



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

GEF ID:	5615		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Building Capacity for LDCs to Participate Effectively in Intergovernmental Climate Change Processes		
GEF Agency:	UNDP and UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5318 (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-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,000,000
Co-financing:	\$15,232,380	Total Project Cost:	\$19,232,380
PIF Approval:	December 13, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	January 13, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Ermira Fida

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. The proposed project would target 35 LDC Parties to the UNFCCC in Africa and the Caribbean. 12/04/2013 “ UPDATE: The proposed project would now benefit all LDC Parties to the UNFCCC.	YES. No change from PIF.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	NA. This is a global project.	YES. No change from PIF.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		

*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)
	<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>NA. Given that the proposed project is global, the LDCF grant would not have to be available under each participating country's equitable access ceiling (\$20 million as at October 24, 2013). The project would benefit 35 LDCs in an equitable manner.</p> <p>12/04/2013 – UPDATE: The proposed project would now benefit all LDC Parties to the UNFCCC.</p>	YES. No change from PIF.
	<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? <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 CCA-2: Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level.	YES. No change from PIF.
	<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>	NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would seek to strengthen the capacities of 35 LDCs to understand and apply state-of-the-art climate change science and technology; to coordinate climate change adaptation and mitigation efforts at the national level; and to enable LDCs to effectively participate in	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to the recommendations made at PIF to be addressed by CEO Endorsement. The PIF committed to a stocktaking exercise of country-specific needs and priorities, the outcomes of which -- as well as stakeholder consultations -- were to be presented at CEO Endorsement. While

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>intergovernmental climate change processes. Accordingly, the degree to which the project is consistent with each country's national strategies, plans and frameworks cannot be adequately assessed at this stage.</p> <p>However, national priorities and circumstances should to a significant extent determine the most appropriate ways to ensure effective, country-wide coordination, communication and knowledge sharing on matters pertaining to climate change. The PIF could clarify how country-drivenness has been and would be ensured in this respect, for instance as part of the start-up activities outlined on p. 8.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify (i) how national priorities “ as articulated in relevant policies, strategies, plans and frameworks “ would be reflected in determining the most appropriate ways to ensure effective, country-wide coordination, communication and knowledge sharing on matters pertaining to climate change; and (ii) how country-stakeholders would be consulted during project preparation.</p> <p>12/04/2013 “ YES. The revised PIF clarifies that a stocktaking exercise would be carried out during project preparation to identify in greater detail the country-specific needs and priorities that the proposed project would address; and it provides adequate, additional details</p>	<p>the Request for CEO Endorsement along with relevant project documents clarify that some stakeholder consultations have taken place, it is unclear how the findings of these consultations -- and the outcomes of the stocktaking exercise -- have shaped project design.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address the recommendations made at PIF and clarify relevant adjustments to the project design.</p> <p>08/01/2014 -- YES. The revised Request for CEO Endorsement clarifies the scope and nature of stakeholder consultations that took place as part of the agreed stocktaking exercise, along with the key findings of this exercise.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>regarding the way in which country-level stakeholders will be engaged and consulted.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, kindly present the outcomes of the stocktaking exercise and stakeholder consultations, and describe how these have been reflected in the project design.</p>	
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>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The PIF provides a useful overview of the challenges LDCs face in participating in intergovernmental climate change processes. It also lists the following baseline initiatives, on which the proposed project would build, including: (i) UNITAR's e-learning course Climate Change Diplomacy; (ii) UNITAR's One UN Service Platform on Climate Change (UN CC: Learn); (iii) UNEP's Africa Adaptation Knowledge Network; (iv) UNDP's Adaptation Learning Mechanism; (v) the Climate Technology Centre and Network; (vi) the Caribbean Risk Management Initiative; (vii) UN Habitat's Cities and Climate Change Initiative; and (viii) Germany's GCF Readiness Programme. UNDP's Knowledge, Innovation and Capacity Group will also provide technical assistance and associated co-financing.</p> <p>The description of the baseline scenario (Section A.1.2) is dissociated from the baseline initiatives (A.1.4). As a result, it is difficult to understand how the participating countries' capacities may be expected to evolve thanks to the many initiatives planned and underway and</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 5 above, as well as the recommendations made at PIF to be addressed by CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>While the Request for CEO Endorsement provides a clear and coherent description of relevant baseline initiatives, along with a more general characterization of the baseline situation, the recommendations at PIF called for a baseline scenario that goes further in recognizing countries' different circumstances and needs.