



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

GEF ID:	5815		
Country/Region:	Regional (Bhutan, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar)		
Project Title:	Building Climate Resilience of Urban Systems through Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) in the Asia-Pacific region.		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$6,000,000
Co-financing:	\$8,700,000	Total Project Cost:	\$14,850,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Fareeha Iqbal	Agency Contact Person:	Ermira Fida

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. The participating countries (Bhutan, Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar) are LDCs and have completed their NAPAs.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>FI, 5/12/2014: Not quite. Letters of endorsement from the national OFP have been provided for each country. However, Cambodia's specifies a lower amount than the other countries, despite an even allocation specified in the PIF.</p> <p>UNEP has confirmed that it will submit a corrected letter of endorsement from Cambodia shortly.</p>	

*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)
		FI, 6/5/14: Yes. The corrected letter of endorsement from Cambodia has been received.	
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	Yes. However, please see comment for Item 24.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund • focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <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>	Yes, the proposed project is in line with LDCF strategic objectives CCA-1 (reducing vulnerability) and CCA-2 (enhancing adaptation).	
	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?	Yes. The proposed LDCF project is in line with priority sectors and actions identified in the NAPA of each country. This includes urban flood protection measures in Bhutan and Cambodia, and adaptation measures in agriculture and forestry in Lao PDR and Myanmar.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>Yes. Each of the four countries is highly vulnerable to current climatic variability, particularly flooding, which could be exacerbated with climate change. Combined with the growing urban heat island effect, urban communities are vulnerable to decreased food security, loss of assets and livelihood options, increased in-migration, and health risks. Rapid and unplanned urban growth is resulting in the loss of resilience in these cities through deterioration of watersheds, deforestation, and other factors. The proposed project will address these problems by catalyzing large-scale implementation of ecosystems-based adaptation in an urban context, including training of city management authorities.</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>Yes. The project will integrate ecosystems-based climate change adaptation measures within the baseline project activities. The LDCF project will synthesize knowledge on urban EbA to guide interventions, train city authorities on EbA, and apply decision-making tools to help guide EbA design. It will also support city-specific EbA pilot actions, support alternative livelihoods for the urban poor, set up a long-term research program on urban EbA, and share lessons emerging from the project nationally and regionally.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement: Please consider, during project preparation, upcoming major initiatives planned for each pilot city that could have a bearing on LDCF project design</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		and activity selection (e.g., major investments/plans in transport, industry, wastewater treatment, etc.). If it is possible to plan/design EbA measures within their context, the actions could be particularly relevant/beneficial.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes. The proposed LDCF project will integrate climate resilience within 3 baseline projects targeting the water resources, sanitation and environment sectors. These include (i) UN HABITAT Water for Asian Cities; (ii) UN HABITAT Mekong Region Water and Sanitation Initiative; and (iii) UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environment Initiative. Including ecosystems-based adaptation measures in an urban context across the baseline projects will catalyze adaptation among the vulnerable poor and build resilience at urban levels.	
	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 for PIF stage. The project will employ a consultative and participatory approach, and will validate all key processes with stakeholders. Stakeholder discussions will be held, active partnerships with NGOs forged at local and national levels, and private sector partnerships sought. Research institutions will also be engaged.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>By CEO Endorsement: Gender equality is an increasingly important aspect of GEF's portfolio. If women are particularly vulnerable to climate change in the pilot urban communities, please discuss at CEO Endorsement how the project will address their particular adaptation needs.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>Yes, major risks pertaining to capacity, acceptance, cost-effectiveness and implementation (including risks posed by climate variability) have been addressed. Relevant mitigation measures have been proposed.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>Yes for PIF stage. Coordination with partners and activities of ongoing initiatives in the countries and region has been proposed. These include a wide range of programs and projects on climate change adaptation and ecosystems-based adaptation funded/implemented by SEA START, ACCCRN, UN-HABITAT CCCI, BMU, AF, LDCF, SCCF, APAN, ICLEI, and others.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement: Please provide further information on the nature of the coordination of the proposed LDCF project with some of the salient country and regional initiatives identified.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is 	<p>Innovativeness: Yes, urban EbA is a relatively new area of the GEF's portfolio. The countries identified in this PIF, particularly in southeast Asia, are experiencing rapid and unplanned</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>migration to cities, which are at risk from a range of current and expected future climatic and other hazards. EbA is a promising and innovative avenue for adaptation.</p> <p>Sustainability: Yes. The project will build capacity at the city authority as well as community levels on EbA, help communities expand their range of livelihood options, and involve stakeholders in key processes.</p> <p>Scale up: Yes, ecosystems-based adaptation measures can be scaled up across urban areas, as locally-relevant. The project will develop a strategy for scale-up as part of the project activities.</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; LDCF grant funding and co-financing amounts are appropriate for the expected outcomes and outputs. The LDCF funding allocated for the component that includes on-the-ground EbA actions is greater than 70% of the total requested grant amount.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing	Yes, indicated co-financing is adequate, at \$8.7 million.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes, it is appropriate, at 4.7% of the requested LDCF grant.	
	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 has been 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?	N/A	
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:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? • Other GEF Agencies? 		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	FI, 5/12/14: No. Clearance is pending receipt of the corrected OFP endorsement letter from Cambodia (see item 2, above). Also, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF. FI, 6/5/14: Yes, the proposal is technically cleared. However, the GEF has temporarily suspended the approval of LDCF funds until additional contributions are received. The project will be processed for Council review and approval as soon as adequate resources become available.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	May 12, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 05, 2014	
Review Date (s)	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.**