



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

GEF ID:	8023		
Country/Region:	Guinea		
Project Title:	Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems for Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change in Guinea		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5552 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$5,000,000
Co-financing:	\$30,514,330	Total Project Cost:	\$35,664,330
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Rawleston Moore	Agency Contact Person:	Henry Rene Diouf

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. Guinea is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the operational focal point and dated December 23, 2014, is attached to the submission.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area 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 LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	YES. The proposed grant is available from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	<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?</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 strategic objectives CCA-2 and CCA-3.	
	<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>	YES. The proposed project would address Guinea's NAPA priority on early-warning in the agricultural sector. Indirectly, however, the project would also inform adaptation and climate-resilient development across other climate-sensitive sectors.	
	<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>	NOT CLEAR. The PIF provides a useful and concise description of the baseline situation as it relates to each component, and it identifies two baseline projects, namely (i) the Lower Guinea and Faranah Expansion of the National Program to Support Agricultural Value Chain Actors (PNAFA-LGF); and the (ii) Rural Development Project of Kalossa (PDR-K).	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>The PIF does not provide the duration of the baseline projects, however, and it is unclear whether these investments “within their intended duration” could realistically benefit from the information and decision-support services enhanced by the proposed project.</p> <p>It is also unclear why the National Directorate of Meteorology (DNM), or the several regional initiatives from which Guinea has benefited, have not been identified as potential sources of co-financing. DNM in particular could be very relevant as a provider of in-kind support.</p> <p>With respect to Component 2, finally, it is not entirely clear what policies, plans and associated processes would be targeted, and to what extent climate change risks and adaptation strategies are already considered in the context of those policies and plans.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) provide the duration of each baseline initiative; (ii) consider expanding the sources of co-financing to capture some of the initiatives and institutions that strengthen and maintain Guinea's hydro-meteorological and climate information services; and (iii) clarify the baseline situation and scenario as it relates to the policies and plans that would be strengthened as part of Component 2.</p> <p>03/30/2015 “ YES. The baseline</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>scenario and the relevant baseline initiatives, including their associated, indicative sources and amounts of co-financing, have been clarified as recommended.</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>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6 and 8, please adjust the project framework accordingly.</p> <p>03/30/2015 “ 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 Section 6 above. In the absence of further clarity regarding the baseline scenario and relevant baseline initiatives, the additional reasoning and expected adaptation benefits cannot be fully assessed.</p> <p>It is unclear what direct impact the proposed project would have on the two baseline initiatives identified on p. 5 of the PIF; and whether those two initiatives are more closely associated with the project than other investments in relevant, climate-sensitive sectors.</p> <p>With regard to Component 2, specifically, it is unclear how the project would in fact ensure that climate risks and adaptation strategies are integrated into development plans. The PIF does not explain whether specific policies or planning processes will be targeted as</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>part of this outcome. Moreover, it is unclear whether the project would specifically seek to expand access to improved early warning in vulnerable, priority areas.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 6, please strengthen the additional reasoning and clarify the intended adaptation benefits accordingly.</p> <p>03/30/2015 “ YES. Please refer to Section 6 above. The additional reasoning and the expected adaptation benefits have been clarified as recommended.</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>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>YES. Public participation, including the role of CSOs, has been adequately described 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 appropriate mitigation measures have been adequately described for this stage of project development.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>YES. Coordination and coherence with other relevant initiatives has been adequately described in Section A.5 of the PIF.</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 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6 and 8, please revisit the innovative aspects of the project as well as the sustainability strategy and potential for scaling up.</p> <p>03/30/2015 “ YES. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>The proposed project would enhance the capacities of Guinea's National Directorate of Meteorology to collect, analyze and disseminate more accurate and more timely weather and climate information in support of improved development planning, as well as early warning for climate-related disaster risks. The project is directly relevant to large-scale investments in agricultural development, as well as key planning processes in climate-sensitive sectors. As a result, there is a clearly identified demand for improved climate information services, and a viable strategy to sustain those services and their application beyond the duration of the proposed project. The project will also explore other avenues to promote the sustainable financing of hydro-meteorological and climate information</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		services, including through emerging, paid-for services.	
	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 in sections 6 and 8, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>03/30/2015 â€œ 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 Section 6 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 6, please review the sources and amounts of co-financing accordingly, and make sure that these are consistently reported across different sections of the PIF.</p> <p>03/30/2015 â€œ YES. Please refer to Section 6 above.</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?	YES. At \$235,000 or less than 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components, the proposed LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate.	
	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. \$150,000 is requested, in line with the norm for projects up to \$6 million.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan 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 CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6, 7, 8, 13, 16 and 17. 03/30/2015 –“ YES. The proposed	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		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	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	February 03, 2015	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 30, 2015	
	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.**