



Sustainable management of water and rangeland resources for enhanced climate resilience of rural communities in Djibouti

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11284

Countries

Djibouti

Project Name

Sustainable management of water and rangeland resources for enhanced climate resilience of rural communities in Djibouti

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

6/27/2024

Review completed by PM

11/22/2024

Program Manager

Ladu David Morris Lemi

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

**PIF
CEO**

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Nov 26 2024

No.

UNDP has been identified as an Executing partners, but this is not reflected in the information table.
Please include UNDP alongside MEDD

GEFSEC DEC 12 2024

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP 10 Dec 2024

Thank you, this has been done; UNDP's role as Executing Partner is revised as advised. The changes are reflected on the information of the project/cover page of the CEO ER and 'Section 4: Roles and Responsibilities of the Project Organization Structure' under Institutional Arrangement and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project segment of the GEF portal and CEO ER document.

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

Yes

Agency Response

2. Project Summary.

- a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?**
- b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes

Agency Response

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**
- b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?**
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes. In addition, please make sure that all KM and communications products feature good practices and lessons learned on gender mainstreaming/women's empowerment, and capture the socio-economic benefits generated for women. During project implementation, please ensure that the PIRs, the MTE and the TE include an analysis and review of the Gender Action Plan and all the relevant gender dimensions of the project.

d) Yes

e) Yes, however, a slight adjustment is required in the Co-financing contribution which stands currently at 5.2%.

GEFSEC OCT 14 2024

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP, Aug 25, 2024

c) We acknowledge the importance of integrating gender dimensions. We will ensure that all Knowledge Management and communication products highlight gender practices and socio-economic benefits for women. The Gender Action Plan will be reviewed in the PIRs, MTE, and TE, with appropriate resources allocated in the budget to support these efforts.

e) The PMC co-financing has been revised to USD 4,500,000, which now constitutes 4.73% of the total co-financing amount. This adjustment ensures alignment with the GEF-financed PMC, which has also been revised to 4.9% of the total GEF financing budget, up from 4.76% following the review comments. These adjustments ensure that the PMC remains within the acceptable range as required, addressing the feedback provided while maintaining compliance with GEF guidelines.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?
- c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) N/A

Agency Response

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust

approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

d) N/A

e) Yes

f) Yes

g) The project design ensures resilience to future changes by focusing on four components including

i) institutional capacity to plan and prepare for climate change; ii) improving local resilience to

climate hazards through adaptation measures; iii) exploiting opportunities for economic development in the context of climate change; and iv) providing strengthened knowledge management environment to enable more effective climate change adaptation at all levels.

h) Yes

i) Yes

j) Yes

k) Yes

l) Yes

Agency Responseg) well noted

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?

b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?

c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

a) Yes. The GEF has taken note of UNDP involvement in the execution of this project and that a letter of support has been provided by the OFP. UNDP's Manager for this project is, therefore, requested to include his/her approval in the comment section of the portal for this arrangement.

b) The GEF Agency has conducted a HACT micro-assessment of the Implementing Partner (Ministry of Environment) and the findings suggested that UNDP will be involved in providing execution support particularly in financial management including payroll management support to facilitate the execution of the project activities.

c) Yes

GEFSEC OCT 14 2024

Cleared

Agency Response

- a) Regional Technical Advisor for this project expressed his approval for this arrangement.
- b) Well noted.

5.3 Core indicators

- a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?
 - b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?
- Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

- a) Yes
- b) Yes

Agency Response

5.4 Risks

- a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?
- b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

- a) No. Please complete the Key risk table by providing an explanation of risk and mitigation measures for overall risk rating.
- b) As in "a" above
- c) Yes

GEFSEC OCT 14 2024

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP, August 25, 2024

- a) The overall risk comment has been added to the CEO on page 47. In addition to the Risks to Project Implementation Section, we have included a detailed Risk Register, which provides explanations of risks and corresponding mitigation measures, as requested. This Risk Register is identical to Annex 6 of the UNDP ProDoc and covers all relevant risk categories, ensuring comprehensive risk management and mitigation.
- b) The detailed Risk Register, included as Annex 6 of the UNDP ProDoc, outlines these risks, their mitigation measures, and provides an overall risk rating that considers the effectiveness of these measures.

