



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

GEF ID:	<b>5075</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Lesotho</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Reducing Vulnerability from Climate Change in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>4630 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCA-1; CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-2;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$8,398,172</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$27,600,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$35,998,172</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>May 02, 2013</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>May 31, 2013</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Knut Sundstrom</b>	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	YES. Lesotho 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 and dated August 10, 2012, has been attached to the submission.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	NOT CLEAR. Whereas UNDP has a clear comparative advantage in the areas of capacity building and policy support for climate change adaptation, the investments and cash-for-work activities proposed under Component 1 should be	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.

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>justified with reference to relevant experience and programming in the country.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please refer to Section 5.</p> <p>04/09/2013 – YES. As recommended, the re-submission provides additional information in support of UNDP's comparative advantage to implement the cash-for-work activities proposed under Component 1.</p>	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project is aligned with Lesotho's 2011-15 UNDAF as well as UNDP's 2008-12 Country Programme and Action Plan. It is not clear, however, whether UNDP has the operational experience and capacity to implement the investments and cash-for-work activities proposed under Component 1.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please demonstrate that UNDP has the relevant experience and capacity required to implement the investments and cash-for-work activities proposed under Component 1.</p> <p>04/09/2013 -- YES. As recommended, the re-submission provides additional information regarding UNDP's experience and capacity to implement</p>	YES. No change from PIF.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		the cash-for-work activities proposed under Component 1.	
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	YES. The proposed grant is available under the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	YES. No change from PIF.
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?		
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	YES. The proposed project is aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	YES. No change from PIF.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-1 and CCA-2 and, specifically, outcomes 1.1, 1.2, 2.1 and 2.3.</p> <p>Still, the Focal Area Strategy Framework should disaggregate grant and co-financing amounts per outcome. Moreover, it is not clear how the proposed grant would contribute towards CCA-1 and CCA-2 in equal shares, as it appears that most of the grant would support investments that correspond to CCA-1.2.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) provide grant and co-financing amounts</p>	YES. No change from PIF.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>for each strategic outcome towards which the project is expected to contribute; and (ii) ensure that the Focal Area Strategy Framework reflects the emphasis of the proposed project on tangible investments in reducing the vulnerability of key natural assets.</p> <p>04/09/2013 “ YES. The Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) has been revised as recommended.</p>	
	<p>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?</p>	<p>YES. The proposed project would contribute towards Lesotho's NAPA priority on promoting sustainable crop-based livelihoods in Foothills, Lowlands and the Senqu River Valley. In addition, the project is aligned with Lesotho's Vision 2020, Poverty Reduction Strategy, and it will contribute towards the development of the 2012-16 National Sustainable Development Plan.</p>	<p>YES. No change from PIF.</p>
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>YES. The proposed project emphasizes the need to build the capacities of local communities as well as local and national government authorities to ensure the sustainable and climate-resilient management rangelands, wetlands and other key natural assets.</p>	<p>YES. The proposed project contributes directly towards addressing the adverse effects of climate change in the context of Lesotho's Land Rehabilitation Program. The project is thereby closely aligned with the country's national development priorities and frameworks. The project would also invest considerably in the capacities of national and sub-national authorities as well as local land-users in implementing and monitoring climate-resilient land and water management practices. As a result, the project presents a viable strategy to ensuring sustainable outcomes with strong</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			ownership at the national and local levels and clear potential for scaling up.
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>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would build on (i) the Land Rehabilitation Programme led by the Ministry of Forestry and Land Reclamation; (ii) the development of rangeland and wetland strategies by the departments of Rangelands Management and Water Affairs; (iii) the implementation of the National Sustainable Development Plan; and (iv) the Lesotho component of the Africa Adaptation Programme (AAP).</p> <p>While the Land Rehabilitation Programme is highly relevant for the proposed project, it is not clear whether the entire national program could be regarded as baseline and co-financing to the LDCF project. As for AAP, it is not clear how it would benefit from additional adaptation measures.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) clarify whether the entire Land Rehabilitation Programme can be treated as a baseline project, given its considerable scale and scope; and (ii) consider removing AAP among the baseline projects and including it among other related initiatives in Section B.6 of the PIF.</p> <p>04/09/2013 “ YES. The indicative co-financing associated with each of the</p>	<p>YES. No significant change from PIF. The proposed project would build on and enhance Lesotho's Land Rehabilitation Program with a view to addressing the adverse effects of climate change on Lesotho's vulnerable rural communities and the natural resources on which they rely.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		baseline initiatives has been clarified as recommended. In addition, AAP has been considered among other related initiatives, with which coordination will be sought.	
	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?		YES. The cost-effectiveness of the proposed approach has been adequately demonstrated.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>With respect to Component 1, the PIF proposes a wide array of pilot investments aiming to enhance the resilience of the land rehabilitation programme. The cost-effectiveness of this approach, vis-à-vis a focus on fewer priority adaptation measures, should be discussed. In addition, given that more than \$6 million or 70 per cent of the proposed grant would be allocated towards Component 1, it would be helpful to see an indicative distribution of resources between outputs 1-3.</p> <p>As for Component 2, it is not clear how the training activities proposed under outputs 5 and 6 relate to and complement those proposed under output 2. The PIF could also provide further information as to the indicative scope of these training programs to better justify the grant request for Component 2.</p>	YES. The UNDP Project Document, in Section 2.4, presents a very clear additional reasoning for the proposed LDCF grant.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing recommendations under Section 11, please (i) consider focusing output 3 on fewer priority investments, or justify the proposed approach; (ii) provide indicative grant and co-financing amounts for outputs 1-3; (iii) clarify how the training programs proposed under outputs 5 and 6 would relate to and complement those proposed under output 2, and (iv) provide further information regarding the scope of the former.</p> <p>04/09/2013 “ YES. The re-submission addresses the recommendations made, proposing a greater focus on a fewer number of sites, greater clarity on the distribution of resources by output, and a more streamlined project structure.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11 and 13, please adjust the project framework accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>04/09/2013 “ YES. The project framework has been adjusted as recommended.</p>	YES. The project framework is sound and sufficiently clear.
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: Upon</p>	NOT CLEAR. The results framework and the expected adaptation benefits are broadly clear. With respect to Outcome 1, however, the framework

