

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

Review PIF 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**

4/13/2023

**Review completed by PM**

5/19/2023

**Program Manager**

Ladu David Morris Lemi

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## **GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET**

### **1. General Project Information / Eligibility**

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes

Agency's Comments

### **2. Project Summary**

**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 results?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

### **3 Indicative Project Overview**

**3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?**

**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?**

Secretariat's Comments

a)The project objective is clear.

b)The project components are severally repeated. For example, there is M&E actions that are not under component 4. Outcomes 3, 4 and 6 as well as outputs 3.2 and 6.4 are repeated. Please revise.

Okay, cleared

#### Agency's Comments

##### **UNDP, 19 May 2023**

b) M&E actions (output 6.4) are now entirely integrated under the M&E component in the portal. In the word document, they appear under component 4. The outcomes 3, 4 and 6 were repeated in the portal to reflect the difference in sources of funds (GEFTF and LDCF), this included splitting outputs 3.2 and 6.4 (now 6.3) which are funded by both GEFTF and LDCF. In the word document, these outcomes and outputs are not repeated.

Note that output 6.3 was deleted as it was overlapping with output 6.2.

**3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

Please reflect gender perspectives / gender equality considerations in Component 4 on Knowledge Management, in particular, in Outputs 6.1 and 6.3; and in 6.4 on Monitoring and evaluation

Okay, cleared

#### Agency's Comments

##### **UNDP, 19 May 2023**

The description of component 4, in section B. Project Description, was updated to strengthen gender perspectives/equality considerations:

?Component 4 will integrate gender-sensitive approaches in knowledge and communication products, to ensure that best practices and lessons learned from the project are shared in a way that takes into account the specific needs, experiences and contributions of different genders. By integrating a gender perspective, the project will promote inclusion and address existing gender inequalities and biases and promote gender equality and women's empowerment.

Gender-sensitive knowledge and communication products will be disseminated through the existing knowledge management platform, which will be further strengthened to increase its impact on gender issues. This platform will share information and resources with regional and national stakeholders, ensuring that gender-sensitive approaches reach decision-makers, policymakers, and technical experts. In addition, the platform will

facilitate the exchange of knowledge and experiences between communities, thereby fostering a collaborative learning environment.

Under output 6.1, knowledge-generating interventions related to climate change adaptation, water and land resource management, and sustainable livelihood practices will be shared on the knowledge management platform. A gender analysis will accompany these interventions to highlight differential impacts on women, men, and other gender identities.

Output 6.2 will focus specifically on the dissemination of best practices and lessons learned among communities. This will involve the development of gender-sensitive guidelines that address the specific challenges faced in adopting and scaling up sustainable livelihood practices. The knowledge management platform supported under outcome 6.1 will play a crucial role in sharing these guidelines and facilitating their replication and scaling up.

To ensure the effectiveness and impact of gender-responsive interventions, output 6.3 will focus on the development and implementation of a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan. This plan will include the collection and analysis of sex-disaggregated data to assess the outcomes and impact of interventions. The results will inform decision-making processes, allowing for adjustments and improvements to maximize sustainable results and investments made by the project.?

**3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?**

**b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**

**c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's Comments

b) Please provide the proportion of the stated co-financing contribution to PMC in addition to the indicated GEF contribution (max 5% scale).

Okay, cleared

Agency's Comments

**UNDP, 19 May 2023**

The co-financing budget is re-arranged to allocate 5% of total co-financing amount for PMC (pages 4-5). Total co-financing was also reduced based on follow-up discussions with the partners; however, more options will be explored during the PPG Phase. Changes are reflected in the revised version of the PIF. The PMC calculation section of the budget is presented below.

