



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

GEF ID:	5332		
Country/Region:	Djibouti		
Project Title:	Supporting Rural Community Adaptation to Climate Change in Mountain Regions of Djibouti		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5189 (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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$5,379,452
Co-financing:	\$28,110,000	Total Project Cost:	\$33,589,452
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Robert Kelly

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	YES. Djibouti is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point and dated March 10, 2013, has been attached to the submission.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	YES. The proposed grant is available from the LDCF in accordance with the	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</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 proposed project would contribute towards objectives CCA-1 and CCA-2.	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	YES. The proposed project would address Djibouti's NAPA priorities in the areas of climate-resilient surface water management, livestock management and the regeneration of pastures. The project is also consistent with the country's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP), as well as the findings of the National Capacity Self-Assessment, sectoral reports of the Great Green Wall Initiative, and the National Programme of Action for the Environment (PANE).	
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, 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 PIF lists several relevant baseline initiatives, including the (a) UNDP, IFAD, FAO and WFP: Programme de mobilization des eaux de surface et de gestion durables des terres (PROMES-GDT); the (b) World Bank: Rural Community Development and Water Mobilization Project (PRODERMO); the (c) IGAD: Programme de pays pour mettre fin aux urgencies liees aux secheresses dans la	

AfDB : Drought resilience programme; the (e) JICA, Tokyo Agricultural University: Stone mulching for tree planting; (f) UNHCR, Light Years Ahead; and (g) Ecologie du village association (EVA): Programme Integre de Conservation et de Developpement.

At present, PROMES-GDT, PRODERMO, and the AfDB Drought Resilience Program are identified as baseline projects for the AfDB funded program in Djibouti, "Rural Livelihood's Adaptation to Climate Change in the Horn of Africa" (GEF ID: 5228), which is currently under review. IGAD is among the executing Agencies of the proposed program. As a result, it is not clear how the proposed project would further build on and enhance the resilience of baseline initiatives (a)-(d) above, given the proposed programmatic approach and LDCF request submitted by AfDB.

Moreover, with respect to the baseline initiatives managed by UNHCR, JICA and EVA, the PIF could further clarify the associated gaps and vulnerabilities that the proposed project would address.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) justify the inclusion of above projects (a)-(d) among the baseline initiatives on which the proposed project would build and the resilience of which it would enhance; and (ii) clarify, with reference to available information on actual and expected climate change, the relevant gaps and vulnerabilities in projects (e)-(g) that the proposed project would address.

		<p>04/25/2013 “ YES. The re-submission clarifies adequately the ways in which the proposed project would build on and strengthen the resilience of the baseline projects identified.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please revisit the baseline scenario and associated projects in light of further information about the AfDB and IGAD interventions currently under preparation, and based on a clearer understanding of the ways in which the baseline projects and their beneficiaries are vulnerable given the expected effects of climate change.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please revise the project framework, as appropriate.</p> <p>04/25/2013 “ YES. The Project Framework has been revised as recommended.</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 CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. Given the outstanding issues regarding the baseline projects, the additional reasoning cannot be fully assessed at this stage.</p> <p>Still, the PIF could further clarify the linkages and synergies between Component 1 on the one hand, and components 2 and 3 on the other.</p> <p>Specifically with regard to Component 1, the PIF could consider alternatives to the development of a national climate change strategy and the potential establishment</p>	

means to enhance coordination and coherence at the national level. In addition, should a potential climate change strategy address adaptation as well as mitigation, the PIF could specify what co-financing would be provided towards this exercise to the extent that it would not be eligible under the LDCF.

With respect to Component 3, the additional reasoning for this component could be strengthened with further references to the baseline initiatives on which it would build.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please revise the additional reasoning accordingly. Specifically, (i) clarify the linkages and synergies between Component 1 on the one hand, and components 2 and 3 on the other; (ii) consider alternatives to the development of a national climate change strategy and the potential establishment of a national climate change fund; (iii) specify the scope of a potential climate change strategy and any co-financing, as appropriate; and (iv) clarify how the proposed Component 3 builds on and strengthens the resilience of relevant baseline initiatives.

04/25/2013 “ YES. The re-submission clarifies the case for developing a national climate change strategy, but removes the proposed establishment of a national climate change fund among the activities proposed for LDCF financing. The revised PIF also clarifies that the LDCF would cover only the adaptation

		<p>proposed Component 3 is also adequately justified for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please revisit the additional reasoning for components 2 and 3 in light of further information about the AfDB and IGAD interventions currently under preparation. Also, please clarify the targeting principles applied in the introduction of fuel-efficient cookstoves with a view to further demonstrating the effectiveness and relevance of this sub-component from a perspective of climate change adaptation.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, 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>YES. Public participation, including of CSOs, is adequately described for this stage of project development.</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>YES. Relevant risks and appropriate mitigation measures have been adequately described for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>YES. Coordination and complementarities have been adequately described for this stage of project development. Please refer, however, to the recommendations under Section 6 above.</p>	

	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above. The proposed project includes a number of innovative technologies and approaches, as well as relevant pathways for scaling up, but these cannot be adequately assessed at this stage.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please revisit the description of innovative aspects, sustainability and scaling up, as appropriate.</p> <p>04/25/2013 " YES. The proposed project introduces innovative adaptation measures and technologies to enhance the resilience of Djibouti's vulnerable, mountainous communities in the face of climate change. The project is designed to address adaptation in a comprehensive manner, by strengthening the physical and natural assets that underpin rural livelihoods, by introducing resilient agricultural technologies and practices, and by promoting livelihood diversification. Through the development of Djibouti's first National Climate Change Strategy, the project strengthens the enabling environment for adaptation and contributes towards sustainability.</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>		

	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 CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please revisit the grant and co-financing figures per component, as appropriate.</p> <p>04/25/2013 â€“ YES. The figures have been revised as recommended and the indicative grant and co-financing amounts are appropriate and adequate.</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 CLEAR. In line with its role, UNDP would bring \$2.86 million in indicative co-financing. Please refer, however, to Section 6 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please revisit the co-financing figures, as appropriate.</p> <p>04/25/2013 â€“ YES. The indicative co-financing figures have been clarified as recommended.</p>	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	YES. At \$256,164, or less than 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1-3, the proposed LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate.	
	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? At CEO endorsement/ approval,	YES. A PPG of \$100,000 has been requested and will be recommended once the PIF is ready for clearance.	



	report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
<b>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
<b>Recommendation at PIF Stage</b>	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 6, 7, 8, 13, 16 and 17.  04/25/2013 " YES.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
<b>Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval</b>	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	March 27, 2013	
<b>Review Date (s)</b>	Additional review (as necessary)	April 25, 2013	
	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.**