledge Network, coordinated by the Ministry of Economic Planning and Investment promotion.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>The project framework is not clear in the sense that, for example, there is no mention of the effort that the SCCF project will work on with the Department of Irrigation Development to mainstream climate change concerns in irrigation development in the selected vulnerable districts that have irrigation schemes targeted for rehabilitation, expansion or development.</p> <p>In addition, the project framework lumps TA and INV subcomponents under Component one; it would be preferable to separate TA and INV into distinct components, and associate SCCF funding and cofinancing accordingly.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please ensure that the elements of the Project Framework, Table B, correspond to the adaptation activities described under the Baseline Projects and Additional Cost Reasoning sections.</p>	

		<p>subcomponents as described.</p> <p>Update 04/24/2012: The TA and INV subcomponents have been separated and project framework modified. This is satisfactory.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>Yes, the methodology and assumptions for the description of the additional benefits are appropriate, and as per comment under #14, these need to be better captured in the Project Framework.</p> <p>Update 04/24/2012: The Project Framework has been modified, as per update under #14.</p>	
	16. 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>Yes, for this stage the description of the socio-economic benefits is sufficient. The SCCF project -- like the baseline projects -- will focus considerably on the socio-economic benefits, with direct impacts specifically on income and food security of vulnerable families, with direct impacts to benefit an estimated 25,000 people.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please ensure a more extensive description of the socio-economic results with gender dimensions. Please consider incorporating gender considerations in the design of the interventions.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	For this stage, yes.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation	For the most part. However, the risk mitigation measure associated with the risk that disaster events may shift stakeholders attention towards	

		<p>not sufficient to rely on effectiveness of a project that could be in the early stage of implementation to mitigate this risk. A proactive awareness-raising dialogue with the stakeholders is necessary to ensure sufficient commitment to adaptation even in face of unforeseen extreme events.</p> <p>Recommended Action: By CEO Endorsement, please ensure that adequate risk mitigation measures are included.</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, the project is consistent and well-integrated with a number of related initiatives in the country and region.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	For the PIF stage, yes.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>No. The funding level for project is above 5%.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please revise the project management cost so that it is no higher than 5% of the subtotal, i.e. cost of all the project components.</p> <p>Update 04/25/2012: The project management cost is currently at \$180,000 which is under 5% of the project components' amount total. This is satisfactory</p>	

	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	No. The cofinancing of the project management cost should be proportionate to the amount of total cofinancing. Please also see the comment under #14. Recommended Action: Please adjust the cofinancing amount of the project management cost. Update 04/24/2012: The cofinancing amount of the project management cost has been raised, and is now closer in proportion to the grant-to-cofinancing overall ratio.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The indicated cofinancing, at USD 58 M, is satisfactory.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not yet. Please address the comments under 2, 14, 18, 23, and 24.	

		Update 4/24/2012: The proposal is recommended for approval.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 17, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 25, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Yes, the proposed activities are appropriate.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	The itemized budget appears adequate. However, the cofinancing is relatively low, in comparison to size of project cofinancing relative to SCCF grant requested in PIF. Recommended Action: Please adjust the amounts so that they are proportionate to the SCCF grant-to-cofinancing ratio.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Not at this time. Please see #2.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 25, 2012
	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.