



**PROJECT DEVELOPMENT FACILITY
REQUEST FOR PDF BLOCK A FOR FSP, MSP, EA
UNDP PROJECT INITIATION DOCUMENT (PID)**



FINANCING PLAN (US\$)			
AGENCY'S PROJECT ID: (PID Number)	GEF Project:		
GEFSEC PROJECT ID:	PDF A	50,000	50,000
COUNTRY: KENYA	Sub-Total GEF	31,000	50,000
COUNTRY ELIGIBILITY: KENYA	CO-FINANCING		
PROJECT TITLE: KITUI SAND DAMS	GEF Agency		
GEF AGENCY:	National Contribution		
OTHER EXECUTING AGENCY(IES):	In Cash		
DURATION: 5 YRS	In Kind		
GEF FOCAL AREA(S):	Others		
GEF OPERATIONAL PROGRAM(S):	Sub-Total Co-financing:		
GEF STRATEGIC PRIORITY(IES):	Total PDF Financing:	50,000	
ESTIMATED STARTING DATE:			

Record of endorsement on behalf of the Government:

(Enter Name, Position, Ministry)

Date: (Month, day, year)

This proposal has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the standards of the GEF Project Review Criteria for PDF Block A approval.

Deputy Executive Coordinator

Date: (Month, Day, Year)

Regional Coordinator/Task Manager

Tel. and email:

1. **Global Significance + Problem Statement**

Kenya and Climate Change

The current (2006) severe Kenyan drought shows that Eastern African economies and livelihoods are highly vulnerable to extreme climatic conditions. The IPCC SRES scenarios show that Climate change is expected to increase the severity, duration and frequency of droughts in this region, thereby threatening water availability and food security for millions of poor people (IPCC, 2001; Lasage et al 2006).

Apart from the current drought challenges, Kenya is not prepared to cope with the effects of future climate change, due to its relatively low adaptive capacity (GDP, Education, dependency on agriculture, etc). During the last decade economic circumstances worsened, especially for (subsistence) farmers which form the biggest part of the population. This deterioration is due to the frequent droughts, the drop in prices for agricultural products on world markets and liberalisation of agricultural sector, but also because the effects of HIV AIDS. Illiteracy rates have risen, though, due to declining enrolment rates in primary schools. (PRSP, IMF 2005). Furthermore, environmental impacts from droughts are also visible as during periods of droughts many farmers shift to charcoal burning for generating income. These activities lead to the overexploitation bushes and woods.

One of the least developed districts East of the Kenyan capital of Nairobi is Kitui where a majority of the population has to deal with annual droughts and food shortages. Agricultural production is hampered by water scarcity and especially women and children walk for miles to get water for domestic and agricultural activities. The Kitui District in Kenya is characterised by two rainy periods that are highly erratic and unreliable. The precipitation usually falls in a few intensive storms. The income of 58 percent of the eastern districts lies beneath the poverty line of 2 dollars a day (PRSP, 2001). During prolonged dry periods the farmers are dependent on relief food from donors. In 2004 and spring 2005 up to 50 percent of the inhabitants of Kitui received food aid (FEWS-NET). The local communities have difficulties with coping with the current climate variability; they have no means to reduce their vulnerability as it is clear that their capacity to cope is low.

Community based approach

Key to a sustainable agricultural sector, and hence to a vital and healthy Kenyan society are reliable water resources and their management. The main challenge is how to manage water resources knowing that droughts already affecting Kenya and climate change will probably increase climate variability – and hence frequency- of droughts. At the national level, the Kenyan Government has new water policies and a new 'Water Act' which emphasises that local communities have to manage their water resources on catchment basis. The real development implementation challenge, however, is to find adaptation to climate changes within the reach of local communities, in terms of techniques and social organisation of mitigating negative impacts of climate change.

Storage of water in small catchments is increasingly seen as an adaptation for ensuring water availability and food security to rural and urban populations in arid areas. The need for increased storage capacity (and thereby an increase in water security) is underpinned by the Millennium Development Goals that specifically address storage needs to adapt to global changes such as sharply growing populations, climate change and land degradation.

