



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: LDCF

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Implementing urgent adaptation priorities through strengthened decentralized and national development plans			
Country(ies):	Malawi	GEF Project ID: ¹	5015
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4958
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Management	Submission Date:	07/06/14
		Resubmission Date:	Sept 2, 2014
GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change	Project Duration(Months)	60
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	n/a	Agency Fee (\$):	450,000
➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/>			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
CCA-2	<u>Outcome 2.2:</u> Strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses	<u>Output 2.2.1</u> Adaptive capacity of national and regional centers and networks strengthened to rapidly respond to extreme weather events	LDCF	430,000	1 672 967
CCA-2 and CCA-1	<u>Outcome 2.3:</u> Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at local level And <u>Outcome 1.2:</u> Reduced vulnerability to climate change in development sectors And <u>Outcome 1.3:</u> Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas	<u>Output 2.3.1:</u> Targeted population groups participating in adaptation and risk reduction awareness activities	LDCF	521,000	200,000
		And <u>Output 1.2.1:</u> Vulnerable physical, natural and social assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability.		650,000	150,000
		And <u>Output 1.3.1:</u> Targeted individual and community livelihood strategies strengthened in relation to climate change impacts, including variability		1,800,000	650,000
CCA-1	<u>Outcome 1.1</u> Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development	<u>Output 1.1.1:</u> Adaptation measures and necessary budget allocations included	LDCF	899,000	3,888,374

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when completing Table A.

	frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas	in relevant frameworks			
(select)	(select)	PMC	LDCF	200,000	-
Total project costs				4,500,000	6,561,341

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To strengthen consideration of climate change adaptation needs in decentralised and national development plans.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Integration of adaptation into local development plans	TA	Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at local level	<p>1.1 A capacity development and incentive plan developed and action plan for implementation created to support the effective deployment of roles and responsibilities</p> <p>1.2 Training materials developed and the capacity of 60 district staff and sub-district project beneficiaries built on climate change integration in local development planning, policies and regulation and environmental impact assessment.</p> <p>1.3 Climate public expenditure and institutional analysis carried out to determine CCA expenditures and CCA expenditure gaps within district level budgets, supported by a training programme for relevant staff.</p> <p>1.4 Participatory vulnerability and adaptation assessments carried out with project communities to prioritise community CCA measures from the perspective of livelihoods upliftment.</p> <p>1.5 Community level disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation plans developed for 3 vulnerable districts.</p> <p>1.6 CCA priorities integrated into the District Development Plans, district policies and</p>	LDCF	745,000	2,462,341

			<p>legislation (by-laws etc) revised, and budgets and Local Council annual investment plans updated to reflect the new plans and policies</p> <p>1.7 CCA vulnerability/CCA resilience indicators and data collection protocols agreed and added to district level databanks for planning purposes.</p>			
2. Providing tangible support to adaptation activities identified in plan	INV	Diversified and strengthened livelihoods for vulnerable people in target areas	<p>2.1 Screening tools used by the Local Development Fund updated to incorporate adaptation to climate change.</p> <p>2.2 Technical training to communities delivered in order to implement the CCA plans sustainably</p> <p>2.3 Community adaptation plans implemented.</p> <p>2.4 Weather forecast information on short timescales disseminated to farmers in Ntcheu and Zomba.</p>	LDCF	2,911,000	1,000,000
3. Integration of adaptation into national level strategies	TA	Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas	<p>3.1 Technical support programme for climate change adaptation costing work set up and made operational.</p> <p>3.2 Training delivered to operationalise the Ministry of Finance budget preparation guidelines.</p> <p>3.3 Training developed and rolled out to 100 technical staff and managers in 3 relevant ministries to facilitate the investment plan development process.</p> <p>3.4 Economic costings of adaptation priorities developed by Sector Working Groups.</p> <p>3.5 Spending plans (as outlined in the Ministry strategies, Sector Working Group strategies/SWAs) in Agriculture, Water and Forestry adjusted to incorporate adaptation</p> <p>3.6 Regulatory and fiscal incentives to stimulate climate risk reduction by</p>	LDCF	549,000	3,099,000

			the private sector (citizens, companies, etc.) identified and work plan for implementation agreed with Government of Malawi for three priority sectors.			
Monitoring and Evaluation					95,000	
Subtotal					4,300,000	6,561,341
Project management Cost (PMC) ³				LDCF	200,000	-
Total project costs					4,500,000	6,561,341

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
Government	Nkhata Bay District Council	Grant	2,366,583
Government	Ntcheu District Council	In-kind	300,000
Government	Zomba District Council	Grant	344,758
Government	Local Development Fund	Grant	1,000,000
Government	Ministry of Economic Development & Planning	Grant	150,000
Multilateral	UNDP-UNEP	Grant	1,600,000
Multilateral	UNDP	Grant	800,000
Total Co-financing			6,561,341

