



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

GEF ID:	5451		
Country/Region:	Congo DR		
Project Title:	Strengthening Hydro-Meteorological and Climate Services		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	144712 (World Bank)
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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$5,329,452
Co-financing:	\$32,700,000	Total Project Cost:	\$38,329,452
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:	

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. The Democratic Republic of Congo is a LDC party to the UNFCCC and has completed its NAPA.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		Yes. The Operational Focal Point endorsed it on Sept. 18, 2013.
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. The proposed grant is available from 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)? 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		NA
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>		Yes. The project is in line with LDCF Framework Objectives for CCA-1 and CCA-2.
	<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>Not clear. The Project is in line with the NAPA, which has identified the strengthening of national meteorological services as a key adaptation option and in line with the LDC Work Program adopted in COP7, however there is no mention of the in country NAP process.</p> <p>Recommended Action Please articulate how the project will coordinate with the ongoing NAP process.</p> <p>UPDATE 8/9/2016 Not yet. The Agency has not clarified how or if the project will inform or coordinate the NAP process in Congo DR.</p> <p>UPDATE 8/19/2016 Yes. It appears that the Agency is</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			coordinating closely with UNDP, which is overseeing the NAP process.
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?		<p>Not clear. Although the projects are described in the synergies and linkages section on page 117-118, more detail would be appreciated.</p> <p>Recommended Action More details regarding the two baseline projects would be appreciated.</p> <p>UPDATE 8/5/2016 Yes. The baseline projects - Strengthening Hydro-Meteorological and Climate Services project (US\$2.7 million), the DRC Urban Development project (US\$20 million) and the Western Growth Poles project (US\$10 million), have been sufficiently described.</p>
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?		<p>It is unclear who the direct project beneficiaries are and some of the language is inconsistent. The project appraisal document identifies "those involved in and receiving (a) weather forecasts through different media, including television and internet, (b) agro-meteorological information services, (c) extreme weather warnings (mostly in urban areas and along fluvial navigation channels), and (d) aviation services." However, elsewhere in the document, such as in the Tracking Tool, "direct beneficiaries" are described differently. Additionally, on page 18, under risks that "Stakeholder risks are assessed as low and the dissemination of customized services to users and stakeholders would be supported from</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>other ongoing projects."</p> <p>Recommended Action Please identify beneficiaries of this project are more clearly. It would be helpful to differentiate between the end users of the equipment, infrastructure, systems, and services provided by this project, and to select additional indicators to track results achieved among the different groups. For example, in the Tracking tool, there are 2.9 million direct beneficiaries identified, however, it appears that reaching these beneficiaries would also depend on other ongoing projects.</p> <p>UPDATE 8/5/2016 Yes. The Agency has clarified that: the direct beneficiaries are those receiving: i) weather forecast; ii) agro-meteo information; iii) extreme weather warnings; and iv) aviation services. And that, based on these categories, the indicator number 3 in the Result Framework and Monitoring includes: i) general public through radio, internet, TV (level 1 and 2); ii) farmers (level 3), iii) population of Kinshasa receiving extreme weather warnings (level 3); and iv) air passengers (level 1).</p>
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>		<p>Yes. The project will support and complement a GFDRR investment to strengthen institutional capacity of MettelSat to provide hydromet information services across several sectors. This will enable MettelSat to provide data and information which will</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			enable institutions and sectors to adapt to climate change and add value to baseline investments.
	<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>Not clear. There is very little information regarding how socio-economic benefits will be delivered by this project and how the delivery of such benefits will support additional benefits.</p> <p>Recommended action Please refer to Item 7. As it is unclear who the target beneficiary population is, determining the integration of appropriate gender dimensions is unclear, however consideration of the gender dimensions of project activities is expected.</p> <p>UPDATE 8/10/2016 Yes. Social benefits have been described and gender dimensions are adequately addressed.</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 clear. Public participation is addressed briefly on page 133.</p> <p>Recommended action Please provide additional details for engaging CSOs and the wider community.</p> <p>UPDATE 8/10/2016 Yes. The Agency has clarified that the design and implementation of the activities taking place on the select pilot sites will associate closely the networks of farmers and populations vulnerable to heavy rains that already benefit from the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Western Growth Pole and Urban Development Projects in the DRC, which may include farmers unions and CSOs from the urban areas targeted. Section I of Annex 8 of the Prodoc now adequately describes public involvement.</p>
	<p>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>		<p>Not clear. The risk framework does not seem to be sufficiently developed. Risks listed do not include risk mitigation measures.</p> <p>Recommended action Please elaborate climate and non-climate risks which are relevant specific to DRC and the target area and issues such as inter-agency coordination.</p> <p>Additionally, on page 18, Item 7, "Stakeholder risks are assessed as low and the dissemination of customized services to users and stakeholders would be supported from other ongoing projects." This indicates that the dissemination of information produced and/or collected through the infrastructure and services delivered by this project rely on complementary investments. In the case that these other investments are not synchronized, or do not materialized, please describe mitigation measures that ensure that proposed capital investments delivered with LDCF funding will be used.</p> <p>UPDATE 8/10/2016 Not yet. The Agency has stated that the team can follow-up with specific risks</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>and mitigation measures, as the information provided is sufficient for the Agency's internal document format in the PAD, but the Secretariat would appreciate more clarification on the specific risks as addressed in the comment provided above.</p> <p>UPDATE 8/19/2016 Yes. The agency has clarified that Component A of the Project, namely "Institutional and regulatory strengthening, capacity building and implementation support" will specifically address institutional risks, with a detailed institutional assessment, a long-term business plan and capacity building program for the institution and its human resources. The Project will improve the capacity of the institution on various fronts (fiduciary, project management, institutional collaboration, technical delivery, etc.). The PAD identifies on page 19 the following risks in relation with Institutional Capacity for Implementation and Sustainability: "Specific risks anticipated are related to the capacity of staff to develop new capacities and skills to maintain, operate and sustain the equipment used for observation, forecasting and service delivery; and, secure the necessary financial resources for the long-term sustainability and continued development of the services."</p>
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country</p>		<p>Not clear. Synergies sought with ongoing initiatives are detailed, but more information on other in country</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>or in the region?</p>		<p>GEF-financed initiatives are not described.</p> <p>Recommended Action Please describe in detail how the project will coordinate with GEF-financed initiatives in the country.</p> <p>UPDATE 8/10/2016 Not Quite. There are at least 8 other GEF-financed projects in various stages of implementation in Cong DR, and while Section H of Annex 8 is discusses coordination and complementarity with other projects, it fails to include any of the other GEF-financed initiatives.</p> <p>Recommended Action Please include how the project will interface with the in country GEF-financed initiatives, to ensure that there is no replication and that the initiative maximizes synergies and complementarity.</p> <p>UPDATE 8/19/2016 Yes. The Agency has clarified all synergies sought with relevant GEF and other donor financed initiatives, sector by sector, in Annex 8, and is ensuring coordination on other projects.</p>
	<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. 		<p>The project appears to be innovative, and would result in delivering climate information services to a number of sectors, to be further confirmed upon clarification of issues listed under section 7.</p>

