



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

GEF ID:	6923		
Country/Region:	Eritrea		
Project Title:	Mainstreaming Climate Risk Considerations in Food Security and IWRM in Tsilima Plain		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4633 (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:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$9,050,000
Co-financing:	\$27,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$36,750,000
PIF Approval:	December 01, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	January 07, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Dustin Schinn	Agency Contact Person:	Phero K. Kgomotso

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 ?	DS, September 5, 2014: Yes. Eritrea is a Least Developed Country Party to the UNFCCC and has completed its NAPA.	DS, July 6, 2016: Yes, unchanged.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	DS, September 5, 2014: Yes. Signed endorsement letter dated April 29, 2014, has been submitted.	DS, July 6, 2016: Yes, unchanged.
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	DS, September 5, 2014:	DS, July 6, 2016:

*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)
	equitable access	The proposed grant (\$10,109,500 including PPG and Agency fees) is available under the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	Yes, unchanged.
	<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>DS, September 5, 2014: Yes. The proposed project is aligned with CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3 objectives.</p>	<p>DS, July 6, 2016: Yes, unchanged.</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>DS, September 5, 2014: Yes. The project is consistent with Eritrea's NAPA.</p>	<p>DS, July 6, 2016: Partly unclear. The project remains highly relevant to address Eritrea's NAPAs and the document also outlines its contribution to the SDGs, however, it would be beneficial to further specify whether it is in line with the country's INDC under the Paris Agreement. Please elaborate.</p> <p>DS, August 9, 2016: Comment cleared.</p>
	<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</p>	<p>DS, September 5, 2014: Yes. Main baseline initiatives consist of the recipient government's strategy for improving food security and its Integrated Water Resources Management</p>	<p>DS, July 6, 2016: Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	assumptions?	Action Plan. These long-term programs are based on sound data and assumptions.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>DS, September 5, 2014: Partly. Project components are appropriately detailed and include Technical Assistance for capacity development and mainstreaming of climate risks into key decision-making processes, as well as promotion of long-term measures for watershed rehabilitation, groundwater recharge, climate smart agriculture and livestock production practices. However, the financing type for Project Component 2, as per Table B, is currently specified as Technical Assistance, while the envisaged activities of \$7,005,000 corresponding to this Project Component should include concrete investments as financing type.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please specify if Project Component 2 in Table B includes concrete investment activities and change the Financing Type in Table B accordingly to "Inv" rather than "TA".</p> <p>DS, October 16, 2014: Yes. Comment cleared.</p>	<p>DS, July 6, 2016: Partly unclear. Overall, the components and outcomes are clear and sound, however, a few issues remain:</p> <p>(1) Please change financing type for Component 3 from INV to TA; (2) Please elaborate why the gender strategy, which is listed under Component 3, is still to be developed and has not been developed as part of the project preparation phase; please ensure that a gender analysis is conducted before the rest of the project is being implemented - if not as part of PPG then please provide assurance that it will be prioritized in project implementation; (3) In regard to Outcome 2.2, please specify how many hydro-meteorological stations would be established and/or refurbished; this also applies to Output 1.1.4; (4) Please specify what kind of "alternative income-generating livelihoods" would be promoted as part of this project (Outcome 2.3); (5) Please integrate and respond to STAP comments.</p> <p>DS, August 9, 2016: Comments cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	DS, September 5, 2014: Yes. Adaptation benefits are clear and appropriately detailed and will complement baseline initiatives.	DS, July 6, 2016: Yes, unchanged.
	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?		DS, July 6, 2016: Yes. However, please consider Comment 2 under Question 7 above. DS, August 9, 2016: Comment cleared.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	DS, September 5, 2014: Yes. Public participation is included in the project's design phase, including by civil society representatives and the local private sector.	DS, July 6, 2016: Yes, unchanged.
	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)	DS, September 5, 2014: Yes. Major risks have been identified and sufficient risk mitigation measures have been listed.	DS, July 6, 2016: Yes, unchanged.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	DS, September 5, 2014: Yes. The project will coordinate with the GEF-financed Sustainable Land Management (SLM) pilot project and a recently approved Adaptation Fund project that is addressing similar adaptation issues in other regions in the country.	DS, July 6, 2016: Yes.
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. • Assess whether the project is	DS, September 5, 2014: The proposed LDCF project is based on consultative planning and participatory approaches which enhances its likelihood for long-term sustainability of project	DS, July 6, 2016: Please consider STAP's comment to add a specific output to plan for scaling up. DS, August 9, 2016:

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>innovative and if so, how, 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>outcomes. Thanks to the project's cost-effective approach, it has greater potential for up-scaling and replication across Eritrea as opposed to more costly structural adaptation measures. Collaboration with, and strengthening of, national research entities further increases likelihood for up-scaling after project completion. The project is innovative in its design as it uses adaptation planning to increase water availability by enabling the storage of excess water during flooding events, increasing ground water infiltration and water storage capacity.</p>	<p>Comment cleared.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>DS, July 6, 2016: Yes, project structure changes have been justified clearly.</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 approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		<p>DS, July 6, 2016: Unclear. Please elaborate on the cost-effectiveness of the project design, in particular as it relates to the implementation of climate-resilient land use planning over 9,000 hectares.</p> <p>DS, August 9, 2016: Comment cleared.</p>
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>DS, September 5, 2014: Yes.</p>	<p>DS, July 6, 2016: Yes.</p>
	<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</p>	<p>DS, September 5, 2014: Yes.</p>	<p>DS, July 6, 2016: Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?		
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	DS, September 5, 2014: Yes. PMC financed by the LDCF is requested at \$45,000 or 0.5% of the sub-total of project components and indicative co-financing of PMC equals \$1,000,000.	DS, July 6, 2016: Yes, unchanged.
	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?	DS, September 5, 2014: Yes. The requested PPG is in line with the norm.	DS, July 6, 2016: Yes.
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		DS, July 6, 2016: Yes.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		DS, July 6, 2016: Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		DS, July 6, 2016: Unclear. While STAP in its review of the PIF has concurred with the proposed approach to be taken by the project, STAP has also provided specific

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>comments and recommendations which should be integrated in the development of the full project document.</p> <p>DS, August 9, 2016: Comment cleared.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>DS, September 5, 2014: Not yet. Please address comment under Question 7.</p> <p>DS, October 16, 2014: Yes. Comments have been addressed appropriately. The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available under the LDCF.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>DS, September 5, 2014: In the CEO Endorsement Request, it would be useful to identify additional relevant projects and initiatives by the national government and by multilateral and bilateral entities, which the proposed LDCF-financed project would coordinate with.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>DS, July 6, 2016: Not yet. Please address comments under Questions 5, 7, 9, 13, 15 and 23.</p> <p>DS, August 9, 2016: Comments cleared. Program Manager recommends CEO Endorsement.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	First review*	September 05, 2014	July 06, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	October 16, 2014	August 09, 2016
	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.