</p> <p>Moreover, it was expected that the proposed project would include baseline values for relevant, quantitative and qualitative indicators with a view to providing a more concrete understanding of how countries' capacities may be expected to evolve thanks to the many initiatives planned and underway. Neither of the above recommendations has been fully addressed.</p> <p>Under Component 2 in particular, the baseline scenario varies considerably</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>how; given this scenario; the proposed project would add value by addressing unmet needs and gaps, recognizing that these are inevitably country-specific.</p> <p>The baseline scenario could better recognize the efforts that the participating countries are already making to promote cross-sectoral coordination of their climate change adaptation and mitigation efforts, for instance in the context of low-emission, climate-resilient development strategies; and their nascent NAP processes. Such processes should be reflected as part of the baseline scenario, while also noting that they may not yet benefit all participating LDCs.</p> <p>The co-financing figures provided in Section A.1.4 amount to some \$7 million, while total indicative co-financing as per Table C is \$8.4 million.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) provide a coherent description of the baseline scenario, considering the status quo as well as the ongoing and planned initiatives and processes that may be expected to enhance countries' capacities to coordinate their adaptation and mitigation efforts, and to participate in intergovernmental climate change processes. In addition, please (ii) ensure that the co-financing figures provided in the relevant section of the PIF match those provided in Tables A-C.</p> <p>12/04/2013 – YES. The revised PIF</p>	<p>from one country to another, and it is evolving rapidly as coordination arrangements have been and will be strengthened with the national adaptation plan process, low-emission, climate-resilient development strategies, efforts to enhance climate finance readiness, etc.</p> <p>As for the baseline values for relevant indicators, the project results framework (Annex A) remains vague. For example, the baseline is defined in terms of "little training material available" and "few LDC negotiators trained". Other indicators refer strictly to inputs that would be provided by the proposed project, where the baseline is by definition nought, e.g. "no LDCs supported to develop strategies for effective participation". As a result, the results framework does not capture how ongoing training initiatives and efforts to strengthen coordination arrangements would contribute towards countries' and negotiators' capacities under the baseline scenario.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address the recommendations made at PIF.</p> <p>08/01/2014 -- YES. The revised Request for CEO Endorsement clarifies sufficiently the dynamic and diverse baseline scenario that the proposed project would address, and provides more detailed indicators, baselines and</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>provides a very clear and coherent description of the baseline scenario and associated baseline initiatives, as well as how the proposed LDCF project could build on and enhance these initiatives. The proposed project now encompasses all LDC Parties and the list of baseline initiatives and sources of co-financing has been expanded accordingly. The co-financing figures are also consistently reported across the document.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, it is crucial that the analysis of the baseline scenario goes further in recognizing that countries' find themselves in different situations, and their baseline scenarios may look very different. Accordingly, their needs and priorities for additional LDCF support will differ considerably.</p> <p>In addition, by CEO Endorsement it is expected that the proposed project will include baseline values and targets for relevant, quantitative and qualitative indicators – this will provide a more concrete understanding of how countries' capacities may be expected to evolve thanks to the many initiatives planned and underway.</p>	<p>targets in the revised results framework. The Request further notes that additional, country-specific stocktaking exercises would be carried out as part of the proposed Component 2.</p>
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8.</p> <p>Thank you for outlining indicative activities for each component in Annex II. In light of these, and the description of the components in Section A.1.4, however, the emphasis on "state-of-the-</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 adjust the project framework as necessary.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>art science and technology" in Component 2 and the associated outputs appears somewhat misleading, The activities include several that seem directly linked with climate change negotiations, and would hence seem more related to Component 1.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, (i) please adjust the project framework as necessary; (ii) ensure consistency between the project framework and the description of project activities; and (iii) clarify the distinction between components 1 and 2.</p> <p>12/04/2013 " YES. The project framework has been adjusted and clarified as recommended.</p>	<p>08/01/2014 -- YES. Please refer to sections 6 and 8.</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 sections 5 and 6 above. In absence of a clear description of the baseline scenario, the additional reasoning underpinning the proposed project cannot be fully assessed.</p> <p>With respect to Component 1, the PIF refers to several initiatives that strengthen the capacities of LDC negotiators and climate change focal points, as well as initiatives that enhance national coordination " both those on which the proposed project would build directly and those with which coordination would be sought. Given this baseline it is not clear what added value the proposed project would have.