<b>Project Objective</b>	<b>Enhancing climate change resilience for rural communities to promote food, water and livelihood security by improving water access through water resource management and infrastructure, improved institutional capacity and climate risk preparedness</b>		
	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>(in \$)</b>	
		<b>GEF Project Financing</b>	<b>Co-financing</b>
<b>Project Management Cost (PMC)</b> (if this is an MTF project, please report separate PMC lines for each TF).	<b>LDCF</b>	859,458	2,000,000
	<b>GEF TF</b>	139,405	1,000,000
	<b>Total PMC</b>	<b>998,863</b>	<b>3,000,000</b>
<b>Total Budget (Outcomes)</b>		<b>19,977,284</b>	<b>60,300,000</b>
<b>Total Budget (PMC + Outcomes)</b>		<b>20,976,147</b>	<b>63,300,000</b>
	<b>PMC in %</b>	<b>4,76%</b>	<b>4,74%</b>

#### 4 Project Outline

##### A. Project Rationale

##### 4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes.

Agency's Comments

##### 4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) 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?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

a & b) Yes

c) The current presentation does not adequately provide an analysis of past or ongoing projects in different parts of Djibouti. Although we acknowledge the description about how the proposed project will align with previous/ongoing investments, there is no any analysis of lessons learnt from those projects. We would like to see more analysis from previous projects to build on the lessons learned and best practices given that GEF had previously supported projects on drought and floods in both Dikhill and Tadjourah regions.

d) No information currently specifies the role of the various stakeholders consulted in the project lifecycle. Please clarify.

Okay, cleared

#### Agency's Comments

**UNDP, 19 May 2023**

Text was added in the PIF under the 'Baseline Projects' section to provide an analysis and present lessons learned from past and ongoing projects, including bilaterally funded emergency projects. The proposed project will align with these lessons learned. The following text was added:

'Relevant projects include the Adaillou Project (2014-2018), the Petit Bara Project (2015-2019) and the CCCD Project (2019-2022) which built institutional capacity and improved access to water and livelihoods of vulnerable people impacted by CC in Djibouti. In addition, an ongoing GEF project in one of the highly water-stressed regions 'Chekheiti Watershed area, helps improve access to water to support agro-pastoral communities through a watershed management approach. Moreover, recently concluded USAID and African Development Bank projects on socio-economic recovery and flood response have been insightful in understanding the behaviour of vulnerable agro-pastoral communities and socio-economic implications in the event of climate risks.

Lessons learned from these projects were taken into considerations during the project formulation and will serve as baseline during the PPG phase. These include:

i. Climate change adaptation interventions need to be designed based on in-depth consultations with local communities and authorities to better understand and identify historical trends and traditional practices adopted by communities in the event of floods and droughts.

ii. The lack of hydrogeological assessments and dissemination of ground water flow patterns is one of the key drivers of increasing water stress in the regions.

iii. During droughts, community members dig wells until they finally strike an aquifer, leading to uncontrolled extraction, with no proper storage mechanisms, causing wastage of water.

iv. Communities build their wells inside wadis (drainage courses formed by water exclusively irrigated during rainy season), which are washed away or damaged by the debris during the rainy seasons.

v. In the absence of information of the groundwater flow, water tables and aquifer recharge mechanisms, the locals and development projects continue to dig wells haphazardly, creating further stress on the water availability in these water deficient areas.

vi. The consultation with the local communities is important to guide the projects on the status of the past projects and also to be informed about the past successes, failures and attempts of improving water access in their respective communities.

vii. The lack of coordination between different stakeholders including ministries, development partners and local actors results in overlap, duplication of effort and misuse of resources. It is important to adopt an integrated and multi-sectoral approach to address environmental and climate challenges. This involves coordination and collaboration between different sectoral partners such as the environment, agriculture, energy, and the ministry in charge of gender issues, to address the problems in a holistic manner and maximize synergies between the actions taken.

viii. Communities should be involved from the early stages of project planning and implementation to ensure the relevance and effectiveness of projects.

ix. The lack of sustainable funding can limit the long-term impact of interventions and make it difficult to continue activities once the initial project funding has been exhausted, and the lack of an exit strategy if not properly put in place can jeopardize the sustainability and continuity of results achieved.

x. Strong monitoring and evaluation mechanism can strengthen the capacity to measure real results and impacts throughout the project. The absence of robust monitoring and evaluation mechanisms can make it difficult to identify problems, adjust strategies and learn from the organization.

