



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

GEF ID:	5233		
Country/Region:	Madagascar		
Project Title:	Enabling Climate Resilience in the Agriculture Sector in the Southwest Region of Madagascar		
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):	CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$6,272,000
Co-financing:	\$37,200,000	Total Project Cost:	\$43,472,000
PIF Approval:	February 07, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	May 29, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	Jean-Marie Meng Lihinag

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes, Madagascar is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	Yes, no change since PIF.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Yes, the Letter of Endorsement signed by the Operational Focal Point is included.	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	n/a	
	• the focal area allocation?	n/a	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes, the funding requested under this project is available for Madagascar under the principle of equitable funding.	Yes, no change since PIF.

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	n/a	
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>	Yes, Components 1, 2, and 3 are well-aligned with LDCF strategic objectives CCA-1 and CCA-3: reducing vulnerability and transfer of technology for adaptation.	Yes, no change since PIF.
	<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>	Yes, water is a top priority in the NAPA, the project emphasizes water management for agriculture, and it also complements a related GEF-funded project on agriculture, which is the top most priority in Madagascar's NAPA.	Yes, no change since PIF. The project's priority is increasing the resilience of the agricultural water infrastructure.
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>	Yes, for this stage. The baseline project aims to improve agricultural production and farmers' incomes through water management in four sites of southwest Madagascar, each of which corresponds to a watershed. This will be done through an agriculture rehabilitation component, whose objective is to improve food security and increase productivity, access to market and services, as well as a component to support the establishment of sustainable agricultural infrastructure management by the beneficiaries, including technical assistance, institutional support, and	Yes, the baseline project and problems are clear, and the project appraisal report for PRIASO, the baseline project, has been reviewed by the GEF SEC.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>awareness campaign against HIV/AIDS and water-related diseases. However, the size of the baseline project is unclear in the proposal.</p> <p>Recommended Action: By CEO Endorsement, it is expected that additional details on the baseline project will be available.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>Yes, the project framework is sound, and the project appears to be well-designed. It will focus on making agricultural water infrastructure climate resilient, to prevent flooding, facilitate irrigation, and employ strategies for agro-forestry and erosion control. The project will also focus on strengthening community livelihoods.</p>	<p>For the most part, the project framework is sound and the project is well-designed. The design has been informed by a study of climate change aspects, including the vulnerability assessments of the three project sites. However, please see comment under question 8. below.</p> <p>Update 4/11: This is now cleared.</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, there is a good description of additional benefits, with respect to infrastructure investments, community livelihoods, and finally, knowledge management which will be used to ensure that lessons learned from the implementation of this project are available for application to other adaptation projects.</p>	<p>For the most part. However, please note that, while AfDB has provided useful clarifications pertaining to the additionality of the four health clinics, it remains unclear whether LDCF will be financing activities that are not clearly aimed at addressing climate-sensitive health issues. For instance, the section on social impact (p. 11 in PAR) includes activities to enhance knowledge of the local populations in both climate-sensitive and climate-neutral health issues.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please confirm the extent to which the LDCF will finance health activities, ensuring that the financing targets</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>activities of components that have a high likelihood of being impacted by climate change.</p> <p>Update 4/11: This is now cleared. The health activities will be funded by LDCF based on the additional cost principle, complementing the baseline investments into the health clinics and associated outputs.</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>Yes, the socio-economic benefits are clearly described, and the benefits role in the achievement of additional benefits are well-argued.</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. The project has emerged as a result of consultations with the key institutions, and further consultations will be conducted during the project preparation phase.</p>	<p>Yes.</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, the main risks and mitigation measures are identified. While the government body responsible for financing the maintenance of large-scale irrigation schemes may not be able to mobilize the necessary fund for maintenance of the infrastructure, AfDB is confident of being able to convince the government to allocate sufficient resources to FERHA, particularly in the southwest of the country where the project is located.</p> <p>Recommended Action: By CEO Endorsement it is expected that</p>	<p>Not fully. While the project does list the major risks, the risk mitigation measures have not been fully included.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please describe the risk mitigation measures aimed at managing Financial, Political, and Management Risks.</p> <p>Update 4/11/2014: This is now cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		full details on the status of this risk will be updated.	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>Yes. For the most part, the project appears consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in Madagascar.</p> <p>Key development partners financing irrigation and agricultural development projects include UNDP, FAO, AFD, GIZ and the World Bank. During AfDB's inception mission links were forged with these relevant partners, and an ongoing dialogue is taking place regarding synergies and complementarities through the ongoing national program in irrigation and catchment protection.</p> <p>Recommended action: By CEO Endorsement, it would be important to demonstrate a project that is fully coordinated with other related initiatives, exploring synergies where possible.</p>	<p>The project appears to be well-coordinated, and has undergone detailed consultations and coordination with various national and local entities. What remains unclear is whether there are any relevant development initiatives (e.g. by bilaterals or other multilateral partners) to note and that, presumably, have also been included under the broad effort of coordination.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide clarifications concerning any development initiatives by bilateral or multilateral partners.</p> <p>Update 4/11/2014: This is now cleared.</p>
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <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 for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency</li> </ul>	Yes. The project focuses on essential institutional capacity building (component two), the establishment of sustainable agricultural infrastructure management by the beneficiaries, while focusing on strengthening Water Users Associations; technical assistance to farmers for agricultural development, institutional support to the relevant national bodies working on anti-locust preventive control; securing land tenure for farmers; and the implementation of	Yes. No changes since PIF.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	experience. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	sensitization and awareness campaign against diseases related to water.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Yes.
	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?		Yes.
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, it seems that the funding and co-financing per objective are adequate for achieving the expected results.	Yes.
	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?	The indicative cofinancing for this project consists of \$30 million for AfDB, and \$3 million of in-kind financing from the Government of Madagascar.	Yes, the confirmed cofinancing consists of \$37.2 million from African Development Bank, through two soft loans.
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	Yes, the funding level for project management, below 5%, is adequate.	The funding level for PMC 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> ,	Update 7/9/2013: The PPG is requested, the amount requested does not deviate from the norm. Therefore, the PPG is recommended for approval, once the PIF is ready to be approved.	No change. 4/11/2014: The agency reported in the PPG-financed activities, this is cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes.
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council?</li> </ul>		Please see comment under 8(b)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>			
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p><b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b></p>	<p>Not yet. Please provide further information on #13 and #20. In addition, please note that the agency fee cannot exceed 9.5% of the project cost as per the fee structure effective Jan 1, 2013, and please adjust accordingly.</p> <p>Update 2/1/2013: All outstanding issues have been resolved. The project is now recommended for approval.</p> <p>Update 7/9/2013: The PPG is recommended for approval.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	#18 and #19	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		Not yet. The project will be recommended after the resolution of pending comments (7, 8, 11, and 12).  Update 4/11/2014: Yes, the project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.
	First review*	January 17, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	February 01, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	July 09, 2013	

\* **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.**