



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

GEF ID:	<b>5683</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Global</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Assisting non- LDC Developing Countries with Country-driven Processes to Advance National Adaptation Plans (NAPs)</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP and UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5347 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCA-1; CCA-2;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$150,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$4,500,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$34,600,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$39,250,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>March 03, 2014</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Rawlestone Moore</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Ermira Fida</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	YES. In accordance with SCCF eligibility criteria, the proposed global project would target developing country Parties to the UNFCCC.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	NA. This is a global project.	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	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		

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	equitable access		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The Secretariat will liaise with the Agencies to provide further guidance on the availability of resources under the SCCF Adaptation Program.</p> <p>01/24/2014 “ YES. The proposed grant (\$4.5 million, excluding Agency fee and PPG) is available from the SCCF Adaptation Program.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> <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>	<p>YES. The proposed project would contribute towards objectives CCA-1 and CCA-2.</p>	
	<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>	<p>YES. The proposed project responds to the guidance provided by the Parties to the UNFCCC in decisions 9/CP.18 and 12/CP.18. While the project would support all developing country Parties to the Convention, it would contribute towards integrating climate change adaptation into key national development plans and processes in each participating country, while drawing on and complementing relevant adaptation-specific plans and reports.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<p>Project Design</p>	<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>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The PIF provides a general description of the baseline scenario as it relates to each of the three components of the proposed project, along with a list of relevant baseline projects on which the SCCF grant would build.</p> <p>While the PIF conveys in general terms the constraints that developing countries face in integrating climate change adaptation into medium- and long-term development planning and budgeting processes (paras 4, 6 and 7), it appears that several of the baseline projects are already addressing these very constraints, as are several projects and programs previously financed through the SCCF, the Adaptation Fund and others. For example, in countries that benefit from UNDP's LECB Programme " which provides nearly 90 per cent of the indicative co-financing towards the proposed SCCF project " what could be the additional needs and gaps that the NAP GSP would address?</p> <p>Given that the proposed project could be expected to benefit up to some 100 countries that are Parties to the UNFCCC and that are not LDCs, Section A.1.2 of the PIF could consider explicitly the fact that countries find themselves in very different situations as it relates to integrating adaptation into medium- and long-term development planning; and that a diversity of needs would therefore have to be met in a flexible manner.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>With regard to the initial co-financing figures, it is noted that the LECB Programme also includes LDCs and it is therefore not clear whether the full program budget could be considered as co-financing towards a project that targets non-LDCs. It is further noted that PROVIA and GAN were included among the confirmed sources of co-financing towards the NAP GSP for LDCs, and it would be important to confirm that the same sources and amounts are not double-counted.</p> <p>Finally, in the description of the baseline scenario, the PIF could note that the NAP GSP for LDCs has developed and will develop training materials and knowledge sharing systems, some of which could be applied as such for a similar program targeting non-LDCs. The PIF could clarify what in addition is needed in this regard under components 2 and 3.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDED ACTION:</b> Please (i) consider explicitly, in Section A.1.2 of the PIF, the extent to which some countries have already made progress in medium- and long-term climate-resilient development planning, including thanks to some of the baseline projects and other relevant initiatives identified, and specify what additional gaps and needs the proposed project could address in such countries; (ii) review the indicative co-financing figures associated with the LECB Programme, PROVIA and GAN</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>to ensure that all of the indicated co-financing is relevant and has not already been counted towards the NAP GSP for LDCs; and (iii) kindly consider the work that has already been carried out and will be carried out through the NAP GSP for LDCs as it relates to components 2 and 3, and identify more specifically the additional needs that the present project should address.</p> <p>01/24/2014 –“ YES. The revised PIF addresses adequately the recommendations made. The PIF provides a more nuanced description of the baseline situation, noting the diverse situations and needs of potential beneficiary countries. The indicative co-financing sources and figures have been reviewed as recommended, and the re-submission outlines the additional gaps and needs that the proposed project could address as it relates to components 2 and 3, given the progress made by the NAP GSP for LDCs.</p> <p>As noted in the PIF, the different baseline situation and country needs will be carefully considered during project preparation and should be captured in the full project document.</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 3, 6 and 8.