



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	5007		
Country/Region:	Somalia		
Project Title:	Preparations of National Adaptation Plan of Action (NAPA) in response to Climate Change for Somalia		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	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):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$200,000
Co-financing:	\$208,500	Total Project Cost:	\$408,500
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Bonizella Biagini	Agency Contact Person:	Keti Chachibaia,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	YES. Somalia is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? * ¹	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point and dated May 18, 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 clear comparative advantage in capacity building and policy support for climate change adaptation and it has a strong track record of facilitating the preparation of NAPAs.
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? *	YES. The proposed project would benefit from UNDP's field presence in Somalia and, in particular, the Agency's ongoing country program on Poverty Reduction and Environmental Protection (PREP).
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	
	• the focal area allocation?	YES. The proposed grant is available under the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.

¹ Questions 2, 3, 4, 18 and 19 are applicable only to EAs submitted through Agencies.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	
Project Consistency	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	YES. The proposed project corresponds to the objective of the NAPA, as described in UNFCCC COP decision 28/CP.7 as well as the 2002 GEF Operational Guidelines for the Preparation of NAPAs (GEF/C.19/Inf.7).
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	NA
	8. 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 activities include an analysis and synthesis of relevant national development strategies, policies and plans, on which the NAPA would build.
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	YES. The proposal is for the participatory preparation of a country-driven and action-oriented NAPA. The NAPA preparation process is expected to contribute towards enhancing the knowledge base, strengthening institutional capacities and forging partnerships for the implementation of urgent and immediate adaptation measures.
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	YES. The proposed project framework is clear and sound.
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	YES. In accordance with relevant guidelines for NAPA preparation, the proposed project would include a comprehensive stakeholder assessment, participatory vulnerability assessments, and stakeholder consultations, all of which consider gender dimensions.
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	YES. Please refer to Section 11 above. The proposal outlines a participatory process based on a comprehensive stakeholder analysis.
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposal notes that Somalia has recently signed and ratified all major international environmental conventions and protocols, but that the country has yet to mobilize resources to carry out activities under these conventions. Yet, the proposal does not describe how the project would be coordinated with enabling activities proposed under other conventions, or other relevant initiatives that seek to enhance the institutional and technical capacities of key institutions in Somalia.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please demonstrate that the proposed project adopts a complementary approach, building on other relevant initiatives underway or planned in the country.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		07/11/2012 -- YES. The re-submission clarifies that the UN inter-agency working group on the environment, the Project Board, as well as multi-disciplinary working groups will serve as mechanisms for close coordination with all relevant stakeholders and initiatives planned or underway in the country. The Project Board will include, inter alia, all focal points for the major international environmental conventions.
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	YES. The project would be lead jointly by UNDP and the Ministry of Fisheries, Marine Resources and the Environment. The project would be overseen by a Project Board, and it would receive technical input from a multi-disciplinary Technical Committee.
Project Financing	15. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>NO. At \$20,000 or 11.1 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 3, the LDCF funding level for project management exceeds the recommended threshold of 10 per cent for projects requesting less than \$2 million.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the LDCF funding level for project management does not exceed 10 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 3.</p> <p>07/11/2012 -- YES. The LDCF funding level for project management has been reduced to \$18,000 or less than 10 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 3.</p>
	16. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed funding and co-financing per component is appropriate. However, the proposed rates for international consultants are high. In addition, it is unclear why a Consultations Facilitator, who would carry out responsibilities such as facilitating community mobilization and consultation processes, and including the interests of the most vulnerable segments of society in the process, should be an internationally recruited consultant.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please consider modifying the budget structure of the current proposal in line with the comment above, or provide justifications.</p> <p>07/11/2012 -- YES. The re-submission clarifies that the fees required to attract experienced and qualified international consultants in Somalia are higher than what may be expected in countries with a stable political situation, particularly due to the higher cost of insurance and</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		security coverage. As for the need to hire an international consultant to facilitate stakeholder consultations, the re-submission notes that there are very limited local capacities and experience to meet the demands of this crucial component.
	17. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	YES. At \$208,500, the co-financing level is appropriate.
	18. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	YES. UNDP would provide a grant of \$140,000 towards the proposed project.
Agency Responses	19. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:*	
	• STAP?	NA
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA
	• Other GEF Agencies?	NA

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	20. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 13, 15, and 16. 07/11/2012 -- YES.
Review Date (s)	First review**	June 08, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	July 11, 2012
	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.**