

Great Green Wall Climate Change Adaptation Regional Support Project

Basic Information

GEF ID

11000

Countries

Regional (Burkina Faso, Chad, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, Sudan)

Project Title

Great Green Wall Climate Change Adaptation Regional Support Project

GEF Agency(ies)

IFAD

Agency ID

GEF Focal Area(s)

Climate Change

Program Manager

Aloke Barnwal

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

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

Please see following comments:

- In terms of countries, LDCF can't support non-LDCs i.e. Nigeria under this project. Therefore, please consider supporting Nigeria through co-financing.
- The CCA Marker should be revised to CCA 2 given that adaptation is a Principal objective of the project.
- In the project title, please consider adding climate change adaptation.
- Please clarify if all the project components will be "Executed" by IFAD only. As per GEF Policy, GEF Agencies are allowed to execute projects only under exceptional circumstances.

May 3, 2022

Thanks for the adjustments. Also, thanks for clarifying the the executing role. The rationale for the partial execution role by IFAD is fine. Please add the other executing agency name at the CEO ER stage. Comment cleared for now.

Agency Response

28 April 2022

1-Nigeria has been removed from the PIF.

2-Revised.

3-Added.

4-IFAD is not usually executing its GEF projects. However considering the linkage with the GCF GGW RSP, implemented and executed by IFAD, and the need for close coordination during implementation, we suggest that IFAD executes also components 1 and 2 of this project.

Component 3 could be executed by another partner, such as ICRISAT or another CGIAR centre with presence in the GGW countries This will be assessed in the PPG phase.

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

Please see below comments:

- In the project objective, please make explicit reference to adaptation or climate resilience. Also, it is not necessary to have **"to increase individual GCF and GEF projects' collective impact"**, in the objective. The project isn't just meant to target GEF projects in GGW countries. It aims to support the countries more holistically including their own adaptation projects and other climate finance projects including of the GCF. An objective statement for your consideration is below. Please revise/edit as appropriate to include any missing element:

To improve access to best practices, foster innovation and digital transformation and facilitate cross-learning across Great Green Wall countries for enhanced resilience to climate change impacts.

- Please clarify what is meant by "GEF Projects" in Table B. Are these past and existing projects or does it mean projects which will be supported under component 3?

- The project design will benefit from clear articulation in components/outcomes/outputs regarding the GEF-GCF collaborative support to GGW countries on topics of knowledge sharing, innovation, coordination, etc. It refers only to GEF projects which doesn't clearly imply the main objective around this project aligned with GEF-GCF LTV. Please add this aspect as appropriate in Table B.

- The budget distribution across the components is recommended to be revised. For example, there is very limited resource allocated for component 2, whereas a large amount is allocated to component 1. The allocation for Component 3 looks fine.

- Comments specific to components are provided later.

May 3, 2022

Thanks for the adjustments. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

28 April 2022

1-Agree and changed as per suggestion.

2-It was meant for past and existing projects, but also for future projects including those supported under component 3.

3-Changed to reflect: It aims to support the countries more holistically including their own adaptation projects and other climate finance projects including of the GEF and GCF.

4-We have revised the budget and moved USD1 million if LDCF funding from component 1 to component 2 to strengthen the focus on innovations and digital transformations

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 Yes.

Agency Response

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 Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

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 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

Please provide rationale behind 25% coverage of DRM. The project design doesn't indicate this clearly.

If there are potential interventions/innovations in sectors not listed e.g. alternate livelihoods, etc. please consider including them under "other".

The project also can potentially support creation of digital solutions and infrastructure. It is likely that they may be directed towards a specific sector e.g. agriculture. However, if there are generic digital solutions and related infrastructure, it could be included under "other infrastructure".

May 3, 2022

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

28 April 2022

1-This was a mistake and has been deleted. 25% coverage of other infrastructure (i.e. digital solutions) has been included instead.

2-Ok Done.