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 5 and 6 above, as well as the recommendations made at PIF to be addressed by CEO Endorsement. In absence of a clear description of the baseline scenario, the additional reasoning cannot be fully assessed at this time.</p> <p>As recommended at PIF, it is crucial that the added value of the proposed project is clearly captured vis-À-vis the baseline scenario (see recommendations in Section 6 above). Some of the key outcomes and indicators in the project results framework (Annex A) remain unclear in this regard, e.g. the number of "structured engagement mechanisms" is</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Similarly, with regard to Component 2, it is not clear whether there is a need for additional knowledge sharing platforms and tools rather than enhanced application of existing tools and platforms, and how the project would strengthen national capacities for reporting to the UNFCCC beyond what has been and will be done through existing support towards national communications, BURs, TNAs, NAPAs and NAPs.</p> <p>For both components, the baseline scenario and associated needs are country specific, and the project should outline an approach to addressing these country-specific needs and circumstances in a flexible manner.</p> <p>Moreover, it would be crucial for the proposed project to learn from past experiences in enhancing countries' capacities to effectively coordinate their adaptation and mitigation efforts, and to participate in intergovernmental climate change processes. The PIF notes that climate change secretariats and coordination mechanisms have not been sustained in the past, but it is not clear how the proposed project would overcome these challenges.</p> <p>Finally, in comparison with other similar initiatives, the project cost appears quite high, particularly given that another \$2 million is sought for an identical project</p>	<p>proposed as an objective-level indicator in absence of a clear or commonly accepted definition of such a mechanism. Also, given that the project would train negotiators from all LDCs, it is unclear why the second objective-level indicator sets a target of 20 LDCs. Indicators 1 for Output 2.1, and 2 for Output 2.2 similarly introduced targets of 20 countries.</p> <p>There is some inconsistency between the project framework (Table B) and the description of the project components in Section A.5 of the PIF. The latter outlines key outcomes for each component (for example, "integrate climate change into development planning" and "national institutional arrangements amended"), which do not clearly correspond to the outcomes and outputs of the project framework.</p> <p>More specifically, with respect to Component 1, it is unclear how the proposed project would deliver the new outputs 1.3 and 1.4 given that both seem to require continued support beyond the scope of a 30 month project. Moreover, while the LDCF may provide assistance to "develop the capacity of negotiators from [LDCs] to participate effectively in the climate change process" (decision 5/CP.7), outputs 1.3 and 1.4 would seem to go beyond that, including negotiation positions, submissions and preparatory work associated with negotiation sessions. It would seem appropriate to</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>for Asian and Pacific LDCs. For instance: it is not clear many negotiators Component 1 would seek to train and how this compares with the number of people trained through UNITAR's e-learning course and national training events with a combined annual budget of \$80,000.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 5 and 6, please (i) clarify the additional reasoning, i.e. how the proposed project would add value by addressing unmet needs given the many similar initiatives carried out in the past, underway or planned, and given country-specific needs and circumstances; (ii) clarify how the project would draw lessons from past initiatives and overcome challenges encountered, particularly as it relates to sustainability; (iii) and “ given the information provided in response to above recommendations “ please ensure that adequate information is provided to justify the proposed project cost.</p> <p>12/04/2013 “ YES. The additional reasoning has been adequately strengthened for this stage of project development. The proposed project would seek to build coherence and continuity to a landscape of multiple, ad hoc initiatives. The revised PIF clarifies how the project will build on, collaborate with and enhance relevant baseline initiatives, including current support</p>	<p>distinguish between LDCs' capacity to participate in the intergovernmental process, on the one hand, and the process itself, on the other hand.</p> <p>As for Component 2, the component seems to have changed considerably from PIF. The new Output 2.1 seems to introduce issues similar to outputs 1.3 and 1.4 regarding the formulation of positions. The output would also seem to overlap with Component 1, with additional training focused heavily on interpreting COP decisions. Output 2.2, in turn, would seem to overlap with support provided towards National Communications, BURs and national adaptation plans. The added value of the component is not clear in this regard. It is also not clear how the two outputs would contribute towards the ambitious outcome of enhancing the "institutional capacity of LDCs to manage climate change in a sustainable and effective manner", or the relevant element of the LDC work program of "strengthening existing and, where needed, establishing, national climate change secretariats and/or focal points to enable the effective implementation of the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, in the least developed country Parties" (decision 5/CP.7).</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 5 and 6 above, please strengthen the additional reasoning</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>towards national communications, BURs, TNAs, NAPAs and NAPs. The proposed project cost is also adequately justified.</p> <p>Further to the comments made in sections 5 and 6 above, it is crucial that the additional reasoning be further strengthened by CEO Endorsement, particularly with a focus on (i) quantitative and qualitative targets and the associate baseline scenario, allowing a complete assessment of the expected added value of the proposed project; (ii) cost-effectiveness, including a cost-comparison with similar initiatives and approaches; and (ii) sustainability “ it remains somewhat unclear how this 30-month project will yield outcomes that are more readily sustained than those sought by the baseline initiatives.