There is limited knowledge on how to successfully develop and implement such storage measures, as many attempts have failed in the past. The key to success lies in participatory approaches where communities are heavily involved in the preparation, implementation of adaptation measures, which could be traditional practices or introduced. This perception is supported by e.g. the Copenhagen Consensus (2004), which regards small-scale water technology for livelihoods as likely to be highly cost

effective. Policy makers, planners and water managers play a key role in the development of adequate adaptation strategies and should be participating together through all stages (e.g. Seckler et al, 1999).

Ensuring water storage capacities under climate change is a complex issue. Water storage for urban water schemes may include options such as construction of dams, long distance conveyance of water or desalination. However, for rural water security such solutions are generally too costly and complicated. Provisions for rural water supply require low cost systems with easy maintenance that can be constructed and operated with a high degree of community involvement. Examples of such -low cost- methods are found within water conservation (or water harvesting) methods. They have been applied and used since ancient times in arid and semi arid regions, such as in the Middle East, for example (ACSAD, 1998). Since local communities are traditionally familiar with such methods, development and maintenance need relatively little training and investments. Therefore, they are increasingly seen as robust adaptations to climate change. In the development of adaptation strategies these and other local activities should be taken into account.)

Sand Dams as a community based adaptation

A local NGO in Kitui, the Sahelian Solutions Foundation (SASOL) assists local communities in building small scale sand dams to store water in sandy aquifers in ephemeral rivers. This technique improves the availability of water for domestic and agricultural use. SASOL's strategy is to achieve several prime targets of the Kenyan Government: (1) reduce the distance to water sources to less than 2 kilometres (2) make water available for irrigation thereby (3) increasing livelihoods and education rates. Over the past ten years they succeeded to reach these goals in the more endowed parts of Kitui district (200,000) are less vulnerable to droughts at an investment of 35 US\$ per person. The income of farmers near a dam have risen with about 9.000 KSh. (120 US\$) and the time spend on collecting water has decreased from 220 minutes a day to 100 minutes a day.

The sand dams differ from traditional dams by not storing water in upstream 'open water reservoirs' as it would evaporate quickly into the atmosphere. Alternatively, the water is stored within the sand and gravel particles that accumulate against the dam. A new built dam will be filled up with sand in about four years time (hence the name 'Sand Dam'). The coarse gravel and sand can store and retain up to 35 percent of its total volume as water. After rains have filled up this artificially created aquifer behind the dam, the water is pumped up for use through an ordinary well or tube well that is dug into the sand. In this way, the stored water is protected against high evaporation losses and against contamination through filtering of precipitation by the sand.

Reducing Vulnerability

This project will not use climate change scenarios for designing new Sand Dams. The future is considered as inherently uncertain, and the focus is therefore on reducing current vulnerabilities in peoples livelihoods (See e.g. Downing et al 2005; Huq 2003, Aerts and Droogers 2004). It is expected that by reducing current vulnerabilities (by building additional sand dams), a community is better prepared for future climate changes. Therefore, it is important to assess the strong weak points of the current sand dam approach, which can be used for learning and capacity building for up-scaling the method to other areas. Furthermore, it will be assessed how current an new sand dams can be enhanced to cope with more extreme droughts that are anticipated under climate change. For this particular aspect, climate change scenarios will be used as an example for portraying how the future might look like in participatory dialogues with stakeholders.

2. **Project Linkage to National Priorities, Action Plan and Programmes and CP/GCF/RCF, CCA and UNDAF situation analysis**

Link to the CCA, UNDAF (2006-2010)

In the Kenya National CCA report of 2001 it is stated that:

“In many rural households, people spend the bigger part of the day fetching water yet access to safe water is crucial for lowering infant and child mortality. It is also a good universal indicator of human development in areas such as education, health and nutrition. Viewed against the goals of the World Summit for Children of universal access, Kenya is far from achieving the goal. This calls to question the practicality of the goals of the World Summit for Children of universal access to drinking water and sanitation.”

