



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

GEF ID:	<b>5615</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Global</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Building Capacity for LDCs to Participate Effectively in Intergovernmental Climate Change Processes</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP and UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5319 (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-2;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$150,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$4,000,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$19,671,396</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$23,821,396</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Bonizella Biagini</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Pradeep Kukusuriya</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	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.	
	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?		

	equitable access	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.  12/04/2013 – UPDATE: The proposed project would now benefit all LDC Parties to the UNFCCC.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b> ? <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>	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.	
	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?	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 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	

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.

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.

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 regarding the way in which country-level stakeholders will be engaged and consulted.

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.

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?

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.

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 how; given this scenario; the proposed project would add value by addressing unmet needs and gaps, recognizing that these are inevitably country-specific.

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

processes. Such processes should be reflected as part of the baseline scenario, while also noting that they may not yet benefit all participating LDCs.

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.

**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.

12/04/2013 “ YES. The revised PIF 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.

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

		<p>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>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>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-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>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>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</p>	
--	--	---	--

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.

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 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.

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>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 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>	
	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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified	NOT CLEAR. The role of public participation, including CSOs, is not clearly reflected in the PIF.	

	engagement explained?	<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>	
	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>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) 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</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>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 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>	
--	--	---	--

		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>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 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 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>	

		sustainability and promoting scaling up will be revisited at CEO Endorsement.	
	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, as necessary.</p> <p>12/04/2013 â€“ 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 â€“ YES. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p>	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> 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 â€“ UPDATE: The proposed project now targets all LDC Parties to the</p>	

		\$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.	
	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 \$100,000 is requested, consistent with the norm for projects up to and including \$3 million.  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.	
	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. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16 and 17.  12/04/2013 “ YES.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO	Please refer to sections 5, 6, 8, 11 and 13.	

Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	October 24, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	December 04, 2013	
	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.