</p>	<p>accordingly. Specifically, please (i) address all recommendations made at PIF, particularly on targets and sustainability; (ii) ensure consistency in the description of project outcomes and outputs; (iii) review the proposed new outputs 1.3, 1.4 and 2.1 vis-à-vis the LDCF mandate; (iv) clarify the added value of outputs 2.1 and 2.2 in relation to Component 1, ongoing support for reporting under the Convention, and the proposed outcome for Component 2.</p> <p>08/01/2014 -- YES. The revised Request for CEO Endorsement adequately clarifies the proposed components, outcomes and outputs; as well as the ways in which sustainability would be sought.</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>NOT CLEAR. While the socio-economic benefits have otherwise been described to the extent that these are relevant for the proposed project, the project does not introduce gender-disaggregated targets for the number of people trained.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide gender-disaggregated targets for relevant training activities, where appropriate.</p> <p>08/01/2014 -- YES. Gender-disaggregated indicators and targets have been introduced, where appropriate.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<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>NOT CLEAR. The role of public participation, including CSOs, is not clearly reflected in the PIF.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify how public participation would be ensured in project preparation and implementation.</p> <p>12/04/2013 – YES. The revised PIF clarifies that stakeholder consultations, including of CSOs, and a survey will be carried out during project preparation.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The Request for CEO Endorsement does not specify how CSOs have been involved in project preparation, although such provisions were introduced at PIF, or how they would participate in project implementation.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify how CSOs have participated in project preparation, and how they would participate in project implementation.</p> <p>08/01/2014 -- YES. The role of relevant, international CSOs during project preparation and implementation has been adequately clarified.</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>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above.</p> <p>The baseline scenario suggests that the risk of national coordination mechanisms/ climate change secretariats not being sustained beyond project completion is more likely than indicated in Table 2. Given the importance of this risk, the key elements of a credible sustainability strategy should be described already at this stage of project development.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: In light of experience, please (i) reconsider the likelihood of national coordination mechanisms/ climate change secretariats not being sustained beyond project completion; and, upon addressing the recommendations under Section 8, (ii)</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above, as well as the recommendations made at PIF to be addressed by CEO Endorsement. The Request for CEO Endorsement outlines some promising approaches to ensure that relevant capacities and coordination arrangements are sustained beyond the duration of proposed project. Still, the project lacks the comprehensive sustainability strategy that was requested at PIF.</p> <p>Specifically, the Request for CEO Endorsement provides very little information regarding the proposed funding mechanism, which would seem crucial to sustain the proposed community of practice, e-learning and knowledge sharing arrangements.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>reflect in Table 2 the key elements of a credible strategy for mitigating this risk.</p> <p>12/04/2013 “ YES. Relevant risks and mitigation measures have been adequately identified for this stage of project preparation.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide a more comprehensive sustainability strategy, as recommended in the comments made under Section 8 above.</p>	<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address the recommendations made at PIF.</p> <p>08/01/2014 -- YES. As recommended, the revised Request for CEO Endorsement provides a clearer sustainability strategy.</p>
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. Based on the information provided in the PIF, it is not clear how the proposed project would complement, add value to, and draw lessons from other similar initiatives aiming to enhance developing countries' capacities to effectively coordinate their adaptation and mitigation activities, and to participate in intergovernmental climate change processes.</p> <p>The PIF lists 25 initiatives that are of relevance, but does not describe how coordination and coherence would be sought.</p> <p>It is not clear why the list of other relevant initiatives excludes UNDP's Capacity Development for Policy Makers to Address Climate Change, which is instead referenced in Section B.3. In addition, the PIF does not mention the regional training workshops of the Least Developed Countries Experts Group, or other tools and resources provided by the</p>	<p>YES. Coordination and coherence with other relevant initiatives have been adequately described.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>UNFCCC Secretariat and its platforms on capacity building and Article 6.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6 above, please (i) clarify how the proposed project would ensure coordination and coherence with the other relevant initiatives identified; and (ii) ensure that the list of other relevant initiatives is complete, reflecting in particular the role of the UNFCCC Secretariat and the various processes, platforms and tools it facilitates and manages.</p> <p>12/04/2013 “ YES. Coordination and coherence with other relevant initiatives is adequately described for this stage of project preparation; and detailed coordination arrangements will be presented at CEO Endorsement.