



# Scaling Financial and Information Services for Smallholder Adaptation

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10954

**Countries**

Regional (Uganda, Zambia)

**Project Name**

Scaling Financial and Information Services for Smallholder Adaptation

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

3/30/2022

**Review completed by PM**

5/12/2022

**Program Manager**

Jason Spensley

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

MSP

## PIF

### Part I ? Project Information

#### Focal area elements

**1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

31March2022:

Yes

Agency Response

**Indicative project/program description summary**

**2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

27April2022:

Cleared

31March2022:

Please include a modest component on monitoring, learning and knowledge sharing.

Agency Response

A forth component was added.

We plan to implement an in-built monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system. From the M&E perspective, this project requires developing well documented quantifiable proof

while being flexible to respond to raising opportunities in a fast-changing work environment with a focus on learning, capacity and competency strengthening. We see these two different needs can often almost be found on the two ends of a spectrum. M&E in the development context is approached differently from M&E in the knowledge management world. While the first is an M&E approach targeted at measuring tangible outputs and impact at field level with the end-users long-term along a set of pre-defined indicators, the second M&E track also looks at monitoring at the point of the intervention, i.e., regularly reviewing the effectiveness of the activity, assessing the methodology at the point of its implementation and shortly after focused on reflection and learning for personal, technical and institutional benefits. This project's monitoring, evaluation and reporting is informed by the CGIAR and the Alliance's global design, i.e., monitoring and evaluation against its SRF (strategic results framework), which is in turn linked to the bigger picture of the SDGs, and fully aligned to GEF's standard requirements for monitoring and evaluation. To the extent possible, to contribute to national systems, indicators would also be aligned to the ones collected by national governments the project works with. Additionally, it will look at any individual specificities that might offer opportunities for optimization coming from the context of the regional knowledge hubs and offices.

Core elements of the M&E plan are:

- a. Logical Framework with specific project indicators and their means of verification documented in the project's results-based logical framework. The logframe covers output, outcome, and objective measurement, including key assumptions, and the identification of risks and strategies to mitigate them.
- b. Learning Agenda with a consolidated range of learning questions agreed with GEF/FAO to serve a global footprint of actors and stakeholders to inform the GEF strategy and partnerships.
- c. Activity work plan with key milestones that give an overview of what should happen when and allow the team to keep track of progress, delays and deliverables produced.
- d. Annual reflection and work planning: this will happen in a participatory manner and under the involvement and guidance of the Project Steering Committee.
- e. Reporting following standard requirements from GEF/FAO, the Alliance and broader CGIAR, e.g. contributing reporting towards the CGIAR common reporting indicators, if relevant: innovations, partners, publications, people involved in capacity development activities, altmetrics, policies, projected uptake (hectares/ people) and outcome impact case reports to capture and evidence observed changes that the project contributed to.
- f. Baseline assessments will be conducted before individual selected activities and if considered useful also overall at the onset of the implementation of the grant.

The project will consistently use built-in monitoring tools into its main activities, like use of after meeting evaluation, after action reviews (AAR), progress barometer, monitoring committee, mood barometer, evaluation wheel. These have been proven to

be particularly useful in other projects we manage for furthering learning, equitable adult learning and ownership building.

Knowledge management and learning are integral to the design of this project. The Alliance has a long-standing partnership experience in their community of knowledge management practitioners. A huge part of knowledge management and learning is taken care of through complementary, highly participatory, innovative and creative monitoring, evaluation and learning, and ownership-building mechanisms. Outcome (KASP) and post technical support/assistance provision surveys are integral parts of the project's good result-based management practices and standard reporting requirement, as well as documentation and reporting of outcome impact cases.

