

Climate change adaptation of Cabo Verde's agri-food systems for improved food security and livelihoods

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11100

Countries

Cabo Verde

Project Name

Climate change adaptation of Cabo Verde's agri-food systems for improved food security and livelihoods

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

4/11/2023

Review completed by PM

4/26/2023

Program Manager

Olusola Uchenna Ikuforiji

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes. Cabo Verde is a least developed country and meets the eligibility criteria for SSCF. The General Project Information table is correctly populated; if possible, specify "SCCF Window A" in the table.

GEFSEC 11 May

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments Noted with thanks. SCCF Window A has been specified in all relevant tables.

2. Project Summary

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 results?

Secretariat's Comments

A generic problem is described. Please further clarify the site-specific climate problem (related to agri-food systems, water stress, and youth unemployment) and how the project intends to address it more succinctly. Also, discuss the projected climate change impacts - these can be summarized into a sentence or two.

GEFSEC 11 May

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments Please, consider the additional language in the project summary on specific climate change impacts.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

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?

Secretariat's Comments

a) Yes, the project objective is clear.

b) No. Please present the logical sequence for achieving the project development objective, showing the linkage between the component, outcomes, and outputs. Consider communicating these elements in a tabular form to distinguish the result levels of the project interventions.

GEFSEC 11 May

Thanks for updating the TOC. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments b) Please, note that the TOC has been presented in tabular form, detailing causal pathways between readiness activities and adaptive capacity.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

Gender dimensions are not clearly described. Please clarify how the project's socially-inclusive approach will target women as potential beneficiaries of value chains and microfinance schemes, and how they would be involved meaningfully in the design of the interventions. Please provide further information on how the project will promote gender equality including in the component on learning and knowledge management . Also, a gender analysis and action plan will need to be submitted by CEO Endorsement. The gender analysis should illustrate the gender issues, the engagement of women and men in the project design, and how their needs and the specific gender inequalities they face these needs have informed [were taken into consideration in the specific solutions/activities proposed in the project.

Knowledge management: Component 3 is dedicated to learning and knowledge management, including co-creating climate adaptation knowledge and establishing a multistakeholder knowledge platform and the community of practice. The knowledge activities need to be further elaborated; how will the knowledge be created and managed? What are the governance and structural dimensions of the multistakeholder platform and CoP? Please map out the stakeholders that will be involved and how they will be engaged.

PPO Comments: An overall approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been provided in the Project Description. Proposal includes KM&L and capacity development deliverables that enable and enhance generation and access to knowledge and information through education and training programs, scholarships and internships for the youth, a community of practice well as a knowledge hub. However, a separate knowledge platform is mentioned for both output 2.2.3 (platform for co-creation of knowledge) and 3.2.1 (multistakeholder knowledge platform). Also, there is no reference to an overall Communication Strategy/Plan.

Thus, the agency is requested to provide a brief description of the project's Communications Strategy/Plan for outreach, awareness raising and dissemination of outputs/results. And it is also requested to clarify if the project is proposing two separate knowledge platforms.

Monitoring and Evaluation: Please revise to indicate how the M&E requirements will be met.

GEFSEC 11 May

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

Gender: Please, consider the additional language provided to clarify the role and participation of women and women's groups in the project design and delivery, as participants in decision-making and as beneficiaries.

Noted on the need to deliver a gender analysis and action plan at CEO endorsement.

Thanks for the additional orientations.

Knowledge management: Additional language has been provided under component 3 in the PIF.

Only 1 knowledge platform will be promoted by the project. The inconsistency/confusion has been addressed in the PIF, amending outputs and clarifying linkages between components 2 and 3.

Furthermore, language has been provided on the communication strategy the project will adopt, also adding a new output under component 3.

M&E: The M&E component has been revised and further developed.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

a. Yes

b. Please clarify the Co-Financing contribution to the PMC

c. Yes

GEFSEC 11 May

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments The agency engages co-financing partners with an understanding that 5% of the mobilised amounts is reserved for project management. This is proportional to the GEF grant PMC portion. PMC co-financing includes the carpool of project co-financiers in the capital and project sites, use of fully-equipped office space and meeting facilities, as well as time of project management staff of baseline investments.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

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

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

a) See comments in section 1 above. Please further strengthen the drivers of climate vulnerability.

b) A thorough barrier analysis needs to be undertaken. Please elaborate on barriers that the project intends to overcome; the agriculture sector, youth unemployment, multistakeholder coordination, etc.