According to the PRSP, 80 per cent of the rural poor depend on agriculture for their livelihood, mostly as subsistence farmers. The latter are largely excluded from the national economy due to low income levels and lack of legally-owned assets (houses and land) that can be used as collateral for bank credit. Subsistence farmers also tend to pay in kind (with agricultural produce or livestock) for communal activities or school fees. Those who do not have long-term security for their agricultural or grazing land do not have any incentive for planting trees. Increased poverty is leading to increasing degradation of land and biodiversity in rural areas. At the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992, Kenya signed the Convention on Biological Diversity. This convention states in Article 6(b), that “each contracting Party shall, in accordance with its particular conditions and capabilities, integrate, as far as possible and as appropriate, the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity into relevant sectoral or cross-sectoral plans, programmes and policies”. Although the National Environment Action Plan has been formulated, its implementation is hampered by the lack of data on trends and appropriate mitigation measures. Consequently, it is not possible at present to estimate the potential impact of population increase and various socio-economic activities on the natural resources of the country. In short, the rural poor depend on natural resources for their livelihood while at the same time they deplete the resources, thus undermining their own source of livelihood.

Linkage to UNDAF and UNIFEM:

The four areas of cooperation set forth here are in line with the UN’s mission to support government efforts to create an enabling environment for the improvement of the quality of life and well-being of Kenyans, to reduce poverty, with a particular focus on the most vulnerable groups and regions, and to ensure the protection of the rights of women and children.

Kenya is part of a five-country pilot project to integrate gender across national MDG efforts that UNIFEM is executing for the UN Development Programme. UNIFEM is assisting the Kenyan government and women’s groups in establishing mechanisms to routinely bring women’s perspectives into national policy-making.

Link to UNFCCC strategy (NAPAs)

NAPAs (national adaptation programmes of action) provide a process for [Least Developed Countries \(LDCs\)](#) to identify priority activities that respond to their urgent and immediate needs with regard to adaptation to climate change. The rationale for NAPAs rests on the limited ability of LDCs to adapt to the adverse effects of climate change. In order to address the urgent adaptation needs of LDCs, a new approach was needed that would focus on enhancing adaptive capacity to climate variability, which itself would help address the adverse effects of climate change. The NAPA takes into account existing coping strategies at the grassroots level, and builds upon that to identify priority activities, rather than focusing

on scenario-based modeling to assess future vulnerability and long-term policy at state level. In the NAPA process, prominence is given to community-level input as an important source of information, recognizing that grassroots communities are the main stakeholders.

Link to Water Act 2002 and National Water Development Strategy

The Inception Report on Operationalising the Water Act 2002 in Rural Water Supplies and Sanitation, prepared by the Ministry of Water and Irrigation (January 2005) repeats the Millennium Development Goals. The MDGs, adopted after the 2000 Millennium Summit, mark the first time the international community has embraced a common set of basic development goals on poverty, education, gender, child mortality, maternal health, epidemic diseases, environmental sustainability and development financing.

With respect to water and sanitation this implies: To reduce by half the proportion of the people without access to hygienic sanitation facilities by 2015; and: To reduce by half the number of people without sustainable access to adequate quantities of affordable and safe water by 2015; Long term goal -To provide water, sanitation and hygiene for all by 2025... In this context, rural water supplies must cover the 65% (16 million) of people presently without safe water and sanitation.

In the same report it is stated in Chapter 3 - Goals and Targets in Service Delivery: “Catchment degradation (...) is seriously undermining the productivity of our land use and thus enhancing poverty.”

Link to PRSP and National Development Strategy

The GoK National Water Policy (1999) and its Poverty Reduction Plan (Economic Recovery Strategy, 2003) specifically state that the rural populations will get comprehensive coverage to alleviate poverty.

3. Stakeholders and Beneficiaries involved in Project

This project has 4 main groups of stakeholders:

- Local NGOs, e.g. SASOL dealing with community based adaptations to drought
- Government institutions such as agriculture, environment and planning ministries at national and district levels
- “interface” institutions such as agriculture extension services
- Community groups, traditional leaders, small farmers and others vulnerable to and affected by climate change.

The main beneficiaries are the communities that will see decreasing their vulnerability to extreme droughts and future climate change.

This project will contribute to GEFs Adaptation Learning Mechanism (ALM) by mainstreaming local adaptations to climate change within the development of communities. The ALM will be strengthened by using existing ‘good practice’ knowledge from SASOL in other communities

The anticipated lesson of this project is how to cope with droughts using a community based ‘water storage’ approach. The project will show the lessons learnt from the current state of the art of developing sand dams and how it can be up-scaled to other areas.

