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

GEF ID:	**5394**		
Country/Region:	**Zambia**		
Project Title:	**Climate Resilient Livestock Management Project**		
GEF Agency:	**AfDB**	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):		**CCA-1; CCA-2;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$6,210,000**
Co-financing:	**$20,708,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$26,918,000**
PIF Approval:	**September 24, 2013**	Council Approval/Expected:	**October 23, 2013**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Knut Sundstrom**	Agency Contact Person:	**Lewis Bangwe**

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. Zambia is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	YES. No change from PIF.
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point of Zambia and dated April 8, 2013, has been attached to the submission.	YES. No change from PIF.
Resource Availability	3. 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	YES. The proposed grant ($6.21 million)	YES. No change from PIF.

*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	equitable access	is available from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).*	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards focal area objectives CCA-1 and CCA-2.	YES. No change from PIF.
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient **country's national strategies and plans** or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	YES. The proposed project is aligned with Zambia's NAPA priorities in the areas of land management and agricultural production. The project is also consistent with Zambia's Sixth National Development Plan (2011-2015).	YES. No change from PIF.
Project Design	6. 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?	NOT CLEAR. The proposed project builds on AfDB's (i) Livestock Infrastructure Support Project (LISP). Among the baseline projects, the PIF also includes the (ii) Smallholder Livestock Investment Project (SLIP), supported by IFAD and the African Union Inter-African Bureau of Animal Resources (AU-IBAR); and the (iii) World Bank Livestock Development and Animal Health Project. Of the above, only LISP is reflected	YES. No change from PIF.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		among the indicative sources of co-financing provided in Table C. If LISP is the only baseline initiative towards which the LDCF would contribute directly, the remaining two projects could be discussed in Section A.4, among other related initiatives. For any baseline projects, the PIF should clarify the intended duration, beneficiaries and targeted areas. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) clarify the relationship between the baseline projects described in Section A.1 and the indicative co-financing figures provided in Table C; (ii) clarify the intended duration, beneficiaries and targeted areas of all baseline projects. 05/30/2013 â€“ YES. The baseline is limited to the AfDB financed LISP, which would contribute $18.6 million in indicative co-financing. The baseline investment would be carried out during 5 years, and it would target the Northern and Muchinga provinces.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	NOT CLEAR. The project objective does not capture how the proposed project would contribute towards climate change adaptation. The expected outcomes are not entirely clear. The outcome associated with Component 1 could potentially be divided into two separate outcomes. The outcomes associated with Component 2 could be more specific to the kind of knowledge and capacities that the	YES. No change from PIF.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		proposed project would strengthen. As for Output 1.1, it is not clear whether the output is to establish a financing mechanism or to enable livestock breeders to access climate-resilient technologies. Finally, outputs 1.3 and 2.1 appear duplicative. Also refer to sections 6 and 8. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations provided under sections 6 and 8, please (i) revise the project framework accordingly, as appropriate; (ii) consider clarifying the objective, outcomes and output 1.1; and (iii) merge or clarify the difference between outputs 1.3 and 2.1. 05/30/2013 â€“ NOT CLEAR. The project objective remains unchanged. The other recommendations have been adequately addressed. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please revise the project objective to capture how the proposed project would contribute towards climate change adaptation. 06/07/2013 -- YES. The re-submission includes a revised project objective, as recommended.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. In absence of a clear description of the baseline project(s), the additional reasoning cannot be fully assessed at this time. The PIF does not describe what areas and beneficiaries would be targeted by the proposed adaptation measures, or what targeting principles would be applied during project appraisal. With respect to Component 1, the nature and purpose of the proposed financing mechanism is not well understood. Output 1.5 on the demonstration of biogas production does not appear to be eligible under the LDCF. As for Component 2, Output 2.2 is included in the Project Framework (Table B) but not described in section A.1 of the PIF (p.7). It is not clear how this output would contribute towards adaptation. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please strengthen the additional reasoning accordingly and ensure consistency between section A.1 and the Project Framework (Table B). In particular, (i) describe the targeted areas and beneficiaries of the proposed adaptation measures; (ii) justify the establishment of a dedicated financing mechanism under Component 1; (iii) consider removing LDCF financing for Output 1.5; and (iv) justify or remove	NOT CLEAR. The Request for CEO Endorsement provides a clear description of the proposed components, outcomes, outputs and activities. Annex A, in turn, provides specific, quantified baselines and targets at the output level. It is not clear, however, why the project results framework does not provide outcome-level baselines and targets. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please specify the objective- and outcome-level baselines and targets in the project results framework (Annex A). 12/11/15 â€“ YES. The revised Request for CEO Endorsement provides additional information regarding the objective- and outcome-level baselines and targets as recommended.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		LDCF financing for Output 2.2. 05/30/2013 â€“ YES. The re-submission provides additional information regarding the intended beneficiaries and targeted areas of the LDCF project. The proposed outputs associated with the establishment of a financing mechanism and the demonstration of biogas production have been removed in the revised PIF; while activities aiming to diversify local livelihoods have been adequately clarified and justified.	
	9. 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?		NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above. 12/11/15 â€“ YES. Please refer to Section 8 above.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would provide employment opportunities for its beneficiaries, but the means of engaging CSOs and other local-level stakeholders in project design and implementation could be further clarified. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify how CSOs and other local-level stakeholders would be engaged in project design and implementation. 05/30/2013 â€“ YES. The role of project beneficiaries and CSOs has been adequately clarified for this stage of project development.	YES. Public participation, including the role of CSOs, is adequately described in the Request for CEO Endorsement and in the Project Document.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	YES. Risks and relevant mitigation measures have been adequately identified for this stage of project development.	YES. The Project Document provides a comprehensive analysis of relevant risks and appropriate, associated mitigation measures.
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above. In absence of a clear description of the baseline scenario, and the targeted areas and beneficiaries of the proposed project, coordination and coherence with other related initiatives cannot be adequately assessed at this time. Specifically, the possible synergies and complementarities between the proposed project and the IFAD/AU-IBAR and World Bank investments, described in Section A.1 of the PIF, are not clear. In addition, it is not clear how the proposed project would complement the significant adaptation investments planned and underway under Zambia's SPCR. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please describe how the proposed project would be coordinated with other related initiatives in the country and in the targeted areas in particular. 05/30/2013 â€“ YES. Coordination and coherence with other relevant initiatives has been adequately described for this stage of project development.	NOT CLEAR. Section A.7 of the Request for CEO Endorsement should revisit and further specify the coordination and collaboration arrangements identified at PIF, specifically as it relates on-going and planned LDCF and PPCR projects and programs in the country. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify how the proposed project will be coordinated with and complementary to other relevant initiatives planned and underway, particularly those financed through the LDCF and PPCR. 12/11/15 â€“ YES. Coordination and coherence with other related initiatives is adequately described in the revised Request for CEO Endorsement as recommended.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.	NOT CLEAR. Section A.1 of the PIF does not address innovative aspects, sustainability or potential for scaling up. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6, 8, 10 and 12, please describe, in Section A.1 of the PIF, innovative aspects associated with the proposed project, and outline the project's strategy for sustainability and scaling up. 05/30/2013 â€“ YES. Innovative aspects, sustainability and potential for scaling up have been adequately described in the re-submission. The project would adopt a value chain approach to promoting climate-resilient development in the livestock sector, and apply innovative delivery and engagement mechanisms at the local level. The proposed LDCF grant is integrated into the AfDB baseline investment, which represents a vehicle for scaling up successful practices and approaches, as do other planned and ongoing initiatives, with which close coordination would be sought.	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 8 and 12 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 8 and 12, please revisit and strengthen the description of innovative aspects as well as potential for sustainability and scaling up, as needed. 12/11/15 â€“ YES. Please refer to sections 8 and 12 above.
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		YES.
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 8 and 12 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 8 and 12, please revisit and strengthen the description of the cost-

