



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

GEF ID:	5211		
Country/Region:	Yemen		
Project Title:	Integrated Water Harvesting Technologies to Adapt to Climate Change Induced Water Shortage		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4989 (UNDP)
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-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,920,000
Co-financing:	\$19,601,596	Total Project Cost:	\$24,521,596
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	Keti Chachibaia

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes, Yemen is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, the Letter of Endorsement signed by the Operational Focal Point is included. Please note that the letter endorses and agency fee of 10%, while the agency fee cannot exceed 9.5%.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. For instance, UNDP has worked extensively on community-based projects in the water sector, including water harvesting, in Yemen.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, the Country Office in Yemen currently manages a program portfolio of over \$70 million, and has the staff	

Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	n/a	
	• the focal area allocation?	n/a	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes, the funding requested under this project is available for Yemen under the principle of equitable funding.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes, Components 1, 2, and 3 are well-aligned with LDCF strategic objectives CCA-1 and CCA-3: reducing vulnerability and transfer of technology for adaptation.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes.	
	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, water is a top priority in the NAPA, and the project is also consistent with the National Water Sector Strategy and Investment Programme, which underlines strategic importance of "rain water harvesting in rural and urban areas". It is also among the sectorial priorities for the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, since the UNDP project focuses on essential institutional capacity building, including engineering skill development and introduction of employment schemes and financial incentives for the sustainability of the water sector	

Project Design	<p>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?</p>	<p>No. The sources of cofinancing list the Social Development Fund (SDF), but it is not clear what the SDF would fund. Other relevant initiatives are listed, but it is unclear how LDCF funding will be used to realize direct additional benefits vis-a-vis the National Water Sector Strategy and Investment Program, or the National Irrigation Program, both of which are referenced as baseline projects.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide clarification on the relationship between the proposed project and all baseline interventions of direct relevance to this project.</p> <p>Update 1/23/2013: Additional information on the baseline projects has been provided. Three main programs and funding frameworks will serve as the baseline interventions, including the National Irrigation Program (with investments of over \$10M/year), projects under the Social Development Fund (about \$30M for water management projects) and an overarching National Water Sector Strategy and Investment Program.</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>Not entirely. The project requests LDCF funding to cover an additional costs of increasing the resilience of rainfed agricultural</p>	

		<p>and risks through developing technical, regulatory and institutional capacities for the revival and upscale of integrated water harvesting technologies, and direct investment in such water harvesting technologies with a view of ensuring long term climate resilience of rainfed agricultural production systems. However, please clarify the relationship of this initiative to the baseline development intervention(s), particularly if serving as source(s) of cofinancing, and in line with the comment under #11.</p> <p>Update 1/23/2013: The additional clarifications have been supplied, and this is satisfactory. The justification for LDCF funding in order to ensure the resilience of the baseline projects is well argued.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes, the framework is sound and clear.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>No. Please address the comments under #11 and #13.</p> <p>Update 1/23/2013: The comments under #11 and #13 have been addressed, and the determination can be confirmed that the assumptions are sound and appropriate.</p>	
	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?	The socio-economic benefits are clear and compelling, including the gender dimensions, considering the burden of fetching water that disproportionately falls on women.	

	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes. The project has emerged as a result of consultations with the key institutions, and further consultations will be conducted during the project preparation phase.	
	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, the main risks and mitigation measures are identified.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>For the most part, the project appears consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in Yemen, including a rural adaptation project in Yemen by IFAD, which also addresses water resources, including harvesting. Since this project's geographic scope also includes the Dhamar governorate, it would be especially important to ensure coordination.</p> <p>Recommended action: By CEO Endorsement, it would be important to provide further assurances of coordination, exploring synergies where possible (in form of cooperation agreements, coordination mechanisms, joint activities, or other as appropriate.)</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>Not clear.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please outline the project implementation or execution arrangements.</p> <p>Update 1/23/2013: Additional information on the project implementation and arrangements has been supplied. The project will be nationally executed by the Ministry of Water and Environment. which will</p>	

		implementation, whereas the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation will be responsible for the successful delivery of components 2 and 3 specifically.	
	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 project management cost is appropriate.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>Please note that agency fee cannot exceed 9.5% of the project cost. Otherwise, the funding and cofinancing for the outcomes listed and described show the signs of a cost-effective project.</p> <p>Recommended action:</p> <p>Please adjust the agency fee.</p> <p>While cost-effectiveness is an important consideration, by CEO endorsement, please ensure that the activities proposed are realistically scaled and are achievable.</p> <p>Update 1/23/2013: The agency fee has been adjusted to 9.5% of the project cost.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing;	The indicated cofinancing appears adequate. Related to the point under	

	confirmed co-financing is provided.	relationship between the cofinanced intervention(s) and the proposed project needs to be clarified, before an assessment can be made whether the proposed activities are a good fit and adequately financed with respect to the baseline initiatives. Recommended Action: Please address #11, 13, and 24, following which this issue will be revisited. Update 1/23/2013: The cofinancing is appropriate.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes.	
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?	Not yet. Please address comments 11, 13, 20, and 24. Update 1/23/2013: All outstanding comments have been addressed, and the project is recommended for approval.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO		

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*	January 11, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 23, 2013	
	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.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	No. The agency fee cannot exceed 9.5%. Update 1/23/2013: The agency fee has been adjusted as requested.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Not at this time. Please adjust the agency fee. Update 1/23/2013: The PPG is ready for approval.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	January 11, 2013
	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.