



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9392		
Country/Region:	Congo DR		
Project Title:	Climate Resilient Growth and Adaptation in Democratic Republic of Congo		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5440 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$8,242,500
Co-financing:	\$19,897,000	Total Project Cost:	\$28,139,500
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Dustin Schinn	Agency Contact Person:	Mame Diop

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>NOT CLEAR. The Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) identifies relevant strategic objectives. The Table should not, however, include a separate row for project management cost.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please remove the row for project management cost in Table A and incorporate the associated LDCF</p>	

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>grant and co-financing across the relevant strategic objectives.</p> <p>04/12/2016 -- YES. The Focal Area Strategy Framework has been revised as recommended.</p> <p>DS, April 8, 2018: Unchanged. Comments cleared.</p>	
	<p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project is aligned with key national policies, strategies, plans and frameworks; including the NAPA, the 2011-15 Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, the National Program on Food Security, and the 2013-17 UNDAF.</p> <p>In addition, however, it would be helpful if the proposal could clarify how the proposed project would contribute towards the adaptation needs and priorities identified in DRC's intended nationally determined contribution (INDC) towards the post-2020 climate agreement.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify whether and how the proposed project could contribute towards the adaptation needs and priorities identified in DRC's INDC.</p> <p>04/12/2016 – YES. The revised PIF</p>	<p>The mention to the "Poverty Reduction and Growth Strategy Paper" was deleted. However, due to the instability in DRC, the UNDAF has not been updated yet. And while the dates of the previous UNDAF indicates an end in 2017, it was extended until the new framework is prepared.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>clarifies to what extent the proposed project is aligned with the adaptation component of DRC's INDC.</p> <p>DS, April 8, 2018: Yes, however, please remove the plans and strategies from the PIF which have expired by 2017, including the 'Poverty Reduction and Growth Strategy Paper for 2011-2015' and the UNDAF (2013-2017).</p> <p>DS, May 8, 2018: Comment cleared.</p>	
Project Design	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 4 below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 4, please revisit and strengthen, as needed, the discussion on sustainability and potential for scaling up.</p> <p>04/12/2016 – YES. Please refer to Section 4 above.</p> <p>DS, April 8, 2018: Unchanged. Comments cleared.</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The PIF provides a helpful description of the baseline scenario and the additional reasoning for each component. Still, further details are needed, particularly given the linkages between the proposed projects and other related initiatives that are planned or underway.</p> <p>With respect to Component 1, it is not entirely clear how DRC's NAP process would evolve in absence of the proposed project. According to the country's INDCs, the process was launched in 2014. Moreover, the PIF does not describe the baseline scenario in the targeted provinces. What are the existing sub-national planning and decision-making processes that would be enhanced through the proposed project?</p> <p>As for Component 2, agro-meteorological services represent an important area of emphasis in three of the four LDCF projects that have been approved in DRC to date (GEF IDs 3718, 5226 and 5451). It seems that the provision and application of agro-meteorological information would be substantially strengthened even in absence of additional LDCF support; and the PIF does not demonstrate clearly what gaps the proposed</p>	<p>(1) Even though both projects target some activities conducted in the agriculture and rural development sector, the LDCF project plans to develop a sectorial NAP framework, while the GCF will (i) support the formulation of a concept note for one adaptation project in the sector of agriculture and rural development, and (ii) develop a financing strategy for the PSPA-CC through the identification of domestic, international and private sector funding. Therefore, instead of duplicating, the LDCF will be able to build on the lessons learned from the project if a financing is identified, and the NAP Agriculture will be able to benefit from the financing strategy developed for the PSPA-CC for its own financing – as Government funding will very likely be insufficient.</p> <p>(2) The dates for the baseline projects were added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current five-year plan for the PNSD covers the period from 2017 to 2022. - The UNDP "Strategic Planning for Development" project, that is implemented between 2018 and 2021 - the first GEF/LDCF Project in DRC "Building the Capacity of the Agriculture Sector in DRC to Plan for and Respond to the Additional Threats Posed by Climate Change on Food Production and Security", from 2010 to 2014

