



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	8034		
Country/Region:	Zambia		
Project Title:	Building the Resilience of Local Communities in Zambia through the Introduction of Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) into priority ecosystems, including wetlands and forests		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$6,185,000
Co-financing:	\$17,650,000	Total Project Cost:	\$23,835,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Dustin Schinn	Agency Contact Person:	Jessica Troni

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	Yes.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes, the project is consistent with the NAPA, national plans, strategies, Climate Convention reports, development documents (UNDAF, PRSP, and other).	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	Not clear. EbA is, in many contexts,	

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>an innovative and sustainable approach to addressing climate change and other environmental concerns, and market transformation is not especially applicable in this case. However, the pathway to scale is not sufficiently clear.</p> <p>Recommended Action:</p> <p>Please provide further details on how the activities proposed will be scaled up during and/or beyond the life of the project, particularly in the context of the Water Resources Development Project referenced in the proposal.</p> <p>Update 7/2/2015: activities during and/or beyond the life of the project has been elaborated in further detail. This is sufficient.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>Not clear. The additional reasoning provided appears sound, but it is unclear how the additional activities specifically related to the key cofinancing or baseline interventions. Please see also the comment under section 3 above.</p> <p>Recommended Action:</p> <p>Please elaborate more clearly the</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>additional reasoning through clarifying the relationship between the components proposed and baselines referenced in the proposal.</p> <p>Update 7/2/2015:</p> <p>The additional reasoning has been elaborated, providing more details on the links between the baseline projects and how the interventions of the proposed LDCF project's activities will build on these.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Yes, the components are sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve adaptation benefits and objectives of the project.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes. The proposed LDCF-financed project will be designed and implemented through a participatory approach that includes ongoing stakeholder consultation and validation of proposed activities throughout the project implementation period.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or 		

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Technology Transfer)?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>Not yet. The PIF will be recommended for clearance after comments under sections 3 and 4 have been addressed.</p> <p>Update 7/2/2015: The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.</p> <p>DS, August 21, 2017: An updated PIF, including an annex summarizing the specific aspects that required updating, was submitted and cleared. The Program Manager thus recommends the updated PIF for CEO approval given that resources available in the LDCF are sufficient to process the project for funding approval.</p>	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.