4. Rationale for GEF Involvement and Fit with GEF Operational Programmes and Strategic Priorities

Kenya’s adaptation policies are directly linked to the GEF goals of developing adaptations to climate change and sustainable development. Furthermore, the project will demonstrate how adaptations at the local scale are developed and implemented which is one of the prime targets of the GEF. The project will

seek synergies with other GEF adaptation initiatives particularly the Coping with Drought and Climate Change regional project and the Adaptation Learning Mechanism and the activities relating to CwD and ALM will be designed during the inception phase.

Without GEF intervention sand dams will be developed but at a smaller scale –fewer people will be reached with clean drinking water. Land will be further degraded due to droughts (e.g. increased in charcoal use during droughts) and water quality decreases.

It is expected that with GEF intervention, socio-economic conditions will significantly improve as shown in Lasage et al (2006); Rempel (2005). Water quality –and hence ecosystems and drinking water-- will improve, walking distance to water will decrease and GDP will increase significantly. Moreover, GEF investment will (1) seek for additional measures that safeguard the anticipated success of the sand dams under long term developments such as climate change and (2) it will seek for up-scaling the sand dam approach to other areas as an adaptation to droughts.

Request for SCCF, LDC or SPA Funding:

(we're not quite sure under which category we should apply)

Development-related baseline activities carried out:

- a. SASOL has already carried out a detailed baseline survey for the water access in the whole district of Kitui whose communities have built 480 dams since 1995. These have been evaluated from a hydrological viewpoint by the Free University of Amsterdam. The socio-economic impacts have been evaluated by University of Manitoba (Rempel, 2005).
- b. Community training and supervision was and will be continue to be undertaken by SASOL with co-financing from its past development partners 'Exchange for Profit', 'Mennonite Central Committee' and 'Canadian Food Grains Bank'.
- c. Following the Government of Kenya, Central Bureau of Statistics survey sample clusters, 6,000 interviews were conducted in Kitui District in 2002 to elucidate water use and socio-economic data. It was established that in the hill areas of Kitui women and girl-children typically walked to water sources 5 km from their homes; this has been reduced now to an average of 2 km. In the drier plains areas they took two days to reach water sources which were few, unsafe and unreliable (SASOL 2002). It these areas which are not yet covered by SASOL.
- d. From 2005, SASOL after extensive discussions with communities, it was established there was a urgent need to build new large-scale community organizations for positive management of the dam cascades in each catchment. Up till now each dam had been built by a specific community. These catchment committees will optimize the management, utilization, environmental protection of the water resources, the up-scaling of the water use technology and its use for production, and the need for communities to invest in catchment protection and land degradation measures.

5. Expected Goal, Objectives and Outcomes of Final Project and Relevance to Outcomes of CPD and UNDAF

Goals and objectives

As the main vulnerabilities of the Kenyan Communities are directly linked to the availability of water resources, the main goal of this project is:

To support local communities adapting to current droughts and future climate change by up-scaling the sand dam method to other areas.

The objective that is linked to the goal is to adapt the sand dams technology ‘*climate proof*’ – to make them robust under long term developments-. And to identify the strong and weak points for *up-scaling* the method to other regions. For this, the following activities are identified

1. *Up-scaling:*

- a. Evaluate and improve the current sand dam method from the lessons learned. The main requirement for a successful development and implementation of sand dams will be described. An assessment will be made of which requirements are generic and which are not.
- b. Develop a major capacity building component to train and involve communities for Kitui and the other pilot regions
- c. Develop and generic handbook for developing sand dams across the world

2. *Implementation:*

- a. Perform siting and development of new Sand dams in Kitui and other pilot regions. This will involve 250 dams in Kitui and another 50 in the other areas.