3- done

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 Yes.

Agency Response

art 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

Under barriers, the project should also consider lack of engagement of sectoral ministries/departments/agencies and local governments in climate financed projects. That is, going beyond the the issue of OFP/NDA coordination only, to the issue of coordinating and involving such institutions in climate adaptation programming and implementation. Accordingly, the project activities should focus on this aspect which will lead to stronger ownership, effective climate mainstreaming and broader outreach to local communities.

May 3, 2022

Thank you. As requested by email, please provide a theory of change for the project.

May 6, 2022

Thanks. Comment cleared for now. The ToC will be reviewed again at the CEO ER stage once the project design is elaborated more.

Agency Response

28 April 2022

Reflected. The barrier has been revised to:

Lack of engagement of sectoral ministries/departments/agencies and governments in climate financed projects, as well as limited coordination at the country level to strategically plan the allocation of GEF, GCF and other climate resources that can contribute to the achievement of the GGW objectives resulting in a duplication of projects and activities.....

May 6, 2022

A theory of change, including assumptions, has been added to the PIF in the beginning of the alternative scenario.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please see comments below:

- Under component 1, please clarify how the knowledge and coordination support work can lead to benefiting 103,000 beneficiaries directly. I think the component 3 may lead to direct beneficiaries with funding provided to specific innovative projects. (ref: Table B)
- Under 1.1.1, thanks for including state of adaptation report as a specific knowledge product. at the CEO ER stage, we would like to see a more detailed proposal of other strategic knowledge products.
- Under this component, as indicated earlier, please also include coordination with GCF supported projects to operationalize the complementarity proposed as a cross cutting priority of this project.
- Component 2 seems quite strategic but comparatively less resources have been allocated to this. We suggest to add more resources to this by drawing from component 1.
- Component 3- at the CEO ER stage we would like to see more details of the innovation grants mechanism. Direct beneficiaries can be supported under this component. At this stage, please clarify if there can be a possibility of co-financing from the GCF or other sources for the innovation grant.

Under Investment mobilized, output 3.2: it's mentioned that Innovation and digital transformation technologies are mapped, and a digital and innovation ecosystem built. Please indicate what types of technologies are envisaged and how these will be deployed in the context of this project, considering that the countries have different levels of IT development systems

May 3, 2022

All the responses and adjustments are fine for PIF stage and will be reviewed in detail at the CEO ER stage. Comments cleared.

Agency Response

28 April 2022

1- The total number of direct beneficiaries is now estimated to 100,000 based on the number of innovation grants with associated co-financing that will be launched, and the indicator has been moved to Component 3. The 3,000 people that are going to be trained on adaptation innovations are now included as a sub-set of the total number of beneficiaries.

2-1.1.1 now mentions that other specific knowledge products will be identified in the PPG phase, such as policy briefs, social media pages, monthly newsletters, internal bulletins and toolkits on methods, tools, templates, techniques and good examples that will be identified in the PPG phase. Coordination with GCF projects has been added.

3- USD1 million has been moved from component 1 to component 2 to strengthen the focus on innovations and digital transformations.

4-One criteria of the innovation grants will be the co-financing, and it could be from the GCF, private sector, IFAD, government, etc. We have indicated that the LDCF to co-financing ratio should be around 1:3.

5-Output 2.2.2 now indicates that digital transformation technologies include e.g. social enterprise innovations, climate technologies, remote sensing (using open-source data, such as trends.earth), digital finance services, financial innovations and other innovative adaptation approaches that are further elaborated upon in the alternative scenario. They will be shared through digital outreach and communication adapted to existing infrastructure and platforms at country level.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

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

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Yes.

May 10, 2022

It is well noted that the project includes a list of stakeholder to be consulted. The submission, however, does not include any information on stakeholder consultations/engagement during project design. Please provide information on the consultations to date (when and with whom) as well as a synopsis of the main findings.

