



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

GEF ID:	6926		
Country/Region:	Lesotho		
Project Title:	Strengthening climate services in Lesotho for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	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):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$120,000	Project Grant:	\$5,000,000
Co-financing:	\$19,318,000	Total Project Cost:	\$24,438,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Ermir Fida

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. Lesotho 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 July 1, 2014 has been 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 (\$5.61 million, including Agency fees and PPG) is within the resources available for Lesotho 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 CCA-2 and, specifically, outcome 2.3, i.e. access to improved climate information and early-warning systems enhanced at regional, national, sub-national and local levels.	
	<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 Lesotho's NAPA priority on strengthening early-warning systems for climate change -induced hazards. The project would also be aligned with the findings of Lesotho's National Communications, as well as the country's National Disaster Management Plan, Poverty Reduction Strategy and Vision 2020.	
	<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. Overall the PIF provides a clear description of the baseline scenario that the proposed project would address, along with relevant baseline initiatives that the project would seek to enhance.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>Beyond the current and expected state of the meteorological observation network, however, the PIF could briefly describe the human and technical capacities of the Lesotho Meteorological Services, and how these are expected to evolve with the baseline initiatives planned and underway (e.g. number of trained staff, etc.).</p> <p>Moreover, while it is recognized that the proposed project would build on a substantial baseline of projects and programs in the water and agricultural sectors, among other, the indicative co-financing estimates appear high. The PIF should provide the expected duration of each baseline initiative, and ensure that indicative co-financing is clearly associated with initiatives and activities that would directly benefit from and contribute towards the proposed project.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) describe briefly the human and technical capacities of the Lesotho Meteorological Services, and how these are expected to evolve with the baseline initiatives planned and underway; (ii) provide the expected duration of each baseline initiative; and (iii) ensure that the indicative co-financing is clearly associated with initiatives and activities that would directly benefit from and contribute towards the proposed project.</p> <p>11/03/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. The revised PIF provides a clearer description of the baseline scenario as it relates to the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>human and technical capacities of the Lesotho Meteorological Services; and it provides the expected duration of each baseline initiative.</p> <p>As for the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing, however, some of these are still not based on realistic expectations. In particular, the PIF cites the full amount of the GCCA project to develop a National Climate Change Policy and Strategy as well as a National Sustainable Energy Strategy as indicative co-financing. Yet the project is expected to be completed in November 2015. It is not clear how the proposed LDCF project could possibly shape the development of these policies and strategies through improved climate information services. Similarly, it remains unclear how the proposed LDCF project would contribute towards the GIZ project on the Protection of the Orange-Senqu Water Sources, which is due to be completed in March 2015.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please review and adjust the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing, particularly associated with the GCCA and GIZ projects in light of their expected duration.</p> <p>11/30/2014 -- YES. The indicative sources and amounts of co-financing have been revised as recommended.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<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, as needed.</p> <p>11/03/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p> <p>11/30/2014 -- YES. Please refer to Section 6 above.</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 8 above. In absence of further clarity on the baseline scenario and relevant baseline initiatives, the additional reasoning and expected adaptation benefits cannot be fully assessed at this time.</p> <p>Please refer also to Section 13 below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please strengthen the additional reasoning and the description of the expected adaptation benefits accordingly.</p> <p>11/03/2014 -- YES. The additional reasoning and expected adaptation benefits have been sufficiently described for this stage of project development.</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</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 below. The PIF could more clearly describe how local beneficiaries and the private sector would be engaged with a view to improving the relevance and sustainability of the services provided through the proposed project.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify how local beneficiaries and the private sector would be engaged in project design.</p> <p>11/03/2014 -- YES. Public participation, including the role of CSOs and the private sector, has been adequate described in the revised PIF.</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)	YES. Relevant risks and appropriate, associated mitigation measures are adequately described for this stage of project development.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	YES. Coordination and complementarity with other relevant initiatives are adequately described for this stage of project development.	
	<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 	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6, 8 and 10 above. There is considerable potential for piloting and deploying innovative technologies and delivery models for enhanced hydro-	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>meteorological and climate information services, and associated early-warning systems; e.g. more effective use of remote sensing, mobile communication technologies and public-private partnerships. The PIF could, at this time, identify relevant solutions that could be explored further during preparation.</p> <p>With respect to sustainability, the proposed project would rely heavily on a permanent government budget allocation, which has yet to be negotiated. In addition, the project could explore additional revenue streams for sustaining the observation network and the human capacities of the Lesotho Meteorological Services; and it could further clarify the role of local communities in contributing to the effectiveness and sustainability of the proposed EWS.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6, 8 and 10, please strengthen the description of the project's innovative aspects and sustainability strategy, with references -- where relevant -- to innovative technologies and delivery models, and additional means to enhance financial sustainability.</p> <p>11/03/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. The Agency's response to GEFSEC comments, as well as Section A.1.4 of the revised PIF mention the need to explore paid-for services as a means to sustain the enhanced hydro-meteorological services,</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>but these references are not captured in Section A.1.6.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: For coherence, please ensure that the project's indicative sustainability strategy is fully captured in Section A.1.6 of the PIF.</p> <p>11/30/2014 -- YES. Section A.1.6 has been revised as recommended.</p> <p>The proposed project would build on and expand a previous LDCF investment to strengthen Lesotho's hydro-meteorological and climate information services, and climate-related early-warning systems; moving from a sub-national to a national approach. The project identifies clear entry points where improved climate information services could be translated into better policy-making, planning and investments in agriculture and water resources management. The project will explore both public and private financing options to ensure the sustainability of the planned investments in Lesotho's hydro-meteorological observation and communication networks, as well as the associated technical and institutional capacities.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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, 8 and 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6, 8 and 13, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts in Table B accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>11/03/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p> <p>11/30/2014 -- YES. Please refer to Section 6 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 Sections 6 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please adjust the indicative sources, amounts and types of co-financing accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>11/03/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p> <p>In addition, while the sustainability of the proposed project would rely heavily on enhanced domestic investment in hydro-meteorological services, the national government is not featured among the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>indicative sources of co-financing.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please (i) adjust the indicative sources, amounts and types of co-financing accordingly; and (ii) consider including the national government, through the Lesotho Meteorological Services or otherwise, among the indicative sources of co-financing.</p> <p>11/30/2014 -- YES. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p>	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES. At \$238,000, or 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components, the proposed LDCF funding towards 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. A PPG of \$120,000 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		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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 YET. Please refer to sections 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 16 and 17. 11/03/2014 -- NOT YET. Please refer to sections 6, 7, 13, 16 and 17. 11/30/2014 -- YES. The proposed 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*	August 26, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	November 03, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 30, 2014	

* 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.