



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|----------------|
| GEF ID: | 9670 | | |
| Country/Region: | Regional (Albania, Algeria, Libya, Morocco, Montenegro, Tunisia) | | |
| Project Title: | Enhancing Regional Climate Change Adaptation in the Mediterranean Marine and Coastal Areas | | |
| GEF Agency: | UNEP | GEF Agency Project ID: | |
| Type of Trust Fund: | Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) | GEF Focal Area (s): | Climate Change |
| GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | CCA-1; CCA-3; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$50,000 | Project Grant: | \$1,000,000 |
| Co-financing: | \$4,891,894 | Total Project Cost: | \$5,941,894 |
| PIF Approval: | November 14, 2016 | Council Approval/Expected: | |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Saliha Dobardzic | Agency Contact Person: | Jessica Troni |

| PIF Review | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
| Project Consistency | 1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹ | Yes. The project is aligned with CCA Objective 2 (Strengthening the institutional and technical capacities for effective climate change adaptation); and Objective 3 (Integrating climate change adaptation into relevant policies, plans and associated processes.) | |
| | 2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions? | Yes. | |
| Project Design | 3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the | Yes. The Mediterranean as a region is | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|---|---|-----------------|
| | drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation? | highly exposed and faces challenges from climate change hazards coupled with existing socio-economic processes, affecting such essential resources like freshwater, agricultural production, fisheries, while endangering coastal communities and assets. | |
| | 4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning? | Yes, the additional reasoning is sound. The overall environmental security, the sustainability of the livelihoods of growing coastal populations and their resilience to the adverse impacts of climate change and variability will be improved by mainstreaming considerations of climate resilience and adaptation into implementing ICZM and nexus planning. Specifically, the adaptation benefits will accrue to the recently approved MedProgramme, in which this project is strategically anchored. | |
| | 5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs? | Yes. | |
| | 6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered? | Yes. For example a gender-sensitive climate risk assessment will be implemented through a stakeholder led process to provide sufficient basis | |

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| | | for building coastal resilience to climate change and sustainability, and balanced gender participation in project execution activities will be ensured. Broad stakeholder participation will be ensured via the Mediterranean Action Plan mechanisms and platforms. | |
| Availability of Resources | 7. 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, the proposed funding is available under the SCCF-A. | |
| | • Focal area set-aside? | | |
| Recommendations | 8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified? | <p>Not yet. The PPG, at \$70,000 is above the norm and has not been justified.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please revise the PPG amount accordingly, or submit a PPG form with the justifications for the amount being requested.</p> <p>Update 11/10/2016: The necessary correction has been made, therefore this is cleared. The PIF is recommended for CEO approval.</p> | |

| PIF Review | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
| Review Date | Review | November 03, 2016 | |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | | |

| CEO endorsement Review | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|
| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
| Project Design and Financing | 1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided? | N/A | |
| | 2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | <p>The outcomes and outputs are not entirely clear. While flexibility on outputs may be necessary in this case, given the complementary role of this project vis-à-vis the MedProgramme, the outputs should be further defined, and, also given the relatively small size of this grant and, by contrast, the ambitious geographic scope, it needs to be more clearly specified how this project will have an impact.</p> <p>It is also important that the next CEO End submission contain details on</p> | |

CEO endorsement Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
|-----------------|-----------|--|----------------------------------|
| | | <p>ways to align the envisioned MSP activities with that of the complex set of milestones and deliverables of the MedProgramme. As an example, the MSP should explore the feasibility of aligning its activities (and their timely execution) with the envisioned development of bankable projects (EBRD, EIB and other Horizon 2020 partners) towards development of priority investments across both the fresh and marine coastal environments. Further, the MSP should reflect on ways to utilize the MedProgramme to facilitate new entry ways towards attaining EC funding, while exploring if a more strategic relationship can be forged with that of the Horizon 2020 partnership?</p> <p>Component 4, which would seem critical to the catalytic aims of this project, appears to be inadequately funded.</p> <p>Please clarify why the proposal does not include cofinancing for the PMC, or make adjustment as appropriate.</p> <p>In addition, the Results Framework is missing.</p> | |

CEO endorsement Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
|-----------------|--|--|----------------------------------|
| | 3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective? | Not clear. Please see the comments for section 2 above. | |
| | 4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience) | Not fully. The coordinating and synchronization of MSP project deliverables across the complex set of MedProgramme activities and partners can be challenging. Please include in the risk section the coordination of MSP activities with that of the larger MedProgramme. While a substantial mitigating action is the formation of the joint PMU, it would also be desirable for the MSP to reflect on concrete mechanisms that can be integrated into its design: e.g. will this MSP form part of a larger project coordination group and/or frequent interagency meetings? | |
| | 5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided? | Yes. | |
| | 6. Are relevant tracking tools completed? | No, the CCA tracking tool has not been provided. | |
| | 7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented? | N/A | |
| | 8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region? | Not clear. It is important that the CEO End submission clearly shows how the project will learn from/build on the previous Sustainable MedProgramme phase, which was a complex one spanning topics from | |

CEO endorsement Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
|-----------------|---|---|----------------------------------|
| | | IWRM and ICZM to pollution control and biodiversity protection and fisheries management. In this respect, and as a means to mobilize additional expertise and co-finance, while strengthening the institutional foundation for the sustainability of project outcomes, it would be interesting to know if some of the previous successful technical partnerships can be leveraged? | |
| | 9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | Yes, however, please see the previous points. | |
| | 10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan? | Yes, however, the knowledge management component appears to be insufficiently funded. Please consider reallocating some of the financing towards the KM, and also mobilizing additional cofinancing towards the same. Mainstreaming adaptation throughout key MedProgramme's activities and in particular with a focus on ultimately achieving climate-smart policies in the Mediterranean towards attracting new or recasting traditional investments will require a substantial investment in knowledge management and continuity and sustainability of project outcomes, as well as replication of Output 3.2, for instance. | |

CEO endorsement Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
|-------------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| Agency Responses | 11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from: | | |
| | • GEFSEC | N/A | |
| | • STAP | N/A | |
| | • GEF Council | N/A | |
| | • Convention Secretariat | N/A | |
| Recommendation | 12. Is CEO endorsement recommended? | Not yet. | |
| Review Date | Review | February 02, 2018 | |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | | |

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.