



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

GEF ID:	5015		
Country/Region:	Malawi		
Project Title:	Implementing urgent adaptation priorities through strengthened decentralized and national development plans.		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4958 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,500,000
Co-financing:	\$15,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$20,000,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Bonizella Biagini	Agency Contact Person:	Jessica Troni

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. Malawi is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point and dated May 10, 2012, has been attached to the submission.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	YES. UNDP has a comparative advantage in technical assistance for climate change adaptation, including institutional capacity building and policy support, as well as community-based adaptation.	

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

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	YES. The proposed project is fully aligned with UNDP's Country Programme and UNDAF 2012-2016. UNDP has an office and adequate staff capacity in Malawi.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	YES. The proposed grant is available under the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	YES. The proposed project is aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-1 and CCA-2 and, specifically, CCA-1.1 on mainstreaming adaptation across broader development frameworks and CCA-2.2 on strengthening adaptive capacity to reduce climate change risks. The Focal Area Strategy Framework has not identified CCA-1.2, which would best correspond to the investments proposed under Component 2.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that Table A identifies all principle LDCE/SCCF objectives and outcomes towards which the proposed project would contribute, along with the associated grant and co-financing amounts.</p> <p>07/24/2012 -- YES. The re-submission includes CCA-1.2 in the Focal Area Strategy Framework, and Table A along with the indicative grant and co-financing amounts has been revised accordingly.</p>	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	YES. The proposed project is closely aligned with Malawi's MDG Strategy and UNDAF, as well as national policies and legislation associated with disaster risk management, agriculture, forestry, water resources management, the environment, as well as local government and decentralization. The project would address Malawi's NAPA priorities in the areas of climate-resilient agricultural production and rural livelihoods, as well as adaptation to more frequent and more intense floods and drought.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13, please demonstrate that the proposed project would achieve meaningful and sustainable benefits in</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>terms of enhancing the adaptive capacity of key institutions and stakeholders, as well as reducing the vulnerability of rural communities and their livelihoods.</p> <p>07/24/2012 -- YES. Please refer to Section 13 below.</p>	
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would build on the UNDP Country Programme, which in turn is aligned with the UNDAF 2012-2016. The Country Programme would comprise UNDP projects on climate change, disaster risk reduction, natural resources management, rural development and economic governance.</p> <p>Noting that the baseline projects and programs are currently still being formulated, the PIF provides no information regarding their scope, intended beneficiaries, or indicative outcomes and outputs. The most important adverse effects of climate change and associated vulnerabilities are presented only in a general manner, but not in relation to the baseline initiatives on which the proposed project would build. Consequently, the relevance of the proposed baseline initiatives cannot be assessed at this stage.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please describe the baseline initiatives on which the proposed project would build, their scope and intended beneficiaries,</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>as well as indicative outcomes, outputs and financing. In addition, please indicate the extent to which these initiatives are vulnerable to climate change or unable to adequately address the effects of climate change.</p> <p>07/24/2012 -- NOT CLEAR. The re-submission specifies the five baseline initiatives on which the proposed project would build, namely the (i) Malawi Local Government Strengthening and Investment Programme; (ii) the Democracy Consolidation Programme; (iii) the Disaster Risk Management Support Programme; (iv) the Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation Support Programme; and (v) the Environment and Natural Resources Support Programme.</p> <p>It is not clear how the Democracy Consolidation Programme is vulnerable to climate change and what entry-points it would offer for additional adaptation measures. Similarly, the Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation Support Programme does not appear to be directly vulnerable to effects of climate change and hence does not represent a relevant baseline initiative. This program should instead be included among other related initiatives, with which coordination and complementarity will be sought, in Section B.6 of the PIF.</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 (i) clarify how the Democracy Consolidation Programme is vulnerable to climate change and what entry points it would offer for additional adaptation measures; (ii) remove the Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation Support Programme among the baseline initiatives and revise the indicative co-financing figures and additional cost reasoning accordingly; and (iii) include the latter among other related initiatives in Section B.6 of the PIF.