



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

GEF ID:	5694		
Country/Region:	Comoros		
Project Title:	Building Climate Resilience through Rehabilitated Watersheds, Forests and Adaptive Livelihoods		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	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-1; CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$5,139,999
Co-financing:	\$16,480,000	Total Project Cost:	\$21,819,999
PIF Approval:	July 01, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	July 30, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Rawleston Moore	Agency Contact Person:	Ermira Fida

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. Comoros is an LDC to the UNFCCC and has completed its NAPA.	Yes. Same as at PIF.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. The OFP endorsed the project on 23 October 2013.	Yes. Same as at PIF.
Resource Availability	3. 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	YES.	Yes.
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or		NA

*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)
	<p>Technology Transfer)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund • focal area set-aside? 		<p>NA</p> <p>NA</p>
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>YES. The project is aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework, and it aims to address CCA-1 and CCA-2 focal area objectives.</p>	<p>Yes. No change from PIF.</p>
	<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>	<p>YES. In particular, the project addresses NAPA priorities related to (1) restoration of degraded soils, (3) reconstitution of basin slops, and (4) increasing water supply.</p>	<p>6/16/2016 More clarification sought. The NAP is referenced on page 49 but no further information is provided.</p> <p>Recommended action Please elaborate on specific ways the project will seek coordination with the ongoing in country NAP process and how the project will inform or be informed by NAP.</p>
	<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>	<p>NOT YET. While the project will support two large baseline initiatives - the National Programme on Forestry (NPF) and the National Programme for Sustainable Human Development (NPSHD) - additional information on the specific baseline activities for each component are required. For example, the PIF sites on page 9, that the NPF is "a loosely constituted group of policies, laws, plans and ad hoc projects", without adequately describing, or providing</p>	<p>6/16/2016 Yes. Information on baseline projects is sufficiently detailed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>examples, of these plans and projects. Currently, this information cannot be distinguished in Table 1 provided in Annex.</p> <p>It would also be useful to provide more information (or lessons learned) from initiatives under the FAO "Support to National Forestry Programme" and the ECDD.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify, for each component, baseline project activities, particularly the FAO support program and ECCD, as described in PIF.</p> <p>CL, 06-12-2014: Yes comments have been addressed in the revised PIF.</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>NOT YET. Please address comments in 6.</p> <p>Once baseline project activities have been fully described under each component, please clarify how baseline co-financing amounts align with project framework (Table B). For example, under component one, co-financing identified for the National Forest Inventory (with FAO support) and the Forestry Development Priority Action Plan, do not amount to the USD 550,000 shown in Table B.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address comments in 6, and ensure baseline co-financing amounts adequately align with each component.</p>	<p>6/16/2016 More clarification sought on knowledge management and monitoring and evaluation - there is no dedicated component for either.</p> <p>Recommended Action Please clarify how KM and M&E will be executed at the project level.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>CL, 06-12-2014: Yes, comments have been addressed in the revised PIF. Baseline cofinancing in Table B aligns adequately with each component and associated outputs.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT YET.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address comments in 6 and adjust the additional cost reasoning where appropriate, and if possible, include any gender-specific aspects being considered by project.</p> <p>CL, 06-12-2014: Yes, comments have been addressed in the revised PIF. Gender-related aspects have also been described in section A.2.</p>	<p>6/16/2016 Yes.</p> <p>Additional cost reasoning is adequately described in Section A1.4 and adaptation benefits are specified in section A1.5</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>6/16/2016 No.</p> <p>Recommended action Please elaborate on the socio-economic benefits delivered by this project and how they will support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits. This is particularly relevant to Component 3, but also pertains to the other activities executed under Component 1 and 2. Additionally, gender is address on page 39 in section A4, however more specificity on the activities designed around women's "specific needs, capacities, knowledge and social roles" would be appreciated. The Secretariat would appreciate additional information regarding how gender will be mainstreamed in this project.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	YES. The project adequately identifies the role of various stakeholders in supporting project activities.	6/16/2016 Yes. The project has adequately described how it will engage local community organizations and NGOs, academic institutions and will be elaborated upon at project inception.
	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, and ranks them by level i.e. high, medium or low.	6/16/2016 Yes. The risk framework is adequately developed and presented in Section A.5
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>NOT YET. The project is consistent with numerous initiatives (pages 19 and 20 of PIF), including the UNDP-UNEP LDCF project, "Adapting water resource management in the Comoros to expected climate change".</p> <p>However, please also clarify linkages to be established between the UNDP project in the Comoros (Council Approved in June 2012), "Enhancing adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change in the agriculture sector in Comoros", which aims to address challenges in the agricultural sector, including inadequate land and forest regulation, poor water management, unsustainable farming practices, and limited information and early warning systems.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify synergies to be established with recently approved UNDP project in the Comoros (GEF ID: 4974).</p> <p>CL, 06-12-2014: Yes, comments have</p>	<p>6/16/2016 Not quite. More clarification sought. The project has identified ways in which it will seek synergies with ongoing GEF-financed initiatives in Comoros, but the "Strengthening of the Comoros' resilience to disaster risk linked to climate change and variability" project (GEFID 6912) is listed but no further elaboration is provided.</p> <p>Recommended Action Please clarify exactly how the proposed project will seek synergies with the aforementioned project.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		been addressed in the revised PIF.	
	<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 for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>NOT YET. Please address comments above, before these aspects can be adequately assessed.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address comments above.</p> <p>CL, 06-12-2014: Yes, comments have been addressed in the revised PIF.</p> <p>INNOVATION: The project is introducing integrated watershed management through ecosystem-based adaptation approaches, as a means of adapting to climate change and alleviating poverty in Comoros. The project is implementing innovative monitoring initiatives e.g. piloting new technologies such as GIS and crowd-sourcing platforms to strengthen natural resource planning at the local level.</p> <p>SUSTAINABILITY: Developing a more thorough knowledge-base on the state of watersheds through community-based approaches, will ensure overall project sustainability. The project will also work closely with local stakeholders, including local organizations, NGOs, and women's groups as to encourage ownership and buy-in of project activities.</p> <p>SCALING-UP: The project aims to scale-up reforestation and watershed rehabilitation activities to other sites, as</p>	<p>6/16/2016 Yes. This project is innovative in Comoros, focusing on the rehabilitation of watersheds and ecosystems are adaptation. Sustainability is addressed through specific mechanisms, including an island based intersectoral platform and the development of watershed rehabilitation and management plans at the community level. The project does show significant potential to be scaled up in nearby communities.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		well as seek coordination with other GEF-funded initiatives in Comoros. The project also includes strong private sector collaboration (with the chamber of commerce and industry associations) through component 3. Alternative livelihood production strategies will be explored with partners, including niche products such as pharmaco-cosmetic uses of agro-forestry products. Increased income generation provided through these activities, will support project scale-up through the enhancement of economic activity.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		6/16/2016 Yes. All changes are justified in Part II A, and are mostly related to syntax.
	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?		6/16/2016 No. The community-based ecological monitoring programme originally proposed as part of component 1 was removed because it was deemed as "not cost effective," but no further elaboration regarding alternative approaches is provided. Recommended action Please elaborate on the cost-effectiveness of the activities identified for this project in comparison to similar alternative approaches.
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?	NOT YET. Please address comments in 7 above. CL, 06-12-2014: Yes, comments have been addressed in the revised PIF.	6/16/2016 Yes.
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing	NOT YET. Please address comments in 7 above. Also, include the FAO support of	6/16/2016 Yes. Co-financing letters confirming a cumulative amount of