This project has been formulated in such a way that the lessons learned from previous projects can be used to propose activities and solutions to address the problems identified.?

d) Key Stakeholders are listed and their roles during project formulation and implementation is explained under the 'Stakeholders' section in the revised PIF (pages 27-29)

The formulation team conducted consultation with key stakeholders, to be engaged throughout the project lifecycle. The below table presents these stakeholders and their roles during project formulation and implementation:

Stakeholder	Role in the project
Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MESD)	The MESD is the <b>implementing partner and GEF Operational Focal ministry</b> . The MESD will have central role in technical guidance as well as for the national level facilitation and coordination with the sectoral ministries and entities.
Ministry of Agriculture	The Ministry of Agriculture is the key sectoral ministry. It is the authority on the hydrogeology, agriculture and agro-infrastructure as well as the scientific research on the floods, drought and other climate risks. The MESD had provided the potential sites of intervention in consultation with the Ministry of Agriculture based on the existing data and information on the climate risks and vulnerabilities.
<b>Local authorities</b>	Engaging local authorities was crucial from the pre-conception phase to support multi-dimensional ownership of the institutional mechanisms being planned in the project, in particular with regards to community based early warning systems and community-based resource (mainly water) governance mechanisms. As the MESD does not have any regional presence, field-based projects were centrally implemented and managed. Local presence is however key for effective and efficient project interventions as demonstrated by the USAID-funded flagship project, where UNDP installed locally recruited regional coordinators based in the Regional Council offices and working closely with Regional Council Presidents. Building upon this recently established regional mechanisms, the proposed project appraised the Regional and local authorities during the conceptual phase and will elaborate on the similar local coordination mechanisms during the formulation phase
Local communities	During PIF formulation, visit to all the potential sites were conducted to understand the terrain and to hear and learn from local communities about historical and most recent trends of climate risks and their coping mechanisms. The consultations were also helpful to make an inventory of the past and ongoing adaptation work in the region to understand potential synergies and complementarities.
Line ministries (public works, higher education and research, women and family, finance, youth and culture, and budget)	These institutions are important to build upon the whole-of-government approach to climate resilience and climate-responsive and gender-aware local planning for better integration of climate priorities into the national and regional development plans and budget.



Development partners	Roundtable discussion for mutual sharing of experiences and lessons learned from their past and ongoing projects were conducted. The formulation team also conducted bilateral discussions with partners with upcoming projects for potential co-financing. These bilateral meetings mark the beginning of co-creation for some of the projects such as those being planned by the African Development Bank and Intergovernmental Agency for Development, whereas for partners like IFAD, World Bank, FAO and WFP, consultations helped to co-appraise both the parties on the upcoming projects and establish mechanisms for synchronization of the project interventions for bigger and longer impact on the climate resilience among the vulnerable communities.
----------------------	---

## 5 B. Project Description

### 5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

- a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?
- b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

#### Secretariat's Comments

Please revise the TC to improve on the justification on how the different pathways will contribute to the change.

Okay, cleared

#### Agency's Comments

**UNDP, 19 May 2023**

The Theory of Change (TC) was revised to reflect the changes following the response to the Secretariat's comments. A justification was provided under Section ?B. Project description?, as follows:

?To enhance climate change resilience against droughts and floods for rural communities in Djibouti, the proposed project will promote food, water and livelihood security by increasing water access through enhanced water resource management and infrastructure. In addition, the project will improve institutional capacity and climate risk preparedness. In the proposed alternative (with project) scenario, barriers to climate resilience will be removed by: i) enhancing the institutional capacity and policy development for climate change adaptation and climate information in Djibouti; ii) improving water and land resource management; and iii) supporting sustainable community livelihoods.

The Theory of Change of the proposed project is expressed as follows:

IF vulnerable rural communities receive support for an integrated approach for establishing resilient access to water supply and agro-pastoral livelihoods, inclusive of

production inputs, skill development, affordable finance, value chain development and marketing,

IF the government capacities to implement and scale-up the ecosystem based adaptation and integrated watershed management for improvement of natural resources and improve agro-pastoral practices

IF early warning systems are installed at the community and regional level enabling the communities and the local governments to facilitate better data collection, analysis and dissemination of gender-responsive early warnings

IF adequate climate resilient water infrastructures are constructed in the most water-deficient and water stressed areas

THEN the resilience of the agro-pastoral and climate-vulnerable communities (men and women) are enhanced to ensure long-term viability of agro-pastoral livelihoods,

BECAUSE vulnerable rural communities have access to reliable water sources, knowledge and skills to maintain their agricultural livelihoods, a strengthened extension support network and a strategy for public investments for climate resilient agriculture, climate-responsive local development plans and budget and an environment conducive for private sector actors to work with the target rural communities.

