



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

GEF ID:	8014		
Country/Region:	Lesotho		
Project Title:	Climate Change Adaptation for Sustainable Rural Water Supply in Lowlands Lesotho		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	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:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$4,416,210
Co-financing:	\$17,250,000	Total Project Cost:	\$21,816,210
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Rawleston Moore	Agency Contact Person:	Amel Hamza

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. As an LDC party to the UNFCCC, with a completed NAPA, Lesotho is eligible to receive funding from the LDCF.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A signed letter from the OFP (dated 11 November 2014) is included with 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?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of	YES. The requested funding of \$5	

*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)
	equitable access	million is within the LDCF resources available for Lesotho under the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• 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>	<p>NOT YET. Please revise Table A to use strategic objectives described in the updated results-based management framework for the 2014-2018 period. For a detailed description of the strategic objectives and the updated results framework, please refer to the LDCF/SCCF council document, "Updated Results-Based Management Framework for Adaptation to Climate Change under the LDCF and SCCF" (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.17/05) and the "GEF Adaptation Strategy for Adaptation to Climate Change" (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.16/03), both available on the the GEF website.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please revise table A to use strategic objectives outlined in the updated RBM framework.</p> <p>1/22/15, ACL: YES. Recommendations have been adequately addressed.</p>	
	<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>	<p>NOT YET. Section B of the PIF provides an adequate summary of the project's consistency with various plans and strategies in Lesotho (including the first National Communication). However, please also describe how the project is consistent with Lesotho's NAPA.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify how project aligns with Lesotho's NAPA.</p> <p>1/22/15, ACL: YES. Recommendations have been adequately addressed.</p>	
Project Design	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 YET. The project builds on the Lesotho: Lowlands Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project (LRWSSP), financed largely through an AfDB loan (Table C). However, in describing the baseline project (pg. 4 and 5), insufficient information is provided on the baseline intervention gaps or vulnerabilities, that would ultimately be addressed by the additional LDCF resources. For instance, the PIF describes the elements of the LRWSSP to consist of "basic rural infrastructure, environmental health support for communities in the project area, as well as capacity building and project management" (pg. 4), without adequately describing these elements in more detail and highlighting specific limitations. And finally, how these elements align with the LDCF project components.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please describe the main elements (and limitations) of the LRWSSP; and also, how the project aligns with LDCF project components.</p> <p>1/22/15, ACL: YES. Recommendations have been adequately addressed. The project will be implemented in parallel</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		with the Lowlands Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project. LRWSSP activities will focus on: 1) water supply infrastructure, 2) environmental health, sanitation and hygiene promotion, 3) institutional support and capacity building and 4) project management and engineering services.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>NOT YET. Please address comments in 6, and adjust baseline co-financing numbers, should it be necessary. Also, indicate GEF Agency fee in PIF.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: 1) Please address comments in 6, and 2) indicate GEF Agency fee in PIF.</p> <p>1/22/15, ACL: YES. Recommendations have been adequately addressed.</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>NOT YET. Please address comments in 6.</p> <p>In addition, under Component 2, the project plans to "integrate climate risks into relevant policies, regulations and planning guidelines" (pg. 7) however it is not clear if these efforts would include revisions to the documents described in section A1.2. i.e. the National Water Resources Management Policy and Strategy (WRMPS) and the Water Act. Also, should there be other relevant national or local policies under consideration, kindly provide examples of these documents.</p> <p>Furthermore, under Component 3, please include illustrative examples of the types</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>of awareness raising activities to be implemented; and in particular, examples of the "top down/ bottom up" approach described (pg. 7). For instance will these include participatory workshops/trainings to be implemented alongside project activities? specific demonstration activities? or educational curriculum?</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: 1) Please address comments in 6, 2) clarify the policies and strategies to be strengthened, and 3) provide illustrative examples on the types of awareness raising activities to be implemented.</p> <p>1/22/15, ACL: YES. Recommendations have been adequately addressed.</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 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?	NOT YET. Section A.2. describes that the project will take-on a multi-sectoral approach, as to promote interest and ownership. However, a description of how engagement with CSOs will be encouraged, is not included in this section. Also, if possible, include project plans to promote female participation, given the project's gender-sensitive approach to implementing project activities.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: During project design/preparation, please include description of how the project will engage with CSOs, and if possible, how female participation will be promoted.</p> <p>1/22/15, ACL: YES. Recommendations have been adequately addressed. The project will take-on a participatory approach to help community manage their water supply and sanitation systems. This information has been included in section A.2. of the 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. This is adequately described in section A.4. of the PIF.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	YES. The project is consisted with LDCF-financed initiative implemented in the Lesotho. However, if possible, please also describe how the project aligns other initiatives financed by external partners/institutions.	
	<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 innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency 	<p>NOT YET. This can not be adequately described; please address comments in 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address comments in 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>1/26/15, ACL: YES. Recommendations have been adequately addressed. The project is innovative in its design. It builds on a robust baseline initiative financed by an AfDB loan, and it puts</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>particular emphasis on managing community vulnerability to climate impact through 1) investments in climate-resilient infrastructure (boreholes of appropriate depth, rainwater harvesting etc.), 2) establishment of resilient institutions and policies, and finally, 3) targeted awareness-raising activities through various avenues (e.g. public gatherings, schools, sports, and media outlets).</p> <p>At the community level, the project adopts a "village-based" strategy aimed at enhancing community knowledge and skills to manage their local water and sanitation services. This local participation ensures increased ownership of project activities, therefore contributing to overall project sustainability. Furthermore, active engagement of different stakeholders, including, local NGOs will further support project activities and sustainability. And finally, documentation of project best-practices and lessons will allow for smoother replicability of the project to other areas.</p>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	NOT YET. Please address comments in 6, 7 and 8 above, and adjust co-financing as appropriate. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address comments in 6, 7 and 8 above. 1/22/15, ACL: YES. Recommendations have been adequately addressed.	
	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?	NOT YET. Please address comments in 6, 7 and 8 above, and adjust co-financing as appropriate. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address comments in 6, 7 and 8 above. 1/22/15, ACL: YES. Recommendations have been adequately addressed.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES.	
	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.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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 monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
Agency Responses	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please address 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 15 and 17. 1/26/15, ACL: YES. However, this project is being recommended for technical clearance. PIF approval will only be granted once additional resources become available under the LDCF.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	December 22, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	January 26, 2015	
	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.**