

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

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## 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**

9/23/2021

**Program Manager**

Jason Spensley

**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.

GEFSEC, 9/9/2021 - Further to the comment above, please change the implementation start date to a future date and correct the duration/completion date accordingly.

Submission Date 2/26/2021	Expected Implementation Start 7/15/2021	Expected Completion Date 7/15/2024
Duration ⓘ 60 In Months		Agency Fee(\$) 103,210.00

GEFSEC, 17/9/2021 - Cleared

**Agency Response**

**IUCN Response to Sept 9 review comments from GEF:**

The implementation start date and completion dates have been adjusted to account for later start, now expected November 1, 2021. Changes have been made to the CEO ER and IUCN Project Document.

**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?

GEFSEC, 19July2021 - Cleared

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.

GEFSEC 9/9/2021 - Further to the comment above, please note that all the co-financing should to be reported as ?Grant? (type) and ?Investment Mobilized?, because the co-financing letters clearly indicates that Nespresso and KCL will provide the co-financing in the form of ?cash? toward the main components of the project. Therefore, please

change the entries accordingly, and complete the 'Investment Mobilized' description by outlining the scope of Nespresso (in DRC and Uganda separately) and KCL's activities and contributions that are expected during the project implementation phase.

GEFSEC, 17/9/2021 - Cleared

Agency Response

**IUCN Response to Sept 9 review comments from GEF:**

Classification of co-financing in Table C of the CEO ER has now been correctly classified as advised. In addition, a description of the scope and activities of Nespresso's and KCL's co-financed contributions in DRC and Uganda is provided in the section on 'Investment Mobilized' beneath Table C of the GEF CEO ER.

**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.

GEFSEC, 9/9/21 - Further to the comment above, Table D in CEO Endorsement incorrectly charged the programming of funds among the two participant countries. Considering that this is a Regional project, the funds should be charged to the 'Regional' option. Table D in the CEO Endorsement has to be identical to Table D approved at PIF stage (see below). Please revise accordingly.

At CEO Endorsement/Approval:

**D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds**

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
IUCN	LDCF	Congo DR	Climate Change	NA	595,449	53,590
IUCN	LDCF	Uganda	Climate Change	NA	551,341	49,620
Total Grant Resources(\$)					1,146,790.00	103,210.00

At PIF:

**D. Indicative Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds**

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
IUCN	LDCF	Regional	Climate Change	NA	1,146,790	103,210	1,250,000.00
Total GEF Resources(\$)					1,146,790.00	103,210.00	1,250,000.00

GEFSEC, 17/9/2021 - Cleared

Agency Response

**IUCN Response to Sept 9 review comments from GEF:**

Table D in the CEO Endorsement Request has been corrected as advised.

**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.

GEFSEC, 19July2021 - This has still not been addressed. Please note that figures are still viewable for GEF Trust Fund indicators 3 and 4 in the portal. Please delete these figures. If you are not sure how to do so, please let us know and we can arrange a session with GEF IT Portal colleagues.

GEFSEC 30August2021 - As indicated above, please remove all figures from the Trust Fund indicators table within the CER document itself. Given this is an LDCF/SCCF project, the impact indicator figures should only be shown in the LDCF/SCCF CCA indicators table which is attached as an Excel document. This is to avoid double counting. Please to not resubmit with figures in the Trust Fund indicators table within the CER.

GEFSEC 30August2021 - Again, please remove all figures from the Trust Fund indicators table within the CER document itself. Given this is an LDCF/SCCF project, the impact indicator figures should only be shown in the LDCF/SCCF CCA indicators table which is attached as an Excel document. This is to avoid double counting. Please to not resubmit with figures in the Trust Fund indicators table within the CER.

GEFSEC 3Sept2021 - Cleared

#### Agency Response

**IUCN response to July 19 comments from GEF:** GEF Core Indicators 3 and 4 no longer have values. GEF Indicator 11 has the target beneficiary values 4,200 direct beneficiaries, 1,680 females and 2,520 males.

