



Climate Resilience Enhancement for Building Adaptive Capacity in Agri- Value Chains in Cambodia (CREA)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11051

Countries

Cambodia

Project Name

Climate Resilience Enhancement for Building Adaptive Capacity in Agri-Value Chains in Cambodia (CREA)

Agencies

IFAD

Date received by PM

12/1/2023

Review completed by PM

1/12/2024

Program Manager

Tshewang Dorji

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/10/2024: GEFSEC: Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/10/2024: GEFSEC: Yes

Agency Response

2. Project Summary.

a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/27/2024: GEFSEC: Cleared. Thanks

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

The summary could be further improved by highlighting importance of the proposed intervention to reduce vulnerability to the impact of current and future climate change for

rural Cambodia. Similarly, the summary can re-focus on building adaptive capacity to withstand the climate shock as the center piece of the project.

Also, please review reasoning for "innovative" and "transformative" aspect of the project.

Agency Response

12/2/2024, IFAD:

Thanks for this comment. The project summary section has been revised to emphasize the connection between farmers' adaptive capacity and the adoption of CRTs. Regarding the "innovative and transformative" section, emphasis has been placed on blended finance schemes, the use of digital technology for CRTs for monitoring, troubleshooting, and payment schemes. The project is also cited as being transformative due to the fact that if the blended finance schemes are successful, opportunities are available for portfolio expansion within the selected PFIs as well as at the policy level a recognition of the importance of such financing tools, which would be given greater significance within national frameworks for agriculture finance

3. Project Description Overview

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/27/2024: GEFSEC: Cleared. Thanks

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

- a) Yes
- b) Please refer to section 5.1 for further comments. Also the document mentions that changes were made since the approved PIF in-line with STAP's observation. For ease of tracking those changes, please highlight it.
- c). The reflection of gender dimensions could be further enhanced in the Project description, in Component 2, Output 1.3, Activity 1.1.4 and Activity 1.2.5 . Under Output 1.4, it is important to address the digital divide between women and men. Financial illiteracy, especially among women, is a common challenge in rural areas. Please ensure that this is factored in. Women are not always represented in formal organizations such as POs and ACs,

hence, it may be good to extend the project's reach to informal organizations to ensure inclusion. In addition, please ensure that in developing any toolkits, frameworks, and instruments, gender experts and representatives of women's organizations are engaged. Also, please include reporting on gender action plan and the gender-specific results of the project under M&E.

On Knowledge Management, please clarify the budget and implementation timeline for key KM&L activities/deliverables across all components, including dissemination and communications. This can be done by including a simple table in the KM&L section

d) No. Please revise as suggested below

e) The co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5.0%, for a co-financing of \$11,407,700 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$570,385 instead of \$152,300 (which is 1.3%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

Agency Response

12/2/2024, IFAD:

b) Noted, all changes have been provided in track changes

c) Noted. The team has revised the sections (in track changes) to reflect the digital divide, and also provided some figures and potential avenues for collaboration to reach informal organizations with a higher representation of women-headed households.

A table outlining the activities and deliverables pertaining to KM has been added, including the timeline and budget.

d) Noted and revised as suggested.

e) The PMC cofinancing has been increased to USD 570,385 (by adding USD 418,085 to item "Office expenses (PSU and Provincial offices)"). The total co-financing cost and total project cost do not change. Numbers in Table "Project Description Overview" and Annex G: Budget Tables have been updated accordingly.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

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

and adequately addressed by the project design?

b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/27/2024: GEFSEC: Cleared. Thanks

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

a) Yes. However, the "Situational analysis of targeted value chain" describes status of the agriculture and livestock products, instead of outlining value chain status of the identified product. Please review.

b) kindly refer to comments under the stakeholder section (section 7.3).

Agency Response

a) Noted, the section on "Situational analysis of targeted value chains" has been revised to include value chain status.

b) Noted. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been developed as per recommendations and included as an annex to the full submission of documents.

5 B. Project Description

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

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

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

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

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

f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-

effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/27/2024: GEFSEC: Cleared. Thanks

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

a) Please simplify schematic representation of the ToC, including mapping of pathways and its associated color representation

b) Yes

c) Under Outcome 1: As the project heavily builds on the past learning and investments, it will be useful to gain insights on the types of CRT and the packages that might have potential to consider under this project. Without pre-empting and pre-judging the outcome of assessment of various types of CRT and its packages, it will be useful to maintain a list of non-exhaustive CRT listing, informed by the past learnings. Please consider to compile lists of CRT for various targeted crops and livestock.

Activity: 1.1.5: Please clarify the usefulness of workshop. Instead of workshop, it may be suggested that the content of the Business Acceleration Program can be delivered by anchoring within the existing or new institutions. Such institution can be used for delivering this and other capacity building program such as those outlined under 1.2.3, 1.2.4 and other relevant capacity building activities. This will also help in strengthening/institutionalizing capacity building mechanism and its sustainability.

Activity 1.2.5: As large portion of the work is anticipated to be contacted out, please review the value of recruiting Rural Finance Officer. This activity may be handled by the PSU.