May 11, 2022

Thanks for additional details. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

11 May 2022

Addressed

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

Secretariat Comment on IIP / WORK Program inclusion

Yes.

May 10, 2022

Please address the following comments and resubmit the project

-The agency did not specify any plans to address gender in project design - for example, through a thorough gender analysis and/or a detailed gender action plan. Agency is requested to specify and elaborate on its plan regarding this.

On the section regarding whether or not the project expects to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment, the agency noted in its description of the gender dimensions of the project that the project will increase opportunities for livelihood improvement for women and men, as well as improving women's financial education. Noting these, Agency is requested to reflect that the project is also aimed at generating socio-economic benefits or services for women (i.e., tick yes for this sub-category)

On project component 2: Identification of innovations and digital transformations, specifically project output 2.1.2 Identify new opportunities for investing in climate adaptation innovations in the GGW. This component of the project is very important from a gender perspective because of the wide gender gap in the fields of innovation and digital transformations. It is thus important for the project to take into consideration gender issues in output 2.1.2. Agency is requested to respond to this in revising the document.

May 11, 2022

Thanks for addressing the comment. However, as suggested, please consider ticking the "generating socio-economic benefits or services for women" sub section as "Yes".

May 12, 2022

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

11 May 2022

Addressed

we ticked on Yes under "generating socio-economic benefits or services for women"

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

In the agricultural sector, please clarify how the local private sector, expected to play a key role in the sustainable production, will be engaged. Partnerships with multinationals, if any, should integrate technology transfer and approaches to address climate risks and climate resilience across all GGW countries.

May 3, 2022

Thanks for the details. Comment is cleared.

Agency Response

28 April 2022

It has been clarified that the GGW RSP directly targets the private sector and will provide capacity building of smallholders, cooperatives, MSMEs to support technology transfer and adaptation. During the PPG phase, an analysis and plan for awareness raising and engagement of private sector stakeholders, including multinationals, will be developed that integrate technology transfer and approaches to climate risk and climate resilience in their activities across all GGW countries. Synergies will also be established with the GCF RSP and its digital marketplace.

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

Please add the following:

- A brief summary of COVID-19 context, risk and opportunities for the project to support green and resilient growth in GGW.

- A brief climate risk analysis as per STAP guidance.

May 3, 2022

Thanks. Please elaborate the climate risk screening more. The STAP guidance can be accessed here.
more. <https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf>

May 6, 2022

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

28 April 2022

These two risks have been expended upon in the revised Risk Matrix, following IFAD and STAP guidance.

May 6, 2022

The climate risks have been further elaborated based on the IFAD Climate Adaptation in Rural Development Assessment Tool that was applied to the GGW countries for the GCF programme.

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

As indicated earlier, please clarify if IFAD will be executing the entire project or other agencies will be involved in project execution.

May 3, 2022

As indicated earlier, this execution arrangement is fine. Please indicate other Executing Agency name/s during CEO ER. Comment cleared for now.

Agency Response

28 April 2022

We suggest IFAD executes C1 and C2 for close coordination and collaboration with the GCF GGW programme, while we will seek another agency to execute the C3. See earlier comments above about this.

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

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Yes.

Agency Response

art 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

Not required.

Agency Response

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

NA

Agency Response

EFSEC 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

Please address the technical comments and resubmit for moving forward.

May 3, 2022

Please address the following additional comments and resubmit the project.

SECRETARIAT COMMENT

- Please add a theory of change

- Please elaborate the climate risks to the project a bit more with more context of future climate risks in the region.

May 6, 2022

The project is recommended for technical clearance and PPG.

May 10, 2022

Please address two additional comments related to gender and stakeholder engagement included in the relevant review sheet sections.

May 11, 2022

Please address the comment related to gender as indicated in the relevant question i.e. please tick the subcategory "**generating socio-economic benefits or services for women**" as **YES**, as the project will likely to contribute directly to this outcome.