**IUCN response to August 30 comments from GEF:** Sorry for the confusion. All figures have now been removed from the GEF Core Indicators on the CER document on the GEF 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?

GEFSEC 19July2021 - The new information provided in paragraphs 44, 45, 48 and 49 on current and anticipated climate hazards and their impacts is well noted. It appears the information on anticipated future scenarios is derived by only one source for each target area (a Climate Service Centre report for the DRC and the IUCN Policy Makers booklet for Uganda). To strengthen the analysis of climate risks that this project is striving to address, please identify other existing sources or data sets, even if they are at the national or regional scale. In doing so, we encourage consulting the set of available sources and data sets provided, with specific links, during the technical dialogue held earlier this with GEF Agencies on strengthening climate change impacts. Please let us know if you would like us to send you this material again.

As more specific comment to support in strengthening this impact, for example:

- Para 44: Regarding DRC we note the general mentions to anticipated increases temperatures, as well as frequency and intensity of wet and dry spells. Can data be specified from this and/or other sources on the range of anticipated increases, preferably based on different climate change scenarios preferably to 2050?

- Para 45: Is it possible to expand on why and to what extent reforestation and agroforestry practices that will be expanded through this project are cost effective ways to address the climate impacts specified?

- Para 44: Further, can you please expand on the anticipated impacts from the changes in rainfall, beyond only increased fungal infections and waterlogging?

- Para 48: Regarding the project area in Uganda, please seek to provide more specific information on the extent of anticipated impacts from the hazards touched on in this paragraph, as well as how these impacts will be reduced through the project by also expanding on information in para 49.

**GEFSEC 30August2021** - We note further information has been added in the IUCN Project Document. However, it seems these changes were not made in the GEF CER document. Please provide all relevant new information in the GEF CEO document itself. In doing to, in order to be sure to note all additions, please either (preferably) attach a tracked changes or highlighted version of the GEF CER document via the documents upload section, and/or indicate what specific paragraphs have been added or changed.

GEFSEC 3September2021 - Thank you and cleared.

Agency Response

**IUCN response to July 19 comments from GEF:**

Section 3C (paragraphs 43 through 59 in the Project document) on *climate threats, root causes and barriers* has been revised and enhanced with additional information on current and anticipated climate hazards and impacts including from several sources suggested by GEF Secretariat including the World Bank, UN Environment, IPCC, USAID and others. This includes additional information on current and anticipated changes in temperature, rainfall and other impacts from climate change covering project sites in DRC and Uganda.

Additional information on the rationale and evidence supporting introduction of regenerative, climate-resilient agricultural practices as a cost-effective means for addressing anticipated impacts from climate change to coffee production is provided in Section 4, Intervention strategy and Component 1 description (paragraphs 78 through 99)

**IUCN response to August 30 comments from GEF:**

The changes to the Project Document referenced in IUCN responses to July 19 GEF Sec comments were uploaded to the GEF portal CER document in our August 30 resubmission. Sorry that CER paragraphs were not also referenced in the below Agency responses as the paragraph numbering seems to change when pasting this material into the GEF portal. We have now uploaded a hard copy of the CER request with track changes however most of CER Section Part II, Project Justification will show up as track changes in part because text has been shifted around to better match the GEF CER template and improve the coherency of the document. We have highlighted in yellow the relevant changes made to address the July 19 comments.

**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?

GEFSEC 19July2021 - Cleared.

**Agency Response**

10 May

[Updated in the CEO Endorsement in the section on baseline analysis and gaps.](#)

18 June

Yes. Baseline projects are included in the portal.

**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.

GEFSEC, 19July2021 - Cleared.

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 rational 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).

GEFSEC 19July2021: Cleared

## Agency Response

10 May

Updated in the CEO Endorsement in the section ?Adaptation reasoning?

