



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

GEF ID:	4340		
Country/Region:	Indonesia		
Project Title:	Strategic Planning and Action to Strengthen Climate Resilience of Rural Communities in Nusa Tenggara Timor province (SPARC)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4549 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-2; CCA-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,000,000
Co-financing:	\$54,800,000	Total Project Cost:	\$59,800,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Rawleston Moore	Agency Contact Person:	Angus Mackay

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	
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	Not applicable	
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	An endorsement letter from the operational focal point is on file	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Further clarification is needed in this area. The project proposes to improve rural livelihoods and food security by strengthening climate resilience, adjusting agricultural practices, and rehabilitating water harvesting and storage facilities. Clarification is needed as to how agricultural initiatives and water management issues fit into the normal	

*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 9-8-2010

		non GEF Strategy of UNDP in Indonesia. Further information is also requested on the ART-GOLD Programme	
	5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	There is a need for a minor clarification on the issue of cofinance. Table C indicates UNDP cofinancing is US\$26.8 million, while section C.1 notes US\$26.6 million of cofinance. A full assessment of the cofinancing should be provided at CEO Endorsment	
	6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Further clarification is requested on the work program of UNDP in the areas of agriculture and water management in Indonesia	
Resource Availability	7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF 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?		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	Currently the resources are available in the SCCF	
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	The project is aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework, as the project reduces vulnerability and enhances adaptive capacity	
	9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	The project addresses the SCCF programme priorities of water management, agriculture and supporting capacity building	
	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?	The National Action Plan on Climate Change in Indonesia notes the need to integrate climate change adaptation into development planning. The Climate Change Road Map notes that food security is priority area for adaptation interventions in The Second National Communications of Indonesia highlights the vulnerability of the Nusa Tenggara Timor, but the second national communications has not been published	

		as yet.	
	11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?	The project does articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to institutional sustainability	
Project Design	12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	The baseline is sufficiently described, however further information on the normal non GEF strategy of UNDP Indonesia in the area of agriculture	
	13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Yes.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	The project framework is clear	
	15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?	The activities are appropriate for the problems identified	
	16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?	The applied methodologies and assumptions are appropriate	
	17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?	Cost effectiveness should be demonstrated at CEO Endorsement	
	18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?	The project will deliver socio-economic benefits to at least 120 villages	

	19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?	The project takes into consideration the role of civil society	
	20. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	The project takes into account major risks, including those risks related to climate change. The project proposes mitigation measures to address the risks	
	21. Is the provided documentation consistent?	The documentation is consistent	
	22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?	Key stakeholders and their roles have been identified	
	23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The project will be linked to relevant regional and national programs such as the Disaster risk Reduction Programme and UN-REDD. Further clarification is required as to the specific and specialized agricultural and water initiatives that this project will be linked with.	
	24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	The project implementation arrangements are adequate	
	25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?			
Project Financing	27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The project management costs are appropriate	
	28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost reasoning principle?	There needs to be clarification on the costs for the following components (i) Capacity Development (ii) Planning and Policy (iii) Learning and Knowledge.	

		Each of these components utilize more than 10% of the proposed LDCF budget. The component on learning management should be incorporated into the community based pilots component in order to reduce cost	
	29. Comment on indicated cofinancing at PIF. At CEO endorsement, indicate if cofinancing is confirmed.	Further clarification is required on the issue of cofinance and this can be done at CEO Endorsement	
	30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The GEF budget for the following components needs to be clarified (i) Capacity Development (ii) Planning and Policy (iii) Learning and Knowledge	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	The tracking tool should be incorporated by CEO Endorsement	
	32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	N/A	
	• Convention Secretariat?	N/A	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	N/A	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	The PIF is not recommended for clearance. There are issues related to comparative advantage and the budget which need further clarification, and explanation. Update Nov 8th 2010 There have been changes in the budget and clarifications on the comparative advantage of UNDP. The changes are acceptable and the PIF is recommended for clearance	
	35. Items to consider at CEO	Co-finance will need to be confirmed at	

	endorsement/approval.	CEO Endorsement.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	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.

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	<p>The proposed activities for project preparation are appropriate.</p> <p>Update Nov. 8th 2010.</p> <p>The proposed PPG activities will assist in further defining the project baseline, identify current and projected risks in NTT. PPG resources, will also identify specific sites for intervention and clarify the additionality of proposed outcomes and interventions</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	The budget is justified. The proposed budget for consultants is acceptable
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	<p>The PPG is not recommended for approval. If the PIF is approved then consideration will be given to approving the PPG</p> <p>Update No. 8th 2010</p> <p>The PPG is recommended for approval</p>
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.