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNDP	LDCF	Climate Change	Malawi	4,500,000	450,000	4,950,000
Total Grant Resources				4,500,000	450,000	4,950,000

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	165,000	-	165,000
National/Local Consultants	235,000	-	235,000

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

N/A

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

There are no changes in the fund strategies or eligibility criteria. The LDCF focal area framework priorities identified in the PIF are still valid. In addition, throughout the process of project development it became apparent that two other priorities are also addressed within this project, and thus they have been added (within the second component), namely Outcome 2.3: Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at local level, and Outcome 1.3: Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas.

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage: N/A

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

The baseline scenario outlining the PIF has not changed: namely that increasing climate variability is being observed, and challenges in public sector capacity contribute to ongoing vulnerability, particularly in rural areas and particularly for groups such as women and children. Challenges for public sector capacity arise from undeveloped key regulatory instruments, financial constraints impeding direct transfers, chronic human resource capacity deficit, and an inconsistent evidence base and lack of capacity to leverage existing data towards policy-making and planning. Malawi is also still committed to a process of decentralisation, enshrined in the Decentralisation Policy 1998. The majority of sectoral decisions are now implemented at district level, although there has been ongoing delay with the establishment of District Councils of elected officials, meaning that the de facto civil service, headed by the District Executive Committee and District Commissioner take responsibility for all decisions. Since the PIF was submitted, there have been developments in the Climate Change National Policy and Climate Change Investment Plan formulation – both of which are currently at advanced draft stage – which further sets the institutional framework to support the integration of adaptation into development planning. However, as yet the strategy for implementation has not yet been developed. There is thus even more pressing need for this project to take place.

Whilst the baseline scenario has not changed, there has been significant changes in the baseline financing from the PIF submission to now. The main reasons for that are the fact that the national election was called in 2013, which called into question the majority of ongoing governance projects in Malawi, awaiting the results of the election to see what would happen with regards to the establishment of the District Councils. Of the three components for the project, the baseline financing for component 2 of the project – the Local Development Fund, remains the same; although the amount has changed (from \$5,700,000 to \$1,000,000) reflecting the change in donor support to governance for the aforementioned reasons, and thus overall reduction in the budget of the LDF. Baseline financing for component 1 of the project was anticipated in the PIF to be a UNDP-run project, the Malawi Local Government Strengthening and Investment Programme (MLOGSIP), which was providing support to the decentralization agenda but not explicitly considering the integration of climate change into activities. This project finished in 2014 and was not renewed given the impending election, and thus new baseline financing was sought for component 1. As outlined above, inkeeping with the commitment to decentralization, sector budgets for the majority of sectors are now administered through the District Executive Committees in support of their District Development Plans, but these plans currently do not incorporate climate change adaptation. The baseline financing thus comprises elements of the District Budgets for the three

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question

districts; and the amount has changed from \$4,100,000 under MLOGSIP to \$3,011,342, which marks the actual sector budgets for the districts which do not include climate change adaptation. Baseline financing for component 3 was expected to be the Environment and Natural Resources Management Programme Support Document to Malawi (2012 – 2016); and the Disaster Risk Management programme support to Malawi (2012-2016). Both of these UNDP programmes have since been deemed more appropriate as baselines for a different LDCF project (“Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Eastern and Southern Africa for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change – Malawi”). However, the joint UN Poverty-Environment Initiative has recently been extended, and under TRAC funding UNDP is also providing ongoing support to national level line ministries to incorporate environmental considerations in planning, but not explicitly climate change adaptation. This project can thus leverage this baseline financing, the amount of which has changed from \$4,200,000 in the PIF to \$3,099,000 now (reflecting the current timeframe of the TRAC funding – which will likely be extended).

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

There have been no changes in the additional cost reasoning although, as stated above, the baseline financing has changed. District level budgets which form the baseline in the first component finance the implementation of the District Development Plans, but these currently do not systematically include aspects of climate change adaptation. What this project does is modify the District Development Plans so that they do incorporate climate change adaptation, and the LDCF funds attributed to component 1 enable this to happen, leveraging an existing process of development planning to add in an aspect of climate change adaptation. In component 2, the Local Development Fund transfers monies to the districts also to support the implementation of District Development Plans, but currently there is no consideration of climate change adaptation. The LDCF resources sought for component 2 will enable funds to be available to implement identified climate adaptation activities, thereby ensuring that adaptation priorities identified in the development plans can be implemented. In component 3, national level ministries currently undertake planning in various modes, and the recently-developed National Climate Change Policy provides the institutional framework to encourage the integration of climate change adaptation. The development of the National Adaptation Plan will also create an institutional mandate for ministries to incorporate climate change adaptation, but there is no finance attached and thus without this project it runs the risk of being a paper-only exercise. The baseline financing is supporting the integration of environmental considerations into national level development planning, but the LDCF resources for this component will enable climate change adaptation activities to also be incorporated into national level plans within the three chosen sectors.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