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>addressing the recommendations under Section 13, please provide a clear description of the adaptation benefits sought.</p> <p>04/09/2013 “ YES. The adaptation benefits are adequately described for this stage of project development.</p>	<p>could clarify what scoring methodology is used. As for Outcome 2, in turn, it is unclear what a 10 per cent increase/ reduction in climate change awareness and vulnerability scores would entail, and whether a percentage change can be provided for a qualitative indicator.</p> <p>Please refer also to Section 16 below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please review and clarify the baselines and targets associated with outcomes 1 and 2.</p> <p>02/08/2015 “ YES. The revised Request for CEO Endorsement clarifies the baselines and targets corresponding to outcomes 1 and 2 as recommended.</p>
	<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?</p>	<p>YES. The socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions of the proposed project are clearly described.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Section B.2 of the Request for CEO Endorsement claims that the project results framework includes gender-disaggregated indicators, but no such indicators are found in Annex A.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please review and revise the project results framework to ensure that relevant indicators on training, awareness and vulnerability reduction are disaggregated by gender.</p> <p>02/08/2015 “ YES. The results framework has been reviewed and revised as recommended.</p>



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	YES. Public participation, including CSOs, is adequately described for this stage of project development.	YES. Public participation, including the role of CSOs, is adequately described in the Request for CEO Endorsement.
	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 major risks, including appropriate mitigation measures, have been adequately described for this stage of project development.	YES. Relevant risks and appropriate, associated mitigation measures are adequately considered in the Request for CEO Endorsement.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	YES. Coordination and complementary with other related initiatives is adequately considered for this stage of project development.	<p>NOT CLEAR. Section A.7 of the Request for CEO Endorsement lists other relevant GEF- and LDCF-financed initiatives planned or underway in Lesotho, but it does not describe how coordination and coherence will be ensured.</p> <p>Please refer also to Section 29 below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please describe, in Section A.7 of the Request for CEO Endorsement, how coordination and coherence with other relevant initiatives will be ensured during project implementation.</p> <p>02/08/2015 “ YES. The revised Request for CEO Endorsement clarifies how the proposed project will be coordinated with and complementary to other relevant initiatives.</p>
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	YES.	YES.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		YES.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES. At USD 360,000 or less than 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 and 2, the proposed funding level for project management is appropriate.	YES. No change from PIF.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.  RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11 and 13, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component if necessary.  04/09/2013 “ YES. The grant and co-financing figures have been revised as recommended.	YES. The grant and co-financing amounts per component seem adequate and appropriate.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Sections 11.  RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please adjust the indicative co-financing amounts.  04/09/2013 “ YES. The co-financing figures have been revised as recommended.	YES. Appropriate confirmation is provided for all sources and amounts of co-financing.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	YES. UNDP would contribute USD 2.5 million of its core resources as co-financing towards the proposed project.	YES. At \$600,000, the confirmed co-financing brought by UNDP is significantly lower than the indicative co-financing reported at PIF, but it remains in line with the Agency's role.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>NOT CLEAR. It is not clear why baselines and targets are not provided for an indicator corresponding to Outcome 2.1, consistent with the Focal Area Strategy Framework.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please use the correct format for the Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool, and provide baselines and targets for at least one indicator corresponding to Outcome 2.1.</p> <p>02/08/2015 – YES. The Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool has been revised as recommended.</p>
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		YES.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council comments?</li> </ul>		<p>NOT CLEAR. In addition to the response provided in Annex B to the Request for CEO Endorsement, coordination and coherence with the relevant initiatives cited in Council comments could be described in Section A.7.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please include, in Section A.7 of the Request for CEO Endorsement, a description of how coordination and coherence will be ensured with the relevant USAID,</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			GIZ and EU -supported projects and programs mentioned in the comments from the LDCF/SCCF Council.  02/08/2015 â€œ YES. Please refer to Section 19 above.
	• Other GEF Agencies?	NA	NA
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 3, 5, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 24 and 25.  04/09/2013 â€œ YES.	
	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?		NA
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		NOT YET. Please refer to sections 15, 16, 19, 27 and 29.  02/08/2015 â€œ YES.
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 29, 2012	December 16, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 09, 2013	February 08, 2015
	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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.