5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

N/A

Agency Response

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

a) Yes

Agency Response

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

a) Yes. However, since there are several outcomes/outputs which are related to proactive drought management, its not clear whether the project is aligned with the National Drought Plan (NDP), or if there are plans to align it to this plan, and if so, how the project can contribute to the implementation of the NDP.

GEFSEC OCT 14 2024

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP, Aug 25, 2024

Djibouti has not yet developed a National Drought Plan (NDP). However, the proposed project demonstrates strong alignment with Djibouti's National Risk and Disaster Management Policy (2006), as outlined in the 'Consistency with national strategies and plans' section of the Project Document (pages 19-22). The project has been designed to address the identified barriers through strategic interventions across its four outcomes.

Specifically, project activities under Outcome 1.1 and Outcome 1.2 are aligned with the objectives of the National Risk and Disaster Management Policy (2006). To enhance clarity, we have incorporated references to the policy within the relevant activities of Outcome 1.1 (page 33) and Outcome 1.2 (page 34), thereby illustrating the project's contributions.

Outcome 1.1, through Output 1.1.1, supports Article 2 of the policy by facilitating the development and updating of regional and national climate risk, vulnerability, and impact assessments.

Additionally, Outcome 1.2 contributes to the operationalization of gender-responsive Early Warning Systems (EWS) for flood and drought preparedness (Output 1.2.2) and aligns with Article 9 by equipping and training community focal points for inclusive, community-based, and gender-sensitive EWS flood preparedness (Output 1.2.1), thereby supporting Article 15's focus on community initiatives.

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

N/A

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

Yes.

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

a) No. Please provide/upload the Gender Action Plan developed for this project

GEFSEC OCT 14 2024

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP, Aug 25, 2024

- a) The Gender Analysis and Action Plan (GAAP) has been uploaded as Annex H. This document is identical to Annex 10 of the UNDP Project Document and provides a comprehensive outline of the gender-related actions and strategies for this project.

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

Yes.

However the Stakeholder Engagement Plan reference only stakeholder groups and does not detail any specific names of civil society, youth, women or farmers groups. Please provide further details.

GEFSEC OCT 14 2024

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP, Aug 25, 2024

The comment is well noted. We have added the requested details in Annex 8 of the UNDP Project Document. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan has also been attached as Annex I in the CEO Endorsement Request Document. The additional information includes the names of community members?both women and men?youth groups, agriculture/agro-pastoral cooperatives, civil society organizations, farmers, academia, and various government and development partners. Additionally, the revised Stakeholder Engagement Plan features a table listing potential collaborators for the implementation phase of the project.

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

Yes

Agency Response

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

Yes (LD Focal Area)

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

Yes (LD)

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

Yes

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

No

Agency Response

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

No

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

No

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

Yes

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

Yes

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

Yes.

However, UNDP's letter of co-financing support for the amount of \$33,300,000.00 is not dated. Please provide an updated letter and estimation of the actual amount that will go to the project considering the timeframe of both the co-finance and the GEF project.

GEFSEC OCT 14 2024

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP, Aug 25, 2024

It is well noted. The UNDP letter of co-financing support has been updated with a more recent date of 20/05/2024. The estimated amount of \$33,300,000.00 remains accurate and aligned with the project's timeframe as detailed in the Confirmed Co-financing table of the CEO ER on page 57, ensuring consistency between the co-financing commitment and the GEF project.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:

Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

N/A

Agency Response

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

N/A

Agency Response

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

N/A

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

d) Yes

Agency Response

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

Yes. However, the geodata provided have no decimal points causing errors. Please correct the latitude and longitude in Decimal Degrees WGS84 format.

GEFSEC OCT 14 2024

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP, Aug 25, 2024

The latitude and longitude coordinates have been converted to Decimal Degrees in WGS84 format as requested. The updated coordinates are now provided in Annex E of the CEO Endorsement Request Document.

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes. However, **(1)** under equipment, there is an allocation of \$148K for the rental of cars. This cost is normally expected to be borne by the co-financed portion of PMCs as GEF strongly discourages the use of its funds to purchase/rent vehicles. You are advised that any request to use GEF funding to purchase project vehicles must be justified by the exceptional specific circumstances of the project/program.

