



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

GEF ID:	8028		
Country/Region:	Somalia		
Project Title:	Support for Integrated Water Resources Management to Ensure Water Access and Disaster Reduction for Somalia's Pastoralists		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5464 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$8,831,000
Co-financing:	\$21,148,000	Total Project Cost:	\$29,979,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Dustin Schinn	Agency Contact Person:	Tom Twining-Ward

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	<p>NOT CLEAR. The Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) cites CCA outcomes associated with the previous programming strategy (2010-14). Moreover, the GEF-6 PIF template does not include project management costs in Table A.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) provide, in Table A, the CCA</p>	

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)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>objectives towards which the proposed project is expected to contribute, consistent with the 2014-18 Programming Strategy on Adaptation, along with the associated grant and co-financing amounts, and update Section B.2 of the PIF accordingly; and (ii) please remove project management costs from Table A. The associated grant and co-financing amounts may be distributed across the relevant CCA objectives, as appropriate.</p> <p>06/13/2015 – YES. Table A has been revised as recommended. The proposed project would contribute towards strategic objectives CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3.</p>	
	<p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>YES. The proposed project would address Somalia's NAPA priorities in the areas of integrated water resources management, and it would contribute towards other priorities in the areas of sustainable land management, watershed management and disaster risk management. The project is further aligned with relevant development plans and strategies at the federal and state levels, including the Somali New Deal Compact (2013), Somaliland's National Development Plan (2012-16) and Puntland's 5-year Development Plan.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 4 below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 4, please revisit the description of the innovative aspects of the proposed project as well as the potential for sustainability and scaling up.</p> <p>06/13/2015 – YES. The proposed project would benefit at least 200,000 pastoralists through improved access to water resources as well as climate information and decision-support services. The project would take a holistic approach to promoting integrated water resources management at the federal and sub-national levels through improved policy and legislation, local-level training and awareness raising, and tangible investments. Thanks to strong linkages with ongoing and planned investments, policies and plans, the proposed project shows clear potential for sustainability and scaling up.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	NOT CLEAR. The PIF provides a clear and concise rationale for integrated water resources	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>management in Somalia, with a particular focus on pastoralists. The proposed project would build on several baseline initiatives, including the (i) Integrated Drought Management Program in the Horn of Africa (IDMP HoA); (ii) the Somalia Water and Land Information Management (SWALIM) service; (iii) the Joint Programme on Local Governance and Decentralized Service Delivery (JPLG); (iv) the New Deal Compact; and (v) support provided by the Red Cross and Red Crescent Climate Centre to improve weather and climate forecasting.</p> <p>While most of the baseline initiatives seem relevant, it is not clear whether these would target specific regions, and how these would relate to the areas targeted by the proposed LDCE project. The description of the New Deal Compact, for example, provides very little information on what investments would be carried out and where.</p> <p>Moreover, the PIF could further clarify how the baseline initiatives relate to the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing cited in Table C. The funding cited in Section A.1.2 amounts to \$14.90 million,</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>whereas total indicative co-financing is \$16.16 million, and it is unclear whether the former refers only to the indicative co-financing associated with each project.</p> <p>With respect to Component 2, it is unclear what the mandate and capacities of Somalia's National Hydro-Meteorological Services (NHMS) are.</p> <p>Finally, in terms of coordination and complementarity with other, ongoing and planned initiatives, the PIF mentions the Drought Resilience and Sustainable Livelihoods Programme in the Horn of Africa (DRSLP), which also benefits from additional LDCF resources, but it should describe further how the proposed project would complement and be coordinated with this program that also targets pastoralists in drought-prone areas.</p> <p>In absence of further clarity regarding the baseline scenario and some of the baseline initiatives, the additional reasoning for the proposed LDCF grant cannot be adequately assessed.</p> <p>The PIF indicates that the proposed project would focus on pastoralists in</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Somalia's arid and semi-arid lands. This would apply to a very large share of Somalia's population and territory and it is not clear how target areas and beneficiaries would be selected, particularly under Component 3.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) provide further information regarding the geographic scope and targeted areas of each baseline project; (ii) clarify how the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing in Table C relate to the descriptions of the baseline initiatives in Section A.1.2; (iii) describe further the mandate and capacities of Somalia's NHMS; (iv) describe how complementarity and coordination would be ensured with the Drought Resilience and Sustainable Livelihoods Programme in the Horn of Africa (DRSLP); and, upon addressing the recommendations regarding the baseline scenario and relevant baseline initiatives, please (v) strengthen the description of the additional reasoning and adaptation benefits accordingly; and (vi) provide further information regarding the targeting principles that will guide the selection of target areas and beneficiaries, particularly under Component 3.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		06/13/2015 – YES. The revised PIF, in Section A.1.2, clarifies the geographic scope and targeted areas of the baseline initiatives, and the relationship between the baseline initiatives and the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing. The re-submission also addresses adequately the questions regarding targeting and complementarity.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 4 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 4, please adjust the project framework accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>06/13/2015 – YES. The components in Table B are sound and sufficiently clear.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	YES. Socio-economic aspects, including gender dimensions, have been adequately considered for this stage of project development.	
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	YES. The proposed grant is available from the LDCF in accordance with	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		the principle of equitable access.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? • 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. Please refer to sections 1, 3, 4 and 5.</p> <p>06/13/2015 – YES. The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/ approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.</p> <p>DS, August 21, 2017: An updated PIF, including an annex summarizing the specific aspects that required updating, was submitted and cleared. The Program Manager thus recommends the updated PIF for CEO approval given that resources available in the LDCF are sufficient to process the project for funding approval.</p>	
Review Date	Review	May 08, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 13, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 21, 2017	

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?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	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.