3. *Organization:*

- a. Institutional requirement for monitoring the sand dams and their communities will be described for areas where dams have been developed. For this, the organisation and institutional arrangements of SASOL have to be transformed from an organisation that develops new dams, into an organisation that also increasingly monitors the use of existing dams. This requires improved cooperation with the government and self-organisation by farmers that will maintain the dams.
- b. To develop sand dam groups on a catchment basis that maintain and monitor the dams

4. *Scientific support*

- a. Set up a monitoring program for assessing trends in water availability including groundwater storage and to link up to food security and early warning systems;
- b. To further investigate the hydrological impacts of the sand dams when expanding the local method a wider scale (e.g. upstream - downstream effects)
- c. To assess the long-term socio-economic and environmental cost-benefit of the Sand dams.
- d. To assess the socio-economic performance of the sand dams under more extreme scenarios. On the short term many benefits are clearly visible and economic growth has been promoted by the construction of dams. However, no quantitative methodology exists to evaluate the performance of the dams under climate change and other long-term developments.

5. *Communication:*

- a. The project requires continuous communication with all stakeholders using a participatory process. In addition dissemination of good practices will be undertaken.

Scale of implementation of the project

The scale of implementation is local to regional in pilot areas in Kenya. However, pilots from other countries can be included in the program as an example to upscale the method.

6. Description of Preparatory Inception Stage ***Expected Outcomes and Completion Date of PDF A project***

The goal of the inception stage is to produce a full work plan for a full GEF project. The inception phase will take about 9 months

The inception phase will involve the following activities:

1. Establish links to ongoing drought projects in Kenyan and Eastern Africa.
2. Involve stakeholders at different levels and assess their knowledge and interest in community based adaptations using interviews.
3. Desk study to describe basic hydrological and socio-economic impacts of the Sand dams using existing studies and reports.

This information will then feed into a

4. Stakeholder workshop to be held in September 2006. The good practices and generic elements from the SASOL experience will be an important input in the workshop aimed to initiate similar programmes by NGO's in other districts in Kenya and possibly in the neighboring countries through the Coping with Drought program. The workshop could also be used to share experiences with countries outside the region and to establish a global sand dam network
5. The inception phase will end by writing full GEF proposal.

NOTE: The proposed seminar as described under activity 4 is a regional workshop with the following objectives:

- To present the Kitui experiences as a detailed case study in which all the success factors and pit falls of the programme are addressed.
- To exchange these experiences with the participants and explore the generic elements of a successful approach and the elements that are location specific.
- To develop a strategy for local communities and NGO's in selection of the technology for the implementation of water conservation programmes.
- Discuss mainstreaming of the strategy in the national poverty eradication, water and gender policies.
- To discuss sand dam construction and small business development financing (credit system, community contribution, grants).
- To discuss the need for a permanent structure for information exchange (global network).
- To assess the need for (technical and institutional) support to NGO's/communities working on water conservation development on water (helpdesk function).

Expected output of the workshop

The main output of the workshop to develop a work plan for a GEF project that aims at developing new sand dams in the Kitui district and upscale the method to neighboring districts and possibly other countries

Total Cost of PDF A (including co-financing amounts and sources)

The total cost of the PDF is U\$ 50,000. The requested GEF funding is U\$ 31,000. Matching funds for this phase are about U\$ 19,000. It must be stated however, that the investments of the consortium in preparatory activities is much higher and amount to about U\$ 60,000 – 80,000

7. **Total Workplan and Budget:** [complete template according to Terminology and Sample below. Click [here](#) for template]

Inception phase (PDF) 'Sand Dam project'					
Duration: March 2006- Nov 2006					
Activity	GEF funding	Match IVM	-VU	Match Aqua4all	
	[U\$]	[U\$]		[U\$]	
1 Linking to other projects	4,000	2,000		3,000	
2 Stakeholder inventory	4,000				
3 Desk study		4,000		6,000	
4 Stakeholder Workshop (incl travel)	15,000				
5 Writing full GEF proposal	8,000	4,000			
	31,000	10,000		9,000	
					50,000

8. Management Arrangements

8.1 Roles and Responsibilities of the Parties, including financial and administrative modalities

8.1.1. Information on Applicant Institution

8.1.2. Mandate (capacity assessment) and sources of revenue

9. Monitoring & Evaluation: adapt [standard](#) text as relevant.

The project will comply with UNDP's monitoring, evaluation and reporting requirements, as spelled out in the UNDP Programming Manual. Quarterly progress reports will be submitted to UNDP by the executing agency, providing a brief summary of the status of activities and output delivery, explaining variances from the work plan, and presenting work-plans for each successive quarter for review and endorsement. The Quarterly progress reports will provide a basis for managing disbursements. An Annual Project Report (APR) will be prepared at the end of year 1, summarizing and evaluating work in progress in more detail, and will be reviewed by the Project Steering Committee, which shall make recommendations to the executing agency and UNDP regarding the subsequent scheduling of project activities. A Terminal Report will be prepared upon project completion and reviewed at a terminal PSC meeting.