18 June

Clarifications in new paragraph 136 ? 142 in the ProDoc. These clarifications are also included in the portal

Please see the co-funding letters (one from Nespresso and one from KLC) specifying the cash and in-kind contributions.

**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.

GEFSEC 19July2021 - Thank for your for the additional explanations in paras 136-142. Please note comments above in question 1 of Part II. Further, we note para 44 in the Prodoc indicates that climate adaptation and resilience will be strengthened in the project area in DRC through reforestation and agroforestry. However, para 137 indicates climate adaptation and resilience will be strengthened by a different set of strategies (livelihood diversification, regenerative agriculture practices, household nutrition, etc.). Please clarify and ensure a consistent and coherent logic in all relevant sections in the

Portal and prodoc of how the project interventions will directly address the specific climate impacts.

GEFSEC 30August2021 - As indicated in the comment above for question 1 of part 2, please ensure these changes have been made to the CER document itself, and specify where there changes are made by either uploading a tracked changes version or specifying each paragraph in the CER.

**GEFSEC 3September2021** - Thank you and cleared.

Agency Response

**IUCN response to July 19 comments from GEF:**

The project document and Portal submissions have been thoroughly amended to ensure consistency of terminology and coherent logic in all relevant sections. A definition of regenerative, climate-resilient agricultural practices is provided in the project summary and in the Introduction (paragraph 5), and this approach is further described in Section 4, Intervention strategy and Component 1 description (paragraphs 78 through 99)

**IUCN response to August 30 comments from GEF:**

Again, apologies for not referencing the revised CER sections that were updated in the GEF Portal. In addition to revising the IUCN Project document, the GEF CER request was amended to ensure consistency of terminology and coherent logic in all relevant sections. A definition of regenerative, climate-resilient agricultural practices is provided in the Project summary at the top of the CER, and in more detail in Part II, Section (c) Proposed alternative scenario, at the top (A. Project goal and expected impact). Additional details on supported regenerative, climate-resilient interventions are provided in the subsequent CER section describing Component 1 (Project components, their expected outcomes and outputs). Relevant revised sections are highlighted on the uploaded hardcopy version of the CER.

**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.

GEFSEC 19July2021 - Cleared

#### Agency Response

10 May

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

18 June

See section 2. Stakeholders engagement plan indicating how stakeholders will be involved included in the portal.

Information on stakeholders can also be found in the prodoc: section D page 30, and Annex 1.1 and 1.2

#### **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.

GEFSEC, 19July2021: Cleared

## Agency Response

10 May

Attachments are added to the portal

18 June

A gender analysis has been completed for both countries and the results informed the project document. Outcomes 2.1 and 2.2 will address any gaps in gender equality and women's empowerment. The full gender analysis is provided as an annex, and the summary of findings of both studies has been included in 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.

GEFSEC 19July2021: Cleared

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

18 June

Please see paragraphs 106 ? 112 in the ProDoc. This information has also been included in the portal

#### **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.

GEFSEC 19July2021: Cleared

Agency Response

10 May

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

18 June

[Please see information on Institutional arrangement and coordination in section 6 of portal](#)

## **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.

GEFSEC, 9/9/2021 - Further to the comments above, please include the detailed Budget Table for M & E.

GEFSEC, 17/9/2021 - Cleared

Agency Response

**IUCN Response to Sept 9 review comments from GEF:**

A detailed budget table for Project M&E activities is now provided on the CEO ER and in the Project Document (page 59)

**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?

GEFSEC 19July2019 - Thank you for the reply. However, can the specific target scale of some quantifiable benefits be identified, with numbers?

GEFSEC 30August2021 - Similar to comments above, please ensure all changes are included in the GEF CER document itself, and not just the IUCN Project Document. In

doing so, please indicate where the changes are made in the GEF CER document by uploading a version in tracked changes and/or indicating the location in the comment.

GEFSEC 3September2021 -Thank you and cleared.