The proposed knowledge management plan will address all dimension of knowledge management, i.e., knowledge generation, knowledge use, and knowledge enabling environment allowing for a stronger and more systematic learning culture. Key knowledge products to be developed through the project include Shamba Shape Up videos filmed at the smallholder farms, value-chain specific iShamba messages on climate risk and risk-management strategies, technical assistance products (both digital and traditional), events each year to share all learnings with a broad range of FAO & CGIAR staff, partners and other key stakeholders, an investment event to take place in a key AgriTech or FinTech city hub, the promotion of champions and success stories emerging from the project in a social media campaign, and information on the project for public consumption.

#### **Co-financing**

**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, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

27April2022:

Cleared, thank you.

31March2022:

The scale of co-financing is rather limited, considering the after co-financing for LDCF projects in GEF7 was 1:5.8. Particularly given the private sector elements of this project, please consider if it is possible to catalyze further co-financing, including some from the Agency if possible. In doing so, please note that co-financing at the PIF stage is considered as "indicative", does not require a co-financing letter until CEO Approval stage, and can be revised at CEO Approval stage.

Agency Response Please, consider the proposed increase.

**GEF Resource Availability**

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

31March2022:

Yes

Agency Response

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

31March2022:

N/A

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

31March2022:

N/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

31March2022:

Yes

Agency Response

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

31March2022:

N/A

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

31March2022:

N/A

Agency Response

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

31March2022:

N/A

Agency Response

**Project Preparation Grant**

**5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

31March2022:

Yes

Agency Response

## Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

19May2022:

Cleared. The intention to further analyze and confirm the high level of impact ambition during project preparation is well noted and appreciated.

17May2022:

We note with appreciation the exceptionally strong ambition of core indicators 1 (number of direct beneficiaries), 2 (number of hectares), and 4 (number of people trained). However, we also note the expected impact levels are significantly higher than other FAO projects and almost all other projects supported by the LDCF. We suggest careful consideration of realistic expected impact ambition levels for these core indicators, so as to avoid significant changes during project preparation.

27April2022:

Thank you for the impact levels indicators for core indicator 2 (hectares) and core indicator 4 (people trained).

Please provide an anticipated number of policies /plans that will mainstream climate resilience (core indicator 3), noting this will be indicative and may be adjusted during project preparation prior to CEO Approval.

31March2022:

We note with appreciation the significant scale of direct beneficiaries.

Please indicate expected impact ambition for core indicators 2, 3, and 4 (hectares, policies/plans, and people trained).

## Agency Response

17 May 2022

Please, consider the updates. Figures have been reduced considerably, though remain high. The tools and approaches proposed in the project have proven to be far reaching and benefitting great amounts of smallholder farmers in Kenya. During PPG, ambitious yet realistic figures will be confirmed.

27 April 2022

Additional core indicators have been informed. These include:

Hectares: 2.7 million hectare (based on 0.97 ha average farm size for 2 million smallholder beneficiaries in Uganda; and 1.5 ha average farm size for 0.5 million smallholder beneficiaries in Zambia)

Policies/plans will be identified during the stakeholder consultations at the project preparation phase.

People trained: 100,000 will be trained in various capacities related to climate risk management strategies, smallholder financial products and use of digital tools.

**Project/Program taxonomy**

**7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

31March2022:

Yes

Agency Response

**Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

27April2022:

Cleared

31March2022:

Please expand on the analysis of anticipated impacts from increasing climate hazards, including by providing references for key data, as well as referring to a conservatives and a high impact scenario of impacts for each country.

Please spell Zambia correctly throughout the document (in at least one place in paras 1.2 a letter is missing).



Agency Response This has been addressed in the corresponding section. We have also tried our best to fix the spelling errors throughout the document.

**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

27April2022:

Cleared

31March2022:

Please consider if and how adaptation planning support provided by the GCF and/or other sources contribute to the baseline.

Please consider relevance and opportunity for further coordination with relevant GEF projects planned or under implementation. For example:

10927 Acceleration of financial technology-enabled climate resilience solutions

10432 Reviving high quality coffee to stimulate climate adaptation in smallholder farming communities

7997 Integrating Climate Resilience into Agricultural and Pastoral Production in Uganda, through a Farmer/Agro-Pastoralist Field School Approach

10101 Promoting the adoption and upscaling of proven climate-resilient agricultural practices and technologies by smallholder farmers in Zambia

Agency Response Please, see additional language in the PIF, on the coordination with ongoing GEF projects.