GEFSEC 11 May

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

- a) Drivers of climate vulnerability have been developed further.
- b) The barriers section has been updated.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

- a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**
- b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?**
- c) 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?**
- d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?**

Secretariat's Comments

- a) The project doesn't provide sufficient justification for the selected approach. Please strengthen the justification for the project, including the rationale for the proposed agro-ecological interventions and the establishment of the multi-stakeholder climate financing management platform (that aims to help Cape Verde attract more climate financing), etc
- b) Further clarify how the project will strengthen the resilience of future changes in the drivers.
- c) The project intends to anchor its co-financing on two non-GEF projects funded by the Adaptation Fund and the Government of Luxembourg. Please elaborate on how coordination with the Adaptation Fund is envisaged. Five other projects, including two GEF projects, were identified to share lessons and experiences. Please provide more details about the BADEA and EU-funded projects.
- d) Please indicate the stakeholder mapping and planning exercises undertaken during the project identification, how stakeholders were identified, how they informed the project design, and what roles they are expected to play throughout the project planning,

implementation, and monitoring process. Please be specific on the roles of the government, CSOs, private sector, women and youth groups, and academia. A Stakeholder Engagement Plan should be submitted by CEO endorsement.

On Stakeholder Engagement: It is very well noted that the project has provided a list of stakeholders consulted during project design, including civil society organizations and IPLCs. It would be good if Agency more clearly could describe its approach to consult these stakeholders further during project development and as part of its plans to develop a Stakeholder Engagement Plan before CEO Endorsement in the Project Description (Section B)

Please add more details in response to the above questions in the PIF.

GEFSEC 11 May

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

a) Project approach/rationale: A comprehensive, integrated and transformational approach has been chosen for this project, which is the agroecology approach. This is the most comprehensive of SFA approaches, defined by the 10 elements. The PIF describes how agroecology is defined and builds on its documented potential, also reported by IPCC reports. See additional highlighted sections in the PIF.

On the climate finance, please consider the highlighted text in the PIF, providing context and justification to these targeted project activities.

b) Resilience to future change: Agro-ecological approaches do not promote 1 solution for 1 driver of change, but rather build the capacity of communities and systems to respond to change systematically. Therefore, the proposed approach prepares the production systems and communities for short and medium-long term climate changes and their potential impacts on agriculture and food production. Additionally, and this has been elaborated further on in the PIF, the project adopts a participatory approach for planning, decision-making and implementation. This participatory approach is believed to be contributing to resilience to change in the medium term.

c) Collaboration with GEF and non-GEF investments: Further language has been provided re co-financing and collaboration with the GEF project in the institutional arrangements section of the PIF.

d) Stakeholder engagement: The queries have been addressed in the PIF.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

a) The causal linkage between the readiness activity (facilitating multi-stakeholder collaboration and capacity to access climate financing) and building the adaptive capacity of the agroecological systems in the intervention area is not clear. Please review and strengthen the justification of these activities.

b) Please elaborate on the specific activities and outputs of the components

Component 1: Clarify how the "whole-of-society" approach promotes multi-stakeholder engagement participation in the decision-making process and helps mainstream climate considerations into relevant decisions across different levels of government/governance. In addition, clarify how the proposed whole-of-government approach aligns or differs from the whole-of-society approach. Within the whole-of-government approach, please specify the coordination mechanism for engaging the relevant government stakeholders in the AFOLU sector and how the project intends to facilitate collaboration between the government entities.

Describe the protocols for the proposed digital management system for climate financing. Please clarify the modalities for its ownership, management, and coordination between the government and CSOs in running the system.

Component 2: Indicate the rationale for selections of the agricultural value chains (honey and fodder) and alignment with government priorities. Please describe how the climate resilience of the proposed adaptation investments will be ensured, i.e., the long-term viability/resilience of the selected seeds and of the proposed value chains (honey, fodder). The selection criteria for technology solutions and target sites should be elaborated by CEO Endorsement.

GEFSEC 11 May

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

Please, see considerable additional language provided in the PIF, addressing the questions on causal pathways and activities.