</p> <p>08/21/2012 -- YES. The Democracy Consolidation Programme and the Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation Support Programmes have been removed among the baseline initiatives and the co-financing figures and additional cost reasoning have been revised accordingly. The latter has been included among other related initiatives in Section B.6 of the PIF.</p>	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above. In absence of a clear description of the baseline initiatives on which the proposed project would build, the additional reasoning cannot be adequately assessed at this stage.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>As for Component 1, there is a discrepancy between the project framework and the description of the component in Section II.B.2 of the PIF. The former mentions a professional training program under Output 1.2, which is not described on page 13 of the PIF. Moreover, the proposal could provide further information regarding the scope of the training and the adaptation plans to justify the rather high indicative cost of this TA component. Finally, it would be helpful to know which districts would be targeted under the proposed component.</p> <p>Component 2 forms the core of the proposed project, yet the PIF provides very limited little about the adaptation investments to be carried out. As a result, the additional reasoning and cost effectiveness of the component cannot be assessed at this stage. Moreover, the PIF should provide at least an indication of the districts and regions to be targeted under this component.</p> <p>On Component 3, finally, please refer to Section 19 on coordination with other LDCF projects, the Africa Adaptation Programme (AAP) and the Malawi Climate Change Programme (CCP).</p> <p>Overall, the proposed project appears quite complex, with entry points at the national, provincial, district and community levels. Moreover, with only</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>\$2 million or 44 per cent of the proposed LDCF grant allocated towards investments in tangible adaptation measures, it is unclear whether and to what extent the project would be able to translate improved planning and institutional capacities into meaningful and sustainable adaptation benefits for local communities and their livelihoods.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please revisit the additional reasoning provided in Section II.B.2 of the PIF. In particular, (i) ensure that the description of the components, outcomes, outputs and activities proposed for LDCF financing is consistent with the project framework (Table B), and that it provides indicative targets, intended beneficiaries, and information about the targeted regions or districts where applicable; (ii) ensure that the costs of the proposed components are justified and proportional to their expected results; (iii) justify the complexity of the proposed project approach, or consider streamlining the proposal; and (iv) demonstrate that the project would deliver meaningful and sustainable adaptation benefits for local communities and their livelihoods, and raise the share of resources allocated towards Component 2, if necessary.</p> <p>07/24/2012 -- NOT CLEAR. Please</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>refer to sections 11 above and 19 below.</p> <p>The additional cost reasoning, along with the intervention logic and targeting principles of the proposed project have been clarified and justified in the re-submission. The indicative costs associated with components 1 and 2 have been adjusted, with a greater focus on tangible, community-based investments under Component 2. Overall, the project design places considerable emphasis on establishing a basis for sustainable and replicable adaptation at the national, district and community levels.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please revise the additional cost reasoning accordingly, including the baseline investments and associated co-financing cited for each component of the proposed project.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please (i) confirm the districts to be targeted by the proposed project; (ii) provide further information as to the adaptation measures to be financed under Component 2 and the intended beneficiaries of these measures; and (iii) clarify the operational interface between the proposed LDCF project and the baseline initiatives on which it would build.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		08/21/2012 -- YES. The additional cost reasoning has been adjusted as recommended.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13, please revise the project framework as appropriate.</p> <p>07/24/2012 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please revise the indicative co-financing amounts in the Project Framework accordingly.</p> <p>08/21/2012 -- YES. The Project Framework has been adjusted as recommended.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13, please describe the adaptation benefits associated with the activities proposed for LDCF financing.</p> <p>07/24/2012 -- YES. The adaptation benefits are sufficiently well described for this stage of project development.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>By CEO Endorsement, please elaborate on the expected adaptation benefits of the proposed project.</p> <p>Update 8/9/2012: No change to previous recommendations as action still pending on Section 13.</p>	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	<p>NOT CLEAR. In absence of information regarding the tangible adaptation measures to be carried out, the intended beneficiaries and the targeted regions or districts, the socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions of the proposed project cannot be adequately assessed at this stage.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13, please revisit the description of socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions in Section II.B.3 of the PIF. In particular, describe the intended beneficiaries of the project or clarify how these will be selected during project preparation.