

# Promoting technology innovation and entrepreneurship to mitigate climate change and combat land degradation in informal settlements and peri-urban areas

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10989

**Countries**

Namibia

**Project Name**

Promoting technology innovation and entrepreneurship to mitigate climate change and combat land degradation in informal settlements and peri-urban areas

**Agencies**

UNIDO

**Date received by PM**

4/13/2022

**Review completed by PM**

6/3/2022

**Program Manager**

Pascal Martinez

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**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

**April 26, 2022:**

No. While the project is using in majority LD STAR Allocation, this is not reflected in the proposal. As funded, the project need to be strongly and explicitly realigned with LD-1-4 objective. The Agency can either use CC STAR Allocation only or make a much stronger case how the proposed concept leads to tangible benefits for LD. Considering the allowed marginal adjustment has been nearly all used by Namibia, the second option of making a much stronger case for LD alignment may be the most beneficial for the country.

**June 3, 2022:**

Thank you for the adjustment clarifying the project focus on lands and therefore its alignment with LD focal area objectives. Cleared.

### Agency Response

A stronger case for LD alignment has been made. A balance between LD and CCM was attempted throughout the proposal. New additions have been highlighted in yellow for easy reference.

### **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

**April 26, 2022:**

1. Considering the project focus on climate change mitigation, the Rio Marker should be: Mitigation 2 (instead of 1). Please amend accordingly.
2. The name of outcome 1.1 is misleading. The relative outputs seem to indicate more the ?Establishment of the GCIP infrastructure in Namibia and support for the annual Accelerators?. Please consider rewording accordingly.

**June 2, 2022:**

- 1 and 2. Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

### Agency Response

1. CCM Rio Marker was amended.
2. Outcome 1.1 was renamed accordingly.

### **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

**April 26, 2022:**

1. The theory of change describes a role for PFAN in this project. Is PFAN expected to provide some co-financing or in-kind services? If so, please include this in the co-financing table.

2. Under Table C, it remains unclear how the co-financing identified as "Investment Mobilized" was identified. Please elaborate further on what concretely this co-financing is expected to be.

**June 2, 2022:**

1 and 2. Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Additional information on the role of PFAN was added to paragraphs 70 and 94.

2. Additional information was added.

**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

**April 26, 2022:**

Yes, with the proposed financing is in line with GEF policies and guidelines and is within the resources available. Cleared.

Agency Response

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**April 26, 2022:**

Yes, with this project Namibia is using all its remaining STAR allocation. Cleared.

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**April 26, 2022:**

Yes, with this project Namibia is using all its remaining allocation in the CCM and LD Focal Areas. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 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

**April 26, 2022:**

Yes, this project is an MSP and the PPG requested in Table E is within the allowable cap. Cleared.

## 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

#### **April 26, 2022:**

1. Expected results for land-related core indicators are missing or extremely small. Please add relevant indicators to justify the use of LD Focal Area resources.
2. As per GEF guidelines, the duration of accounting for the indicator 6.1 should be 20 years (and not 3). Please amend accordingly.
3. Please indicate the methodology used to assess the GHG emission mitigation target and present clearly or upload the calculation in the Portal entry.

#### **June 2, 2022:**

- 1 and 2. Thank you for the improvements of the core indicators and for the amendment on the duration of accounting for the indicator 6.1. Cleared.
3. We take note of the additional information provided and of the development during the PPG phase of a methodology for calculating the area of landscape under improved practices. During PPG phase, please use a land-related methodology (such as EX-ACT tool for instance) to assess the GHG expected benefits coming from the land-related projects. Cleared.

## Agency Response

1. LD Indicators were adjusted.
2. Duration was amended to 20 years.
3. Additional information on GHG emission accounting was added in the text under the table of core indicators as well as in paragraphs 141 -146

### 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

**April 26, 2022:**

Yes, cleared.

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

**April 27, 2022:**

The problems, root causes and barriers should also be described in the land degradation context to justify the use of LD Focal area resources. Please complete accordingly.