The selected value chains are to be confirmed during the PPG phase, when detailed feasibility studies will be conducted. However, these value chains have been selected in a participatory way by DGASP and therefore represent priority sectors for the local communities and for the government institutions, while they have a great potential to contribute to system resilience.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

No. The incremental reasoning is presented, but further details about the incremental inputs of the project in general and of the GEF funding, in particular, will need to be provided by CEO Endorsement. Please briefly describe the incremental cost reasoning and the role of the GEF/SCCF financing.

GEFSEC 11 May

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments In addition to the paragraphs already provided on the co-financing investments, each component description now has some detail on baseline and GEF increment.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

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

Secretariat's Comments

No. Please provide more details of the implementation framework and proposed institutional arrangement. The project proposes a whole-of-society approach that should be considered in the implementation framework. Please clarify how the fund will be

managed, including the coordination mechanisms between the proposed Operation Partner (MAA) and other government agencies, CSOs, and the private sector. Further, clarify the coordination between the Adaptation Fund and the Government of Luxembourg (bilateral projects). Consider the development of an implementation matrix, clarifying the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders.

GEFSEC 11 May

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments A matrix has been developed to illustrate the institutional arrangements of the project, clarifying roles and responsibilities, and linkages between different project actors. Further see additional text.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

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

Secretariat's Comments

Core indicators are provided. Consider revising the sectoral distribution to include nature-based management.

GEFSEC 11 May

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments This has been done.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

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

Secretariat's Comments

a) yes

b) Review the rating and management of environmental and social risks on the project preparation and implementation. Youth migration, particularly from rural to urban areas, is a social challenge in Cape Verde. Please elaborate on how the project intends to motivate and engage the youth during project preparation and implementation.

c) Proposed interventions (component 2) should be screened for potential environmental and social impacts, and management measures identified by CEO Endorsement.

GEFSEC 11 May

Thanks. The FAO Environment and Social Risk Screening Certificate is noted. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

b) The risk log (risks from the project - in particular the Environmental and social risk) has been updated. New text could not be highlighted in yellow.

c) Please, note that the FAO Framework for Environment and Social Risk Management FESM is used for risk screening, avoidance, minimization and management. The screening and risk level certificate is attached to the PIF. Apologies for the omission.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

a) Yes, the project intends to be integrated and transformative. Please further elaborate on the durability and sustainability of the project

b) Yes.

b) Yes, the project aligns with relevant national policies

GEFSEC 11 May

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments Please, consider the additional focus on project durability in the PIF.

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

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

- Describe the project's alignment with the SCCF's priorities on technology transfer, innovation, and private sector engagement (N/A to SCCF-A).

GEFSEC 11 May

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments The SCCF window A has been targeted for this project, and this funding window has a strong focus on adaptation priorities in SIDS. The project is rooted in national strategies and plans to address climate vulnerability, including the NAP (2021), therefore addressing the adaptation priorities. It is noted that, even though window SCCF-B is not directly targeted for funding, the project embraces innovative approaches, which are part and partial of an agroecology approach. The project also facilitates private sector engagement, whether this is smallholder producers, lenders or other private sector actors, as described in the stakeholder section of the PIF.

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's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

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's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments Yes, the list of stakeholders consulted and dates was provided.

Agency's Comments

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 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's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments Yes the PPG is within the allowable cap

Agency's Comments

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

Partly

On co-financing: Public investment is investment mobilized normally. Please revise the cofinance classified as 'recurrent expenditures' to 'investment mobilized'.

GEFSEC 11 May

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments Please, note that in many cases public investments are categorised as mobilized investment. However, in this particular case, the public investments are regular budgets invested into water management infrastructure and other agriculture related infrastructure. The investments from MAA also include staff time, car pools, training facilities, and more.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

Please upload the endorsement letter.

GEFSEC 11 May

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments Please, confirm that the LOE is visible, as this was uploaded earlier.

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments Idem

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

No. The project needs to be screened against environmental and social impacts during project preparation.

On Environmental and Social Safeguards: The project needs to be screened against environmental and social impacts during project preparation. In addition, FAO needs to 1) attach the ESS analysis and Risk certification and 2) be consistent with an overall

Environmental and Social Safeguard Risk (moderate) in 'D. Policy Requirements' (page 34) and Environmental and social risk in the 'Risks to Project Preparation and implementation' (page 25). FAO has attached only the climate change risk assessment and does not attach the ESS analysis and Risk certification.

GEFSEC 11 May

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments Noted with thanks. The ESS analysis and Risk certification is attached now.

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/24/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/2/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		