



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

GEF ID:	6951		
Country/Region:	Morocco		
Project Title:	Enhancing the climate resilience of the Moroccan ports sector		
GEF Agency:	EBRD	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$6,192,694
Co-financing:	\$48,900,000	Total Project Cost:	\$55,292,694
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	October 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Fareeha Iqbal	Agency Contact Person:	Craig Davies

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, Morocco is a non-Annex-1 country Party to the UNFCCC.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, a letter of endorsement from the OFP has been submitted.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	Yes (SCCF-A).	

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

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

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	Yes, it is aligned with SCCF strategic objective CCA-1 (reducing vulnerability of people, livelihoods, physical assets and natural systems).	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	Yes. The proposed project is consistent with Morocco's Second National Communication to the UNFCCC, which discusses the vulnerability of Morocco's coastal zones to climate change and calls for adaptive responses that include the increased climate resilience of port infrastructure. The project is also consistent with Morocco's 'National Plan for the Fight Against Climate Change' and its Technology Needs Assessment.	
	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	Yes. Ports are economically significant for Morocco. Climate change is expected to exacerbate climate-related risks posed to ports, both directly (e.g., damage from higher storm surges resulting from SLR and more intense/frequent storms) and indirectly (e.g., the demand for port services is affected by the impacts of climate change on other sectors). Various Moroccan ports have suffered climate-related damage recently to piers, jetties, dikes and guard walls, as well as fencing,	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		electric installations and buildings. In line with sector strategies that call for expansion of Morocco's ports, the EBRD is providing baseline investment for the construction of new or upgraded ports.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	Yes. The proposed SCCF project will comprise two components: The first, which will be supported by a PPG, is 'Capacity development for reducing vulnerability to climate change'. The second component, toward which the SCCF grant will be directed, is for 'Building structural resiliency features in port facility infrastructure', which will support port infrastructure rehabilitation or new construction that is resilient to climate risk.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes. The baseline investment in ports does not include provisions to build resilience to the anticipated adverse impacts of climate change, despite their high potential vulnerability. The proposed SCCF project will provide the needed adaptation-related elements.	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes. The roles of key stakeholders have been discussed, including private companies that are developed two of Morocco's ports. Project components will be gender-inclusive.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Yes, significant potential risks have been identified and mitigation measures proposed	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes. Lessons will be applied from EBRD experience with port infrastructure in Poland and Turkey, where guidance is being applied from technical guidelines for assessing and managing climate risks to ports. The proposed project will also coordinate with SCCF and other GEF projects underway in Morocco, and with infrastructure and coastal zone projects being implemented in the country by UNDP and the World Bank.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>Innovative aspects: Yes, the project is innovative. Despite their obvious economic significance and high potential vulnerability, examples of adaptation projects involving ports are relatively scarce. In the Moroccan context, the project is expected to be catalytic for identifying opportunities for future climate-resilient infrastructure planning.</p> <p>Sustainability: Yes for PIF stage; the added resilience and capacity built through the project will render port infrastructure more sustainable. However, a fuller picture is expected by CEO endorsement, when more details can be provided on relevant factors such as: degree of stakeholder engagement, expected robustness of the selected adaptation measures vis a vis long-term</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>climate change, ability to include appropriate resilience actions in baseline investments in a timely and well-integrated way, and institutional considerations.</p> <p>Potential for scale up: Yes, the project will remove barriers for scale-up, paving the way for future investments in climate resilience in other Moroccan ports.</p>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes. The entire requested SCCF grant will support on-the-ground investment in climate-resilient port infrastructure.	
	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?	<p>Yes. Co-financing totals \$48.9 million. EBRD is providing a loan of \$44.67 million and in-kind financing of \$2.2 million. An additional 2 million are being provided through technical cooperation donor trust funds.</p> <p>\$46.39 million will co-finance the SCCF INV component to rehabilitate or construct new port infrastructure.</p>	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. PMC will be supported by the co-financing resources. PMC have not been	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		requested from the SCCF grant resources.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	Yes, PPG is requested and is within the norm.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	Yes. Most of the co-financing is being provided as a hard loan. The Agency is capable of managing this.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Yes.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Item 13 (sustainability): Please discuss in depth the factors contributing to sustainability. Will it be possible to	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		assess the long-term resilience (over several decades) of the ports, to climate change? Importantly, will measures be put in place to maintain port infrastructure on a regular basis?	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	August 13, 2014	
Review Date (s)	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.**