Outcome 2: As the outcomes deals with formulation of blended finance and its associated instrument, the project might also benefit from engaging Finance Ministry and Central Bank, if possible.

Output 2.1: Pleased to note that the project is considering to work with two financial institutions that has a strong track record on the ground. However, in order to ensure the transparency of the selection process, it might be useful to documents the comparative advantages against other financial institution, if any.

Activity 2.1.1: Suggest to include knowledge about the climate risk in the agriculture sector as one additional criteria for assessing PFIs.

Outcome 3, Activity 3.4.4 and 3.4.5: It is suggested to explore ways of integrating this activities with larger national research agenda, if appropriate. This could include supporting/enhancing existing institutions and infrastructure. This outcome can also benefit by aligning with activities under the output 1.3

M&E workplan and adaptive management: It is mentioned that the inception workshop of the project will also set the project goal, in addition to other work. Please keep in mind that project goal cannot be changed from what is being already agreed.

d) Thanks for outlining a series of ongoing projects. In order to avoid duplication and harvest synergies, it would useful to understands the targeted area by those projects. In addition, a brief explanation on how those projects that are not in similar geographical areas can collaborate with this project.

Similarly, the SCCF funded S-RET was mentioned as in the few places in the document. However, such reference wasn't reflected in the "lesson learned from recently completed projects". Please clarify

e) Please provide clear narratives on the social economic benefits of the project.

f) Yes.

g) Yes, the project focuses on engaging financial and private sector. Both these sectors are nimble to change in the future conditions

h) Yes

i) Yes

j) Yes

k) No. however, as suggested, please engage Finance Ministry and Central Bank to ensure that incentive of reduced interest rates to purchase CRT can be supported into post project era.

l) The project has a potential for scaling up. It is unclear how it is transformative and innovative

Agency Response

a) Thanks. The ToC has been simplified by grouping the assumptions, mapping, and color-coding the causal pathways, improving the readability of the text, and simplifying attribution arrows.

c) Noted. Under Outcome 1, a short table has been included summarizing some CRT packages with high potential for scalability without taking away potential for others.

The purpose of activity 1.1.5 is to keep MAFF informed of the progress made under the Business Acceleration Program. The workshop will provide MAFF with an opportunity to consult with and agree on the CRT companies that exhibit potential markets for scaling up their activities. Additionally, noted on the synergies, and under Activity 1.1.4, it has been added that the project will build synergies with existing initiatives for clean and renewable technologies incubation and acceleration that are being implemented by Energy Lab, Impact Hub and Techo Start-up Centre (TSC), among others.

Following recent consultations with MAFF, the implementing agency has requested additional support in this area. This expertise would provide technical oversight also to the baseline project (ASPIRE-AT) in reviewing the business plans submitted by ACs/POs for submission to state-owned banks (ARDB and SME bank). It should be noted, however, that the role has been changed from a full-time position to one of a consultant on a retainer basis. Additionally, the appointment of this individual will facilitate a better communication between the GEF grant (CREA project) and its baseline project by avoiding the application of different standards/procedures in the evaluation of the CRT packages.

Noted, thanks. This has been integrated under the section on implementation arrangements of Component 2.

Noted. The Annex on 'CREA Brief Company profiles' has been updated and includes a section on 'scoping/ analysis of other PFIs' and explains why the CREA project has selected Chamroeun and Wing Bank. During the PIF and full design, the mission team met with most of the active PFIs and six of these institutions were *de facto* excluded from any potential partnership with the CREA Project since they are currently being investigated by IFC under allegation of violation of IFC environmental and social standards. These organizations are the following: Acleda, Amret, Prasac, Hattha Bank, LOLC and Sathapana. Full details are provided in the annex mentioned above.

Thanks. Added under activity 2.1.1

Noted. This is a key activity also suggested by H.E. Dith Tina (MAFF Minister) who expressed importance to link these activities to larger national research agenda. Sentence has been added to reflect this more coherently.

Thanks. The sentence has been rewritten and the reference to setting project goals removed.

d) Thanks, added the geographic locations of the projects where possible (as some projects mentioned in this section have a nationwide targeting approach).

Apologies for this oversight. Indeed, the S-RET is a key project on which CREA builds upon. It has now been added in the lessons learned section.

e) Socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and have now been described in the Project Description section

k) Well noted and agreed this is a very important point which the mission team will do on a continuous basis.

l) Addressed this in the section on project overview.

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

a) Yes

b) No

c) Yes

Agency Response

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?

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

Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/27/2024: GEFSEC: Cleared. Thanks

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

The core indicator number has reduced significantly from the approved PIF. Please ensure to re-instate the PIF approved figure.