May 12, 2022

The comment above has been addressed. The project is recommended for technical clearance.

May 12, 2022

Please revise Table A where it says CCA-2 as the programming directions. It is not consistent with details in the alignment section which says alignments with CCA 1 objective. the project is actually aligned with both CCA 1 and CCA 2. The agency is requested to modify accordingly and split the budget across the two objectives.

May 13, 2022

Thanks for revising Table to make it CCA-1. Comment cleared.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- The project will have to secure OFP letters depending on the detailed project design during PPG phase. If the project will deliver activities in country in terms of technical assistance or small grant, a letter of endorsement from all the countries will be required.

- The project execution arrangement needs to be elaborated more with further justification for IFAD to become executing agency and

proposed executing agency for component 3 as indicated in the PIF.

- A detailed section on GEF GCF complementarity and its alignment with LTV will be useful at the CEO ER stage.
- The ToC may need to be revised depending on the detailed project design.
- A more detailed information about the management of the innovation grant.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/20/2022	4/29/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/3/2022	5/6/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/6/2022	5/11/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/9/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/11/2022	

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The proposed regional LDCF project “Great Green Wall Climate Change Adaptation Regional Support Project” by IFAD is a transformative project that will strengthen climate resilience of Great Green Wall countries in Africa and will demonstrate collaborative working between GEF (LDCF) and GCF in the pursuit to operationalize the long term vision of complementarity of the two climate funds. It will specifically work in close collaboration with GEF-IFAD GGW Regional Support Program and GGW Accelerator program and develop synergies for large scale adaptation benefits to vulnerable communities and ecosystems in the GGW region.

The project will be first of its kind regional scale adaptation project covering the GGW countries aimed at catalyzing innovation, facilitating knowledge sharing and strengthening coordination between various actors working towards the common goal of making the region resilient to climate change and reducing environmental degradation while ensuring sustainable socio-economic growth. With funding of nearly 10

million USD and co-financing of 29.8 million USD from GCF and IFAD, the project will support adaptation of 100,000 people, bring 17000 hectares of land under climate resilient management and build capacity of 3000 people across different local and national governments and community and private sector organizations.

The project will lead to these outcomes through three components. First, a knowledge management and exchange support which will bring together all GGW countries under one platform for sharing best practices and lessons, and fostering collaboration between countries and agencies for scaling up adaptation action. The second component is dedicated for innovation with a specific focus on digital technology transformation in the region. Finally, to support emerging innovative adaptation solutions in the GGW countries, the project will create an innovation fund to provide catalytic grants to innovative adaptation projects by private sector including SMEs, CSOs, government agencies and other actors in the region.

The project will build on the strong baseline of past and existing LDCF, GEF TF, GCF and other projects in GGW countries. It will establish a mechanism to liaise with the existing regional collaboration mechanisms such as those created under UNCCD and by countries. The regional program will aim to strengthen this institutional ecosystem by specifically working with GEF Operational Focal Points, GEF Agencies, GCF National Designated Authorities, GGW National Focal Points and regional entities, GCF Accredited Entities, country project teams and other key country stakeholders.

The project is being developed at a time when the region is recovering from the varied social and economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. The focus on digital technologies and platforms will not only support tackling the risks but also create new economic opportunities in the region. The emphasis on resilient agriculture and land management will also contribute strengthening livelihoods and creating new green jobs thereby directly contributing to local economies.

The project is proposed to be executed by the GEF Agency IFAD. Having IFAD as the executing agency will ensure smooth coordination between the LDCF project and the GCF project for which also IFAD is the executing agency. Given the regional nature of the project, it will be difficult to find a credible institution which can implement various activities outlined in the PIF in a coherent way. Therefore, the justification for IFAD becoming the executing agency is sound. At the PPG phase, IFAD will be encouraged to identify other executing partner/s for the third component of managing the innovation grant.