

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

Edit and Submit CEO Endorsement

Basic project information

GEF ID

10432

Countries

Regional (Congo DR, Uganda)

Project Name

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

Agencies

IUCN

Date received by PM

2/27/2021

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Katya Kuang-Idba

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/8/2021 - Yes.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - Clarifications requested. Some of the outputs are written as outcomes. Please ensure the outputs are easily measurable against the intended outcomes and are actions or items that can be delivered, as opposed to an intended broader achievement.

GEFSEC, 5/19/2021 - Clarifications requested. Outputs 1.1, 1.3, 1.4; 2.2.1, are not written as outputs. Even 2.1.1 can be clarified -- is the output here the training?

Agency Response

10 May,

[See the revised ProDoc & CEO Endorsement.](#)

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 -
Yes, this cleared.

Agency Response
GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 -
Yes.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, 3/8/2021 - No, please include this in Annex C on the portal. OR - Clarify whether the worksheet "PPG" in Annex 5 is meant for Table C? If so, just add it onto the portal please.

GEFSEC, 5/24/2021- Cleared.

Agency Response

10 May

The table has been added in Annex C in the portal

Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - Action requested. Please remove all figures from the Core Indicators table on the portal to prevent double counting.

GEFSEC, 5/24/2021 - Action requested. This has not been done-- Core Indicators for 3,4, and 11 are still filled out on the portal.

Agency Response

10 May

This has been adjusted in the portal

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - More information requested. This information is referred to as being updated in the prodoc, but the new basis for the adaptation problem, root causes and barriers is missing. Please include this on the portal.

GEFSEC, 5/24/2021 - More information requested. There is no specific information provided, including scenarios and climate information, regarding the adaptation risks to the target areas where the project is being implemented?

Agency Response

10 May

Updated in the CEO Endorsement in the section ?consistency with national priorities and plans?.

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - More information requested. The baseline scenario at CEO Approval stage is not included, but rather refers to information at PIF stage. Please provide the baseline information in the portal.

GEFSEC, 5/24/2021 - Please confirm all the changes have been reflected in the portal now?

Agency Response

10 May

Updated in the CEO Endorsement in the section on baseline analysis and gaps.

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - More information requested. It seems the project structure has changed, but the new information has not been added in detail to the portal. Please provide a detailed description of the alternative scenario on the portal itself, instead of just referring to the prodoc.

Agency Response

10 May

Updated in the CEO Endorsement in section 3 and 4.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - Yes, this project is will aligned with the Challenge Program's objectives, as well as CCA-1.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - It seems that the underlying rationale for the adaptation reasoning has changed but the updated information is missing from the portal. Please add.

GEFSEC, 5/24/2021 - Clarifications requested: There does not seem to be any elaboration on the additional cost reasoning. Please provide some more details regarding the co-financing and what it is covering, and what the LDCF portion of the project is financing within this context.

Additionally, the co-financing letters do not specify the Type of co-financing, which needs to be stated clearly in the letter (recurrent expenditure).

Agency Response

10 May

[Updated in the CEO Endorsement in the section ?Adaptation reasoning?](#)

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - More information requested: this information seems to be missing.

GEFSEC, 5/24/2021 - Clarifications requested.

This is an adaptation project, so while the elaboration on co-benefits generated across GEF focal areas can be added here, it is not necessary. The main purpose of this section is to highlight the benefits of this project in terms of how it results in increased resilience of target communities and natural and physical assets. Within the context of this specific project, more specific information regarding how the resilience of the communities working on the smallholder coffee farming households will be increased and how these communities will be supported in adapting to the negative impacts of climate change specific to the target areas and this intervention.

Agency Response

10 May

The updated CEO Endorsement has the adaptation benefits copied & pasted from the ProDoc in section 3 and 4 and section 10.

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 5/24/2021 - Yes. These three elements are captured in the presentation of the concept.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - Yes, this is cleared.

Agency Response

12/02/2019

The scoping phase is still on-going. Geo references to specific project sites in the two countries will be provided at the end of the project preparation phase.

IUCN - 13/01/2020

The maps cannot be pasted in the portal. There are compiled in a document called ?maps? attached in the portal submission

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response
Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the
implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of
engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - More information requested. At this stage of project development, the Secretariat would appreciate a more detailed summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement; as well as an actual plan for engagement once implementation begins.

GEFSEC, 5/24/2021 - Please include this information on the portal.

Agency Response
10 May

Please see the revised stakeholder engagement sections in the Pro Doc Annex 1.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - Please add all the information in the attachments to the portal submission regarding the gender analysis and socio-economic assessment.

GEFSEC, 5/24/2021 - Please include this in the relevant section of the portal.