Some of risks identified during the PIF stage are still valid:

1. Insufficient ownership and engagement in the project by key stakeholders. The PPG phase has confirmed the active interest and commitment of the national and district level government.
2. Weak community engagement and interest in the project. The PPG phase has undertaken community-level consultations in the selected districts, selected by district officials as being vulnerable and in areas particularly exposed to climate change, and general interest in participation (in mainstreaming adaptation into Village Action Plans) was high. Participatory vulnerability and adaptation assessments under component 1 will determine the precise beneficiaries for the tangible adaptation activities that are identified as priorities in the Village Action Plans – and thus the risk of their insufficient engagement and interest remains.
3. Community interest and engagement may wane if project interventions do not generate tangible benefits. The participatory vulnerability and adaptation assessments means that the beneficiaries and communities themselves will be selecting the precise nature of the adaptation activities to be implemented, within a broad context of appropriate climate-resilient activities that has already been shortlisted by the districts through active consultation at PPG stage. The risk of waning interest is thus low.

4. Droughts and floods during the project implementation period could shift stakeholders' attention towards emergency relief thereby reducing the resolve of government and communities to focus on long-term adaptation. This risk is ever present, however, as stated in the PIF, the project activities are expressly designed to build resilience in the face of exposure to climate hazards, and thus their occurrence would offer an opportunity to test project effectiveness. The diversion of attention to key implementing district officers to emergency relief elsewhere in their area, thereby reducing their focus on the project, could be problematic, although timeframes have been designed to allow for small unanticipated delays such as these.

Additional risks identified through assessments of stakeholder capacity during the PPG phase include:

5. Changes in the political environment that disrupt the institutional framework. The PPG phase has identified the key district and national government level departments and job roles that will be active implementing agents and responsible parties in the project implementation phase. Although the management framework has been designed to be robust and sustainable in the case of change of individual staff, extraneous factors, such as political change which disrupt the institutional framework still present a risk in terms of delay to the project and the potential need for redesign of the management framework (e.g. change in ministry functions following the 2014 national election; or further changes to the decentralisation framework). Since the election was in May 2014, and the project start date is set for the last quarter of 2014/first quarter of 2015, UNDP will have the opportunity to monitor this situation carefully and take a proactive approach to modifying the management and implementation framework if necessary.

6. Financial risks were highlighted following the 2013 "cashgate" situation. The PPG phase has investigated the level of confidence in the financial management procedures of the key responsible partners, which includes the District Councils and Local Development Fund, as well as national ministries. All three Districts have been HACT-assessed as moderate risk. The Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Management and Ministry of Economic Planning and Development have already been positively assessed. The Local Development Fund is too new to have yet been assessed, although the National Local Government Development Committee (as its oversight body) is already monitoring its financial management. Weaknesses and gaps picked up in the District-level HACT assessments will be addressed through financial management training as well as quarterly spot checks.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

Since the council endorsement of the PIF, there has been progress with two other LDCF-funded initiatives in Malawi. The climate proofing urban and rural development gains in Mangochi and Machinga districts project (GEF ID 5015), also through UNDP, has a goal of using ecological, physical and policy measures to reduce vulnerability to climate change driven droughts, floods and post-harvest grain losses for rural and urban communities of Machinga and Mangochi Districts of Malawi (reaching over 0.5 million people). The two projects address the same priorities in the NAPA but have different (complementary) approaches and geographical focal areas in order to expand the range of evidence to the government of Malawi for implementing adaptation into development planning. ADAPT-Plan focuses on embedding a system that incentivises the incorporation of adaptation into development planning at district level and in national line ministries (focusing on 3 districts and 3 line ministries identified as priorities within the NAPA and forthcoming National Climate Change Policy), and in demonstrating the importance of strengthening the involvement of the local level in adaptation planning through strengthening vertical channels (in keeping with Malawi's commitment to decentralisation). There will thus be no overlap of activities on the ground. At the same time, there are a number of synergies. The National Climate Change Steering Committee will oversee both the projects, through the National Climate Change Technical Committee. This will ensure effective exchange of materials, experiences and lessons. In addition to the creation of adaptation plans and climate-resilient development plans in 5 districts overall, the outputs of each project will complement each other in informing scaling up by the government of Malawi. Tangible adaptation activities as implemented in this will provide the basis for additional districts and line ministries adopting the "adaptation-incentivising" system that it also develops.