</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>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Sections 5, 6, 8, 10, 11 and 12 above. The innovative aspects, as well as the potential for sustainability and scaling up cannot be adequately assessed at this time.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations made under sections 5, 6, 8, 10, 11 and 12, please revisit the description of innovative aspects, as well as the potential for sustainability and scaling up accordingly.</p> <p>12/04/2013 “ YES. The proposed project addresses, in a comprehensive</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Sections 5, 6, 8, 10 and 11 above. The innovative aspects, as well as the potential for sustainability and scaling up cannot be adequately assessed at this time.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations made under sections 5, 6, 8, 10, 11 and 12, please revisit the description of innovative aspects, as well as the potential for sustainability and scaling up accordingly.</p> <p>08/01/2014 -- YES. The proposed project would build on and enhance</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>manner, the barriers “ institutional and technical ” that prevent LDCs from participating more effectively in intergovernmental climate change processes, a priority recognized in the LDC Work Programme. The project works at the national level to strengthen countries' abilities to coordinate climate change activities across institutions and sectors; as well as to collect, analyze, interpret and archive climate change data and information in support of national reporting and decision-making. Building on this, the project will provide training for country representatives in intergovernmental processes, and promote South-South learning and knowledge sharing.</p> <p>The proposed strategies for ensuring sustainability and promoting scaling up will be revisited at CEO Endorsement.</p>	<p>ongoing initiatives to strengthen the institutional and technical capacities of LDCs to effectively participate in the UNFCCC process. The project identifies clear entry points for technical support, tools and guidelines; along with practical means to ensure the dissemination and sustainable application of improved skills and resources across institutions and countries. Crucially, the proposed project would focus on updating, tailoring and effectively communicating knowledge to LDC negotiators and other relevant stakeholders; rather than developing and introducing entirely new products.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above. The Request for CEO Endorsement introduces changes to project outcomes, as well as new outputs, which are not clearly justified.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 8, please justify all changes to the design presented at PIF.</p> <p>08/01/2014 -- YES. Please refer to Section 8 above.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above. In absence of a clear understanding of the baseline scenario on which the proposed project would build, and the additional activities, the cost-effectiveness of the proposed project cannot be adequately assessed at this time.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please revisit Section B.3 of the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>08/01/2014 -- YES. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above.</p>
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 adjust the grant and co-financing amounts, as necessary.</p> <p>12/04/2013 – YES. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above.</p>	<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 adjust the grant and co-financing amounts, as necessary.</p> <p>08/01/2014 -- YES. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above.</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. Please refer to Sections 6 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please adjust the co-financing amounts, as necessary, and ensure consistency across the document.</p> <p>12/04/2013 – YES. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p>	<p>YES. The Request for CEO Endorsement provides confirmation of relevant sources and amounts of co-financing.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>YES. The LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate at \$180,000 or less than ten per cent of the sub-total for project components.</p> <p>12/04/2013 “ UPDATE: The proposed project now targets all LDC Parties to the UNFCCC, requesting a project grant of \$4 million, of which \$313,364 would support project management. While exceeding 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components, the request is justified given the nature of the project.</p>	YES. No change from PIF.
	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?	<p>YES. A PPG of \$100,000 is requested, consistent with the norm for projects up to and including \$3 million.</p> <p>12/04/2013 “ UPDATE: The proposed project now targets all LDC Parties to the UNFCCC, requesting a project grant of \$4 million and, consistent with the norm established for projects up to \$6 million, a PPG of \$150,000.</p>	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?		YES. The Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT) has been completed with baselines and targets for relevant indicators.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		YES.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? • The Council? 		<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 5, 6, 8, 9 and 11 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 5, 6, 8, 9 and 11, please ensure that all Council comments have been addressed accordingly in Annex B of the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>08/01/2014 -- YES.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
	Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>NOT YET. Please refer to sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16 and 17.</p> <p>12/04/2013 – YES.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please refer to sections 5, 6, 8, 11 and 13.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>NOT YET. Please refer to sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 23.</p> <p>08/01/2014 -- YES.</p>
	First review*	October 24, 2013	June 23, 2014
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	December 04, 2013	August 01, 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.**