



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

GEF ID:	5002		
Country/Region:	Benin		
Project Title:	Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems in Western and Central Africa for Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change - Benin		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5105 (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; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$4,000,000
Co-financing:	\$18,087,302	Total Project Cost:	\$22,087,302
PIF Approval:	May 31, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 29, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Mark Tadross

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?	YES. Benin is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	YES. Benin 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 April 24, 2012, has been attached to the submission.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	YES. UNDP has a comparative advantage in institutional capacity building, as well as technical and policy support in the area of climate change adaptation.	YES.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the	YES. UNDP has a considerable portfolio of relevant projects, as well as	YES.

		UNDP's programming in the areas of climate change adaptation and disaster risk management is well described in the PIF.	
Resource Availability	6. 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 equitable access	YES. The proposed grant (\$4.4 million, including Agency fee) is available under the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	YES.
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	YES. The proposed project is fully aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	NA
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-2 and CCA-3 and, specifically, CCA-2.2 on strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks of climate change-induced economic losses; and CCA-3.1 on the successful demonstration, deployment and transfer of relevant adaptation technology. More than 70 per cent of the proposed LDCF grant would support CCA-3.1.	NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-2 and, specifically, outcomes 2.1 and 2.2. The Request for CEO Endorsement does not, however, provide a breakdown of grant and co-financing by CCA outcome. RECOMMENDED ACTION: In the Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A), please provide a breakdown of grant and co-financing by CCA outcome.
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national	YES. The proposed project is well aligned with Benin's Poverty Reduction	YES. The proposed project would address Benin's first NAPA priority on

	assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	towards the implementation of the country's first NAPA priority on "establishing a system for climate monitoring and early warning".	early-warning system for food security. By providing accurate and timely climate information services, the project would also contribute towards the implementation of other NAPA priorities in water resources management, coastal-zone management and public health. The project is aligned with Benin's Second National Communication, PRSP and National Environmental Management Program.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	YES. The project combines physical investments in hydro-meteorological monitoring and early-warning infrastructure with capacity building for national hydro-meteorological services and other key stakeholders. The project includes a sub-component focusing on long-term public and private financing arrangements to ensure the sustainable management of the systems developed. By CEO Endorsement, please provide a more detailed analysis of the risks associated with the lack of sustainable financing, institutional support and political commitment, along with appropriate mitigation measures.	YES. The proposed project addresses current gaps in Benin's hydro-meteorological monitoring capacity and early-warning systems in an integrated manner, with a focus on hardware, software, capacity building, planning, coordination, and finance. A detailed sustainability strategy is presented in section 2.7 of the Project Document.
	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?	YES. The proposed project would build on and contribute towards the following baseline initiatives: (i) the African Monitoring of the Environment for Sustainable Development (AMESD) project, financed by the EU; (ii) the UNDP Millennium Villages Project; (iii) the World Bank Emergency Urban Environment Program; (iv) the DfID and IRDC project. Protecting the Urban	NOT CLEAR. Section A.4 of the Request for CEO Endorsement describes a general baseline situation, rather than a dynamic baseline scenario with relevant baseline projects and programs. The latter are provided in Section A.5. While the EU, World Bank and GIZ baseline projects are all relevant, these are not all reflected in the confirmed sources and amounts of

Project Design		<p>of Climate Change; and (v) disaster risk management activities financed by GFDRR. Further baseline initiatives and details regarding co-financing will be established during project preparation.</p> <p>The baseline initiatives are all relevant and adequately described for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, upon a more detailed understanding of the specific activities to be carried out in the context of the proposed project, please discuss the gaps and needs associated with the baseline initiatives to allow for a complete and thorough assessment of the additional reasoning.</p>	<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) include, in Section A.4 of the Request for CEO Endorsement, a list of the baseline initiatives on which the proposed project would build; and (ii) seek consistency between the sources and amounts of co-financing reported in Table C, and the baseline projects and programs.</p>
	<p>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>		<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project appears to have been designed in a cost effective manner. The Project Document (Section 2.6) demonstrates that sufficient cost comparison has been carried out for all key components of the project.</p> <p>In addition, taking into account the simultaneous submission of 9 similar projects in the region, and with a view to enhancing cost-effectiveness, the Request for CEO Endorsement could explore approaches to enhance regional coordination and collaboration. This would also respond the request of the LDCF/SCCF Council, captured in the Highlights of its 12th meeting.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please consider, from the perspective of cost-effectiveness, approaches to enhance</p>