Agency Response
10 May

Attachments are added to the portal

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - Yes.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - As requested in the final comment box, in this section please elaborate on both the risks posed by the current COVID-19 pandemic as well as the opportunities; focusing on how this project can facilitate building back better and green recovery in the two target areas.

GEFSEC, 5/24/2021 - More information requested. Please provide more specific information on how this project will support building back better and green recovery within the COVID context. The information provided currently is quite general and speaking more about protocols and safety measures.

Agency Response

10 May

[Updated in the CEO Endorsement.](#)

The projects important contribution to rural sustainable development and climate adaptation and resilience remains unchanged thanks to the adaptive capabilities of the local partners, which meant that project activities were largely able to continue with precautionary measures in place

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - More information requested. Please include this information, as requested at PIF, in the CEO Approval request regarding coordination with ongoing LDCF projects. Additionally, the graphic in this section does not show up -- more specific information on the the institutional structure of the PMU and executing arrangements.

GEFSEC, 5/24/2021 - More information requested. The information regarding coordination does not seem to be included? Please clarify.

Agency Response

10 May

[Updated in the CEO Endorsement in section 6 and in the stakeholder engagement plan](#)

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - Yes, this project is broadly aligned with the NAPAs and NAPs of DRC and Uganda.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - More information requested. The information provided in this section is quite general and at this stage of project development, the Secretariat would appreciate a more detailed KM plan with a timeline and set of deliverables. Regarding

the creation, capture, management, and dissemination of project-level progress against its milestones; are the only relevant knowledge products/deliverables the report for each origin as mentioned?

GEFSEC, 5/24/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

10 May

[Updated in the ProDoc paragraph 136-138 and the CEO Endorsement in section 8.](#)

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 CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - Yes an ESMAP screening is included.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - Clarification and action requested: Please include a budgeted M&E plan specifically for measuring the results of this project on the portal. The portal currently seems to indicate that the information is contained across 2 annexes in the prodoc.

GEFSEC, 5/24/2021 - OK.

Agency Response

10 May

Please see the update in Annex 17.

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/8/2021 - More information requested. At this stage of project development, some quantifiable benefits would be appreciated, if available. Is there any estimate in income generation benefits as a result of the project, or how many households will experience lessened food insecurity, for example?

Agency Response

10 May

Please see revised text on adaptation benefits in the Project Document and CEO Endorsement.

Further, a clear proxy for additional benefits will be the volumes provide to Nespresso that result in additional premium payments to coffee growers. This can be seen as one way that can contribution to an increase of household income. It is not the main objective of this project to measure hh incomes or reduced food insecurity, the focus is on increasing the resilience to climate change of coffee growers in DRC and Uganda.

Additionally, at Nespresso we are currently working at the global level on a living income strategy and once clearly established and defined, context specific interventions could be integrated into the programs in origin

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - In process.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 3/8/2021 - Yes.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 3/8/2021 - Yes

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - No. Please include any STAP comments and responses in Annex B.

GEFSEC, 5/24/2021 - Please include the responses to STAP in Annex B

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/8/2021 - No, please include this in Annex C on the portal. OR - Clarify whether the worksheet "PPG" in Annex 5 is meant for Table C? If so, just add it onto the portal please.

Agency Response

10 May

Added in Annex C

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 3/28/2021 - Yes.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/8/2021 - Not yet. Please refer to flagged items and resubmit. Additionally, there are numerous sections in the portal submission where it refers to the prodoc for changes/updates since PIF stage. The portal is meant to capture all updates and information as a comprehensive submission for PIFs and CERs/approvals. It is automatically synchronized with the Web site, so it's very important that any updated information contained in prodocs is reflected on the portal submission itself -- please rectify.

Lastly, in light of the current COVID-19 pandemic, please provide a section that thoroughly analyzes both the risks and opportunities posed by the pandemic and how this project will address them to assist participating countries in building back better through a greener recovery. This was also flagged in the "Risks" Section.

GEFSEC, 5/24/2021 - Not yet.

Please provide more specific information regarding how this project will address specific risks relating to this project and how it will support building back better and green recovery. This is also flagged in the RIsks section. The information currently provided is quite general, but we would appreciate a more in depth analysis on how this project will contribute to the recovery period (not just protocols and safety).

Additionally, there are quite a few items that still refer to the prodoc. It is very important that all pertinent items of the proposal are included in the Portal submission because donors and other stakeholders may read the portal and have questions. Not all attachments and documents are accessible to donors and external stakeholders. Please ensure that all relevant flagged items are articulated/updated on the portal submission itself and not on a separate attachment.

Lastly, in line with the guidelines, please ensure the FULL project budget is Annex E -- this looks like a summary of the budget, but we need the entire budget.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review	3/11/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/24/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	