**June 2, 2022:**

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response Additional information was added in paragraphs 17-19 and 21 - 43.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**April 27, 2022:**

The baseline scenario should also consider initiatives, policies, commitments and stakeholders specifically related to land degradation. Please complete accordingly.

**June 2, 2022:**

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response Additional information was added in paragraphs 31 - 43

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**April 27, 2022:**

1. As mentioned above, the alternative scenario must demonstrate a clear specific focus on LD-related interventions and outcomes.
2. Information on the linkages with the Global GCIP are scattered across the document. Please include a short section under the 'Project Approach' (paragraph 50 onwards) and before the Theory of change, that clearly describes the 'Interaction and coordination with the Global GCIP'.
3. The theory of change pictures mentions in the 'outputs' that there will be 2 cycles of accelerator. Activity 1.1.3 considers 3 cycles. Please correct the inconsistency.
4. Output 1.2.3. In addition to the linkages which are described with the GCIP global, it seems appropriate to highlight the activities that will be done to link this project with other GCIP initiatives on a regional scale, with other African countries that have developed the GCIP program, such as South Africa. A regional scale seems appropriate for the initial scale up/replication of the GCIP supported entrepreneurs in Namibia. Please revise accordingly.
5. Output 1.2.4. Please note that the financial mechanism and methodology to award GEF funding through it should be fully described during PPG for the CEO ER.
6. Output 2.1.2. This project output should indicate that the new/revised policies are submitted for adoption to the relevant policy decision makers, not just 'developed'.
7. Outcome 3.1. This outcome looks expensive for what it includes for the three outputs. Please provide more justification or revise the budget. Saved resources from this activity could be invested in the financial support to MSMEs (outcome 1.2).

**June 3, 2022:**

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Thank you for the amendments and additional information. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

1. a clear focus was added throughout the project document
2. additional information was added in paragraphs 69 - 71
3. the TOC was corrected
4. the output was revised
5. thank you, noted



6. the output was revised

7. the budget was moved and additional information was added in paragraph 103

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**April 27, 2022:**

Yes, if a much stronger case is made on how the proposed concept leads to tangible benefits for LD. This needs to be more explicit with the proposed outputs and outcomes in the project description including in Table B and in the alternative scenario.

**June 3, 2022:**

Thank you for adjusting the project towards clearer alignment with LD focal area. Cleared.

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

**April 27, 2022:**

The description is general and should also focus on the incremental/additional cost reasoning on LD-related stakeholders and objectives. Please complete accordingly.

**June 3, 2022:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response Additional information was provided in paragraphs 124 - 138.

**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

**April 27, 2022:**

1. The LD targets are definitely not aligned with the expectations for a GEF project. There is no elaboration of how the selected entrepreneurs will be contributing to the

objectives of the LD GEF focal area, including sustainable management of land through agriculture or reduced pressure on forests. The selection criteria for the LD-related portion of the accelerator competition will have to clearly state the minimum threshold of LD-related indicator potential (area of lands under improved practices or restored) that will need to be reached for a specific entrepreneurs/idea to be supported. The current level of LD GEBs under core indicator 4 does not warrant the use of LD funds.

2. It is understood that additional work will be done at PPG stage to better define the methodology for GHG and LD GEB calculations. However, please elaborate on the use of a multiplication factor of 5 of the direct emissions to obtain the value for expected indirect emissions. Why was this factor chosen and what expected circumstances does it represent?

**June 3, 2022:**

1. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.
2. Thank you for the information provided. As mentioned in the previous review, a more precise assessment is expected for the GHG and LD GEB calculations during PPG phase.

**Agency Response**

1. Indicator targets were adjusted and further information is provided in paragraphs 147 - 151
2. More information was provided in the text box under the core indicator section as well as in paragraphs 141 -146

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**April 27, 2022:**

The sustainability of the acceleration cycles is unclear. Please clarify 1- what are the plans for the sustainability of the acceleration cycles and 2- which institutions will be in charge of continuing with the selection process and acceleration/incubation after the project ends.

