



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

GEF ID:	<b>9670</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Regional (Albania, Algeria, Libya, Morocco, Montenegro, Tunisia)</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Enhancing Regional Climate Change Adaptation in the Mediterranean Marine and Coastal Areas</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCA-1; CCA-3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$50,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,000,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$4,450,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$5,450,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Saliha Dobardzic</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Jessica Troni</b>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	Yes. The project is aligned with CCA Objective 2 (Strengthening the institutional and technical capacities for effective climate change adaptation); and Objective 3 (Integrating climate change adaptation into relevant policies, plans and associated processes.)	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	Yes. The Mediterranean as a region is	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	highly exposed and faces challenges from climate change hazards coupled with existing socio-economic processes, affecting such essential resources like freshwater, agricultural production, fisheries, while endangering coastal communities and assets.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes, the additional reasoning is sound. The overall environmental security, the sustainability of the livelihoods of growing coastal populations and their resilience to the adverse impacts of climate change and variability will be improved by mainstreaming considerations of climate resilience and adaptation into implementing ICZM and nexus planning. Specifically, the adaptation benefits will accrue to the recently approved MedProgramme, in which this project is strategically anchored.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Yes.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes. For example a gender-sensitive climate risk assessment will be implemented through a stakeholder led process to provide sufficient basis	

<sup>1</sup> 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)?

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		for building coastal resilience to climate change and sustainability, and balanced gender participation in project execution activities will be ensured. Broad stakeholder participation will be ensured via the Mediterranean Action Plan mechanisms and platforms.	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. 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 SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	Yes, the proposed funding is available under the SCCF-A.	
	• Focal area set-aside?		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>Not yet. The PPG, at \$70,000 is above the norm and has not been justified.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please revise the PPG amount accordingly, or submit a PPG form with the justifications for the amount being requested.</p> <p>Update 11/10/2016: The necessary correction has been made, therefore this is cleared. The PIF is recommended for CEO approval.</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	November 03, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	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)		

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

<sup>3</sup> 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.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	Additional Review (as necessary)		