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon further guidance on the funding availability and upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8,</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>please adjust the project framework as appropriate.</p> <p>01/24/2014 “ YES.</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 3 and 6 above. Given the need to further clarify the baseline scenario, the additional reasoning cannot be fully assessed at this stage.</p> <p>With regard to Component 1, considering the lessons emerging from the NAP GSP for LDCs and the very large number of potential beneficiaries to the proposed project, it would be important to indicate early on the ways in which eligible countries could access support towards stocktaking, coordination arrangements and roadmaps as per outputs 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3.</p> <p>As for components 2 and 3, as noted under Section 6, it would be very important to identify the extent to which the proposed project could in fact apply the resources and platforms developed for the NAP GSP for LDCs; and specify the additional investments required to meet the needs of a larger number of countries.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon further guidance on the funding availability and upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please (i) strengthen the additional reasoning and clarify the adaptation benefits accordingly. Moreover, please (ii) provide an indication of the ways in</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>which eligible countries could access support towards stocktaking, coordination arrangements and roadmaps as per outputs 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3; and (iii) specify the additional investments that would be carried out under components 2 and 3 given the progress made under the NAP GSP for LDCs.</p> <p>01/24/2014 â€œ YES. The additional reasoning has been clarified as requested. The Agencies' response explains adequately how countries could access support towards Component 1, and the revised PIF provides further details regarding the interface between the proposed project and the on-going NAP GSP for LDCs.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide further information regarding the partnerships that the proposed project will pursue, and the potential contributions that partners could make, particularly towards Component 1.</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>NOT CLEAR. The role of CSOs is not described in Section A.2 of the PIF.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please describe how CSOs could be engaged in</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>project design and implementation.</p> <p>01/24/2014 “ YES. The role of CSOs is adequately addressed 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 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. The PIF identifies relevant initiatives with which coordination and coherence will be sought. Complementarities and coordination arrangements should be specified by CEO Endorsement.</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. Given the questions raised above, the innovative aspects and potential for sustainability and scaling up cannot be adequately assessed at this time.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please revisit and clarify, if necessary, the innovative aspects of the proposed project as well as the potential for sustainability and scaling up.</p> <p>01/24/2014 “ YES. The proposed project represents an innovative effort to allow developing countries to integrate climate change adaptation into their medium and long-term development</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>planning processes in a continuous, progressive and iterative manner. The project draws on state-of-the art knowledge and resources on climate-resilient planning and the economics of adaptation, and it includes an innovative component aiming to foster South-South and North-South cooperation.</p> <p>The project strengthens core institutional and technical capacities at the national level, and develops tools and methodologies that allow countries to further pursue their national adaptation planning processes in a sustainable and autonomous manner.</p>	
	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?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 3, 6 and 8.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon further guidance on the funding availability and upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component as necessary.</p> <p>01/24/2014 â€“ YES.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<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>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please adjust the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing, and ensure that these are consistently reported across the document.</p> <p>01/24/2014 â€œ YES. \$34.6 million in indicative co-financing has been identified.</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 3 above.</p> <p>At \$545,455 or 10 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 3, the SCCF funding level for project management is somewhat high. While a funding level above 5 per cent may be justified, it is noted that substantive, indicative co-financing (\$4.05 million) has been identified towards project management, and that the project could benefit from the on-going implementation of the NAP GSP for LDCs.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon further guidance on the funding availability, please seek ways to reduce the SCCF funding level for project management.</p> <p>01/24/2014 â€œ YES. The SCCF funding level for project management has been adjusted to \$333,333 or 8 per cent of the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		sub-total for components 1 through 3.	
	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. A PPG of \$150,000 is requested, in line with the norm established for projects of up to and including \$6 million.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	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?		
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. <b>Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 16, 17 and 18.  01/24/2014 â€œ YES.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO	Please refer to Section 12.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	endorsement/approval.	01/24/2014 – Please refer also to sections 6 and 8 above.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	January 15, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	January 24, 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.**