The theory of change is based on the following assumptions:

- Assumption 1: Planners are willing to engage in cross sectoral planning and budgeting

- Assumption 2: Local communities and all project stakeholders actively participate in and support the implementation of EbA interventions

- Assumption 3: Grey infrastructure will be sufficient for meeting community water needs

- Assumption 4. Sustainable land management practices will improve the provision of ecosystem services, including increased water quality.

- Assumption 5. Local communities actively uptake and engage in sustainable livelihood development?

## 5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

## 5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

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

#### Secretariat's Comments

There is currently contradicting statement on the project execution. In one part, it states that UNDP will execute the project, and in the other, UNDP will provide country support for the ministry who will be implementing the project according the signed letter of endorsement provided. Please clarify and provide a support letter from the OFP confirming the direct executing functions and for the PPG management.

You still need to provide more inform here. UNDP is shown as the executing partner for the PPG and in the checklist provided, it reads as follows: *?The implementation support was requested by the Government through a letter of agreement ??* (page 5 of the check list doc). Could you share by uploading a copy of that LOA, requesting for the support?).

Okay, cleared

#### Agency's Comments

**UNDP, 22 May 2023**

A letter for the execution of the PPG and a letter for the execution support to national implementation were signed by the GEF OFP. They are now uploaded on the GEF portal.

**UNDP, 19 May 2023**

MESD will be responsible for the implementation of the project under the supported-National Implementation Modality (supported-NIM), with UNDP providing country support to the ministry. Execution support will be based on the findings and recommendations of the recent audit of the MESD and the partner capacity assessment undertaken by UNDP. In addition, based on the HACT micro-assessment, NIM audit and PCAT findings and recommendations, UNDP has put in place a capacity building plan to help MESD to transition from ?assisted NIM? to full NIM to implement the project. It is expected that UNDP will support the implementation of the project during the first two years, and transition to full NIM in the subsequent years. A letter of agreement will be signed between the MESD and UNDP during PPG in accordance with UNDP policies and procedures, specifying execution functions, mainly procurement and finances. Execution support will be clearly outlined in the CEO endorsement request, in particular under the management arrangements section. The letter of agreement for execution support will be signed based on the specificities identified and elaborated during the formulation phase.

As accredited entity, UNDP will also perform oversight functions, including technical oversight of the project interventions. This oversight will be done in three layers ? at the country office, regional and HQ levels. The separation of execution and oversight functions will be ensured at the Country Office level.

UNDP will also be responsible for the implementation of the PPG. All project formulations are conducted in partnership with the national partners, under Direct Implementation Modality (DIM). This is the standard practice for project formulation and a letter is not required for PPG management.

**5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?**

**b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

Please clarify this statement as its not clear how you arrived at the 4000 target. "The proposed project will targeting 6 sites throughout the four target regions ? Ali Sabieh, Dikhil, Tajdoura and Obock. It is estimated that approximately 1,000 ha per site will undergo restoration activities, resulting in a total of 4,000 ha of restored land".

Also provide methodological approach and underlying logic to justify target levels for core indicators 3 and 4. For Core Indicator 11, on Direct beneficiaries, the number is very large. Please review the number to ensure it includes only direct beneficiaries. You may refer to pages 24-25 of the GEF-8 Results Measurement Framework Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01) which provide examples of what might be counted as direct beneficiary.

Okay, cleared

#### Agency's Comments

**UNDP, 19 May 2023**

Thank you for raising the inconsistency. The area of land restored is not 1,000 per site, but 1,000 ha per region. This is corrected in the section on ?Areas of land restored? in the PIF (page 29). The methodological approach and underlying logic to justify target levels for core indicators 3, 4 and 11 is provided below and is reflected in the PIF.