			collaboration, including activities carried at the regional level.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>YES. The additional cost reasoning is adequately described for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, upon a more comprehensive assessment of baseline initiatives, as well as associated gaps and needs, please describe in greater detail the activities proposed for LDCF financing, their associated cost, and the additional reasoning on which these activities are based.</p>	<p>YES. The Request for CEO Endorsement provides a detailed description of the baseline scenario and associated gaps and needs, as well as the additional activities proposed for LDCF financing.</p> <p>Please refer, however, to Section 11 above.</p>
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	YES. The project framework is sound and sufficiently clear.	<p>YES. The project framework is sound and sufficiently clear.</p> <p>Please refer, however, to the recommendation under Section 12 above, and make appropriate adjustments in the Project Framework in response to the request of the LDCF/SCCF Council, if necessary.</p>
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	YES. The adaptation benefits associated with the activities proposed for LDCF financing are clearly described, based on sound and appropriate assumptions and methodology.	YES.
	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. The socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions are well described for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide further information as to how the proposed project would reach the most vulnerable communities and groups, particularly women.</p>	YES. The expected socio-economic benefits, as well as the gender dimensions of the proposed project have been adequately described.

	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>YES. Public participation is adequately considered for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, kindly provide further information regarding the local-level stakeholders involved in the project.</p>	<p>YES. Public participation, including the role of CSOs, has been adequately considered during project preparation. A stakeholder engagement plan for project implementation is presented in Section B.1 of the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p>
	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>YES. The risk assessment is adequate for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide a more detailed analysis of risks and relevant mitigation measures, considering in particular the sustainability of the systems established and the capacities developed (see also Section 10 above).</p>	<p>YES. Relevant risks, along with appropriate mitigation measures have been adequately described in Section B.6 of the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p>
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>YES. The PIF identifies relevant initiatives and processes in Benin as well as in the wider region.</p> <p>BY CEO Endorsement, in addition to listing other relevant initiatives, please describe in greater detail how the proposed project will be coordinated with such initiatives.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Section A.7 of the Request for CEO Endorsement describes in some detail the ways in which the proposed project would be coordinated with and complementary to other relevant initiatives in the country and the wider region.</p> <p>Please refer, however, to Section 12 above. In addition, the Request for CEO Endorsement could discuss the relationship between the proposed project and other, similar LDCF-financed initiatives under preparation in the region, including potential synergies.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please discuss the relationship between the proposed project and other, similar LDCF-financed initiatives under preparation in the region. including</p>

	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	YES. The project would primarily be executed by the National Meteorological Services and the Ministry of Environment and Urban Planning.	YES.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		YES.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES. At \$190,000, the funding level for project management costs is below 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 and 2.	YES. At \$190,000, the funding level for project management costs is below 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 2.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	YES. The LDCF funding and co-financing are appropriate and adequate.	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 12 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 12, please adjust the proposed grant and co-financing amounts accordingly, if necessary.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The overall, indicative co-financing amounts to \$18.09 million, resulting in a co-financing ratio of 1:4.5.	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please ensure that letters of confirmation are provided for all sources and amounts of co-financing.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	YES. UNDP would bring \$9.73 million in indicative co-financing to the proposed project.	YES. At more than \$3.4 million, the co-financing brought by UNDP is adequate and in line with the Agency's role.
Project Monitoring	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for		YES. The Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT) has been

			for relevant indicators.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		YES.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	NA	NA
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	NA
	• Council comments?		NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 12 and 18 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address the recommendations under sections 12 and 18.
	• Other GEF Agencies?	NA	YES.
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	YES.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please refer to sections 11, 13, 16, 17, 18 and 19.	
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.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		NOT YET. Please refer to sections 8, 11, 12, 19, 24, 25 and 29.
Review Date (s)	First review*	May 23, 2012	July 03, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	Yes, the itemized budget is justified.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Yes, PPG approval is being recommended.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 08, 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.