10. Legal Context (standard text below)

This Project Document shall be the instrument referred to as such in Article I of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between the Government of [name] and the United Nations Development Programme, signed by the parties on [date]. The host country implementing agency shall, for the purpose of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement, refer to the government co-operating agency described in that Agreement.

The UNDP Resident Representative in [location] is authorized to effect in writing the following types of revision to this Project Document, provided that he/she has verified the agreement thereto by the UNDP-GEF Unit and is assured that the other signatories to the Project Document have no objection to the proposed changes:

- a) Revision of, or addition to, any of the annexes to the Project Document;
- b) Revisions which do not involve significant changes in the immediate objectives, outputs or activities of the project, but are caused by the rearrangement of the inputs already agreed to or by cost increases due to inflation;
- c) Mandatory annual revisions which re-phase the delivery of agreed project inputs or increased expert or other costs due to inflation or take into account agency expenditure flexibility; and
- d) Inclusion of additional annexes and attachments only as set out here in this Project Document

11. Mandatory Annexes

Annex 1: TOR for key staff

Annex 2: Government GEF Operational Focal Point Endorsement Letter

SIGNATURE PAGE

Country: _____

UNDAF Outcome(s)/Indicator(s): _____
(Link to UNDAF outcome., If no UNDAF, leave blank)

Expected Outcome(s)/Indicator (s): _____
(CP outcomes linked t the SRF/MYFF goal and service line)

Expected Output(s)/Indicator(s): _____
(CP outcomes linked t the SRF/MYFF goal and service line)

Implementing partner: _____
(designated institution/Executing agency)

Other Partners: _____
(formerly implementing agencies)

Programme Period: _____
Programme Component: _____
Project Title: _____
Project ID: _____
Project Duration: _____
Management Arrangement: _____

Budget	_____
Allocated resources:	_____
• Government	_____
• Regular	_____
• Other:	
o Donor	_____
o Donor	_____
o Donor	_____
• In kind contributions	_____

Agreed by (Government): _____

Agreed by (Implementing partner/Executing agency): _____

Agreed by (UNDP): _____

Notes:

UNDAF Outcome and Indicator(s)

The signature page details the UNDAF outcome(s) as well as the Outcome(s) and Output(s) related to the project. If the UNDAF lists outcomes, they should be included in the signature page. When UNDAF outcomes are not clearly articulated, country teams may decide to either revisit the UNDAF to clarify the outcomes or leave the field blank.

UNDAF Outcome indicators should be listed here.

Expected Outcome(s) and Indicator(s)

Expected Outcomes are Country Programme (CP) outcomes. They should reflect MYFF/SRF outcomes and ACC sector, which will be in the ERP).

Outcome indicator(s) should be listed here.

Expected Output(s) and Indicator(s)

Expected Outputs are Country Programme outputs. They should reflect MYFF/SRF outputs.

Output indicator(s) should be listed here.

Implementing partner:

Same as designated institution in the simplified project document – name of institution responsible for managing the programme or project (formerly referred to as executing agency). Implementing partners include Government, UN agencies, UNDP (see restrictions in Programming Manual Chapter 6) or NGOs.

Other partners:

Formerly referred to as implementing agencies in the simplified project document—partners that have agreed to carry out activities within a nationally executed project. This would include UNDP when it provides Country Office Support to national execution. Private sector companies and NGOs hired as contractors would generally not be included. The agency (i.e. Government, UN agency) that contracts with the private sector company and/or NGO is the responsible party. ‘Other partners’ can also apply to other execution modalities.

When an NGO contributes to an output, it can be noted along with the responsible party with which it contracts (e.g., UNDP/NGO, Govt/NGO). Consistent with current practice the rationale for selecting an NGO as a contractor, must be documented.