Regarding Core Indicator 3, ?the proposed project will be targeting 6 sites throughout the four target regions ? Ali Sabieh, Dikhil, Tajdoura and Obock. It is estimated that approximately 1,000 ha per region will undergo restoration activities, resulting in a total of 4,000 ha of restored land. The total area of the four target regions is 2,120,000 ha. The proposed targeted area represents about 0.25% of total area of each region. The project will target the areas which will be deemed highly likely to restore and those which offer best ecosystem services to the agro-pastoralists in each region. The actual locations will be determined after detailed assessments conducted during the PPG phase.?

Regarding Core Indicator 4, the project interventions will have an impact on land use practices in rural areas throughout the four target regions. Through EbA and IWRM approaches, the project will engage local communities and local authorities in improved practices of agriculture and pastureland management. The proposed interventions support nomadic and non-nomadic agropastoral rural communities in the region and engage them in the climate change adaptation interventions proposed by the project. Considering the project's intention to improve existing agro-pastoral practices for nomadic and non-nomadic agropastoralists, land use management and water access and conservation practices for the climate-vulnerable rural communities, the project estimates that at least 7% of the total land area of the four regions needs to be improved to create substantial impact on the rural lives and livelihood. In addition, for the budget requested for the project, the intervention is deemed appropriate and realistic.

Regarding Core Indicator 11 (page 30), the project targets nomadic populations practicing agro-pastoralism, smallholder farmers and cooperatives supported through value-chain based livelihood interventions. The total estimated nomadic population of the four target regions is 203,372 (about 51% of the total regional population). The sites selected for the project include those with highest density of nomadic populations. While the exact population of nomadic population in the target sites is difficult to indicate (considering their nomadic behavior), estimates will be made during the PPG phase. The current estimates assume that 25% of the nomadic population and 25% of the rural population will directly benefit from project interventions. The conservative estimates for the project direct beneficiaries is revised to 100,000 for the six target sites in four regions, including the nomadic and non-nomadic populations, the local and regional authorities receiving EbA and IWRM trainings. This includes beneficiaries from (i) water infrastructure and improved land use and ecosystem conservation practices (ii) the installation of community based EWS, and training, empowerment and engagement of local communities in the EWS mechanisms in each project site, and (iii) support to value-chain based MSMEs through performance-based grants mechanisms and building the entrepreneurship capacity of urban population. An additional 100,000 indirect beneficiaries are expected from their access to the public water infrastructures introduced and the access to EWS.

Region	Estimated nomadic population in 2022	Estimated non-nomadic population in 2022
Ali Sabieh	51,638	49,612.98
Dikhil	51,356	49,342.04
Obock	32,642	31,361.92
Tadjourah	67,736	65,079.69
<b>Total</b>	<b>203,372</b>	<b>195,396.63</b>

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

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

**a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?**

**b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?**

**c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat's Comments

Yes

Agency's Comments

**5.7 Qualitative assessment**

**a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**

**b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**

**c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

Secretariat's Comments

a) Yes

b) Creation of enabling environment for gender-responsive early warning systems (EWS), Development of community cooperatives, women's groups and community savings plans to promote livelihood development and enhanced food security.

c) Contributes to the National Adaptation Programme of Action, National Adaptation Plan (NAP) and national adaptation priorities in the Intended Nationally Determined Contribution of the Republic of Djibouti.

Agency's Comments

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

**6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?**

Secretariat's Comments

Yes

Project is aligned with the GEF-8 programming strategies (CCA-1 and LD-2&3)

Agency's Comments

**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's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

**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's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

#### **7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

**7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?**

Secretariat's Comments

List of stakeholders provided. Please also provide dates when these consultations were conducted

Okay, cleared

Agency's Comments

**UNDP, 19 May 2023**

The field missions were organised from 05 to 28 February 2023. A column was added in table 4 to indicate the dates of consultations (page 28)

