



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

GEF ID:	<b>5318</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Cambodia</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems in Cambodia to Support Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5235 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCA-2; CCA-3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$150,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$4,910,285</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$16,672,931</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$21,733,216</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>March 22, 2013</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Bonizella Biagini</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Butchaiah</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Cambodia is a LDC and is eligible to receive resources.	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	An endorsement letter from the operational focal point is on the file.	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
<b>Resource Availability</b>	• the STAR allocation?		
<b>Resource Availability</b>	• the focal area allocation?		
<b>Resource Availability</b>	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	The resources are available for the project under the principle of equitable access.	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	• the SCCF (Adaptation or		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</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>	The project is aligned with the LDCF results framework and strategic objectives.	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>The project is consistent with the NAPA of Cambodia. The necessity for Early Warning Systems (EWSs) are embedded as priority activities under NAPA projects on agriculture/food security, health, disaster preparedness and response capacity and water resources.</p> <p>The project is aligned with other NAPA project priorities, specifically (i) Enhancement of the National Weather Forecast Centre" seeks to build capacity of the Department of Meteorology (DOM) to provide weather forecasts and natural disaster warnings to ensure better preparedness and management and (ii) Disaster Preparedness and Response Capacity to equip communities with the knowledge and tools needed to prepare for and cope with climate hazards.</p>	
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and</p>	The baseline project(s) are sufficiently described and based on sound data.	

Project Design			
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	The components outcomes and outputs in Table B are clear sound and appropriately detailed.	
	8. Are <b>global environmental benefits</b> adequately identified, and the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the <b>incremental/additional reasoning</b> sound and appropriate?	The adaptation benefits are adequately identified and the methodology and assumptions for the description of the additional reasoning is sound and appropriate.	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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?		
	10. Is <b>public participation</b> , including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	The project proposal identifies key stakeholders which will be involved in the project. For example the Cambodian Red Cross is involved in the project. By CEO endorsement please provide additional CSOs which will participate in the project.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential <b>major risks</b> , including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Yes the project takes into account potential major risks, and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures.	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country	Yes. The project is consistent and coordinated with other related initiatives such as the pilot program for climate	

		Cambodia.	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>- Assess the project's sustainability strategy and the likelihood project outcomes will be sustained or not based on the evidence in the literature.</li> <li>- Are there measures to secure the institutional and financial stability of the project?</li> <li>- Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention strategy and critique the plan for scaling up.</li> </ul>	<p>The project is innovative as it will procure and install meteorological and hydrological monitoring stations across the country, customize the climate and weather information for national planning purposes. The project will also increase communication between countries in the context of transboundary issues. The project has the potential to be scaled up, with the potential additional installation of stations. The project will increase the capacity of the individuals and institutions to maintain early warning systems, and to assimilate and forecast climate and environmental information.</p>	
	14. Is the <b>project structure</b> sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the <b>cost-effectiveness</b> been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	16. Is the <b>GEF funding and co-financing</b> per component appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes the funding and co-financing per component appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs is appropriate.	
Project Financing	17. At PIF: Is the amount that the	Co-financing should be confirmed at	

	comment on the indicated amount and composition of <b>cofinancing</b> ? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	the project is in line with its role.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	The funding level for project management is appropriate.	
	19. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
<b>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	20. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	21. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	22. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
<b>Recommendation at PIF Stage</b>	<b>23. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	The project recommended for clearance.	
	24. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
<b>Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval</b>	25. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested and approved? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?	There is a request for a PPG and it is approved.	
	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
<b>Review Date (s)</b>	First review*	March 15, 2013	

	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.**