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>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?</p>	<p>USD 300,000 to table. CL, 06-12-2014: Yes, comments have been addressed in the revised PIF.</p>	<p>USD \$16.48 million have been received by MAPEEIA, DGEF, DNSAE, and DGEF (Japan).</p>
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>YES.</p>	<p>6/16/2016 Yes. Same as at PIF.</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>YES. A PPG of USD 100,000 has been requested.</p>	<p>6/16/2016 Yes. A table is included in Annex C outlining spent and committed amounts of the PPG grant.</p>
	<p>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		<p>6/16/2016 More clarification sought. Outcome 2.3, Indicator 9 is [ertains to: (a) Number of people (percentage of whom are female) trained to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and evaluate adaptation strategies and measures; and (b) the degree to which the capacities of those people have been strengthened (measured e.g. through a capacity perception index). The unit of measurement listed on the tracking tool is "intro to integrated watershed management." This is unclear and does not sound measurable.</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)
			Please clarify the unit of measurement and respond to Indicator 9b - to what degree will the capacities be strengthened?
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		6/16/2016 Yes. A costed M&E plan was included in Section C.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		6/16/2016 No - are there comments and/or responses to STAP? No comments were included in the package.
	• Convention Secretariat?		NA
	• The Council?		Yes
	• Other GEF Agencies?		NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please address comments in 6, 7, 8, 12, 16, and 17 above. CL, 06-12-2014: Yes. The project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		6/16/2016 Not yet. Please refer to Items 5,7,9,12,14,15,21,23
	First review*	February 13, 2014	June 16, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	June 13, 2014	
	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.**