Type of stakeholder engaged	Stakeholder(s)	Date consulted	
National government ministries	Ministry of Environment	Feb 5, 2023	
	Ministry of Energy	Feb 5, 2023	
	Ministry of Finance	Feb 5, 2023	
	Ministry of Agriculture	Feb 5, 2023	
Regional authorities	Pref?t of the Regional Council ? Dikhil region	Feb 6 2023	
	Pref?t of the Regional Council ? Tajdoura region	Feb 8, 2023	
	President of the Region Council ? Tajdoura region	Feb 8, 2023	
	Pref?t of the Regional Council ? Ali Sabieh region	Feb 26, 2023	
	President of the Regional Council ? Ali Sabieh region	Feb 26, 2023	
	Pref?t of the Regional Council ? Obock region	Feb 26, 2023	
	Development agencies	FAO	Feb 2, 2023
		World Bank	Feb 1, 2023
African Development Bank		Feb 28, 2023	
Community consultations	Oudoukia (Dikhil)	Feb 6, 2023	
	Gagad? (Dikhil)	Feb 7, 2023	
	Sagalou (Tajdoura)	Feb 7, 2023	
	Ripta (Tajdoura)	Feb 8, 2023	
	Dasbayo (Ali Sabieh)	Feb 26, 2023	
	Souwali (Obock)	Feb 27, 2023	

## 8 Annexes

### Annex A: Financing Tables

**8.1 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's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes, this include (CCA-1-1 and LD-3)



Agency's Comments

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat's Comments No

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments No

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

**8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's Comments

No.

The PPG requested is \$400,000, but the maximum threshold for PPG is \$300,000. Also, the PPG Agency fee requested is \$36,000, but the max is \$27,000. Please adjust these figures.

Okay, cleared

Agency's Comments

**UNDP, 22 May 2023:** The PPG amount was reduced to \$300,000. This is reflected in the LoE and the portal.

**8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat's Comments

Yes. However, please revise or clarify the "in-kind" co-financing currently showing as investment. Also UNDP is the implementing agency not a Donor Agency

Okay, cleared

Agency's Comments

**UNDP, 19 May 2023.** The corrections were made in the table on ?Indicative Co-financing?.

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?s(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

No.

Please use the correct GEF-8 template that was previously shared with all GEF Agencies as the current LoE used GEF-7 Template. Also ensure that the amount you enter into the portal correspond to the figures in the LoE.

A correct GEF-8 template has now been used. However there is inconsistency in the endorsed STAR focal area. The LoE endorsed STAR allocation FA as Climate Change while in Portal selection of the STAR focal Area is Land Degradation. Could you correct this.

Okay, cleared

Agency's Comments

**UNDP, 22 May 2023.** Thank you for pointing out the inconsistency. The LoE was revised to reflect the Land Degradation as the STAR allocation FA. This is also reflected in the portal.

**UNDP, 19 May 2023.** The correct letter for GEF-8 has been uploaded, with numbers into the portal corresponding to those in the LOE.

**8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?**

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

**Annex C: Project Location**

**8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

## Agency's Comments

### **Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating**

**8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?**

## Secretariat's Comments

There is currently no information on the Environmental and social risks of the 'Risks to Project Preparation and Implementation' (Page 49). Please add a summary of Environmental and social risks information in the 'Risks to Project Preparation and Implementation' (Page 49).

Okay, cleared

## Agency's Comments

**UNDP, 19 May 2023**

In table 6 of the section 'Risks to Project Preparation and Implementation', details on the Environmental and social Risks were added

In addition, Annex D, presenting the Environmental and Social risks in the UNDP SESP format, was submitted separately for the Secretariat's review.

### **Annex E: Rio Markers**

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes (CCA principal objective 2 and LD objective 2)

## Agency's Comments

### **Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet**

**8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

**Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat's Comments

There is need to revise the co-financing details.

Okay, cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 19 May 2023. This was done, please refer to Agency's comment on Secretariat's comment 8.3

## **9 GEFSEC Decision**

**9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?**

Secretariat's Comments

Following the review of the Agency second response to the comments, the PIF and the PPG is recommended for technical clearance

Agency's Comments

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>4/26/2023</b>	<b>5/19/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/19/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/22/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		