



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

GEF ID:	5382		
Country/Region:	Guinea		
Project Title:	Ecosystem-Based Adaptation targeting vulnerable communities of the Upper Guinea Region		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5176 (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; CCA-1;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$8,000,000
Co-financing:	\$27,600,000	Total Project Cost:	\$35,600,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	Fabiana Issiler

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	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 of Guinea and dated April 3rd, 2013, has been provided.	
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?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes. The proposed grant \$8,760,000 (including agency fee) is available to	

		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>	<p>Yes. The proposed project is in line with CCA-1 and CCA-2, as the project will result in concrete physical interventions in the watersheds, and will increase the adaptive capacity through a rigorous program of technical assistance, and limited investments in hydro-meteorological infrastructure.</p>	
	<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>	<p>Yes. The project is aligned with Guinea's NAPA, particularly with respect to erosion control. The proposal also adequately describes the consistency of this project with other key strategies, such as the PNISA, the National Environment Policy, PNDA, and NBSAP.</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. Overall, the PIF describes six baseline initiatives that are relevant for the proposed project. However, it is unclear what the relationship is with the proposed project and what effect would the proposed project have on the baseline initiatives.</p> <p>Aside from the initiatives listed, it is unclear whether other relevant initiatives in the project zone have been considered, including those associated with wetland restoration, watershed management and land-use planning, as appropriate.</p>	

		<p>The PIF also states that "Guinea is undertaking efforts to strengthen technical and institutional capacities" for enabling climate change adaptation, but does not adequately describe these efforts, particularly as they relate to the country's capacity for integrating climate change adaptation and ecosystem-based approaches with national, regional and local strategies/plans, in line with component 2.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please clarify baseline activities in the proposed project zone as they relate to component 1. Please also consider other relevant baseline initiatives related to wetland restoration, watershed management and land-use planning. The proposal should elaborate on the relationship and complementarity of the baseline initiatives with the ecosystem-based investments proposed, including how the proposed project would influence the baseline interventions, and through which mechanism(s). Please describe the baseline scenario in regard to Guinea's efforts to strengthen technical and institutional capacities, particularly as they relate to mainstreaming climate change into Guinea's national, regional and local strategies.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>Not clear. "Expected Outputs" in Table B contains lengthy descriptions of mostly expected outcomes, rather than a brief description of outputs.</p> <p>The associated baseline amount for component 2 as described on pg.19 (\$2.9 million) does not match what is shown in Table B (\$3.9 million).</p>	

		Recommended Action: Please modify, including shortening, the "Expected Outputs" descriptions in the project framework, and ensure consistency in the financial amounts presented throughout.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>No. The adaptation benefits are clear. However, the additional cost reasoning will be considered after the recommendations under sections 6 and 7 have been adequately addressed.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please address recommendations in sections 6 and 7.</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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>Yes. Engagement with relevant stakeholders, including CSOs and rural populations is sought throughout the duration of the project.</p> <p>Recommended Action: By CEO endorsement, and related to question 9, please ensure how gender balance in public participation will be supported.</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>Yes. The project adequately describes major risks - operational, political and institutional - that may affect project goals.</p> <p>Recommended Action: By CEO Endorsement, please consider carefully the option of direct implementation modality for the reasons stated, given the importance of country-drivenness with LDCF projects, and the risk of loss of</p>	

		strengthening national institutions and capacity.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes. In addition to baseline initiatives, the project is aligned with 2 UNDP/GEF biodiversity projects: the "Regional Project West Africa Endemic Livestock - PROGEBE", and "Conservation of the Biodiversity of the Nimba Mountains through Integrated and Participatory Management". The PIF also cites coordination with relevant initiatives in collaboration with the World Bank.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <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>The project includes several innovative aspects.</p> <p>Firstly, the ecosystem approach in itself is an innovative feature; the PIF references only one previous experience with ecosystem-based adaptation in Guinea. Therefore, the "nature-based" solutions proposed under component 1, will be cost-effective and sustainable techniques that will support rural livelihoods. Also, the project's integration of mobile technology will be an innovative means of conducting communication and outreach activities.</p> <p>Throughout its duration, the project will partner with a range of stakeholders on the ground (namely relevant NGOs and rural development programs), which is expected to support sustainability and scaling up of the project outcomes.</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?	Not clear. Please address the recommendations in section 6.	
	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?	Yes. In line with its role, UNDP will be bringing \$10.6 million in project co-financing.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. The proposed grant request for project management is appropriate, at \$375,000 which is under 5% of the sub-total for project components.	
	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?	A PPG of \$200,000 has been requested and will be recommended once the PIF is ready for clearance.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with		

	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?	No. Please see recommendations under sections 6,7,8 and 16.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	April 17, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.