The other project that has been submitted for council approval is entitled Building climate change resilience in the fisheries sector in Malawi (GEF ID 5328). This project focuses on vulnerability and adaptation of fish stocks in the lower lake regions. It thus has no geographical overlap nor thematic linkages with this project. However, as with all climate change projects in Malawi, its implementation will be overseen by the National Climate Change Steering

Committee, through the National Climate Change Technical Committee, and thus close coordination of project progress will be available and any opportunities for lesson sharing will be enabled.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation

This project was initially conceived by the Climate Change Technical Committee and the development of the project since the PIF stage involved extensive district level consultations with the three districts of Nkhata Bay, Ntcheu and Zomba (themselves chosen based on NAPA-identified vulnerable districts) as well as the relevant stakeholders at national level in the three line ministries. The CCTC has been kept well-informed of the consultation process and emerging finds of the project document development phase.

Stakeholders described as Responsible Parties in the table will be leading project outputs, and are all government entities. NGOs were actively involved in the consultation process and are formally represented on each District Executive Committee, so will also play an indirect supporting role in project implementation.

Table: Key stakeholders and their role in the project

Stakeholder	Role in the project
Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Management	As the government-mandated lead on all climate change issues in Malawi, the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Management will be the Implementing Partner for the project, so accountable for project results. It will also be Responsible Party (RP) for Output 2.4. It comprises 3 departments (Environmental Affairs, Climate Change and Meteorological Services and Forestry), all of which will play key roles in this project. Environmental Affairs coordinates District Environmental Officers, who are taking the operational lead on the district-level aspects of components 1 and 2; Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services will be a key partner in the provision of forecast information under output 2.4; and the Department of Forestry is one of the three sectors chosen for integrating climate change in its planning.
Ministry of Economic Planning and Development	The Ministry of Economic Planning and Development will be a RP for component 3.
Ministry of Finance	The Ministry of Finance will be a collaborator/beneficiary by virtue of modifying its existing environmental budgeting guidelines to include climate change adaptation.
Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security	The Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security will be a collaborator/beneficiary and their Sector Wide Approach (SWAp) is one of the three sectors chosen for integrating climate change in its planning.
Ministry of Water and Irrigation	The Ministry of Water and Irrigation will be a collaborator/beneficiary and their Ministry Strategy is one of the three sectors chosen for integrating climate change in its planning.
Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development	The Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development is the lead ministry for decentralisation. Their role as a collaborator/beneficiary will be overseeing and coordinating district level training and capacity building activities in order to ensure complementarity with other ongoing climate change training at local level (as part of the technical support programme).
Local Development Fund	The Local Development Fund will be the RP for Outcome 2 with the role of releasing funds to district level in accordance with the newly developed adaptation indicators (and training will be provided to LDF

	staff, and to district M&E staff in conjunction with LDF staff regarding the use of these indicators).
Nkhata Bay District Council	Nkhata Bay District Executive Council will be a RP for Outcome 1. They will screen their district development plan for adaptation opportunities (including consultation at sub-district level), introduce these in the next iteration, and incorporate appropriate adaptation indicators for M&E (following appropriate training); and implement the priority adaptation activities, as well as contributing to project level M&E.
Ntcheu District Council	Ntcheu District Council will be a RP for Outcome 1. They will screen their district development plan for adaptation opportunities (including consultation at sub-district level), introduce these in the next iteration, and incorporate appropriate adaptation indicators for M&E (following appropriate training); and implement the priority adaptation activities, as well as contributing to project level M&E.
Zomba District Council	Zomba District Council will be a RP for Outcome 1. They will screen their district development plan for adaptation opportunities (including consultation at sub-district level), introduce these in the next iteration, and incorporate appropriate adaptation indicators for M&E (following appropriate training); and implement the priority adaptation activities, as well as contributing to project level M&E.
NGOs	In Ntcheu active NGOs include Concern Universal, Care International, CADECOM, Red Cross and NASFAM. In Nkhata Bay active NGOs include World Vision, Livingstonia Synod, Ripple Africa, the Wildlife and Environment Society of Malawi, Total Land Care and CADECOM. In Zomba active NGOs include Emmanuel International, World Vision, Save the Children, CADECOM, Malawi Red Cross and LEAD International. A variety of these will be involved in the participatory vulnerability and adaptation assessments and supporting the implementation of tangible adaptation activities, depending on the needs identified and the relative strengths.
Project beneficiaries at community level	Whilst all residents in the three districts should ultimately benefit from the project as a result of the integration of adaptation into the development plans, direct beneficiaries of tangible adaptation activities to support the implementation of Village Action Plans with integrated adaptation include those in the traditional authorities of Fukamalaza, Mankhambira, Mkumbira, Timbiri, Kabunduli and Mnyaluwanga in the Lweya-Limphasa valley area of Nkhata Bay (2000 households); 2000 households in the Chipusira catchment area in Ntcheu; and 1800 households in the TAs of Mwambo and Ngwerero in Zomba.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

