



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

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|------------------------|
| GEF ID: | 6967 | | |
| Country/Region: | Ethiopia | | |
| Project Title: | CCA Growth: Implementing Climate Resilient and Green Economy plans in highland areas in Ethiopia | | |
| GEF Agency: | UNDP | GEF Agency Project ID: | 5478 (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: | \$6,277,000 |
| Co-financing: | \$10,450,000 | Total Project Cost: | \$16,827,000 |
| PIF Approval: | | Council Approval/Expected: | |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Dustin Schinn | Agency Contact Person: | August 21, 2014 |

| 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. Ethiopia is a Least Developed Country Party to the UNFCCC and has completed its NAPA. | |
| | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? | Yes. Signed endorsement letter dated July 3, 2014, has been submitted. | |
| 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 equitable access | The proposed grant (\$6,982,815 including PPG and fees) is available under the LDCF in accordance with the | |

*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) |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
| | | principle of equitable access. | |
| | <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> | Yes. The proposed project is aligned with CCA-1 and CCA-2 objectives. | |
| | <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> | Yes. The project is consistent with Ethiopia's NAPA. | |
| Project Design | <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 assumptions?</p> | Yes. Main baseline initiatives consist of the recipient government's MERET (Managing Environmental Resources to Enable Transitions) and PSNP (Productive Safety Net) programs. Other baseline initiatives include bilateral (GIZ, USAID, JICA) and multilateral (World Bank) projects. | |
| | <p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p> | Yes. Project components are appropriately detailed and include technical assistance for capacity development as well as concrete investments, including for climate information services and on-farm | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| | | irrigation technology and infrastructure. | |
| | 8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate? | Yes. Adaptation benefits are clear and appropriately detailed and will complement baseline initiatives. | |
| | 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? | | |
| | 10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained? | Yes. Public participation is included in the project's design phase, including by civil society representatives. | |
| | 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) | Yes. Major risks have been identified and sufficient risk mitigation measures have been listed. | |
| | 12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | Yes. The project will coordinate with the GEF-financed initiatives "Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Africa for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change - Ethiopia" and " Promoting autonomous adaptation at the community level in Ethiopia". The project will also coordinate with other relevant initiatives | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>in the country.</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. • 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>Unclear. The project includes integrated watershed management and landscape management plans for adaptation and vulnerability reduction, including gender aspects, which are innovative in the national context. Participative approaches such as inclusion of grassroots beneficiaries and universities, together with state authorities, enhance the likelihood of long-term sustainability of the proposed initiative after project completion. However, potential for scaling-up does not seem sufficiently elaborated.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide more detail, at least indicatively, as to how this project's activities could be scaled up over time.</p> <p>Update, September 2, 2014: The proposed project's potential for scaling up activities over time has been clarified appropriately. Randomized control trials will be used to capture best practices and lessons. Meetings will be held to share these lessons and facilitate cross-learning between Woredas, the national government and important stakeholders. Leveraging partners such as coffee and Teff grower associations to unlock further adaptation investments has been included in the project design. CLEARED.</p> | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-------------------|--|---|--|
| | 14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes? | | |
| | 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? | | |
| 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? | Yes. Indicative total co-financing amounts to \$10.45M and is adequate for this project, including co-financing from the Agency in the amount of \$150,000. This is in line with the Agency's role. | |
| | 18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate? | Unclear. PMC is currently given at \$310,000 equaling 5.2% of the sub-total of project components. Recommended action: Please reduce PMC to an amount not greater than 5% of the sub-total of project components. Update, September 2, 2014: PMC has been reduced to \$295,000 and equals 4.9% of the sub-total of project components. CLEARED. | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | 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? | Yes. The requested PPG is in line with the norm. | |
| | 20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included? | N/A | |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? | | |
| | 22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | | |
| Agency Responses | 23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from: | | |
| | • STAP? | | |
| | • Convention Secretariat? | | |
| | • The Council? • Other GEF Agencies? | | |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | | |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage | 24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended? | Not yet. Please address comments under Questions 13 and 18. Please further align the total co-financing amount listed in Table A (currently \$10.30M) with the total co-financing amount listed in Table C (currently \$10.45M). Update, September 2, 2014: | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|--|
| | | 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. | |
| | 25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval. | By CEO Endorsement, please consider the full cost of project management and ensure that it is appropriately distributed among LDCF funding and cofinancing. | |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended? | | |
| | First review* | August 25, 2014 | |
| Review Date (s) | Additional review (as necessary) | September 02, 2014 | |
| | 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.**