



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

GEF ID:	5504		
Country/Region:	Central African Republic		
Project Title:	Reducing Rural and Urban Vulnerability to Climate Change by the Provision of Water Supply		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
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-2; CCA-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$7,140,000
Co-financing:	\$21,469,000	Total Project Cost:	\$28,609,000
PIF Approval:	December 03, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	January 07, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	Sylvie p. Bara

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	Yes, CAR is an LDC and Party to UNFCCC.	Yes, no change.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, the letter dated June 22, 2013 is on file.	Yes, no change.
Resource Availability	3. 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 funding amount requested is available to CAR under the principle of equitable access.	Yes, no change.
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or		

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</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>	<p>Not clear.</p> <p>The project appears to be aligned with the LDCF results framework and strategic objectives, including CCA-1, CCA-2, and CCA-3. However, only CCA-1 and CCA-2 are listed.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please clarify why CCA-3 was not listed as a strategic objective, considering that the substantial portion of the grant would promote alternative water sources and technologies.</p> <p>Update 9/12/2013: CCA-3 has been included in the revised proposal.</p>	<p>Yes, the project is aligned with the CCA results framework, and accordingly a number of indicators has been identified. However, please see comment under Section 21.</p>
	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?	<p>Yes, the project is consistent with the CAR NAPA, national Integrated Water Resources Management Plan, and the Water and Sanitation Sector Plan, and is in line with CAR's PRSP for 2011-2015.</p>	<p>Yes, as at PIF.</p>
	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?	<p>Yes, the baseline problem and project are well described. The baseline project will help to restore the nominal drinking water production capacity in Bangui, as well as increase drinking water rates from 23% to 67% by 2015 in targeted rural areas.</p>	<p>The baseline problem is well described. No major change since PIF.</p>
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>Yes, they are clear, sound, and appropriately detailed for the PIF stage.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes, the adaptation benefits are clearly identified. The project will improve the robustness of the water supply by ensuring the baseline investments are appropriately resilient, including through physical alterations of the intake infrastructure area, and by diversifying water supply sources, using various techniques and technologies.	Yes, no major change since PIF.
	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?		Yes, this is clear. However, please note the comment under Section 21.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>Not clear. A Water-Hygiene-Sanitation Thematic Group, steered by UNICEF, is ensuring the coordination of the sector's stakeholders. However, the the key stakeholders, including donors, development organizations and banks, CSOs, indigenous people, gender groups, and others, as relevant, have not been identified.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please identify the key stakeholders, or, in cases where it is not possible to do so now, provide justifications and planned actions for addressing this gap.</p> <p>Update 9/12/2013: Key stakeholders have been identified, including donors. Additional information on community participation was provided, which referenced a plan for a</p>	Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		participatory process, and also will include women's and youth groups, as well as other at-risk groups.	
	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)	<p>Not clear. Weak institutional capacity and financial management capacity have been identified. However, there are potentially more than these two risks that could prevent this project from achieving success. In addition, please see comment #13.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please expand on this section with a more comprehensive assessment of risks and mitigation measures.</p> <p>Update 9/12/2013: The risk and mitigation section has been expanded, with focus on institutional capacity of the the sub-program's EA, financial management, project progress, and sustainability. For PIF stage, this is adequate, with the understanding that a thorough risk assessment and appropriate mitigation measures will be included by CEO endorsement.</p>	<p>(please note comment at PIF)</p> <p>Not clear. A comprehensive risk assessment with mitigation measures has been provided, however, see Section 13 with relation to the financial risk mitigation measures.</p> <p>Update 9/8/2015: Cleared. The risk assessment has been updated.</p>
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, it appears that there are mechanisms in place to ensure that the project is consistent and properly coordinated with other initiatives.	Yes.
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <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 	<p>The project is innovative in its approach to increase robustness of the water supply, as a strategy for increasing resilience. In addition, the project is linked to a substantial baseline intervention, which is likely to increase the chances of scaling-up and sustainability. However, please consider</p>	<p>(please note comment at PIF).</p> <p>The sustainability of the investment is not yet clear. The risk framework mentions financial risk, but presents weak mitigation measures.</p> <p>Recommended action:</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>further the issue of sustainability, including any potential risks.</p> <p>Update 9/12/2013: In line with the comments under Question 11, the sustainability of investments is an issue that needs particular attention, and it is expected that, by CEO endorsement, a robust plan will be in place. This is cleared.</p>	<p>Please further elaborate how sustainability of the investment will be ensured, and how the risk to the proposed investment will be managed.</p> <p>Update 9/8/2015: Cleared. To ensure the sustainability of investments, a periodic maintenance activities will take place both for rural and urban areas, and appropriate institutional and community arrangements will be put in place, such as responsibility for tariffs collection, and provision of finance for small maintenance.</p>
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Yes.
	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?		<p>Not clear. Cost-effectiveness of the project design, as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits is not argued in the proposal.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please elaborate further on the cost-effectiveness considerations, and how they may justify this particular approach, or provide clarifications.</p> <p>Update 9/8/2015: This is cleared. Additional and adequate information has been supplied in the revised submission.</p>
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes	Yes.	Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	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?	Yes.	Yes.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes.	Not clear. The project management cost has increased substantially since the PIF stage. Recommended action: Please provide the justifications for this substantial change, or revise the amount. Update 9/8/2015: The justifications for the PMC cost have been provided.
	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?	Yes, and the PPG does not deviate from the norm.	Yes.
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	n/a
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Not clear. The tracking tool has been included with information for all relevant indicators. However, concerning number of people provided

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>with access to safe water supply, it is not clear how the project plans to target 900,000 female beneficiaries, versus 600,000 male.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide clarification justifying the significantly different target numbers for the two genders (i.e. how access to safe water could be provided selectively.)</p> <p>Update 9/8/2015: Cleared. The tracking tool has been appropriately revised, and further clarifications have been supplied.</p>
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes, which seems to be appropriately cofinanced.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		n/a
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Not yet. Please see comments under 4, 10, 11, and 13.</p> <p>Update 9/12/2013: The pending issues have been resolved satisfactorily for this stage, and the PIF is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		the LDCF.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please see items for which the reviewer requested follow up by CEO Endorsement (11 and 13).	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Not yet. Please address comments under Sections 4, 9, 11, 13, 15, 18, and 21. Update 9/8/2015: All remaining issues have been addressed and the project is now recommended for CEO Endorsement.
	First review*	August 05, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	September 12, 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.