The project will directly benefit around 5,800 Malawians (40,000 if we include the household members of beneficiary participants); and indirectly benefit around 600,000 who live in the three districts (2008 Census, Republic of Malawi, 2008) through planning and budget allocation processes that direct investment flows towards adaptive practices. They will be chosen during the vulnerability assessment and proactive attention will be paid to the importance of gender equity in the selection of beneficiaries. This project will deliver tangible vulnerability reduction that also addresses MDG 7 (environmental sustainability) and MDG 3 (promote gender equality and empower women). The tangible

adaptation activities identified by each of the districts all recognise the imperative of a healthy natural environment to enable climate-resilient natural resource-based livelihoods, whilst respecting their different geographical contexts. Unsustainable natural resource use costs Malawi USD191 million or 5.3 percent of GDP every year and the percentage of forest cover in the country has decreased from 41 percent in 1990 to 35 percent in 2008. Increased climate variations experienced in the form of prolonged dry spells, droughts, floods, and temperature variability, have compounded the stress on the natural resource base, in turn negatively affecting the performance of sectors such as water and irrigation, agriculture, natural resources and energy, thereby aggravating poverty, especially for the already vulnerable population in marginal areas. Restoring viable and robust ecosystems will contribute to reforestation and catchment management, which in turn will not only have environmental benefits but will also contribute to the integrity of the natural resources upon which the majority of local livelihoods, are based, thereby improving the socioeconomic status of both project beneficiaries and other residents in the project target areas. At national level the inclusion of adaptation in development plans in the three sectors (agriculture, water and forestry) will have the same effects; ensuring that resources are managed in such a way that their integrity is restored and enhanced within the context of a changing climate, thereby improving the likelihood of socioeconomic improvement as well as adaptation within the Malawian population.

In lakeside and forested Nkhata Bay, 2000 beneficiaries will be selected from the 8,230 households in the target TAs for a programme of group-focused Ecological Entrepreneurship, involving climate adaptation and basic business development training, as well as training in techniques to encourage afforestation and conservation (e.g. tree seedling development) as income-generating activities which will then be managed through revolving loan schemes. Households farming in fragile ecosystems on customary-owned land will be supported to shift to alternative productive areas through the provision of new technologies to adapt to the different environment, and training to restore the ecosystems and reduce future vulnerability to climate change.

In water-stressed Ntcheu, 2000 households will benefit from the project on-site in Chipusire, whilst a further 20,000 people in Ntcheu Boma and Balaka will benefit from the resultant improvements in water availability and management. On site targeted households will receive training in climate adaptation, irrigation, conservation agriculture and aquaculture, improving livelihoods and food security, as well as contributing to environmental integrity within the district.

In Zomba 1800 men and women, identified by the participatory vulnerability assessment process, will be targeted to benefit from intended ecosystem-based adaptation activities that promote climate-resilient livelihoods in the context of increased flood risk. Depending on their exact location, they will variously participate in projects around nursery raising and afforestation of water-retaining trees upstream in the catchment and, specifically, the rehabilitation of the Mvai forest; and training and inputs for improved or alternative livelihoods, such as early maturing varieties of beans, onions, maize, Irish potato, cabbage and other green vegetables (winter crops) and the construction of fish ponds.

In terms of gender equity, women are among the most vulnerable to climate change yet do not have the technical skills to respond, and so climate change risks reinforcing underlying inequalities. In Malawi there are higher poverty levels amongst female-headed households and the 3 MDGs that are not likely to be met have strong gender connections (girl education, women's economic and political empowerment, and maternal mortality (UN 2011)). Women were invited to and attended the stakeholder consultations, participating and acting as chairpersons, sharing their perspectives on how climate change is contributing to undermining their livelihoods (dwindling forest cover in Nkhata Bay, water shortages in Ntcheu and flood-proneness in Zomba), which have been included in the planned ecosystem-based tangible adaptation activities. The equitable participation of women, men and children will be ensured during the community adaptation planning exercises, and it is anticipated that the direct beneficiaries of tangible adaptation support will include more women than men given the existing literature on their relatively higher socio-economic vulnerability. This will maximize adaptation benefits among both genders and contribute towards the promotion of gender equality.