</p> <p>07/24/2012 -- YES. The socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions are sufficiently well described for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please elaborate on the expected socio-economic benefits of the proposed project, and describe in detail how gender dimensions would be systematically considered in the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		proposed adaptation plans and investments.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>NOT CLEAR. CSOs and local communities are not found among the stakeholders listed in Section II.B.5 of the PIF.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please describe, at least in an indicative manner, how CSO and local communities would participate in the design and implementation of the proposed project.</p> <p>07/24/2012 -- YES. Public participation has been adequately considered for this stage of project development.</p>	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	YES. The PIF identifies the principle risks and relevant mitigation measures.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	NOT CLEAR. Given its strong focus on district and national level planning and policy support, the PIF should better demonstrate that the project would not duplicate similar efforts carried out under CARLA, the UNDP-LDCF Climate-Proofing Local Development project, CCP and AAP. The proposed components 1 and 3 should clearly consider the achievements, targets and limitations of these past and ongoing initiatives.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please describe, in greater detail, how the proposed project would complement and build on, rather than duplicate, CARLA, the UNDP-LDCF Climate-Proofing Local Development project, CCP and AAP, all of which include components and activities similar to those proposed under components 1 and 3.</p> <p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above.</p> <p>The re-submission clarifies that the proposed project will build on and complement past and ongoing adaptation initiatives in Malawi.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please describe, in Section B.6 of the PIF, how the proposed project would be coordinated with the Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation Support Programme.</p> <p>08/21/2012 -- YES. Adequate information on the coordination with the climate change adaptation and mitigation suport program has been provided.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	YES.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES. At \$200,000 or 4.66 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 3, the proposed funding level for project management is appropriate.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13, please adjust the indicative grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>07/24/2012 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please revise the indicative co-financing amounts per component accordingly.</p> <p>08/21/2012 -- YES. The indicative co-financing amounts have been adjusted as recommended.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above. In absence of a clear description of the baseline initiatives on which the proposed project would build, the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>associated co-financing cannot be adequately assessed at this stage.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please revise the indicative co-financing figures accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>07/24/2012 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please revise the indicative co-financing figures accordingly.</p> <p>08/21/2012 -- The indicative co-financing amounts have been adjusted as recommended and the level of co-financing is adequate at \$15.5 million.</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 25 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11 and 25 above, please adjust the indicative Agency co-financing accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>07/24/2012 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please revise the indicative Agency co-financing accordingly.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		08/21/2012 -- YES. The indicative co-financing amounts have been adjusted as recommended and the level.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	NA	
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	
	• Council comments?		NA
	• Other GEF Agencies?	NA	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 24, 25 and 26. 07/24/2012 -- NOT YET. Please refer to sections 11, 13, 14, 19, 24, 25 and 26. 08/21/2012 -- YES.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	07/24/2012 -- Please refer to sections 13, 15 and 16.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	June 22, 2012	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Additional review (as necessary)	July 24, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 21, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

*** This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	YES. The PPG includes two principle components, namely a (i) vulnerability and adaptation assessment; and (ii) project scoping and institutional arrangements. The activities proposed are relevant and appropriate.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	YES. The proposed grant (\$100,000) would be allocated in equal shares between the two components. The proposed rates for local and international consultants are appropriate at \$2,000 and \$3,000 per week respectively.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	NOT YET. The PPG will be recommended once the PIF is ready for approval. 08/21/2012 -- YES.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	June 22, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 21, 2012

* 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.