



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	<b>6915</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Kazakhstan</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Southeast Europe and Central Asia Catastrophe Risk Insurance Facility</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>World Bank</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>152230 (World Bank)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCA-1;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	<b>\$5,000,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$15,000,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$20,000,000</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>September 15, 2015</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>October 21, 2015</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Saliha Dobardzic</b>	Agency Contact Person:	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	The project is aligned with the relevant climate change adaptation objective, namely CCA-1, which is to reduce the vulnerability of people, livelihoods, physical assets and natural systems to the adverse effects of climate change. The project will reduce the vulnerability of people, physical assets, and livelihoods.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies	Yes. In order to address the impact of natural disasters on homeowners and	

<sup>1</sup> 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	SMEs, the government is introducing a new Law on Compulsory Catastrophe Insurance. Preparations for the draft law are currently underway under a separate program of World Bank technical assistance. The project is also in line with the Country Programming Strategy, UNDAF, and Second National Communication to the UNFCCC.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes, particularly sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes. The project will be additional to/nested within a World Bank TA program to address disaster risk. The TA program mainly focuses on the risk of earthquake, while the proposed SCCF project would add climate-related hazards and help deliver a comprehensive package of insurance market infrastructure in support of catastrophe insurance products. However, it is expected that by CEO endorsement, the relationship with the baseline initiative(s), including cofinancing, will be fully clarified.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the	Yes. However, by CEO endorsement please ensure the following is reflected into project design: (i)	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	GEBs?	Insurance price should reflect, to the extent possible, varying degrees of risk exposure, and (ii) SCCF funding should not be used to subsidize premiums.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Not clear. By CEO endorsement, please ensure all due consideration of gender elements, indigenous people and CSOs are considered.	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	n/a	
	• The focal area allocation?	n/a	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	Yes, from the Adaptation window.	
	• Focal area set-aside?	n/a	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	Yes, the PIF is being recommended for clearance. The PPG was not requested.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	No significant changes.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>Yes. The project structure and design seem appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs.</p> <p>Recommended action: Clarify on how the implementing agency and its partners will communicate results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project.</p> <p>Update 1/19/2016: The Agency has provided additional clarifications in this regard, and will strive to the extent possible to make the knowledge generated through this project publicly available.</p>	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	<p>Not clear. The financing appears adequate and given that the project is expanding upon an existing Catastrophe Risk Insurance Facility and will benefit from the already-established systems and institutions through a related project, it is expected to be cost-effective. However, there is no discussion of cost-effectiveness in the proposal.</p> <p>Recommended action:</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Please revise the project document to include a discussion of cost-effectiveness considerations.</p> <p>Update 1/19/2016: This has been done (p. 17 of the revised PAD).</p>	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	<p>Not clear. In the consideration of risks, the risk response measures do not appear to be fully elaborated. Specifically, it is not clear how the project would be impacted in the event that the national compulsory catastrophe insurance program law is not passed in late 2016, as planned. In addition, it is not clear how in that case cost-effective use of grant resources would be ensured.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please clarify how the project will be viable and cost-effective in the event that the law is not passed.</p> <p>Update 1/19/2016: Additional clarifications have been provided, ensuring there is a viable pathway for the project even in the unlikely event that the law is not passed.</p>	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>Not yet.</p> <p>Recommended action: By this project's Board meeting date,</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		please ensure that the cofinancing is confirmed and the evidence is provided to the GEF Secretariat.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	Yes.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	The project appears to be well-coordinated with the relevant national initiatives, namely the ongoing technical assistance program on catastrophe insurance.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	<p>The project proposal contains a Results Framework and Monitoring plan, but it is not fully clear whether this has been budgeted.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please consider including a component on monitoring and evaluation in the GEF Data Sheet, along with the relevant budget.</p> <p>Update 1/19/2016: The clarification on this item has been provided.</p>	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	<p>Not clear.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide information on how the knowledge produced as a result of this project will be systematically</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>captured and disseminated. Also please see reviewer comment under Section 2, "Recommended Action".</p> <p>Update 1/19/2016: The clarifications on this item have been provided.</p>	
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEFSEC</li> </ul>	Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP</li> </ul>	Yes.	
		Responses have been provided to each of the comments provided by STAP.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEF Council</li> </ul>	Yes.	
		Responses have been provided to the comments provided by the GEF Council. However, please ensure to clarify how the implementing agency and its partners will communicate results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	The project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		