At national level, this project will further develop adaptation planning capacities more effectively and sustainably across a number of key climate-related sectors drawing on UNDP's experience and current support to climate change and institutional strengthening. The development of national level adaptation indicators for screening sector strategies will initially be used for these three sectors, but once the system has been put in place it can easily also be replicated for use

across other national sectors, thereby ensuring that adaptation is effectively mainstreamed, supporting the achievement of the MGDSII and the forthcoming National Climate Change Policy and Strategy.

From a strategic perspective at local level, the project supports Malawi's ongoing commitment to decentralisation and strengthening of democratic governance processes. Target communities will lead the decision-making process, through the creation of adaptation plans, building on the role they played during the PPG phase when they identified priority needs for adaptation to build climate-resilient livelihoods. The project provides the support package required to make it happen through the allocation of a set budget, thereby building confidence that the planning process can enable tangible change in livelihoods that reduce vulnerability to climate change. Districts will also be incentivised to incorporate adaptation into their development planning through the allocation of budgets, and an appropriate system of locally appropriate adaptation indicators for assessing and then monitoring and evaluating the rollout of these plans, through the links with the national planning system and thereby also providing feedback into the national planning system. Building the capacity and incentives for district officials to make the case for budgetary allocations will strengthen fiscal decentralisation, enabling leveraging of regular development resources for climate-resilient investments. Stakeholder consultations to date have shown considerable enthusiasm at district level for this process, which not only links the availability of funding to climate-resilient activities, but also contributes to the establishment of an appropriate M&E system that creates the data to identify tangible gains and opportunities for improvement.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

Value for money has been sought in all aspects of the project design, inkeeping with UNDP's experience with, and knowledge of, the national context. The emphasis on capacity development (technical analyses, development of indicator frameworks, training) and the plans for District management of this project is highly cost-effective due to the partnering with the relevant government staff, whose time and efforts are not charged to the project. The training and capacity building elements will all be conducted through one technical support programme, likely managed by a consortium chosen on the basis of competitive tender (in which cost-effectiveness will be one of the evaluation criteria) to ensure that the specialist expertise is well represented; and both international and national partners to ensure sustainability. Once the system has been enabled (i.e. adjusting the screening tools that trigger release of public monies through the establishment of adaptation M&E indicators at district and national level) it will be self-sustaining provided there is capacity to apply the modified system and enforcement. It will be easily replicable to other districts and line ministries. It will also be catalytic in ensuring that regular domestic public sector investments contribute to resilience to climate change rather than inadvertently create vulnerability.

The bulk of resources associated with this project are for with the procurement of goods to support tangible adaptation activities (under outcome 2). With regard to procurement of project inputs under outcome 2, standard procedures of the Malawi government and UNDP will be carefully applied to ensure value for money in all purchases of goods and procurement of services for the project.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The project will be monitored through the following M&E activities. The M&E budget is provided in the table below. The M&E framework set out in the Project Results Framework in Part III of this project document is aligned with the AMAT and UNDP M&E frameworks.

Project Start

A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 3 months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP country office and, where appropriate/feasible, regional technical policy and programme advisors. The Inception Workshop will be held under the auspices of the Climate Change Technical Committee, which also involves other relevant stakeholders, and is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan.

Baseline and target has been included for indicator 1.2.10 “% change in income generation in targeted area given existing and projected climate change “in the tracking tool. A vulnerability assessment is planned under output 1.4 at

the beginning of the project. It will set the baseline and then surveys and RCT methodology will be used at mid term and end of project to track increase in income generation and attribution to the project.

The **Inception Workshop** should address a number of key issues including:

- Finalising the details of the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RCU staff vis-à-vis the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again, and MoUs signed as planned (e.g. between UNDP and the Districts for the District Environment Officer to be the designated point of contact with the project manager)
- Based on the project results framework and the LDCF related AMAT set out in the Project Results Framework in Section III of this project document, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.
- Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan – including responsibilities and reporting lines - and budget should be agreed and scheduled.
- Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
- Plan and schedule PB meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organisation structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first PB meeting should be held within the first 12 months following the inception workshop. Additional meetings should be planned to take place between the project manager and each of the three participating districts.

The details and agreements reached will be documented in an **Inception Workshop report**, which will be agreed and accepted by all participants.

Quarterly:

Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform.

Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS by the project manager, based on inputs from all implementing agencies. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Note that for UNDP GEF projects, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as revolving funds, microfinance schemes, or capitalization of ESCOs are automatically classified as critical on the basis of their innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical).

Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.

Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

Annually:

Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period. The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)

Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).

Lesson learned/good practice.

AWP and other expenditure reports

Risk and adaptive management

ATLAS QPR

Periodic monitoring through site visits:

UNDP CO and the UNDP GEF region based staff will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the Project Board may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RCU and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and Project Board members.

