



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

GEF ID:	6912		
Country/Region:	Comoros		
Project Title:	Strengthening Comoros resilience against climate change and variability related disaster		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5445 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$8,932,421
Co-financing:	\$37,650,000	Total Project Cost:	\$46,782,421
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Alice Chibulu Luo	Agency Contact Person:	Henry Rene Diouf

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, as an LDC party to the UNFCCC, is eligible to receive funding under the LDCF.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. The project was endorsed by the OFP on 25th February 2014.	
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	The proposed grant (\$8.93 million) is available under the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	

*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)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>YES. The project is aligned with CCA-1 and CCA-2.</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. Including the NAPA, other strategies to which the project is aligned are adequately described in section B.1.</p>	
Project Design	<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.</p> <p>1) Please expand on the baseline scenario (page 7), by providing additional description of activities, plans or targets, in regard to: i) the new institutional DRM framework and Climate Change and Natural Disaster Risks Reduction Strategic Framework (2011-2016), ii) emergency/contingency plans, in particular the "national preparedness plan", does it include any adaptation/climate change components?, iii) the country multi-hazard profile, and iv) the early warning system - is coverage</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>being established at the national level only through the Indian Ocean Commission "Strengthening National Capacities Project", or through other projects also?</p> <p>2) In line with Outcome 3, please also describe the baseline scenario as it relates to land-use planning and management,</p> <p>3) Where appropriate, please highlight existing programming barriers under the various baseline projects described (UNDP, IOC, UNIDSR, PADST etc.),</p> <p>and 4) It is not clear how the two referral hospitals to be built in Anjouan and Moroni (supported by the Qatar and Chinese governments), are related to project scope. To this, please describe the baseline scenario, as it relates to the socioeconomic environment, and in particular the health sector.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide more information on 1) various baseline scenarios mentioned above, 2) baseline projects and existing barriers, and 3) provide justification for referral hospitals as relevant baseline projects.</p> <p>11/18/2014, CL -- comments have been adequately addressed in revised PIF.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>Not yet. Please address comments in 6, and adjust baseline financing amounts in Table B, where necessary.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please address</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>comments in 6.</p> <p>11/18/2014, CL -- comments have been adequately addressed in revised PIF.</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. The adaptation benefits have been identified through the three project outcomes. However, please address comments in 6.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please address comments in 6.</p> <p>11/18/2014, CL -- comments have been adequately addressed in revised PIF.</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>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>Not yet. While the PIF highlights engagement with communities through CBOs, Scout Associations and NGOs (Section A.2.), please also include information to how these local groups will be engaged in project design/preparation (e.g. workshops, trainings etc.), and in particular, indigenous groups where relevant.</p> <p>Recommended action: please provide additional clarification to how communities will be engaged in project design/preparation.</p> <p>11/18/2014, CL -- comments have been</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		adequately addressed in revised PIF.	
	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.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>Not yet. Please also describe plans to ensure appropriate coordination with other UNDP-LDCF financed projects, currently under implementation in the Comoros: "Adapting water resource management in the Comoros to expected climate change" (GEF ID: 3857), "Enhancing adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change in the agriculture sector in Comoros" (GEF ID: 4974). As well as recently approved UNEP project, "Building Climate Resilience through Rehabilitated Watersheds, Forests and Adaptive Livelihoods" (GEF ID: 5694).</p> <p>Recommended action: please identify consistency with other LDCF projects in Comoros.</p> <p>11/18/2014, CL -- comments have been adequately addressed in revised PIF.</p>	
	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, 	<p>Not yet. The innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scale-up can not be fully addressed at this time. Please address comments in 6, 10 and 12.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please address</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>and if not, why not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>comments above.</p> <p>11/18/2014, CL -- comments have been adequately addressed in revised PIF.</p> <p>The project will be the first LDCF-financed disaster risk management (DRM) project in the Comoros; and is, in itself, innovative. The project will build on existing baseline interventions to strengthen adaptation capacities to manage and control current and long-term climate drivers and impacts in the DRM sector. Strong engagement with local communities (as well as key CSOs, NGOs and CBOs) during project preparation and design, will enhance stakeholder ownership of project, therefore contributing to overall project sustainability . The project also has a strong gender integration; in particular, gender-based vulnerability assessments will be conducted during the PPG phase, as to develop gender sensitive adaptation measures and strategies. And finally, the close coordination with other relevant initiatives in the country will allow for the sharing and replication of best practices.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	<p>Not yet. Please address comments in 6, and adjust numbers in Table B, where appropriate.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please address comments in 6.</p> <p>11/18/2014, CL -- comments have been adequately addressed in revised PIF.</p>	
	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?	<p>Not yet. Please address comments in 6, and adjust numbers in Table C, where appropriate.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please address comments in 6.</p> <p>11/18/2014, CL -- comments have been adequately addressed in revised PIF.</p>	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES.	
	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.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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?	NOT YET. Please address comments in 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16 and 17. 11/18/2014, CL -- comments have been adequately addressed in revised PIF. The project is recommended for "technical clearance" and will be approved as additional LDCF resources become available to support programming.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	September 10, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	November 18, 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.**