**June 3, 2022:**

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response Additional information was provided in paragraphs 157 and 158.  
**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  
**April 27, 2022:**

Yes, as the project is at national level. Nevertheless, during PPG, the project should consider the relevance of specific areas aligned with the country priorities and potential to deliver GEBs related to land degradation. Cleared.

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  
**April 27, 2022:**

1. We don't find the "Annex Evidence of Stakeholder Consultations" in the document section of the Portal. Please upload this document.
2. In addition to uploading the "Annex Evidence of Stakeholder Consultations", please provide in this section a summary of the consultations conducted including the modalities, the stakeholders and the main findings that informed the project design.
3. The description includes a table with an indicative list of stakeholders to be engaged for successful implementation and execution of the project. Please also indicate how the stakeholders will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.
4. Please also consider specific LD-related stakeholders in all the description.

**June 3, 2022:**

1, 2, 3 and 4. Thank you for uploading the annex and for the additional information. Cleared.

### Agency Response

1. Annex was uploaded
2. Additional information was added in paragraph 164
3. Information on the role and means engagement of these stakeholders was added to the table
4. LD related stakeholders were added

### **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

**April 27, 2022:**

1. The description is very general and there is no specific analysis of the context in Namibia. While the general background is relevant and welcome, please complete the analysis with elements of the gender situation in Namibia so that we can understand the relevance of the proposed consideration and actions in this project in particular. Again, this analysis should be conducted including a focus on LD Focal Area objectives.
2. As this project foresees the promotion of sustainable uses of lands, please explain why the mention of "closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources" is checked with a "No".

**June 3, 2022:**

Thank you for the additional information and amendment. Cleared.

### Agency Response

1. additional information was added in paragraphs 173 - 175
2. Changed to "yes"

### **Private Sector Engagement**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**April 27, 2022:**

If the use of LD Focal Area is confirmed, please complete the description with the presentation of the private sector stakeholders involved in land-based activities and with their modalities of engagement in the project.

**June 3, 2022:**

Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

Agency Response Additional information was added to paragraph 182 and the stakeholder table.

**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

**April 27, 2022:**

The table under "Outcome-based climate risk analysis (scale: low, moderate and high)" goes beyond the limit of the page of the Portal entry on the right side (format issue). Please adjust the table so that it fits within the page limits of the Portal entry.

**June 3, 2022:**

Thank you for the adjustment. Cleared.

Agency Response The formatting of the table was adjusted.

**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

**April 27, 2022:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**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

**April 27, 2022:**

The description provide a list of national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under Conventions. Please select the most relevant ones (especially related to UNCCD and land degradation) and for each them, clearly elaborate on how the proposed project is aligned. Please note that the alignment with the national LDN process in particular needs to be highlighted (it is a key element of the UNCCD strategy).

**June 3, 2022:**

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response Additional information was provided in paragraphs 212 - 215

**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

**April 27, 2022:**

Thank you for the detailed description. In addition, in the beginning of this section please also indicate how existing lessons informed the project concept and plan.

**June 3, 2022:**

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response Additional information was provided in paragraph 216.  
**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  
**April 27, 2022:**

Thank you for uploading the ES screening document. In Table 1 of this document, the question 6 is answered with a "yes" and we understand that with such answer, the project should be categorized as "Category C" (and not B). If the project is actually categorized as "C" please correct accordingly and in this section, please adjust the text taking into account the eventual consequences in terms of risks and responses.

**June 3, 2022:**

Thank you for the adjustment and clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

To keep the project in line with UNIDO ESS clearance and other GCIP projects, Question 6 was marked with a "No" . Risks associated with Category C are already included in Category B. As such ticking "Yes" in question 5 of Category B projects is sufficient. An updated ES&S sheet was uploaded.

**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  
**April 26, 2022:**

Yes, the project has been endorsed by the GEF OFP in Namibia. Cleared.

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

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

**April 27, 2022:**

Not yet. Please address the comments raised in the review.

**June 3, 2022:**

Thank you for addressing the comments. The PIF and PPG are now recommended for clearance.

#### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**Review Dates**

**PIF Review**

**Agency Response**



**PIF Review**

**Agency Response**

<b>First Review</b>	<b>4/27/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>6/3/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

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