



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5075		
Country/Region:	Lesotho		
Project Title:	Reducing Vulnerability from Climate Change in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4630 (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-1; CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$8,398,172
Co-financing:	\$26,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$34,398,172
PIF Approval:	May 02, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	May 31, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	

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 August 10, 2012, has been attached to the submission.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	NOT CLEAR. Whereas UNDP has a clear comparative advantage in the areas of capacity building and policy support for climate change adaptation, the investments and cash-for-work activities proposed under Component 1 should be justified with reference to relevant	

*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>experience and programming in the country.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please refer to Section 5.</p> <p>04/09/2013 – YES. As recommended, the re-submission provides additional information in support of UNDP's comparative advantage to implement the cash-for-work activities proposed under Component 1.</p>	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project is aligned with Lesotho's 2011-15 UNDAF as well as UNDP's 2008-12 Country Programme and Action Plan. It is not clear, however, whether UNDP has the operational experience and capacity to implement the investments and cash-for-work activities proposed under Component 1.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please demonstrate that UNDP has the relevant experience and capacity required to implement the investments and cash-for-work activities proposed under Component 1.</p> <p>04/09/2013 -- YES. As recommended, the re-submission provides additional information regarding UNDP's experience and capacity to implement the cash-for-work activities proposed</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		under Component 1.	
Resource Availability	6. 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 is available under the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?		
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	YES. The proposed project is aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-1 and CCA-2 and, specifically, outcomes 1.1, 1.2, 2.1 and 2.3.</p> <p>Still, the Focal Area Strategy Framework should disaggregate grant and co-financing amounts per outcome. Moreover, it is not clear how the proposed grant would contribute towards CCA-1 and CCA-2 in equal shares, as it appears that most of the grant would support investments that correspond to CCA-1.2.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i)</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>provide grant and co-financing amounts for each strategic outcome towards which the project is expected to contribute; and (ii) ensure that the Focal Area Strategy Framework reflects the emphasis of the proposed project on tangible investments in reducing the vulnerability of key natural assets.</p> <p>04/09/2013 “ YES. The Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) has been revised as recommended.</p>	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country’s national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards Lesotho's NAPA priority on promoting sustainable crop-based livelihoods in Foothills, Lowlands and the Senqu River Valley. In addition, the project is aligned with Lesotho's Vision 2020, Poverty Reduction Strategy, and it will contribute towards the development of the 2012-16 National Sustainable Development Plan.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	YES. The proposed project emphasizes the need to build the capacities of local communities as well as local and national government authorities to ensure the sustainable and climate-resilient management rangelands, wetlands and other key natural assets.	
	11. 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?	NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would build on (i) the Land Rehabilitation Programme led by the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation; (ii) the development of rangeland and wetland strategies by the departments of Rangelands Management and Water Affairs; (iii) the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>implementation of the National Sustainable Development Plan; and (iv) the Lesotho component of the Africa Adaptation Programme (AAP).</p> <p>While the Land Rehabilitation Programme is highly relevant for the proposed project, it is not clear whether the entire national program could be regarded as baseline and co-financing to the LDCF project. As for AAP, it is not clear how it would benefit from additional adaptation measures.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) clarify whether the entire Land Rehabilitation Programme can be treated as a baseline project, given its considerable scale and scope; and (ii) consider removing AAP among the baseline projects and including it among other related initiatives in Section B.6 of the PIF.</p> <p>04/09/2013 “ YES. The indicative co-financing associated with each of the baseline initiatives has been clarified as recommended. In addition, AAP has been considered among other related initiatives, with which coordination will be sought.</p>	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>With respect to Component 1, the PIF proposes a wide array of pilot investments aiming to enhance the resilience of the land rehabilitation programme. The cost-effectiveness of this approach, vis-à-vis a focus on fewer priority adaptation measures, should be discussed. In addition, given that more than \$6 million or 70 per cent of the proposed grant would be allocated towards Component 1, it would be helpful to see an indicative distribution of resources between outputs 1-3.</p> <p>As for Component 2, it is not clear how the training activities proposed under outputs 5 and 6 relate to and complement those proposed under output 2. The PIF could also provide further information as to the indicative scope of these training programs to better justify the grant request for Component 2.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing recommendations under Section 11, please (i) consider focusing output 3 on fewer priority investments, or justify the proposed approach; (ii) provide indicative grant and co-financing amounts for outputs 1-3; (iii) clarify how the training programs proposed under outputs 5 and 6 would</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>relate to and complement those proposed under output 2, and (iv) provide further information regarding the scope of the former.</p> <p>04/09/2013 “ YES. The re-submission addresses the recommendations made, proposing a greater focus on a fewer number of sites, greater clarity on the distribution of resources by output, and a more streamlined project structure.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11 and 13, please adjust the project framework accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>04/09/2013 “ YES. The project framework has been adjusted as recommended.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13, please provide a clear description of the adaptation benefits sought.</p> <p>04/09/2013 “ YES. The adaptation benefits are adequately described for this stage of project development.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	16. 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?	YES. The socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions of the proposed project are clearly described.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	YES. Public participation, including CSOs, is adequately described for this stage of project development.	
	18. 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)	YES. The major risks, including appropriate mitigation measures, have been adequately described for this stage of project development.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	YES. Coordination and complementary with other related initiatives is adequately considered for this stage of project development.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	YES.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES. At USD 360,000 or less than 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 and 2, the proposed funding level for project management is appropriate.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11 and 13, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component if necessary. 04/09/2013 “ YES. The grant and co-financing figures have been revised as recommended.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Sections 11. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please adjust the indicative co-financing amounts. 04/09/2013 “ YES. The co-financing figures have been revised as recommended.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	YES. UNDP would contribute USD 2.5 million of its core resources as co-financing towards the proposed project.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	NA	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	
	• Council comments?		NA
	• Other GEF Agencies?	NA	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 3, 5, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 24 and 25. 04/09/2013 “ YES.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 29, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 09, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	

	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.