



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

GEF ID:	5419		
Country/Region:	Cambodia		
Project Title:	Strengthening the Resilience of Cambodian Rural Livelihoods and Sub-national Government System to Climate Risks and Variability		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5174 (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-1; CCA-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$4,567,500
Co-financing:	\$14,347,850	Total Project Cost:	\$19,065,350
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Rawleston Moore	Agency Contact Person:	Yusuke Taishi

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 ?	Cambodia is eligible to receive resources from the LDCF	
Resource Availability	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	A letter from the operational focal point is on file.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
Resource Availability	• the STAR allocation?		
Resource Availability	• the focal area allocation?		
Resource Availability	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	The resources are available under the principle of equitable access.	
Resource Availability	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		

	Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	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>	The project is aligned with the LDCF framework.	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	The project is consistent with the NAPA of Cambodia, and will implement the following priority interventions (i) Development and Improvement of Community Irrigation Systems (ii) Promotion of Household Integrated Farming (iii) Water Gates and Water Culverts Construction.	
Project Design	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?	Yes the baseline projects are sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	The components, outcomes in the project framework are clear, sound and appropriately detailed.	

	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	The adaptation benefits are identified, and the description of the additional reasoning sound and appropriate.	
	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 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 is identified.	
	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 the project takes into account potential risks.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The project is consistent and properly coordinated with other relevant initiatives in the country.	
	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 	The project has potential for scaling up. The project will create an enabling environment to manage a greater volume of climate change adaptation finance for building the resilience of rural livelihoods.	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 		
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes the GEF funding and cofinancing is appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs.	
	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?	The indicated amount of co-financing is adequate.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The funding level for project management is appropriate.	
	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 report on the activities using the PPG fund?	A PPG is requested and is justified.	

	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A.	
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?	The PIF is recommended for approval.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*		
Review Date (s)	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.