Programme period: Refers to the Country Programme period

Programme component: MYFF Goal

Project title, project code, project duration (self explanatory)

Management arrangement: Indicate NEX, AGEX, NGO Execution, DEX

Budget: Total budget minus the General Management Services Fees

General Management Services Fees: This was formerly COA (Country Office Administrative fee) for cost sharing and UNDP Administrative Fee for Trust Funds.

Total budget: Includes the budget and General Management Services Fees. In-kind contributions can be listed under ‘other’ resources. Unfunded amounts cannot be committed until funds are available.

Signatures:

The Implementing partner is the institution responsible for managing the programme or project. (The institution now commonly referred to as the “executing agency” but will now be referred to as the “implementing partner”)

UNDP is the UNDP Resident Representative.

The Government counterpart is the government coordinating authority.

CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF ADAPTATION PROJECTS

	Project Concept Review (delegated to IAs)	Project Brief Review/CEO Approval	Implementation/Completion
1. Country Ownership			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country Eligibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPA/SCCF/LDC: Country be a party (ratified) <i>to the UNFCCC</i> SPA: <i>In addition country be a party (ratified) to other focal area conventions</i> 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country Drivenness 	Concept <u>consistent with priorities</u> of the country as identified in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National communications, NAPA, etc. 	Clear description of project's fit within: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National communications, NAPA, etc 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Endorsement¹ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation with UNFCCC and GEF focal point 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Endorsement by national GEF operational focal point. 	
2. Program & Policy Conformity			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program Designation & Conformity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPA: must produce GEB, enhance ecosystem resilience, long term SCCF: GEB not required, links to development, long term LDC: LDCs only, GEB not required, links to development, short term 	Describe briefly how project objectives are consistent with respective adaptation fund guidelines	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outline the incremental (for 	Describe briefly:	

¹ Country endorsement is mandatory before a MSP Brief is submitted for CEO approval. No endorsement is required for the submission of a MSP Concept Document or draft project brief. However, country operational focal points may choose to endorse the Project Concept Document and state in the endorsement letter that they do not want to endorse the MSP brief. Endorsement is required for the submission of a PDF-A request for MSP project preparation. A PDF-A request could also double as a Concept submission.

	Project Concept Review (delegated to IAs)	Project Brief Review/CEO Approval	Implementation/Completion
	<p>SPA) or additional (for SCCF and LDC) reasoning of the concept, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem statement (must address adaptation to climate change). • Description of sensitivity to climate change: vulnerability to current and projected climatic conditions. Climate change, including vulnerability, must be one of the primary stresses on eco- or human systems. Various NC scenarios should be used. • Use of APF: Reference to APF methodologies to be used during design phase • What would happen without GEF intervention, how would human- and eco-systems develop without adaptation (socio-economic & global environmental consequences) – baseline scenario. • What would happen with GEF intervention, how would human- and eco-systems develop with adaptation (socio-economic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sector issues, root causes, threats, barriers, etc, affecting global environment. • Project logical framework, including a consistent strategy, and details of goals, objectives, outputs, inputs/activities, measurable performance indicators, risks and assumptions. <p>Use of APF: APF methodologies for assessing current vulnerability, likely future risks, strategy formulation, stakeholder engagement and long term planning</p> <p>Hazard-based</p> <p>Vulnerability-based</p> <p>Adaptive-capacity based</p> <p>Policy-based approach</p>	

	Project Concept Review (delegated to IAs)	Project Brief Review/CEO Approval	Implementation/Completion
	& global environmental consequences) – alternate scenario. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPA: Costs associated with delivery of global benefits in the absence of global warming to be covered by focal area allocations • SCCF/LDC: Costs associated with delivery of development benefits in the absence of global warming to be covered by co-financing contributions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Global environmental benefits of project (performance indicators at objective and outcome level should refer to the environmental, socio-economic, institutional and policy/legal impact of the project). • Project cost to be financed by the GEF.² 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability (including financial sustainability) 	Indicate factors that influence continuation of project benefits after completion of project implementation.	Describe briefly specific actions to be undertaken, within and/or outside the project, to address factors that influence continuation of project benefits after completion of project implementation.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replicability³ 	Outline the potential for repeating the project lessons and transferring experience elsewhere. Include a learning component Include link to Adaptation Learning Mechanisms (ALM)	Describe briefly specific actions, with work plan and budget, if any, to foster knowledge transfer (for e.g., dissemination of lessons, training workshops, information exchange, national and regional forum, etc. and	

² The share of the project cost to be borne by the GEF should be related to the incremental reasoning of the project. The project brief should identify partners who will co-finance the project.