Mid-term project cycle

The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation expected to be in June 2017. The Mid-Term Review will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term review will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term review will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. The LDFC/SCCF AMAT as set out in the Project Results Framework in Section III of this project document) will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#).

End of Project

An independent Terminal Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final PB meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP-GEF guidance. The terminal evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term review, if any such correction took place). The terminal evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. The LDFC/SCCF AMAT as set out in the Project Results Framework in Section III of this project document) will also be completed during the terminal evaluation cycle. The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response, which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#).

Learning and knowledge sharing:

Monitoring of project progress at district and sub-district level will take place quarterly and be used to inform both district level and ministry level policies and plans. Currently although districts have M&E officers and collect their own data, there is no mechanism for this to feed into MEP&D, and thus this project is innovative in establishing that mechanism. Likewise the development of internal analysis on adaptation costs, supported by the economic aspect of the technical support programme, can be used to inform line ministry spending plans and the level of need for devolved budgets, as well as the development of a strategic plan for the Climate Change Fund proposed in the Climate Change Investment Plan.

Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums (such as the Climate Change Technical Committee).

The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyse, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus through the structure of the National Climate Change Programme and the members sitting on the Project Board.

Audit:

The Project will be audited in accordance with UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies.

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Manager UNDP CO, UNDP CCA 	Indicative cost: 5,000	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP CCA RTA/Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members. 	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop.	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on <i>output and implementation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversight by Project Manager Project team 	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager and team UNDP CO UNDP RTA UNDP EEG 	None	Annually
Periodic status/progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager and team 	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager and team UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost: 35,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager and team, UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost: 40,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager and team UNDP CO local consultant 	0	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP CO Project manager and team 	Indicative cost per year: 3,000 = \$12,000	Yearly
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP CO UNDP RCU (as appropriate) Government representatives 	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 95,000	


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Aloysius Kamperewera	Director, Environmental Affairs Department	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE MANAGEMENT	10 MAY 2012

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu Executive Coordinator and Director a.i. UNDP/GEF		Sept 2, 2014	Benjamin Larroquette	+251936636877	Benjamin.larroquette@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in the UNDAF Action Plan:					
UNDAF Outcome 1.3 - Targeted population in selected districts benefit from effective management of environment, natural resources, climate change and disaster risk by 2016.					
Country Programme Outcome Indicators:					
CP/UNDAF Outcome Indicator 1 - Proportion of land covered by forest (Baseline 36.2%; Target 32%).					
Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area					
3. Promote climate change adaptation					
Applicable SOF (e.g. GEF) Strategic Objective and Program:					
Objective 1 - Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level					
Objective 2 – Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level					
Applicable SOF (e.g. GEF) Expected outcomes					
Outcome 2.2: Strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses					
Outcome 2.3: Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at local level					
And					
Outcome 1.2: Reduced vulnerability to climate change in development sectors					
And					
Outcome 1.3: Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas					
Outcome 1.1: Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas					
	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective ⁵ To strengthen consideration of climate change adaptation needs in decentralised and national development	Adaptation actions implemented in national/sub-regional development frameworks (Outcome 1.1 and 2.2, AMAT 2.2.1)	Communities are highly vulnerable to climate change and adaptive capacity is not supported within the development planning framework at national	Development frameworks that include specific budgets for adaptation actions - 3 ministries and 3 DDPs	Spending plans in three ministries and the three DDPs.	Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Problems related to involvement and co-operation of stakeholders Conflicts among stakeholders as regards roles in the project. Poor co-ordination among implementing and

⁵Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR
GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-December 2012.doc

plans.		or local level			<p>Responsible Parties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of commitment from target communities. • Climate hazards disrupting tangible adaptation activities • Extraneous factors, such as political change, disrupting institutional framework <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National and local authorities whose involvement is essential remain keen and committed to active participation • Ministries want to collaborate on the project for enhanced socio economic development; • Other projects and programmes do not displace interest and willingness to collaborate on the project; • Local communities see value in the project and actively engage in the identification and implementation of adaptation measures
<p>Outcome 1⁶</p> <p>Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at local level</p>	<p>Stakeholder-driven adaptations are specified and budgeted within District Development Plans and Village Actions Plans (Outcome 2.3 AMAT 2.3.1)</p> <p>Number and type of targeted institution with increased adaptive</p>	<p>Adaptation does not feature in appropriate development frameworks and thus is not owned by the population</p>	<p>At least 3 DDPs and 3 Village Action Plans</p>	<p>District Development Plans for Nkhata Bay, Ntcheu and Zomba; Village Actions Plans for targeted communities in each district; qualitative interviews with custodians of development frameworks and relevant community members</p> <p>60 District and Sub-District officers in each of the 3 Districts (180 in total) trained on adaptation technical</p>	<p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problems related to involvement and co-operation of stakeholders (including turnover of staff and loss of staff who actively embrace the project) • Conflicts among stakeholders as regards roles in the project. • Lack of commitment from target communities. • Extraneous factors, such as political change, disrupting institutional framework (for example further changes to the decentralisation framework) <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Executive Committees and Village Development Committees whose involvement is essential remain keen and committed to active participation • Other projects and programmes do not displace