#### Agency Response

##### **IUCN response to July 19 comments from GEF:**

We can provide numbers on how many households will benefit from the training and the program (4,200 households in total), as well as quantifiable outcomes such as number of demo plots but we will not be able to quantify increases in farmer incomes or lessened food security as this will also be impacted by factors outside of the project's control. This has been clarified in the Project document see footnote 112 from paragraph 86.

##### **IUCN response to August 30 comments from GEF:**

The qualifying footnote on socioeconomic benefits noted in IUCN response to the July 19 review is in the CER document on the Portal in *section Part II, (c) The proposed alternative scenario, (A) Project goal and expected impact*. The footnote is found in paragraph 5 of this section and is highlighted in the uploaded hardcopy version of the CER.

#### **Annexes**

##### **Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 3/10/2021 - In process.

GEFSEC, 9/9/2021 - On the Budget: There are 9 budget tables and most of them in low quality in Annex E of the CEO Endorsement view in Portal. Please harmonize, get only one table (see suggested format in Guidelines ? page 46) and upload a readable version (which has to be the same appended to the Document's section and the ProDoc, if there is one), so this can be reviewed ? then we will be in a position to provide comments on the budget.

Notes on the budget for the Agency: (i) the budget must be presented to allow the Secretariat assessing whether the budget categories (civil works, contractual services, consultants, salaries, etc.) are appropriately charged to the sources (project's components, M&E, PMC); (ii) presenting the budget per outcome instead of per outcome would make the table slimmer, so a bigger table would fit within the margins.

GEFSEC, 21/9/2021 - While the resubmission did include one budget table instead of 9 (this is appreciated), the current budget table included in Annex E of Portal requires specific points to be addressed:

- (i) requires an identical Excel format appended to the Documents? tab as requested in Guidelines and indicated in the previous review;
- (ii) there are not figures in the column ?TOTAL USD?, so it is not possible to confirm the accuracy of the sum for each budget line;
- (iii) considering that ?*Other Operating Costs: KCL office & operational support for Uganda Office costs and operational support?* seem to be for the project execution, they have to be charged to PMC, not to the project components (if not related with the project's execution, please explain);
- (iv) ?*Procurement of means to transport for trainers to travel to farmers for visits in DRC - Motorbikes for team to visit farmers?*? per guidelines, vehicles cost are normally expected to be borne by the co-financing (see screenshot of the full text below). Please modify this accordingly.
- (v) In the budget line ?*Office related costs such as rent, utilities and security in DRC & project management - Office costs and operational support in Uganda & project management?* charged to PMC, the underlined part ?*& project management?* lacks explanation. Please clarify what ?*& project management?* entails, because as it is it looks like this is an overhead for the executing agency and it can not be approved as such.

GEFSEC, 23/9/2021 - Cleared

GEFSEC, 27/9/2021

- In the budget line ?*Office related costs such as rent, utilities and security in DRC & project management - Office costs and operational support in Uganda & project management?* charged to PMC, the underlined part ?*& project management?* (in DRC and Uganda) and ?*operational support?* (in Uganda) lacks explanation. One can understand the part ?*Office related costs such as rent, utilities and security?*, but it is unlikely that the costs of these three items will add up to \$104,253. Hence, please provide cost breakdown of the portion of ?*Office related costs such as rent, utilities and security?*.
- Regarding ?*& project management?* (in DRC and Uganda) and ?*operational support?* (in Uganda), the GEF cannot finance such unspecified items. Instead, what could be budgeted is a position related with the execution of the project (i.e. project coordinator ? administrative assistant). In case that the cost of this position cannot be fully covered by PMC, should this cost be supported also by the project?s components, TORs reflecting the contributions to the components from which the salary will be paid are required.