(2) Under contractual services, we have noticed that a Chief Technical Advisor and a Project Coordinator are charged to the project components. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC, not project components. Please refer to paragraph 4 ? page 42 of the Guidelines to understand when project's staff could be charged to the project's components.

c) No. Although there is a procurement plan uploaded to the portal that indicates future recruitment of consultants, there is no TORs document added. Please provide a copy of the planned TORs for those positions.

GEFSEC October 30 2024

1. We acknowledge your response to the previous comments. As we stated earlier, the GEF expects the cost related to car purchase/rental to be taken care of by the project's co-finance portion of PMC, not by the GEF grant. Hence, we advise that you revise the plan accordingly by ensuring that the allocated \$148K comes from the PMC co-finance portion.
2. Usually, recruitment of project staff are charged to the PMC not project component. We have taken note of your explanation below. However, we require the TOR for the Chief Technical Advisor and a Project Coordinator to assess their relevance to the project components charged.
3. In the procurement plan (Annex K), ensure that there is not overlaps in the period your require the services of National Expert #6 and #11.
4. You have allocated \$28k for project laptops. We feel that this amount is too much and might lead to large quantities of laptops than what is needed for the project. Alternatively, this cost could be covered by co-financing.

GEFSEC Nov 26 2024

Thanks for addressing the car rental issue and for sending the ToR for the two positions.

We have observed some areas and have suggested modification as follow.

1. Cost for Execution Services: Earlier this year, the GEF Secretariat had requested UNDP to internalize such costs,. You are, therefore, advised to remove the "Execution Services" charges of (US\$520,268 + US\$117,786) from the budget and then use the resources to cover any expenses for the Project Management.

2. The budget table: The table contains several sub-divisions making readability hard. Please use only components to improve the table. you are also requested to put all the costs of the PMU in one budget line.

3. PC and CTA Roles: After reviewing the ToRs for the Project Coordinator and the Chief Technical Adviser, we noticed overlap of responsibilities and the two roles alone would cost \$1,055,664 of the project fund and costs are all above average. We advise that the two positions be merged into one. Given that the PC will at some point assume both role in the later stage of the project, we discourage the CTA role which has very high cost of more \$811,000. Part of this

resources should be reallocated to PMC and some project activities that directly benefit local farmers instead of salaries. If the CTA role is deemed necessary, then one of the positions (PC or CTA) should be 100% covered by co-financing.

GEFSEC DEC 12 2024

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP, 12 Dec 2024

1. The execution services charges previously included in the project budget have been reallocated to strengthen the Project Management Unit (PMU) in line with the GEF Secretariat's request to internalize such costs. UNDP recognizes the fiduciary risks highlighted by the HACT and PCAT assessments and has proposed a robust Capacity Development Plan for the Implementing Partner (IP). The reallocated funds will be used to enhance PMU capacities, particularly in procurement, financial management, and human resources management. These enhancements will mitigate fiduciary risks while ensuring effective project delivery. To ensure sustainability and capacity building, the PMU staff will receive on-the-job training from UNDP operations staff, supporting the overall goal of strengthening the IP's execution capabilities. By reallocating the execution support service fees to build in-house PMU capacity, the extent of execution support required from UNDP will be reduced, aligning the approach with GEF requirements and enhancing national ownership of the project.
2. The budget table has been simplified in line with the advice provided by the GEF Secretariat. All sub-divisions have been consolidated under the main project components to improve readability, reducing the length of the table. Additionally, all costs associated with project execution support has been reallocated to activities related to strengthening the Project Management Unit (PMU). The updated budget table reflects these changes and ensures a more streamlined. presentation.
3. We would like to clarify that the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) role was originally proposed for recruitment for a period of three years, not for the full six-year project duration. The amounts referenced in the comment appear to be based on a misinterpretation, assuming the CTA's costs apply for the entire project duration. To address this, the simplified budget sheet provides a clearer breakdown of the requested amounts.

Additionally, to align with the guidance and further streamline the budget, we have revised the role of the CTA to be that of an **International Climate Change Adaptation Expert**. This expert will lead critical components of the project, including Component 1, Outcome 2.1, Outcome 2.3, and Outcome 3.1, and co-lead Outcome 2.2 with the International Engineer.