⁶ All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.

	capacity to minimise exposure to climate variability. (Outcome 2.3 AMAT 2.3.1.1)			themes.	<p>interest and willingness to collaborate on the project;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local communities see value in the project and actively engage in the Village Action Plan development process
<p>Outcome 2</p> <p>Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in target areas.</p>	<p>Livelihoods of 5,800 people made climate-resilient following training in, and tangible support for, risk-resilient livelihood activities according to their particular geographical locations (Outcome 1.2 and 1.3 AMAT 1.2.10 and 1.3.1.1)</p> <p>Relevant risk information disseminated to stakeholders (Outcome 2.3 AMAT 2.3.1.1)</p>	<p>Indicator score = 1</p> <p>Climate risk information (1 day through to seasonal forecasts) exists and is communicated at national level but rarely makes it through to local level</p>	<p>Indicator score = 3</p> <p>Risk reduction and awareness activities implemented for 5800 households in Nkhata Bay, Ntcheu and Zomba:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> agricultural diversification, sustainable forest management, erosion control/sustainable land and water management, resilient livelihoods <p>70% of the 5,800 households regularly receiving climate risk information</p>	<p>End of project evaluation survey with project beneficiaries</p> <p>End of project evaluation survey with project beneficiaries</p>	<p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Problems related to involvement and co-operation of stakeholders (Village leaders and community members) Staff change among key positions at district level (impeding effective coordination with Village Development Committees) Conflicts among stakeholders as regards roles in the project. Lack of commitment from communities in their chosen resilient livelihood activities Climate hazards disrupting tangible adaptation activities Poor co-ordination between DCCMS and the Ministry of Agriculture Difficulties for the project manager in coordinating the improved communication of climate information <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local government staff collaborates effectively to implement resilient livelihood activities. Other projects and programmes do not displace interest and willingness to collaborate on the project; Local communities see value in the project and actively engage in the identification and implementation of resilient livelihoods Met Services and the Ministry of Agriculture play a proactive role in translating and then communicating climate information down to local level

<p>Outcome 3</p> <p>Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas</p>	<p>Number of development frameworks and sector strategies that include budget allocation targets for adaptation (Outcome 1.1 AMAT 1.1.1 and 1.1.1.1)</p> <p>Number and type of targeted institution with increased adaptive capacity to minimise exposure to climate variability. (Outcome 1.1 AMAT 1.1.1 and 1.1.1.1)</p>	<p>Within the three priority sectors (forestry, water and agriculture) adaptation is, to varying degrees, hinted at but not explicitly or comprehensively addressed, and nor are effective budgets allocated</p>	<p>3 sector strategies/ for water, forestry and agriculture and appropriately budgeted adaptation measures</p>	<p>Water sector strategy, forestry sector working group strategy, agriculture SWAp documents and Ministry of Finance disbursement records</p> <p>60 Sector officers in ministries of agriculture, water and forestry trained on CCA technical themes.</p>	<p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problems related to involvement and co-operation of sector staff • Conflicts among stakeholders as regards roles in the project. • The Ministry of Finance does not release funds as anticipated • Turnover of key staff may impede progress • Political change (e.g. ministry restructuring or other institutional change) may affect the decision-making process <p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sector stakeholders see the value of incorporating adaptation and are willing to work to do so • Other projects and programmes do not displace interest and willingness to collaborate on the project; • The Ministry of Economic Planning and Development and Ministry of Finance undertake their supporting roles • There is no significant delay from a change to how each sector undertakes its development planning and budgeting (e.g. one may switch from a sector working group to SWAp, which would require a likely overhaul and therefore take the team's time before adaptation could be included)

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁷

A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

N/A

B. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Activity Aim: To generate baseline information from consultation with stakeholders for the formation of the Adapt Plan Project Document. To achieve this aim, the following activities were budgeted for and implemented:			
Hiring of International Consultant	39,000	14,549	24,451
Hiring of Local Consultant	27,000	27,000	0
Travel to Project Sites	20,000	5,448	14,552
Meetings with National and Local Stakeholders	10,000	1,441	8,559
Communication	4,000	0	4,000
Total	100,000	48,438	51,562

⁷ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A