



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

GEF ID:	5435		
Country/Region:	Zambia		
Project Title:	Promoting Climate Resilient Community-based Regeneration of Indigenous Forests in Zambia's Central Province		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4712 (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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$3,885,000
Co-financing:	\$23,698,776	Total Project Cost:	\$27,683,776
PIF Approval:	October 29, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Bonizella Biagini	Agency Contact Person:	Lucas Black

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. Zambia is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
Resource Availability	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point of Zambia and dated May 6, 2013, has been attached to the submission.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
Resource Availability	• the STAR allocation?		
Resource Availability	• the focal area allocation?		
Resource Availability	• the LDCF under the principle of	YES. The proposed grant \$4,254,075	

		the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>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).</i></p>	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-1 and CCA-3.	
	<p>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?</p>	YES. The proposed project would directly address the Zambia's NAPA priority on the regeneration of indigenous forests. In addition, the proposed project is aligned with the country's Sixth National Development Plan, the National Policy on the Environment, the Zambia Forest Action Programme, the Draft National Forest Policy, as well as other relevant national policies, plans, reports and assessments.	
	<p>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?</p>	NOT CLEAR. The PIF lists a range of baseline initiatives that are relevant to the proposed LDCF project. However, given that the description of the baseline scenario and associated projects should focus on the areas targeted by the proposed additional adaptation measures, the PIF should clearly describe what activities have been or will be carried out in Central Province as part of the baseline	

Project Design

how the proposed LDCF grant would build on, strengthen and transform the largest baseline initiatives 6 (Government of Finland) and 7 (USAID), which do not appear to cover Central Province at all. These projects could be moved to Section A.4 of the PIF.

In addition, the time frame associated with each baseline initiative should be provided, where available.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please revisit the description of the baseline scenario and associated baseline initiatives, with a focus on the targeted Central Province, and include time frames for each project or program, where available.

08/22/2013 – YES. The re-submission clarifies the baseline scenario for Zambia's Central Province, and the co-financing amounts have been adjusted accordingly.

The proposed LDCF project would build on the following baseline initiatives: (i) the Department of Forestry programs on the Management of forest reserves and the enhancement of natural regeneration of forests, and the development of a Land Information Management System (LIMS); (ii) annual funding towards the rural development initiatives of the Community Development Department; (iii) annual funding towards household energy initiatives carried out by the Ministry of Mines, Energy and Water Development; (iv) District support towards joint forest management (JFM)

		<p>(CBFM); (v) conservation and SFM initiatives carried out by local NGOs; (vi) UN-REDD Program; and (vii) relevant components of USAID's support towards the UN-REDD Program. The re-submission provides the indicative co-financing amounts associated with each of the above baseline activities, along with their duration.</p> <p>The activities financed by the Government of Finland have been moved to Section A.4 of the revised PIF.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6, 8 and 16.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6, 8 and 16, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts in the project framework accordingly, as appropriate.</p> <p>08/22/2013 " YES. Please refer to sections 6 and 8.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The PIF establishes a clear link between deforestation and forest degradation on the one hand, and the effects of climate change and associated vulnerabilities on the other. It is important, nevertheless, that the proposed LDCF investments under components 1-3 be targeted with a view towards attaining the greatest adaptation benefits. This has yet to be clearly demonstrated.</p> <p>Moreover, in absence of a clear and consistent description of the baseline scenario in Central Province (see Section 6 above), the additional reasoning cannot be adequately assessed at this stage.</p>	

describe relevant baseline development activities in Central Province; the extent to which such baseline activities and their beneficiaries are vulnerable to the effects of climate change; and how the additional activities financed through the LDCF would build on, strengthen and transform relevant baseline initiatives and reduce vulnerability to climate change.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) demonstrate how the proposed investments would be targeted with a view to ensuring the greatest adaptation benefits; and, upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, (ii) clarify the extent to which the baseline activities and their beneficiaries are vulnerable to the effects of climate change, and how the additional activities financed through the LDCF would build on, strengthen and transform relevant baseline initiatives and reduce vulnerability to climate change.

08/22/2013 “ YES. Please refer to Section 6 above. The baseline scenario for Zambia's Central Province has been clarified, along with the extent to which its forest resources and rural communities will become increasingly vulnerable to the effects of climate change in absence of additional adaptation measures. The re-submission clarifies the targeting principles adopted for the proposed project, and adequately demonstrates that the investments in agroforestry, assisted natural regeneration (ANR), and wood-saving energy technologies contribute towards climate change adaptation while promoting the conservation and

		<p>resources.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, however, the adaptation benefits should be described in further detail, and quantified as appropriate. In particular, the final project document and request for CEO Endorsement should demonstrate that the 15,000 hectares benefiting from agroforestry and ANR investments under Component 1 is selected with a view towards attaining the greatest adaptation benefits for the people, livelihoods and natural assets that are most vulnerable in the face of climate change.</p>	
	<p>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?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>YES. The project promotes public participation across project preparation and implementation, and also identifies the role of key stakeholders.</p>	
	<p>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)</p>	<p>YES. The PIF adequately describes both operational, technological and climate risks.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. The PIF adequately describes opportunities to coordinate and leverage lessons learned from several initiatives within the country, including LDCF-funded projects and the Pilot Program on</p>	

		<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please include additional, relevant initiatives in Section A.4 of the PIF, as appropriate.</p> <p>08/22/2013 “ YES. Section A.4 of the revised PIF has been expanded as recommended, now including the Decentralized Natural Resources Management Programme financed by the Government of Finland.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project’s innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>NOT CLEAR. At this stage, innovative aspects cannot be adequately described. First, please address recommendations in sections 6, 7 and 8.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address recommendations in sections 6, 7 and 8.</p> <p>08/22/2013 “ YES. The proposed project represents an innovative effort to implement Zambia's NAPA priority on the regeneration of indigenous forests as a means to enhance the resilience of vulnerable rural communities, their livelihoods and the natural assets on which they depend. The project adopts a multi-pronged approach to addressing the drivers of deforestation, while enhancing climate-resilient agricultural practices and energy production. Through strong political support and close coordination with other, ongoing adaptation and SFM initiatives underway in Zambia, the project is well positioned to generate sustainable adaptation benefits that may readily be scaled up beyond the targeted Central Province.</p>	

	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		
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?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>08/22/2013 â€œ YES. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above.</p>	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : 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? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. In line with its role, UNDP would bring \$100,000 towards the proposed project.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please adjust the indicative co-financing figures accordingly, as appropriate.</p> <p>08/22/2013 â€œ YES. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p>	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES. At \$185,000 or 5% of the sub-total for components 1 through 3, the LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate.	

	19. <u>At PIE</u> , 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? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	YES. At \$100,000 the proposed PPG is in line with the norm for projects up to and including \$6 million.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 16 and 17. 08/22/2013 -- 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.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		

CEO Endorsement/ Approval	being recommended?		
	First review*	May 29, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 22, 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. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**