GEFSEC

GEFSEC 28/9/2021;

Cleared

#### Agency Response

##### **IUCN Response to Sept 9 review comments from GEF:**

A harmonized budget table using the GEF Budget Template has now been included in Annex E of the CEO ER, and Annex D of the IUCN Project Document (Page 98-106)

##### **IUCN Response to Sept 21 review comments from GEF:**

- (i) A hardcopy Excel format budget file, "GEF LDCF ID 10432\_GEF Budget Template Sept 23 FINAL" has been uploaded to the GEF Portal in the Documents tab.
- (ii) Budget has been amended to include figures in the Total column - sorry for the oversight
- (iii) Project budget has been amended so that all operating costs for project management are been charged to the PMU budget line
- (iv) Project budget has been amended so that vehicle expenditures are borne by co-financing
- (v) Project budget has been amended so that all operating costs for project management are been charged to the PMU budget line. Costs of services for sub-contracted work were incorrectly classified on prior budget.

Changes are visible in the Sept 23 CEO ER track changes hardcopy uploaded to the GEF Portal. Changes have also been made to the online CEO ER in the GEF Portal, and to the hardcopy IUCN Project Document dated Sept 23.

##### **IUCN Response to Sept 27 review comments from GEF:**

Project budget PMU expenditures have been revised and clarified to show breakdown of the \$104,253 USD PMU expenditure line. The PMU will cover office rental costs for the 3 year duration of the project in the two locations where the project will operate: Rwenzori, Uganda (\$50k in total) and Minoba, South Kivu, DRC (\$54,253). Changes are visible in the Sept 28 CEO ER track changes hardcopy uploaded to the GEF Portal. Changes have also been made to the online CEO ER in the GEF Portal, and to the hardcopy IUCN Project Document dated Sept 28, and the Excel file project budget dated Sept 28.

#### **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

GEFSEC 19July2021 - Further to the comment above, please include in Annex B the responses made by IUCN to comments from STAP in October 2019 and attached as a document via the portal.

GEFSEC 30August 2021 - As indicated above, please also include in Annex B the responses made by IUCN to comments from STAP in October 2019 and attached as a document via the portal

GEFSEC 3September2021 - Thank you and cleared.

Agency Response

**IUCN response to July 19 comments from GEF:**

The response to STAP are now included in the GEF portal accompanying documents.

**IUCN response to August 30 comments from GEF:**

The response to STAP review comments are now included in Annex B on the CER document in the Portal, as well as provided as an uploaded hardcopy in the documents section of the GEF portal.

**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.

GEFSEC 19July2021: Please clarify if the balance of \$19,976.76 is still current and if these PPG funds will or will not be spent.

GEFSEC 30August2021: If the remaining funds are committed, please indicate this directly in Annex C. Similar to comments above, information of this nature is required within the GEF CER document.

GEFSEC 3September2021 -Thank you and cleared.

### Agency Response

#### **IUCN response to July 19 comments from GEF:**

The PPG funds will be spent on additional studies on resilience activities in the coffee sector.

#### **IUCN response to August 30 comments from GEF:**

The table on Status of Utilization of the Project Preparatory Grant is now uploaded onto Annex C. in the GEF CER on the GEF Portal, and included in the hard copy GEF CER with track changes. As noted, the remaining balance of \$19,975 USD will be spent on additional preparatory studies on resilience activities in the coffee sector and reported to the GEF Trustee through the Quarterly Report.

#### **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.

GEFSEC 19July2021 - Please see all further comments highlighted in yellow.

GEFSEC 30August2021 = Please see all comment still needing to be addressed in yellow highlight.

GEFSEC 3September2021 - This CER is technically cleared by the PM pending further comments from on policy matters.

GEFSEC 9September2021 - Please note and kindly address the further comments on policy matters.

GEFSEC 17September2021- The further policy related comments are technically cleared by the PM.

GEFSEC 21September2021 - Please note and address the final comments as related to the budget.

GEFSEC 27September2021 - Please note and address the further clarifying comment related to budget.

GEFSEC 28September2021 - Technically cleared by the PM

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

<b>First Review</b>	<b>3/11/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/24/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>7/19/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>8/30/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>9/3/2021</b>	

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**