**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

27April2022:

Cleared

31March2022:

•It is recommended to refer to STAP primer on ToC (<https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer>) for further elaboration. Casual pathways between each item should be clearly delineated.

Agency Response Please, note that a theory of change was developed for the project and causal pathways are color-coded. This initial theory of change will be further developed and refined during PPG in a participatory way, engaging partners at the national and global levels. STAPs guidance will be further consulted for this exercise.

**4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

31March2022:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

31March2022:

Yes

Agency Response

**6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

31March2022:

Please note the comment above on impact targets for climate adaptation core indicators 2, 3, and 4.

Agency Response Noted with thanks. See above.

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

31March2022:

Yes

Agency Response

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

27April2022:

Cleared

31March2022:

Please provide georeferenced information.

Agency Response We have shown the country boundaries in the PIF, however sub-national details such as the sub-regions (Uganda)/provinces (Zambia) and districts will be identified during the stakeholder consultation in the project preparation phase.

Further details such as locations of villages or smallholder beneficiary farms will be recorded at the implementation stage.

**Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

31March2022:

Please provided information about each stakeholders' potential role in the project and the proposed means of future engagement with each.

Agency Response This has been addressed in the corresponding section.

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

17May2022:

Cleared

17May2022:

From the project description, it appears that the project will address "closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources", as specified in the Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment section. Given this, it is recommended to tick this category/respond yes to this category (or gender tag).

Agency Response Thank you for the suggestion. The amendment has been made.  
**Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

31March2022:

Yes.

Agency Response

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

27April2022:

Cleared

31March2022:

We note there are only 3 risks listed. Please expand to consider further risks as relevant.

Agency Response Based on some initial assessment, we have identified 5 additional risk and corresponding mitigation strategies in the PIF.

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

27April2022:

Cleared

31March2022:

Please briefly elaborate on how the project will ensure coordination and learning among the focal countries.

Please also briefly elaborate on how local actors will be engaged and involved.

Agency Response Additional details have been included in the corresponding section of the PIF.

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

31March2022:

Yes

Agency Response

**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed ?knowledge management (KM) approach? in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project?s/program?s overall impact and sustainability?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

27April2022:

Cleared

31March2022:

We note the reference to ?plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives?. Please briefly elaborate on what this will involve.

Agency Response We have discussed this in separate paragraph in the PIF.  
**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

31March2022:

Yes

Agency Response

**Part III ? Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country?s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

12May2022:

Cleared

29April2022:

We note the LOE from the OFP of Uganda is still pending.

27April2022:

We note the LOE from the OFP is still pending.

31March2022:

Please note that Letters of Endorsement are required at PIF stage for all countries indicated as being supported by this project.

Agency Response

4 May 2022

Please, find the LOE from the Ugandan OFP attached for your review.

27 April 2022

We continue working with the GEF OFP from Uganda to secure the Letter of Endorsement in due time.

**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

**Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

31March2022:

N/A

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

19Mar2022:

Cleared and recommended for technical clearance.

17May2022:

Please address the 2 remaining comments (indicators and gender).

12May2022:

All comments have been addressed.

29April2022:

Please address the only remaining comment regarding the LOE from the OFP of Uganda.

27April2022:

Please address the remaining reduced set of comments.

31March2022:

Please address the comments provided and resubmit the PIF accordingly with all relevant changes to it. In do so, please indicate in highlight or a tracked changes version all changes made to the PIF base on the comments.

#### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

31March2022:



During the PPG phase, please ensure that the project results framework captures the impacts also from ?tailored climate information services etc.?, ?agro-advisory?, and ?financial products?.

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>3/31/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/27/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/29/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/12/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/17/2022</b>	

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**