Agency Response

The core indicator number are reinstated and updated as follows:

- ? Direct beneficiaries: Based on data from MAFF, CREA has recalibrated its target, aiming to encompass 50% of ASPIRE-AT's AC/POs in the designated provinces. Consequently, this approach will facilitate the adoption of Climate-Resilient Technologies by 228 ACs, benefiting 10,000 households. This strategy is projected to positively impact approximately 40,000 direct beneficiaries through enhanced resilience of physical and natural assets.
- ? Area of land managed for climate resilience: Following the recommendation from GEFSEC, the targeted land area for climate resilience of 20,000 hectares has been reinstated.
- ? Number of policies / plans / frameworks / institutions to strengthen climate adaptation: Reinstated as per PIF-approved goals.
- ? Number of people trained or with awareness raised (sex disaggregated): Reinstated as per PIF-approved goals.
- ? Output 1.4. (*Outreach campaign promoting CRT benefits and CRT packages available for sale on existing digital agriculture marketplaces.*) indicator elected to become a Core Indicator as per GEFSEC recommendation.

Number of private sector enterprises engaged in climate change adaptation and resilience action: Reinstated as per PIF-approved goals. During the full design process, the CREA team engaged with over ten companies and observed that the ability of these companies to scale operations and attract commercial or blended financing was still at an early stage. As a result, a more conservative estimate of private sector engagement was made. As per GEFSEC recommendations, we have reinstated the original target of 30 CRT/agri-MSMEs accelerated, since several companies expressed interest during the consultation workshop. Moreover, CREA intends to enhance its communication strategies in order to engage additional companies that may have recently emerged (including regional and international ones).

5.4 Risks

a) Are climate and other main risks relevant to the project identified and adequately described

(e.g. including these related to work in fragile locations and/or countries)? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Are the key risks that might affect implementation assessed and adequately rated?

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/27/2024: GEFSEC: Cleared. Thanks

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

Risks are identified. However, since there is significant portion of the project fund to be disbursed by the Financial Institutions, fiduciary risk may be higher than current rating. Please review and suggest most appropriate mitigation measure.

Agency Response Noted and addressed in the risk section.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/27/2024: GEFSEC: Cleared. Thanks

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

The document mentions that alignment with GEF-8 programming strategy will be further elaborated during the PPG stage. Please review.

Agency Response

Thanks, now addressed in Section C: Alignment with GEF-8 Programming strategies and country/regional priorities

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/27/2024: GEFSEC: Cleared. Thanks

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

Yes. However, please see how the project will contribute to implementation of Cambodia's NAPs.

Agency Response

Thanks. This section has been added highlighting that the NAP process also carved out a number of strategic intervention areas, of which CREA will contribute especially to:

- systematic financial support: establishment of a function to match financing needs with sources
- capacity development and vertical mainstreaming linking national and sub-national level
- support measures such as capacity development, advisory services, upscaling mechanisms and enhanced ownership at the local level

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/27/2024: GEFSEC: Cleared. Thanks

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

Yes, however, the uploaded stakeholder engagement plan seems incomplete. It mainly contains information on stakeholder consulted in project development. It does not provide any analysis of the different stakeholders or information on the means of stakeholder engagement and their roles and responsibilities in project implementation. Please clarify and provide additional information

Agency ResponseA comprehensive stakeholder engagement plan (SEP) has been developed and added as Annex to the complete package. The new plan provides stakeholder analyses and outlines their engagement throughout the project.

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency Response

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency Response

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency Response

Annex B: Endorsements

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

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

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/27/2024: GEFSEC: Cleared. Thanks

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

Please refer to comments under the 5.3.

Also, it was noted that Table is off margins. Please correct.

Agency Response Noted and addressed.

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

Yes

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

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

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified

sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/27/2024: GEFSEC: Cleared. Thanks

1/21/2024: GEFSEC:

a) Please clarify what entails ?Support to Ministry of Environment on inter-ministerial cooperation with MAFF and other line ministries?

Agency Responsea) The Ministry of Environment chairs the National Council for Sustainable Development, including the Department of Climate Change, which is responsible for coordinating the development and implementation of the climate change response in Cambodia and reporting on Cambodia's commitments under the UNFCCC. As such, it plays a critical role for the successful implementation of CREA and Cambodia's overall efforts in climate change adaptation, requiring regular exchange and close cooperation with project-relevant line ministries such as the Ministry of Water Resources and Meteorology (MoWRAM), the Ministry of Women Affairs (MoWA), and especially MAFF as CREA's lead executing agency. Particularly, under component 3.1.2, a series of seminars (training and capacity building) is to be planned, coordinated and implemented that provide a venue for government agencies, MAFF research institutes and aforementioned line ministries involved in climate change adaptation in the agriculture sector to enhance inter-ministerial knowledge sharing, including support activities to the GEF office of MoE on the following matters: (i) Cambodia Climate Change Policy framework; (ii) Climate Change policy goals of the RGC relevant to the agricultural sector; (iii) Meaning of mainstreaming climate resilience in agriculture with reference to the monitoring framework designed by IIED for MoE and MAFF, (iv) Barriers to the adoption of CRT and scaling up blended finance solutions for AC/POs; and (v) Awareness of a range of potential cross-sectoral actions MAFF/MoE can take to promote dialogue around the importance of CRT.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Additional Annexes
9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation
Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/27/2024: GEFSEC: Recommended for approval

1/10/2024: GEFSEC:

Not yet. Please address the above mentioned comments.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/21/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/27/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		