



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

GEF ID:	<b>5868</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Global</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Expanding the ongoing Support to Least Developed Countries (LDC) with Country-driven processes to advance national adaptation plans (NAP)'</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP and UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5399 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)</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>\$6,200,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$8,400,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$14,750,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Knut Sundstrom</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. The proposed global project would target LDC 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 equitable access	YES. The proposed grant is within the resources available from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable	

\*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)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> <li>• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	access.	
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>	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards objectives CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3, and specifically, outcomes 1.1, 2.1 and 3.1.	
	<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>	YES. The proposed project responds to the guidance provided by the UNFCCC COP in decision 12/CP.18. The project would support LDC Parties to the Convention in integrating climate change adaptation into key national development plans and processes, while building on and complementing relevant adaptation plans, programs and projects, particularly NAPAs.	
	<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>	NOT CLEAR. The PIF provides a useful overview of the progress made through the LDCF-financed project "Assisting Least Developed Countries (LDCs) with country-driven processes to advance National Adaptation Plans (NAPS)" (NAP Global Support Program [GSP]), and the outstanding gaps and needs that the proposed project would address.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>The PIF provides a description of a static baseline situation, however, whereas the proposed project would in fact address a very dynamic baseline scenario, with considerable diversity among countries. The PIF does not describe the ways in which the NAP GSP will continue to assist LDCs during its final year of implementation. For example, the work plan for the final year of the GSP includes an additional training workshop as well as tailored support towards a larger number of countries than those listed in paragraph 5 of the PIF.</p> <p>Similarly, while recognizing that an in-depth analysis should be provided by CEO Endorsement, reference could be made to the fact that several countries have developed or are developing national and sectoral strategies for climate change adaptation that go beyond NAPAs, including the associated coordination mechanisms and financing arrangements. The PIF, in paragraphs 4, 6 and 9 does little to take note of the diversity of country circumstances and needs.</p> <p>Finally, Section A.1.2 makes no reference to the indicative sources, types and amounts of co-financing listed in Table C.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) provide further information regarding the baseline scenario associated with each component of the proposed project,</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>taking into account the agreed work plan and targets of the LDCF-financed project “Assisting Least Developed Countries (LDCs) with country-driven processes to advance National Adaptation Plans (NAPS)”; the progress made and underway in several LDCs to develop national adaptation strategies and plans that go beyond NAPAs; and the relevant technical and financial support provided towards such activities; and (ii) clarify how the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing relate to the baseline scenario.</p> <p>07/10/2014 -- YES. The baseline scenario has been strengthened as recommended, and the revised PIF clarifies how relevant baseline initiatives relate to the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing provided in Table C.</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 6 and 8.</p> <p>While it is important that the proposed project sets a clear target to extend support to all LDCs, recognizing that the ongoing NAP GSP is unable to do so; the project objective could go beyond support -- an input -- to capture what LDCs would achieve thanks to the support provided.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please (i) revise the project framework accordingly; and (ii) review the project objective.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>07/10/2014 -- YES. The project framework, including the objective as well as relevant outcomes and outputs, has been adjusted as recommended.</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 Section 6 above.</p> <p>In absence of a clearer understanding of the dynamic baseline scenario on which the proposed project would build, and recognition of the diversity of country needs and circumstances that the project would address, the expected adaptation benefits and the additional reasoning cannot be adequately assessed at this time.</p> <p>The proposed project is labeled 'Phase II' to the ongoing NAP GSP. It is unclear whether this an appropriate way to frame the project given that the NAP process is not envisaged as a phased process, and given that the proposed project would expand rather than deepen the support provided through the NAP GSP.</p> <p>With respect to the project results and outcomes, there is a lack of coherence between the project framework (Table B), on the one hand, and the goal and outcomes described in paragraphs 12 and 13 of the PIF, on the other hand. For example, it is unclear whether the outcome under Component 1 would be achieved solely or even mainly through national roadmaps or strategies, which may not be a relevant tool in all</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>countries. Paragraph 15 introduces an additional output in the "development of bankable proposals", which is not mentioned under any particular component and which does not seem relevant for any of the project outcomes as per Table B.</p> <p>With respect to Component 2, it seems the NAP GSP has opted to disseminate existing tools and guidelines rather than develop new ones. Table B suggests that the proposed project would place more emphasis on manuals, tools and guidance, although this is not clear from paragraphs 20-22. The PIF could be more coherent in this respect.</p> <p>As for Component 3, it is unclear how the training and tools proposed here would complement and add value to Component 2.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDED ACTION:</b> Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please strengthen the description of the expected adaptation benefits and additional reasoning accordingly. Specifically, please (i) reconsider framing the proposed project as Phase II, which seems misleading; (ii) ensure coherence in the description of the project goal, objective and outcomes; (iii) clarify how Component 1 would achieve its intended outcome, beyond the possible development of roadmaps and strategies; drawing on the ongoing NAP GSP, (iv) clarify to what extent the proposed</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 would develop new tools, manuals and guidelines, as suggested in Table B; and (v) clarify the interface between components 2 and 3 in terms of training, tools and guidance.</p> <p>07/10/2014 -- YES. The project title has been revised and the re-submission provides a stronger additional reasoning, as well as a coherent description of the additional activities supported through the proposed LDCF grant.</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 PIF makes no reference to CSO participation.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify how CSO participation would be ensured.</p> <p>07/10/2014 -- YES. The revised PIF clarifies that CSOs would be consulted during project preparation, and that these would continue to be engaged through country missions.</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</p>	<p>YES. Relevant risks and mitigation measures have been adequately described for this stage of project development.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	resilience)		
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	YES. Coordination and coherence with other relevant initiatives has been adequately described for this stage of project development.	
	<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.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please strengthen the description of the project's innovative aspects, sustainability and potential for scaling up.</p> <p>07/10/2014 -- YES. The proposed project represents an innovative effort to allow least developed countries to integrate climate change adaptation into their medium and long-term development 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 disseminates tools and methodologies that allow countries to further pursue their national adaptation planning processes in a sustainable and</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		autonomous manner.	
	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 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 per component, if necessary.</p> <p>07/10/2014 -- YES. The proposed grant and co-financing amounts per component are appropriate and adequate.</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 Section 6 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please adjust the indicative sources, types and amounts of co-financing, if necessary, and ensure that those sources, types and amounts are consistently described in Section A.1.2 of the PIF.</p> <p>07/10/2014 -- YES. Please refer to</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Section 6 above.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	YES. The proposed LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate at \$295,238 or 5 per cent of the 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 sought, consistent with the norm for projects up to \$10 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	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 16 and 17.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
PIF Stage		07/10/2014 -- YES. The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	June 20, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	July 10, 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.**