



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

GEF ID:	5489		
Country/Region:	Lao PDR		
Project Title:	Climate Adaptation in Wetlands Areas (CAWA)		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$4,717,579
Co-financing:	\$16,905,000	Total Project Cost:	\$21,772,579
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	Purushottam Mudbhary

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes; Lao PDR is an LDC and has completed its NAPA preparation.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Yes; a letter of endorsement from the GEF OFP is attached, dated 6 June 2013.	
Resource Availability	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?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagova Protocol Investment		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</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; project Components 2 and 3 correspond to LDCF objective CCA-1 and Component 1 to CCA-2</p>	
	<p>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?</p>	<p>Yes. The project will support investments to build resilience in the areas of agriculture and disaster risk management (relating to floods and droughts). In addition, various national plans and strategies (e.g., National Climate Change Strategy, National Water Resources Policy) have emphasized the need for early warning systems, flood-maps, and other technical inputs to assist with vulnerability reduction, which the project will support.</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>No. More clarity is requested regarding baseline projects for Component 2, which pertains to actual investments in improved wetland management in the 2 target areas.</p> <p>The following 6 baseline projects seem to have been identified – some only receive brief mention and others are discussed in detail: (i) management plan for BKN Ramsar site; (ii) development of management plan for XC; (iii) WCS's support for the Siamese Crocodile; (iv) WB support to the IWRM Program; (v) work being done by the Ministry of Forestry; and (vi) the MPC's Climate</p>	

		<p>Recommended action: Please confirm whether all of the above 6 initiatives and projects will constitute baseline activities for the LDCF investments.</p> <p>Update 9/25/2013: It has been clarified that the initiatives listed will constitute the baseline activities for the LDCF investments.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>More detail is requested. The activities in the Project Component column of Table B are very general, e.g., "Component 1: Improvement of knowledge and understanding of CC impacts and risks". Outcomes and outputs are sound and appropriately detailed.</p> <p>Section A.1.2. of the PIF identifies project components in more detail. These include: Comp 1 "vulnerability assessments for the 2 targeted wetlands, as well as development of an assessment tool and training in its use; Comp 2 "improved farming, infrastructure and livelihoods practices; climate-resilient DRM and improved CC-resilience of wetland ecosystems; Comp 3 "integration of mutli-sector adaptation and DRM into local planning, including an associated tool and training. However, these activities are discussed in very general terms.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please provide more specific description of the Project Components in Table B.</p> <p>Update 9/25/2013:</p>	<p>By CEO endorsement: Please provide a fuller description of: (i) target locations within the XC and BKN wetlands (will the LDCF activities benefit the full populations of the wetlands? If not, how many villages/communities?); and (ii) specific CC adaptation interventions to be taken. For example, in the description of the Component 2 Adaptation Alternative in the PIF, it states, "LDCF resources will be used to improve, rehabilitate and climate proof existing irrigation infrastructure!" Please provide specifics on the types of infrastructure to be improved, the number of investments, the types of climate-resilience measures that will be undertaken, and the analysis that will guide the selection and design of climate-resilience measures. (iii) We would greatly appreciate at CEO endorsement stage an indication of costs for the PIF Outputs 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4.</p>

	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes for PIF stage.  (a) Adaptation benefits: Theoretically, this is clearly described. But for Component 2 we would appreciate more information on the actual measures that will be taken. (See Item 7's comment (ii)).  (b) Additional reasoning: This could benefit from more detail. For example, it is not clear why improvements and rehabilitation of existing infrastructure, livelihoods diversification and improved wetlands management constitute measures that are additional to baseline development actions and that will generate adaptation benefits.</p>	<p>By CEO endorsement:  Please provide more information on the specific resilience-building activities to be undertaken, and kindly clarify how these would be additional to the baseline development measures. A table showing baseline investments and the additional LDCF activities would be very helpful.</p>
	<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?</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 for PIF stage. The PIF states that provincial, district and village level stakeholders will be critical to the project development process. Among the stakeholders that will be consulted in the PPG stage, the PIF mentions "local civil society and mass organizations".</p>	<p>By CEO Endorsement:  Please provide more details on which civil society actors have been engaged. Please also discuss how they were engaged and will continue to be (the latter in the context of sustainability). If relevant and possible, please also identify any Indigenous Peoples living in the 2 wetlands who will be beneficiaries of the projects.</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 for PIF stage.</p>	<p>By CEO Endorsement:  Please provide an expanded explanation of how the various activities will be properly coordinated and co-related with each other, so as to avoid being a set of activities developed and managed in isolation of each other, with possible</p>

			<p>already been touched upon in the PIF, but its mitigation needs to be thought out more, particularly given (i) the seemingly long list of baseline investments; and (ii) LDCF projects in Lao PDR that have some degree of overlap (see Item 12). Is there a committee to oversee the project? If so, which agencies will it comprise?</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>Yes; the proposed LDCF project proposes coordination and cross-fertilization with 3 other LDCF projects in Lao PDR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Improving the resilience of the agriculture sector to Climate Change Impacts (UNDP);</li> <li>(ii) Effective governance for small-scale rural infrastructure and disaster preparedness in a changing climate (UNDP); and</li> <li>(iii) Enhancing the capacity for monitoring and analysis of climate variability and climate change impact on the agriculture sector to improve food security (FAO; pipeline).</li> </ul> <p>Such coordination may enable sharing of baseline data; experiences with agricultural pilots (IRAS project), successful resilience-building measures in other provinces (e.g., climate-proofing of rural infrastructure) and tools for adaptation planning.</p>	
	<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</li> </ul>	<p>More information requested (Sustainability).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Innovation: Yes. The activities proposed are not innovative in themselves; however, they are relatively new in the Lao PDR context, and can thus be viewed as innovative in a country</li> </ul>	<p>By CEO endorsement, please elaborate specifically how will the project ensure engagement in district planning and other efforts relevant for ensuring sustainability.</p>

	<p>likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability: More information is needed on coordination and maintenance aspects.</li> <li>Scale-up: Yes. The procedures developed for participatory vulnerability assessments, integrating climate-resilience measures in farming and irrigation infrastructure; and improved DRM can be scaled up to other areas of the country.</li> </ul> <p>Recommended action: Please provide more Sustainability-related information, i.e., on (i) coordination across the various baseline initiatives and (ii) capacity building to ensure ownership and maintenance of investments.</p> <p>Update 9/25/2013: It has been clarified that the project will ensure that the maintenance and continuous improvement of infrastructure is included in district planning or community based management plans as an essential element of CC adaptation and disaster risk reduction or management, and that maintenance and improvement of infrastructure will be included in the planning tools developed under Component 3. This is satisfactory for PIF stage.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-</p>		

	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?	Yes. 78% of the LDCF grant and 59% of the co-financing will be used to support investments in climate-resilience in 2 wetland areas; the remainder will finance the development of supporting tools and the inclusion of CC adaptation and disaster risk management in local and national planning processes.	
	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. The project will leverage \$16.9 M in total co-financing, of which \$10M will support climate-resilient investments.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	Yes; it is 4.6% of the total LDCF grant requested.	
	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, PPG has been requested and is within the norm.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
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	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Not yet; it is pending response to Items 6, 7 and 13.  Update 9/25/2013: All the outstanding issues have been resolved, and the PIF is now recommended for clearance. 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.	Items 7, 8, 10 and 11.  We would greatly appreciate, if possible, consideration of inclusion of indicators for (i) gender-related activities, (ii) activities targeting indigenous peoples (if any), and (iii) CSO involvement.  Update 9/25/2013: Item 13	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	July 22, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	September 25, 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.**