



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

GEF ID:	4609		
Country/Region:	Sri Lanka		
Project Title:	Strengthening the Resilience of Post Conflict Recovery and Development to Climate Change Risks in Sri Lanka		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4863 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,121,818
Co-financing:	\$57,266,000	Total Project Cost:	\$60,387,818
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Junu Shrestha	Agency Contact Person:	Gernot Laganda

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, Sri Lanka is a non-annex I Party to the UNFCCC.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. An endorsement letter signed by the OFP Dr. R H S Samartunga and dated September 7, 2011 has been submitted. A letter with the revised grant amount, which is lower than the initial requested grant is expected.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. UNDP has been supporting climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction in Sri Lanka. UNDP was a part of 2004 tsunami relief efforts and it is also a core partner of the "Mangroves	

*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		For the Future" programme, which empowers local communities to take action for the restoration and sustainable use of coastal ecosystems. It has long-standing partnerships with the Ministry of Disaster Management, the Ministry of Environment and the Department for Agriculture. Such relations will be imperative to integrate climate risk resilient planning considerations and instruments into a variety of donor-funded reconstruction and development projects	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes. The proposed project is in compliance with the new UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) Pillar IV on "Environment, Climate Change, and Disaster Risk Reduction".The proposed project will contribute to Outcome 4.1. (Disaster Risk Reduction policies and programme in place, with enhanced national, local and community resilience to climate change and disasters and participation in disaster risk reduction) and Outcome 4.2 (Strengthen Climate Change mitigation and adaptation).	
Resource Availability	6. 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		

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 SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	Yes. The requested amount of \$3.121 million is within the resources available from SCCF-A.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes. The project is aligned with the SCCF results framework and will contribute to CCA-1.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes. The project will contribute to reduction of vulnerability to climate change impacts.	
	9. 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 project will make progress towards delineating vulnerable areas in the country, and will provide resources to communities to help address problems related to water scarcity and variability, needs recognized in the Second National Communication of the country. It is also in line with Sri Lanka's National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy (NCCAS) and National Climate Change Policy.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		
	11. 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?	After 30-years of armed conflict in the country, reconstruction and development process are underway. This provides a suitable avenue to integrate climate change resilience into the reconstruction and development investments. The main climate related risks that could undermine the value of the baseline projects are: effects of sea	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>level rise (salinization of soils and groundwater; coastal erosion and inundation; disappearance of mangrove greenbelts and wetlands), longer dry spells and drought periods, more intense tropical storms, and accelerated soil erosion.</p> <p>The proposed project will build upon 5 baseline projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gama Neguma and Divi Neguma which focuses on focus on community and economic development in all districts across Sri Lanka. In the Eastern and Northern Provinces, the baseline project helps communities identify their priority needs and design village development plans. 2. Community Livelihoods in Conflict Affected Areas Project which has facilitated the organization of community-based institutions and ensured benefits from rehabilitated irrigation schemes, feeder roads and bridges, water wells, marketing links, drainage schemes, and multi-purpose buildings. 3. North East Local Services Improvement Project “NELSIP: It aims to improve the delivery of local infrastructure services by Local Authorities (LAs) in the Northern Province and Eastern Province of Sri Lanka. 4. Support to Reconstruction and Development in selected Districts in North and East Sri Lanka : It aims to bridge the socio-economic gap between 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>North and East Sri Lanka and the rest of the country through sustainable regional development and good local governance.</p> <p>5. Strategic Support to Operationalize the Road Map Towards a Safer Sri Lanka (UNDP): The project includes an assessment of hazards, vulnerabilities and risks for all major hazards in Sri Lanka, establishment of Multi-Hazard Early Warning Systems at the district level, promotion of community-based climate risk management, and the promotion of disaster risk reduction in research institutions and schools.</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>Yes. SCCF project will integrate principles of climate-resilient land-use planning, climate resilient construction of physical infrastructure, climate-resilient water resources management and ecosystem-based adaptation into the baseline projects and will facilitate the use of climate change related tools by planners at all levels.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>Yes. The framework is composed of three TA components, and each includes suitable outcomes and outputs.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes. The methodology and the assumptions are sound for the PIF stage.	
	16. 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?	<p>Yes for the PIF stage. The project will inform local, sub-national and national entities and communities about climate change risks and the benefits of implementing climate resilient infrastructure/development plans. Direct benefits will be generated to the communities through investments in climate-resilient communal water supply. The proposed project will actively consider gender equality issues in its activities.</p> <p>More information regarding communities and local governments that will benefit from the project and clear description of the concrete adaptation benefits is expected by the CEO endorsement.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes for the PIF stage. Please identify and include community groups and local level organizations whose input will be important for the proposed project.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Yes. Inertia within key stakeholders towards change, and a preference to prioritize speed over quality of infrastructure investments has been identified as a major risk. High degree of visibility for the proposed project is expected to mitigate the risk.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the	Yes. The project will coordinate with with the "Mangroves for the Future" (MFF) project, the SPA-funded and	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	region?	IFAD-supported project "Participatory Coastal Zone Restoration and Sustainable Management in the Eastern Province of post-tsunami Sri Lanka"(2008-2015) and community-based initiatives financed by the GEF Small Grants Programme.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes. The proposed project will be executed by Ministry of Economic Development, which also implementing 3 out of 5 baseline projects. Other executing partners include Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Disaster Management and Finance Commission of Sri Lanka. UNDP will be providing technical assistance to ensure climate resilience in the baseline projects.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. The requested project management cost is 4.7% of the requested grant.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes. Over 60% of the requested grant will be utilized in implementing climate resilient reconstruction and development plans.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Indicative co-financing for the project is \$57.266 million which is at 18:1 ratio to the requested amount.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in	Yes. UNDP is providing \$11.266 million in form of a grant, through two	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	line with its role?	projects that are a part of the baseline for the proposed project.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Yes PIF clearance is recommended.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 26, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Yes. PPG activities include technical definition and capacity needs assessment, institutional arrangements (including development of monitoring and evaluation arrangements) and stakeholder consultations.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes. About 41% of the PPG amount will be utilized in technical assessments.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Yes PPG approval is recommended.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 26, 2011
	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.