The project has a high degree of complexity and introduces several innovative approaches tailored to Djibouti's unique context. A senior international expert is essential to spearhead the implementation of these approaches, ensure successful recruitment of subject matter experts, and provide capacity building and knowledge transfer to the government counterparts and stakeholders. This role is integral to ensuring the project's success and achieving its intended outcomes.

The updated budget allocation for the **International Climate Change Adaptation Expert's salary** is **USD (342,840)** for (2.5) years. Meanwhile, the **Project Coordinator's salary**, covering the entire duration of the project, is **USD 180,000**.

The Project Coordinator (PC) will primarily focus on coordinating the project components, day-to-management of the project activities and overseeing stakeholder engagement. Given the distinct responsibilities of the PC and the revised role of the International Climate Change Expert, it is not feasible to merge these two positions. Additionally, since both roles are project-specific and not UNDP staff positions, it is not possible to cover them through co-financing.

UNDP Nov 2024

1. We acknowledge the GEF Secretariat's guidance regarding the allocation for car purchase/rental expenses. In line with your advice, the project plan has been revised to ensure that the \$148,000 for car rental is now covered as co-finance by UNDP. An updated co-finance letter reflecting this adjustment has also been provided.

2. We acknowledge the requirement for further details on the recruitment of project staff. Please note that the Chief Technical Advisor and Project Coordinator will not be UNDP project staff; instead, they will be seconded to the Government of Djibouti. The Terms of Reference (ToR) for both roles have been included in Annex-7 TORs for your review.

3. Well noted, National Expert #6 ends Oct 2026 and #11 starts Nov 2026

4. We appreciate the Secretariat's careful review of the budget and their commitment to ensuring the efficient use of GEF resources. We understand the concern regarding the allocation of \$28,000 for laptops. Which are listed under (*IT equipment PMU @USD 1,500/unit for 15 units-and common use IT equipment @USD 10,000 GEF TF = USD 32,500, Total: 32,500*), Therefore, we would like to clarify that the budget for laptop is **\$22,500**, which we affirm is an essential investment to ensure the project's success. This allocation supports both field operations and data-intensive activities critical to this climate resilience initiative.

Given that the project involves extensive fieldwork in remote and rural areas of Djibouti focusing on sustainable water and rangeland management to enhance climate resilience reliable IT equipment is indispensable. It is essential for project staff to collect, analyze, and manage data

critical to these activities. The laptops are allocated to key project personnel, including field officers, data analysts, and technical specialists directly involved in implementing project components. They will be used for specialized tasks such as Geographic Information Systems (GIS) mapping, climate modeling, and resource assessment, which require high-performance specifications to run effectively. Therefore, **15 laptops at \$1,500 each, totaling \$22,500**, are needed to equip these personnel adequately. The IT equipment is indispensable for executing the project's GEF-funded components, particularly those involving data-driven approaches to sustainable resource management and climate resilience strategies. Providing project-dedicated equipment ensures that all team members have the necessary tools to perform their duties effectively, reducing delays and increasing the quality of outputs.

Our co-financing partners have allocated their contributions toward complementary activities. Redirecting funds to cover IT equipment would strain these areas and potentially hinder the project's overall impact. Moreover, the equipment will serve the project throughout its duration and, upon completion, will be handed over to the Government of Djibouti, contributing to sustainability and ongoing capacity building.

We are committed to the responsible and efficient use of GEF resources and believe that this allocation is both justified and necessary. We kindly request that this expenditure remains under the GEF grant to provide the project team with the essential tools required for success.

The allocation of 15 laptops is based on the specific roles outlined in the recruitment plan, each of which is essential for the successful implementation of the project. Below is the justification for this allocation:

1. **Administrative and Financial Assistant (1 laptop):**
 - Recruitment Plan Reference:** Position 2.
 - Justification:** Responsible for administrative tasks and financial management. Requires a laptop for accounting software, budgeting, and financial reporting.
2. **Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Officer (1 laptop):**
 - Recruitment Plan Reference:** Position 3.
 - Justification:** Oversees data collection, monitors project progress, and evaluates outcomes. Needs a laptop for data analysis software and management of monitoring systems.
3. **Knowledge Management and Communications Officer (1 laptop):**
 - Recruitment Plan Reference:** Position 5.
 - Justification:** Manages information dissemination and communication strategies. Needs a laptop for content creation, managing digital platforms, and stakeholder engagement.
4. **Regional Field Officers (4 laptops):**
 - Recruitment Plan Reference:** Positions 6 to 9.
 - Justification:** Four officers covering each of the project's target regions. Responsible for on-the-ground implementation, community engagement, and data collection. Laptops are essential for recording field data, accessing project resources, and maintaining communication with the central team.
5. **International Chief Technical Advisor (1 laptop):**
 - Recruitment Plan Reference:** Position 10.