³ Replication refers to repeatability of the project under quite similar contexts based on lessons and experience gained. Actions to foster replication include dissemination of results, seminars, training workshops, field visits to project sites, etc.

	Project Concept Review (delegated to IAs)	Project Brief Review/CEO Approval	Implementation/Completion
		provide the budget associated with these efforts. It could also be within project description)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder Involvement/ Intended Beneficiaries 	Identify major stakeholders, relevant to project objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private sector NGOs Communities public agencies marginal groups others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe briefly how stakeholders have been involved in project development. Describe briefly the roles and responsibilities of relevant stakeholders in project implementation. Describe how the marginal groups are going to be involved in the project implementation. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring & Evaluation 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe briefly M&E Plan , based on the project logical framework, including the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget. Organizational arrangements for implementing M&E Specification of indicators for project objectives, outputs and activities, including intermediate benchmarks, and means of measurement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On an annual basis, during project implementation, submit project implementation report to GEF M&E as input into the PIR. Prepare project completion report and submit it to GEF M&E.
3. Financing			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financing Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicate potential sources of co-financing, if known. Indicate financing instrument, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project cost, including: Costing by activity and sub-activity 	

	Project Concept Review (delegated to IAs)	Project Brief Review/CEO Approval	Implementation/Completion
	if known.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Implementation Plan. Financing plan, including commitments by co-financiers. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost-effectiveness 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimate cost effectiveness, if feasible. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-financing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicate the nature of co-financing: whether it is “initial” co-financing critical to project success or “subsequent” co-financing which would be mobilized during implementation. LDC: between 4:1 to 1:4 GEF:Non-GEF SCCF: between 1:1 to 1:4 GEF:Non-GEF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letters of commitment from co-financiers should be attached. Update the financing plan with respect to the status of any co-financing that would be mobilized during implementation. Clearly identify if co-finances are in-kind or in-cash contributions. Provide explanation if co-financing amount or sources included in the MSP Concept Document deviate substantially from the current project brief submitted for CEO approval. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementing Agency should report to the Secretariat any substantive changes on the co-financing arrangements throughout the project cycle.
4. Institutional Coordination & Support			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Core commitments & Linkages 		Describe how the proposed project is located within the IA’s: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country/regional/global/sector programs. GEF activities with potential 	

	Project Concept Review (delegated to IAs)	Project Brief Review/CEO Approval	Implementation/Completion
		influence on the proposed project (design and implementation).	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation, Coordination and Collaboration between IAs, and IAs and ExAs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that project does not duplicate/overlap with activities of other IAs and ExAs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe how the proposed project relates to activities of other IAs (and relevant ExAs) in the country/region. Describe planned/agreed coordination, collaboration between IAs/ExAs in project implementation. Provide documentation to support these consultations and agreements (e.g. minutes of the meetings, memos, MOUs, etc.) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation/execution arrangements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain how the IA will ensure a high quality technical and financial implementation of the project (e.g. international project coordinator, supervision by country-based staff or HQ, UNOPS, arrangements with other involved agencies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attach a written plan for implementation/execution arrangements, or clearly address the plan in the Project Executive Summary. 	
5. Response to Reviews			
GEF Secretariat		Respond to upstream comments from GEFSEC, if applicable.	
Convention Secretariat		Respond to upstream comments from Convention Secretariat, if applicable.	
Other IAs and relevant ExAs.		Respond to upstream comments	

	Project Concept Review (delegated to IAs)	Project Brief Review/CEO Approval	Implementation/Completion
		by other IAs and relevant ExAs, if applicable.	
Review by expert from STAP Roster (Optional)		Respond to review by expert from STAP roster.	