



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

GEF ID:	5226		
Country/Region:	Congo		
Project Title:	Building the resilience and ability to adapt of women and children to changing climate in Democratic Republic of Congo		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5110 (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-2; CCA-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,725,000
Co-financing:	\$15,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$20,225,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Mame Dagou

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?	YES. DRC is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point and dated December 15, 2012, has been attached to the submission.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	YES. UNDP has a comparative advantage in community-based approaches and capacity building for climate change adaptation.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	YES. The proposed project will benefit from UNDP's past and current programming in DRC, as well as the	

Resource Availability	6. 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 proposed grant (\$5,297,500, including Agency fee) is available from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?		
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	YES. The proposed project is aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA objectives 1, 2 and 3 and, specifically, outcomes 1.3, 2.3 and 3.1.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards DRC's NAPA priorities in the areas of crop and livestock production and food security, water resources management, and hydro-meteorological monitoring and information services. The project is also aligned with DRC's Poverty Reduction and Growth Strategy Paper, and it would contribute towards the achievement of several MDGs.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	YES. The proposed project combines pilot investments and technology transfer with relevant capacity building, as well as improved access to micro	

		women.	
Project Design	11. 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>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would build on the following baseline development initiatives: (i) the USAID Food Production, Processing and Marketing Programme (FPPM), totaling \$32 million with \$4 million in expected co-financing; (ii) the UNDP Micro-Finance Support Programme (PASMIF II), totaling \$14 million with \$2 million in expected co-financing; and (iii) the AfDB Rural Infrastructure Development Support Project (PADIR), totaling \$50 million, with \$4 million in expected co-financing.</p> <p>While the three baseline initiatives are adequately described for this stage of project development, further information is required as to the baseline activities supported by the national government and its agencies, which are expected to provide \$5 million in in-kind co-financing according to Table C.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify the baseline development activities associated with the \$5 million in indicative, in-kind co-financing from the national government.</p> <p>02/05/2013 “ YES. The re-submission clarifies that the co-financing provided by the national government is primarily associated with the maintenance of the country's meteorological stations, and the implementation of its Poverty Reduction Strategy in the agriculture sector</p>	

	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. With respect to Component 1, the proposed LDCF grant would in part seem to support activities that will also be carried out by the baseline projects, particularly FPPM and that could be considered part of business-as-usual rural development. It is not entirely clear how these investments would target individuals and communities most at risk in the face of climate change, building on and complementing the baseline initiatives in line with the principle of additional cost.</p> <p>With respect to Component 2, it is not fully clear to what extent the proposed training activities would be stand-alone or integrated into existing projects and programs, such as the farmer field schools promoted by FPPM.</p> <p>In addition, please refer to Section 11 above. In absence of a complete account of the baseline initiatives on which the proposed project would build, the additional cost reasoning cannot be fully assessed at this stage.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please (i) revise the additional cost reasoning accordingly, as necessary; (ii) clarify the targeting</p>	

		<p>Component 1, with reference to relevant baseline initiatives; and (iii) clarify to what extent the training activities proposed under Component 2 would be integrated into existing projects and programs.</p> <p>02/05/2013 “ YES. The re-submission clarifies adequately the additional cost reasoning for this stage of project development. In particular, the revised PIF specifies the scope of FPPM, and how the proposed LDCF grant would strengthen this baseline initiative through targeted investments in livelihood diversification and agro-meteorological services. The linkages between the proposed Component 2 and existing training and extension services have also been strengthened.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please describe in greater detail the targeting principles adopted for Component 1, i.e. how beneficiaries would be selected based on relevant vulnerability assessments, and how appropriate, climate-resilient technologies and practices would be prioritized.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11 and 13, please revise the project framework accordingly, as necessary.</p> <p>02/05/2013 “ YES. The project framework is sound and sufficiently</p>	

	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13 above, please clarify the adaptation benefits associated with Component 1.</p> <p>02/05/2013 “ YES. The expected adaptation benefits have been adequately described for this stage of project development, based on sound methodology and assumptions.</p>	
	<p>16. 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>YES. The expected socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions are clearly described.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>YES. Public participation, including CSOs, is well considered for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>YES. The PIF identifies relevant risks and appropriate mitigation measures adequately for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>YES. Coordination with other related initiatives is adequately considered for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>YES. The implementation and execution arrangements are adequate.</p>	
	<p>21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		

	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES. The proposed LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate, at \$225,000 or 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 and 2.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 and 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11 and 13, please (i) adjust the grant and co-financing amounts accordingly, as necessary. In addition, please (ii) ensure that the proposed Agency fee does not exceed the allowed 9.5 per cent of the project grant, in accordance with the revised fee structure.</p> <p>02/05/2013 â€“ YES. The proposed Agency fee has been adjusted as recommended.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please substantiate the indicative, in-kind co-financing of \$5 million from the national government, included in Table C.</p> <p>02/05/2013 â€“ YES. The sources and nature of the co-financing provided by the national government has been adequately clarified for this stage of</p>	

	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	YES. In line with its role, UNDP would bring \$2.4 million in indicative co-financing towards the proposed project.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	NA	
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	NA	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 11, 13, 14, 15, 24 and 25. 02/05/2013 â€œ YES.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	January 10, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 05, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	YES. The proposed PPG (\$100,000) would support (i) assessments of needs and technical feasibility; (ii) project development; (iii) stakeholder consultations; and (iv) financial planning.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	NOT CLEAR. While the proposed preparation activities have been designed in a cost-effective manner, the proposed Agency fee is too high. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the proposed Agency fee does not exceed the allowed 9.5 per cent of the project grant, in accordance with the revised fee structure. 02/05/2013 – YES. The proposed Agency fee has been adjusted as recommended.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to Section 2 above. 02/05/2013 – YES.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	January 10, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 05, 2013

* 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.