



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

GEF ID:	4934		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Enhancing Capacity, Knowledge and Technology Support to Build Climate Resilience of Vulnerable Developing Countries		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3; CCA-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,900,000
Co-financing:	\$23,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$27,900,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Junu Shrestha	Agency Contact Person:	Ermira Fida, Head

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes. The proposed global project will be based in China and China is a non-annex I party to the UNFCCC.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. An OFP endorsement letter dated March 30, 2012 is attached to the submission.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. UNEP has a comparative advantage in providing proof of concept and the best available science and knowledge upon which investments can be based. The proposed project focuses on knowledge of ecosystems and and adaptation technology which are in line with the UNEP's core business of providing technical advice on ecosystem management.	

	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes.	
Resource Availability	6. 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	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	Yes. The requested grant is within the resources available from the SCCF-Technology Transfer window.	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes. The project is aligned with the SCCF results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes. The project will contribute towards all three SCCF adaptation objectives.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Not clear. The proposed project will support China's South South Cooperation Programme on Climate Change along with the 11th Five Year Plan for National Economy and Social Development and the China national Climate Change Programme. However the proposed project's alignment with the developing countries	

		<p>implemented have not been presented.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please support the consistency of the proposed project with the strategies and plans of the regions or countries where the project will take place.</p> <p>4/25/2012 JS Explanation provided is satisfactory for PIF stage. The pilot countries identified at this stage have not been confirmed through agreement with the respective governments.</p> <p>Recommended Action by CEO Endorsement: Please confirm the choice of pilot countries by CEO Endorsement and please support the consistency of the proposed project with the strategies and plans of the countries.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>Yes. The SCCF project will be based on a number of baseline projects with strong national or global missions. By coordinating these baseline projects and also by building technical and institutional capacity on adaptation technologies, the results of the SCCF project could be expected to be sustained.</p>	
	<p>11. 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>	<p>Yes. The proposal describes limited capacity and knowledge in the developing countries on climate change adaptation, and the limited sharing of climate change adaptation knowledge and transfer of effective adaptation technologies as main problems.</p> <p>The SCCF project will build on several</p>	

Project Design		climate change knowledge. Baseline projects include national and global level projects as well as knowledge sharing programmes between different regions. The role of the baseline projects is adequately described.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>Yes. The climate change risks in the target regions and the underlying problem of lack of adaptation knowledge and technology as well as limited avenues for sharing available information is clear. Role of baseline projects as they relate to the SCCF project is adequately explained for the PIF stage.</p> <p>Recommended Action: By CEO Endorsement stage please provide information on the status of the baseline projects and point of integration for the SCCF project. For component 3, please demonstrate additional adaptation benefits for each pilot country.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>Not clear.</p> <p>Project components include a) capacity building in developing countries to plan and implement adaptation technologies b)Inter-regional knowledge support for climate change adaptation c) Technology and know-how support through integration and demonstration.</p> <p>The third component (c) is categorized</p>	

		<p>Also pilot activities are planned in SIDs but none of the listed baseline projects have focus on SIDs.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please revise the grant type for the third component as appropriate. Please provide justification or support concerning how a pilot project in the SIDs would be viable. Project Framework table (Table B) states "Trust Fund" as SCCF, please specify SCCF window as well.</p> <p>4/25/2012 JS The third component has been appropriately changed into an investment activity and the funding window SCCF-B has also been clearly mentioned. Explanation given regarding pilot project in SIDs is satisfactory for PIF stage.</p> <p>Recommended Action by CEO Endorsement: Please note that for activities defined in component 3, concrete on-ground intervention that the proposed project can integrate into should be proposed for all three pilot countries especially for Seychelles.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
	<p>16. 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</p>	<p>Yes. The description given is sufficient for the PIF stage. The project will facilitate transfer of adaptation technologies to assist with ecosystem management in developing countries</p>	

	additional benefits?	<p>researchers in these countries to pursue adaptation related topics.</p> <p>Recommended Action: By CEO endorsement, please provide more information on local level benefits and efforts to integrate women in the project.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>Yes for the PIF stage.</p> <p>Recommended Action: By CEO endorsement, please identify CSOs, local communities etc that could directly participate in the project.</p>	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	<p>Yes and appropriate mitigation measures are presented.</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>No. Most of the partner programmes listed are also baseline projects.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please list and explain the coordination of the proposed project with related programmes other than the baseline projects.</p> <p>4/25/2012 Yes. Requested changes have been made.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>Yes for the PIF stage.</p> <p>Recommended Action: By CEO endorsement stage, please describe in detail implementation scheme of the project so that its goals at both global and local scales are met.</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. The requested project management cost is appropriate.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes. The stated funding and co-financing per objective is appropriate for the PIF stage. 4/25/2012 Allocation per country for component 3 has been stated. Please confirm the allocations by CEO Endorsement and ensure their appropriateness for the activities planned per country.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The indicative co-financing of \$23 M in grant will be provided through the Chinese government, a bilateral agency and as well as UNEP.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes. UNEP has the primary role in the project and it is suitably reflected in \$ 7M co-financing UNEP grant.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	NA	
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	
	• Council comments?		

Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	No. Please see comments for section 9, 14, and 19. 4/25/2012 Yes. Changes appropriate for PIF stage have been made as requested.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please see sections 9, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, and 23.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 12, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 25, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Yes. The proposed PPG activities include country and site selection for pilot activities, stakeholder analysis, local consultations and establishment of coordination mechanisms among the related initiatives.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes. The budget appears well balanced and presents a reasonable level of co-financing (1:1.5). Costs for travel, workshops and other non-consultancy items are acceptable, and well justified by the activities to be implemented. Consultancy costs are acceptable at \$1000/\$2500 per week for local/international consultants.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Yes, once the PIF has been approved.

Review Date (s)	First review*	April 12, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 25, 2012

* 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.