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>project would fill.</p> <p>With respect to the baseline scenario for agribusiness and agricultural development, it is not clear whether and to what extent the baseline investments cited will cover the three provinces targeted by the proposed project.</p> <p>Given the need to further clarify the baseline scenario and associated investments, the additional reasoning cannot be fully assessed. Nevertheless, with respect to Component 1, the proposed project requests US\$2.15 million for, inter alia, a framework for the NAP process and awareness raising, although the process appears to be well underway and would be further still when the project would be ready for implementation. As for output 1.3, it is not clear whether and how the proposed provincial plans would strengthen existing planning processes and, in the event that they would not be associated with any existing process, how their implementation would be financed.</p> <p>Component 2, in turn, does not clearly articulate how the proposed outputs would depart from a business-as-usual</p>	<p>- The second GEF/LDCF project in DRC "Improving women and children's resilience and capacity to adapt to climate change in the Democratic Republic of Congo" implemented between 2015 and 2018.</p> <p>- the METTELSAT project will be implemented from 2016 to 2021</p> <p>(3) Resource mobilization refers to the identification of public and private financing for CCA. This would include support to decision makers on how to better allocate the available resources towards climate change adaptation practices and identify the intervention that could trigger private sector involvement. The term has been reviewed as "resource allocation".</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>approach to agricultural and rural development. It is not evident how the proposed technologies and approaches would contribute towards reducing the vulnerability of the targeted beneficiaries to the current and expected impacts of climate change.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) clarify the baseline scenario as it relates to DRC's ongoing NAP process, relevant existing sub-national planning and decision-making processes, the provision and application of agro-meteorological information, as well as relevant agribusiness and agricultural development projects, programs and investments specifically in the three targeted provinces. Upon clarifying the baseline scenario, please (ii) sharpen the additional reasoning for Component 1 and consider focusing LDCF support on fewer, very targeted outcomes that will add value to DRC's existing NAP process and sub-national planning; (iii) demonstrate how the proposed outputs would depart from a business-as-usual approach to agricultural and rural development; and (iv) consider dropping Output 2.2 given the significant support provided through</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>other projects, or develop a very clear justification for requesting additional support for agro-meteorological services. Finally, please (v) revisit and clarify the expected adaptation benefits based on the above recommendations.</p> <p>04/12/2016 – YES. The baseline scenario, additional reasoning and expected adaptation benefits have been adequately clarified for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, the proposed project is expected to demonstrate a clearer additional reasoning in relation to projects and programs underway in the country, particularly for Output 2.2.</p> <p>DS, April 8, 2018: Partly unclear. Please consider the following:</p> <p>(1) There seems to be potentially significant overlap with the GCF-approved NAP funding. For instance, the GCF NAP funding targets "priority sectors agriculture, rural development, coastal management, biodiversity, energy, transport and</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>water and sanitation", while the LDCF project aims to "set up a NAP framework for the priority sectors of agriculture and rural development and water". Please consider restructuring the proposal to fully account for the GCF NAP funding and ensure that LDCF funding is used in the most effective and impact-full manner. This restructuring should be undertaken in close consultation with the government of DRC and may require some reallocation of requested resources between individual components.</p> <p>(2) Please provide the time frames of implementation for each of the baseline initiatives listed in the PIF.</p> <p>(3) Please clarify what kind of "resource mobilization" is envisaged as part of Outcome 1 (see PIF page 8).</p> <p>DS, May 21, 2018: Comments cleared.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 4 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>addressing the recommendations in Section 4, please revise the project framework (Table B) accordingly.</p> <p>04/12/2016 – YES. Please refer to Section 4 above.</p> <p>DS, April 8, 2018: Unchanged. Comments cleared.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>YES. Socio-economic aspects, including gender dimensions and public involvement have been adequately described for this stage of project design.</p> <p>DS, April 8, 2018: Unchanged. Comments cleared.</p>	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	<p>YES. The proposed grant is available from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.</p> <p>DS, April 8, 2018: Unchanged. Comments cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 		

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Recommendations	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>NOT YET. Please refer to sections 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 above.</p> <p>04/12/2016 – YES. The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the project may be processed for clearance/ approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.</p> <p>DS, April 8, 2018: Resources for this project have become available under the LDCF, and the agency has submitted an updated PIF. However, some questions remain unclear given in particular that the GCF has approved NAP funding after initial technical clearance of this project. Please therefore address comments under Question 2 and 4 above, and submit revised PIF along with response matrix.</p> <p>DS, May 21, 2018: Comments cleared. PM recommends PIF for clearance and PPG.</p> <p>The following comments are to be taken into account by the agency during PPG phase:</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>As per consultation with the GCF Secretariat, the approved GCF NAP proposal specifically includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o advancing the adaptation planning process for priority climate sensitive sectors and regions in DRC o legal and institutional framework and capacity building for climate change adaptation planning; o aligning the climate change adaptation and development priorities reflected in the PNSD, the PNIA and the PDPs of priority provinces; and o financing options for adaptation investments in agriculture and rural development, health, land use planning and energy. <p>It seems the LDCF proposal intends to prepare a high level NAP framework that can support the detailed activities of the GCF NAP proposal. By CEO endorsement, it will be important that DRC clarify in detail how this NAP framework will be supported by activities of the GCF NAP project, and vice versa, and clearly demonstrate that there is no overlapping support provided by the GCF and GEF.</p>	
Review Date	Review	March 08, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 12, 2016	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 08, 2018	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.