



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

GEF ID:	4568		
Country/Region:	Madagascar		
Project Title:	Adapting Coastal Zone Management to Climate Change in Madagascar Considering Ecosystem and Livelihood Improvement		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	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-1; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-3; CCA-3; Project Mana; Others;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$129,650	Project Grant:	\$5,337,500
Co-financing:	\$11,965,000	Total Project Cost:	\$17,302,500
PIF Approval:	July 19, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Rawleston Moore	Agency Contact Person:	Ermira Fida

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?	Madagascar is a least developed country, and is eligible to receive resources	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	An endorsement letter from the operational focal point is on file	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	This project has a substantial investment component, however there is also a substantial capacity development component. The project in its current structure does fit satisfactorily into the comparative advantage of UNEP.	
	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	Overall the project fits in with UNEPs program of work, as it relates to	

		countries, to integrate climate change responses into national development processes.	
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	The resources are available for the project under the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	The project is aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	The LDCF/SCCF objectives are identified. CCA 1-Reducing Vulnerability, CCA-2 - Increasing Adaptive Capacity and CCA -3 - Adaptation Technology Transfer are identified.	
	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?	The project is consistent with the countries NAPA and addresses the following NAPA priorities; Priority 1 Rehabilitation and or construction of protective dams and dikes,; Priority 4. Adoption of anti-erosion measures, soil rehabilitation and dune stabilization; Priority 5. Installation of light climate monitoring infrastructure and strengthening of decentralized climate services; Priority 6. Installation of	

		<p>breakwaters, groynes and others to prevent sea level rise impacts; Priority 7. Rehabilitation of degraded coastal areas, including through reforestation of filaos, mangrove plantation, stone dikes and shoreline management, and tide or wave breaks.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>The project proposes to strengthen the institutional capacities to address climate change in coastal zones, and to train relevant staff in the ecosystem based approach to adaptation. Mechanisms to develop resilient standards, legislative instruments, and an effective coordinating system to address climate change adaptation strategies will be established.</p>	
<p>Project Design</p>	<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 fully. The baseline projects are not effectively described. Further one of the projects identified as a baseline project is the Support to the Madagascar Foundation for Protected Areas and Biodiversity (through Additional Financing to the Third Environment Support Program) is a GEF financed project. While it is noted that many initiatives were suspended as a result of unrest in 2009, there is a need to provide further information on the baseline projects. The baseline for this project needs to be enhanced and not use projects that are already receiving GEF support.</p> <p>Recommended Action: The baseline for this project needs to be enhanced and not use projects that are already receiving GEF support.</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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	The activities which are proposed to address are effective and appropriate, to address the problems which have been identified, however there is no effective baseline for the project	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	The project framework is sound and sufficiently clear. The project has three main components, institutional capacity development, coastal and marine ecosystem rehabilitation and management for resilience, and integrating adaptation measures into national and sectoral policies, development strategies.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	The applied methodology and assumptions are appropriate	
	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?	Yes. There is a clear description of socio-economic benefits.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes the role of civil society is included.	
	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)	The project takes into account major risks and identifies mitigation measures. There is a major risk as it relates to political stability.	

	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Project coordination with other initiatives will be ensured by the Climate Change Direction of the Ministry of Environment. There has been the establishment of the of the Structure de Concertation et Coordination (SCC) and the Plan d'Action du Programme Pays between the government of Madagascar and UNDP for the period 2008-2011. It is unclear as to whether this project will work with the SCC to ensure coordination with other initiatives.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	The project implementation/execution arrangements are adequate however political stability in Madagascar is a high risk, and this could affect the execution arrangements.	
	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?	No, the project management costs are not appropriate. Currently the project management cost are 8.61% and this is not in line with recent GEF guidance that project management costs, be at a maximum of 5% of the GEF LDCF grant	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	No. The LDCF/SCCF funding per objective is not appropriate. The resources allocated to components 1 and 3 from the LDCF should be reduced. Components 1 and 3 consist of institutional capacity development and	

		into national policies and development strategies . The costs associated with these components are too high for the type of proposed activities. Recommended Action: Reduce the cost associated with components 1 and 3, by at least 30%	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Currently there is no cofinance being provided by the agency for this project.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	The project proposes cofinance from a number of areas. These include: a grant and in kind contributions from the Government of Madagascar, grants from AFD, JICA and WWF. There is no cofinance contribution from UNEP for this project.	
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?	The PIF is not recommended for clearance. The baseline for this project is not effective. The baseline for the project	

support which is not appropriate.

The project does not entirely fit in with the comparative advantage of UNEP, and should focus on rehabilitation of ecosystems that provide key protective services such as: mangrove plantation and restoration, reef protection and rehabilitation, beach nourishment, shoreline reforestation, as well as threat monitoring, forest connectivity maintenance and enhancement, and watershed protection where necessary; rehabilitation of climate monitoring infrastructure for early warning and risk management in coastal areas and developing a system that integrates local communities in the management of coastal zones. Consideration should be given to the inclusion of a small pilot sea wall rehabilitation to complement the mangrove restoration at a reduced cost.

Update July 6th 2012

The budget for the project has been reduced to US\$5,337,500. The project will now include a small pilot, demonstrating technologies for rehabilitation of coastal infrastructure, along with the rehabilitation of ecosystems that provide protective coastal services. The baseline project is the Support Programme for Rural Development which aims to enhance the living conditions of rural communities. UNEP will also provide a grant of US\$2,925,000. All cofinance should be confirmed at CEO

		project has been clarified and the project now focuses on rehabilitation of ecosystems that provide key protective services. The project is recommended for clearance.	
	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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	The proposed activities are appropriate for project preparation. The activities include, stakeholder consultation, baseline analysis and technical and feasibility analysis to finalize the project sites.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	The budget is justified.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	The PPG is being recommended for approval.
	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.