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			effectiveness of the proposed design, as needed. 12/11/15 â€“ YES. Please refer to sections 8 and 12 above.
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please adjust the indicative grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly, if necessary. 05/30/2013 â€“ YES. The proposed LDCF grant and co-financing amounts per component are adequate and appropriate.	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 8, please adjust the LDCF and co-financing amounts per component accordingly, if necessary. 12/11/15 â€“ YES. Please refer to Section 8 above.
	17. At PIF: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please ensure consistency between the indicative co-financing figures provided in tables A-C, and the baseline initiatives described in Section A.1 of the PIF. 05/30/2013 â€“ YES. In line with its role, AfDB would bring $18.6 million in indicative co-financing in the form of a concessional loan.	YES. Appropriate confirmation is provided for the co-financing cited in Table C of the Request for CEO Endorsement.
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	YES. At $295,000 or less than 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components, the LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate.	YES. No change from PIF.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	19. At PIF, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	YES. A PPG ($182,695) is requested.	NO. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please complete Annex C of the Request for CEO Endorsement for the PPG ($182,695) that was provided at project approval. 12/11/15 â€“ YES.
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		YES. The Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool has been completed.
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		NOT CLEAR. Section C of the Request for CEO Endorsement does not provide an M&E budget. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide a budgeted M&E plan in Section C of the Request for CEO Endorsement. 12/11/15 â€“ YES.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		YES. The comments provided by STAP have been adequately addressed in the Request for CEO Endorsement.
	• Convention Secretariat?		NA
	• The Council?		NA
	• Other GEF Agencies?		NA
Secretariat Recommendation			

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16 and 17. 05/30/2013 â€“ NOT YET. Please refer to Section 7. 06/07/2013 â€“ YES. The project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF. 09/23/2013 â€“ YES.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		NOT YET. Please refer to sections 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19 and 22. 12/11/15 â€“ YES.
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 22, 2013	November 05, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)	May 30, 2013	December 11, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 07, 2013	

* **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.**