



## 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:	\$12,050,000	Total Project Cost:	\$17,517,150
PIF Approval:	July 19, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	August 23, 2012
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 <sup>1</sup>	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	DS, July 15, 2014: Yes, unchanged.
	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.	DS, July 15, 2014: Yes, unchanged.

\*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)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	n/a
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Overall the project fits in with UNEPs program of work, as it relates to strengthening the ability of developing countries, to integrate climate change responses into national development processes.	DS, July 15, 2014: Yes, unchanged.
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.	DS, July 15, 2014: Yes, unchanged.
	• 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?	The project is aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	DS, July 15, 2014: Yes, unchanged.
	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.	DS, July 15, 2014: Yes.
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant	The project is consistent with the countries NAPA and addresses the following NAPA priorities; Priority 1 Rehabilitation and or construction of	DS, July 15, 2014: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	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 protective infrastructures such as dike, 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.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	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.	DS, July 15, 2014: Yes.
	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?	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	DS, July 15, 2014:  Yes. The LDCF financed project will build on, and is co-financed by, a number of sound baseline initiatives, among them IFAD's AD2M and the PROSPERER programs, and the PPRR program jointly supported by IFAD and FAO. In addition, the project will build on other baseline national development initiatives and programs.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>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?		<p>DS, July 15, 2014:</p> <p>Yes. The project utilizes data and information on cost effectiveness of proposed alternative livelihoods and monitoring of ecosystem resilience resulting from baseline activities. The project also foresees a participatory study on the cost effectiveness, gender dynamics and resilience of proposed alternative livelihood activities. Investments proposed for each region were assessed and the most urgent and most cost efficient interventions selected as part of this project.</p>
	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	<p>DS, July 15, 2014:</p> <p>Yes.</p>
	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,	<p>DS, July 15, 2014:</p> <p>Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		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	DS, July 15, 2014: Yes, unchanged.
	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.	DS, July 15, 2014: Yes, unchanged.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes the role of civil society is included.	DS, July 15, 2014: Yes.
	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.	DS, July 15, 2014: Yes.
	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.	DS, July 15, 2014: Yes. As part of Component 1, the project will establish a coordinating mechanism for climate change adaptation in the selected project sites. In addition, the project seeks to align with the climate change coordination by the relevant Ministry.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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.	DS, July 15, 2014: Yes.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Yes. Changes have been justified in an appropriate manner.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		n/a
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	DS, July 15, 2014: Yes. PMC is appropriate at 4.0% of the total grant amount.
	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 mainstreaming adaptation measures into 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%	DS, July 15, 2014: Yes.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated	Currently there is no cofinance being	DS, July 15, 2014:

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>provided by the agency for this project.</p>	<p>Yes. However, it is unclear whether the IFAD-supported co-financing has been confirmed by IFAD or only by the GoM.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify whether the co-financing that is sourced from IFAD-supported programs needs to be confirmed by IFAD, or whether there is an indication from IFAD that the GoM can confirm the co-financing instead. If IFAD has to approve the co-financing, please provide signed letter from IFAD confirming the co-financing. If not, please briefly specify the reasoning.</p> <p>UPDATE: DS, July 17, 2014: Yes. Confirmed co-financing is provided and it has been clarified that the GoM is the executing partner for IFAD's initiatives, hence authorized to allocate co-financing from IFAD's initiatives to this project. CLEARED.</p>
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>DS, July 15, 2014: Yes, co-financing provided by the Agency is in line with its role.</p>
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		<p>DS, July 15, 2014:  Partly. The tracking tool has been provided, however, it does not specify targets at CEO Endorsement.</p>

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: In the tracking tool, please delete information currently listed in column "Mid-Term Results" and instead fill in "Targets at CEO Endorsement". Mid-term results can only be specified once mid-term stage has been reached. Please also specify baseline levels pertaining to any targets listed.</p> <p>UPDATE: DS, July 29, 2014: Revised tracking tool has been submitted. CLEARED.</p>
	<p>28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&amp;E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		<p>DS, July 15, 2014: Yes.</p>
Agency Responses	<p>29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council comments?</li> </ul>		<p>DS, July 15, 2014: Yes.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p><b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b></p>	<p>The PIF is not recommended for clearance.</p> <p>The baseline for this project is not effective. The baseline for the project uses projects which already receive GEF support which is not appropriate.</p> <p>The project does not entirely fit in with</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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.</p> <p>Update July 6th 2012</p> <p>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 is 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</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		endorsement. The baseline for the 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?		DS, July 15, 2014: Yes.
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		DS, July 15, 2014:  Not yet. Please address issues raised under Questions 25 and 27.  UPDATE: DS, July 17, 2014: Not yet. Please address issues raised under Question 27.  UPDATE: DS, July 29, 2014: Yes, CEO Endorsement is 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	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	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.