●**Justification:** Provides technical leadership and expertise. Requires a laptop for coordinating project activities, technical reporting, and communication with international stakeholders.

6. **International Engineer (1 laptop):**

●**Recruitment Plan Reference:** Position 11.

●**Justification:** Oversees technical aspects of infrastructure development. Needs a laptop for engineering designs, technical documentation, and coordination with local engineers and contractors.

7. **Livelihood Consultant (1 laptop):**

●**Recruitment Plan Reference:** Position 12.

●**Justification:** Works on value chain development and supports micro, small, and medium enterprises (MSMEs). Requires a laptop for data analysis, report writing, and coordination with beneficiaries.

8. **Agropastoral Consultant (1 laptop):**

●**Recruitment Plan Reference:** Position 13.

●**Justification:** Provides technical expertise on agropastoral practices. Needs a laptop for research, field data analysis, and developing technical guidance.

9. **National Engineer (1 laptop):**

●**Recruitment Plan Reference:** Position 14.

●**Justification:** Supports infrastructure projects at the national level. Requires a laptop for technical drawings, GIS mapping, and coordination with the international engineer.

10. **Administrative and Financial Officer (1 laptop):**

●**Recruitment Plan Reference:** Position 15.

●**Justification:** Manages administrative and financial aspects at a higher level. Needs a laptop for financial oversight, reporting, and coordination with the administrative assistant.

11. **Procurement Officer (1 laptop):**

●**Recruitment Plan Reference:** Position 16.

●**Justification:** Manages procurement processes, including tender documentation and supplier communication. Requires a laptop for maintaining procurement records and ensuring compliance with policies.

12. **Procurement Associate (1 laptop):**

●**Recruitment Plan Reference:** Position 17.

●**Justification:** Assists the Procurement Officer with procurement-related tasks. Needs a laptop for documentation and coordination.

UNDP, Aug 25, 2024

b) (1) The GEF policy regarding the use of funds for vehicle purchases is well noted. Given the project's focus on remote sites, where access is only possible via robust 4x4 vehicles due to poor road conditions, we emphasize that close monitoring of the water infrastructure construction (which constitutes approximately 80% of the total GEF financing) is critical. The existing vehicles from the ministry and UNDP do not meet the necessary safety standards for frequent

travel to these remote sites. Therefore, renting well-maintained 4x4 vehicles with adequate insurance coverage is the most viable solution. This rental is exclusively for field purposes, while urban transportation needs are covered by co-financing. The proposed vehicle rental budget, including the driver and fuel, represents approximately 0.7% of the total GEF financing, which is crucial to the successful implementation of the project.

b) (2) The Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) will focus on technical expertise in ecosystem services and nature-based solutions, with no management functions. The CTA's role is critical in ensuring that the technical aspects of the project are effectively translated into high-quality interventions. The Project Coordinator, who will also assume the role of Project Manager, is expected to bring relevant technical expertise, particularly as the CTA's position is funded only for the first three years. Post-Mid-Term Review (MTR), the Project Coordinator will take on the additional functions of the CTA. Accordingly, the CTA's salary is allocated under Outcomes 1.1, 2.1, and 2.2, while the Project Coordinator's salary is charged to the PMC for the first three years and to Outcomes 2.3, 3.1, and 4.1 in subsequent years, reflecting their expanded role.

c) The Terms of Reference (ToRs) aligned with the Procurement Plan have been attached as Annex K. This document corresponds to Annex 7 of the UNDP Project Document, with the ToRs for PMU staff beginning at the start and those for consultants beginning on page 12. The Procurement Plan itself is included as Annex 11 in the UNDP Project Document.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC Jul 30 2024

a) N/A

b) N/A

c) N/A

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC Nov 15 2024

Yes

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC DEC 12 2024

N/A

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/30/2024	10/8/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/14/2024	11/12/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/30/2024	12/10/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/27/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/12/2024	