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"> 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>The project has potential for sustainability, namely by supporting directly institutional and technical capacity building at MettelSat through long-term on demand capacity building program for staff. Given the critical importance of achieving sustainability beyond project life, please elaborate on concrete measures towards ensuring that financing will be sustained past project closure.</p> <p>Please discuss the potential for scaling up (e.g. further innovative applications of the project outputs in the country.)</p> <p>UPDATE 8/9/2016 Yes. Scaling up is addressed in Annex 6 on potential beneficiaries over the project duration and beyond - the strengthening of MettelSat's capacities as a result of the project could lead to the potential scaling up of activities and development of additional services to additional users.</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>No.</p> <p>Recommended Action Please provided a basis for the cost-effectiveness of this project.</p> <p>UPDATE 8/10/2016 Not quite. Cost effectiveness of the chosen intervention in comparison to</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>alternatives has not been elaborated upon.</p> <p>UPDATE 8/19/2016 Yes. The agency has clarified that project activities have been identified in order to respond to priorities in the three most critical sectors: air navigation, agriculture, urban flood management. The most cost effective low technology options and implementation methods have been selected, and Agency has provided several examples, including:</p> <p>(1) Real-time monitoring of flood risk in urban areas will be conducted using combination of satellite remote sensing and simple rain gauge strategically positioned upstream major flood-prone areas, this solution is highly cost-effective compared to the acquisition, operation and maintenance of a dedicated weather radar. (2) Capacity-development for staff, will be conducted cost-effective cost through partnerships with WMO, ASECNA, ICAO and local training institute (ISTA). These enabling partnerships are made possible because the project is operating in the framework of the Africa Hydromet Program, a partnership between WB, AfDB and WMO. Africa Hydromet Program is considered a flagship program as part of the World Bank Climate Business Plan presented at the 21st United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Conference of Parties (COP21).</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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.
	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 cofinancing needs to be confirmed no later than at Board approval.
	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?		NA
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Not clear. Recommended Action Please provided a budgeted plan for M&E.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>UPDATE 8/10/2016 No budgeted M&E plan included.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION Please provide a budgeted M&E plan.</p> <p>UPDATE 8/29/2016 An indicative budget of US\$100,000 is made available under component D for the M&E specialist, the definition of the detailed baseline and methodology for estimation of indicators, and implementation of regular surveys to update the results framework annually. This information has been added to page 73 of the PAD.</p> <p>More specific information about the M&E plan will be detailed during implementation, as per Agency policy.</p>
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		NA
	• Convention Secretariat?		NA
	• The Council? • Other GEF Agencies?		NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>06/12/2013 -- NOT YET. Please provide a GEF Data Sheet and a signed Letter of Endorsement.</p> <p>09/09/2013 -- 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.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		CEO Endorsement will be recommended once the review comments are adequately addressed. 8/19/2016 Yes. CEO endorsement is being recommended at this time.
	First review*	June 12, 2013	August 01, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	September 09, 2013	August 10, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		August 19, 2016

* **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.**