



## 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:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$3,980,000
Co-financing:	\$12,700,000	Total Project Cost:	\$16,780,000
PIF Approval:	April 26, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 07, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	Benjamin Larroquette

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 country eligible?	Yes.	Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>A letter signed by the Zimbabwe OFP has been supplied. However, the funding amount endorsed by the OFP has not been specified.</p> <p>Recommended Action: The OFP endorsement letter needs to specify the source and amount of funding requested, as per template available online at <a href="http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1713">http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1713</a></p>	

\*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Update 4/24/2012: The OFP endorsement letter has been provided.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes, the UNDP has extensive experience in integrated policy development, human resources, institutional strengthening, and non-governmental and community participation.	Yes, no change since PIF.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A.	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.	Yes, no change since PIF.
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.	Yes, no change since PIF.
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes.	Yes, the project is aligned with the SCCF results framework.
	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 frameworks at country level and targeted vulnerable areas" and "strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses."	Yes, specifically CCA-1 ("Reducing vulnerability to climate change and variability") and CCA-2 ("Increasing adaptive capacity".)
	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.	Yes, the project is consistent with Zimbabwe's national strategies and plans, including the Medium Term Plan, SNC, ZUNDAF, CAADP, and SADC Climate Change Adaptation strategy, in addition to Zimbabwe Agenda for Sustainable Socio-Economic Transformation (ZimASSET 2013-2018), and a number of other policy documents, official reports, and assessments.
	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.	Yes, the theory of change model which serves as the basis of the project indicates how the capacities developed will sustain the project outcomes, including on microwatershed management, microfinance, and agricultural activities. The knowledge transferred and the self-organization of the communities (supported by the project) are the key elements contributing to the sustainability of project outcomes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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.	Yes, the baseline projects and problems are well described.
	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>Not clear. The Tracking Tool appears to indicate that the target number of beneficiaries is around 3000 (while the project description indicates 10,000+). Based on the cost of the project, 3,000 translates to \$1,327 per beneficiary, which seems high for this context.</p> <p>Recommended action: kindly elaborate on the cost-effectiveness, with sufficient clarifications concerning the number of target beneficiaries, and modifications where necessary.</p> <p>Update 7/29/2014: The revised CEO Endorsement specifies clearly the number of expected beneficiaries, at upwards of 10,000. This is cleared.</p>
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	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	The additional reasoning is acceptable, based on the description of the climate-based development challenges, and given that the proposed solutions are appropriate.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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. Please separate the TA and INV 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>	<p>For the most part, however, the project management cost appears high at 7%, exclusive of M&amp;E costs.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please revise the PMC or provide justifications for financing the PMC at this level.</p> <p>Update 8/6/2014: The PMC has been justified.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<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>	<p>Yes. The project builds on an appropriate choice of baseline (namely the USAID-supported "Enhanced Nutrition Stepping up Resilience and Enterprise", as well as AusAID-supported food security and livelihood programs) and ensures to complement these interventions so that the beneficiaries are prepared for or resilient to future climate change, through e.g. development of tailored early warning systems and suitable disaster risk management plans, improving agricultural practices through farmer field schools and resilient agriculture demonstration plots, access to microfinance, etc.</p>
	<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>	<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>	<p>The socio-economic benefits are explained, however, the gender dimension is not clear from the description.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide more contextual information on the vulnerability of women and accordingly measures to ensure inclusion of women as beneficiaries, as well as further information on their role in the process of increasing resilience.</p> <p>Update 7/29/2014: More details have been provided, and this is satisfactory.</p>
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role</p>	<p>For this stage, yes.</p>	<p>Yes, this project is well-anchored in a broad partnership approach.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	identified and addressed properly?		
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	<p>For the most part. However, the risk mitigation measure associated with the risk that disaster events may shift stakeholders attention towards emergency relief is not adequate. It is 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>	Yes, the project elaborates on the risks and describes the mitigation measures, including concerns the Council has raised at PIF approval.
	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.	Yes, the project is coordinated with other related initiatives in the country and region.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	For the PIF stage, yes.	Yes, Oxfam will implement this project.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		The project structure has changed following donor comments, and the justifications for the changes are satisfactory.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		n/a
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	No. The funding level for project is above 5%.	Not clear.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing		<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>	<p>Recommended action: Please see no. 14.</p> <p>Update 7/29/2014: Yes, given the unique circumstances of this project, and as it is being implemented by Oxfam, the higher than usual PMC is warranted.</p>
	<p>24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>No. The cofinancing of the project management cost should be proportionate to the amount of total cofinancing. Please also see the comment under #14.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please adjust the cofinancing amount of the project management cost.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Yes, with the exception for PMC, for which clarifications are pending.</p> <p>Update 7/29/2014: This is cleared.</p>
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>The indicated cofinancing, at USD 58 M, is satisfactory.</p>	<p>The letters for the bulk of confirmed cofinancing are provided.</p> <p>Update 8/6/2014: Letters from the National Government (\$100,000) and the CSO Oxfam (\$500,000) are missing. Please provide the missing cofinancing letters, or revise the cofinancing amount throughout the proposal.</p>



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Update 9/3/2014: The letter of support from the National Government in the amount of \$100,000 has been provided. The \$500,000 in support from CSO Oxfam has been removed from the cofinancing list. This is cleared.</p>
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>Yes, however, the letter of cofinancing from the Agency is missing.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide the missing cofinancing letters.</p> <p>Update 8/6/2014: The letter of cofinancing from the Agency has been provided.</p>
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		<p>Not clear, since the number of beneficiaries needs clarifications, as mentioned in comment under #12.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide clarifications on the number of beneficiaries.</p> <p>Update 7/29/2014: This is cleared.</p>
	<p>28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&amp;E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		<p>Yes.</p>
Agency Responses	<p>29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> <li>• Council comments?</li> </ul>		

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>Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	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?		Yes, the report of PPG utilization is included.
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		Not yet. Please address comments under #12, 14, 16, 23, 26, and 27.  Update 8/6/2014: The proposal will be recommended for endorsement once comment under #25 is addressed.  Update 9/3/2014: The project is recommended for endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 17, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 25, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		September 03, 2014
	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?	<p>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.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please adjust the amounts so that they are proportionate to the SCCF grant-to-cofinancing ratio.</p> <p>Update 6/11/2012: The cofinancing amount listed in Table C is inconsistent with other tables.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please correct the cofinancing amount in Table C.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	<p>Not at this time. Please see #2.</p> <p>Update 6/11/2012: Not at this time. Please see #2.</p> <p>Update 6/22/2012: The PPG is recommended for approval.</p>
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 25, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 11, 2012

\* 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.