

Resilience of Pastoral and Farming Communities to Climate Change in North Darfur

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10159

Countries

Sudan

Project Name

Resilience of Pastoral and Farming Communities to Climate Change in North Darfur

Agenices

FAO

Date received by PM

4/3/2019

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Aloke Barnwal

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The project has the potential to contribute to GEF 7 CCA objective 1 on technology transfer and innovation and objective 2 on mainstreaming climate change adaptation for systemic impact.

The project will contribute to climate risk and security agenda directly by targeting migratory routes of communities in Sudan where there is a prevailing conflict between pastoralists, agro-pastoralist and farmers over use of diminishing resources. As climate change is directly impacting the quantity and quality of these resources, the conflicts are set to exacerbate in absence of any targeted support making people and their livelihoods more vulnerable.

The project proposes to facilitate transfer of best practices and technology in agriculture and livestock sector by adopting an integrated and strategic land use and livelihood planning and utilizing participatory conflict resolution and decision making tools.

While the integrated and systemic approach of identifying and prioritizing climate change adaptation solutions with communities is a strong part of the project, it needs to strengthen or elaborate more on the following aspects linked to GEF's strategy:

- Innovation and technology transfer: The project makes a number of reference of innovation, however, it is not well elaborated with specific examples in the PIF. It refers to traditional agriculture and livestock production improvement practices with some potential adaptation in the local context.
- Private sector engagement: The proposal refers to working with private sector to catalyze innovation in adaptation. However, the definition of private sector is not clear from the proposal and has multiple references from private producers to private enterprises. The agency is requested to elaborate on this more e.g. what is the difference between an individual farmer/livestock producer and a private producer? Also, it would be good to elaborate on what private enterprises will the project support and how their business models will be advanced through the project for adaptation.
- The project aims to establish Agro-pastoral Field Schools (APFS) and indicates that it will provide venture capital to test infrastructural and production improvements. This is not clear in many ways e.g. do APFSs already exist? from where will they get the venture capital? what are the infrastructure and production improvement where they may will venture capital investments? What will be the role of LDCF funds in this?
- There are two images referred in the background section of the proposal. However, these images/mps cannot be seen. The agency is requested to upload these images again.

GEFSEC response: 23 October

- Thanks for your response. We acknowledge that the approach of addressing the conflict and adaptation challenges is unique. Also, the use of two specific tools on participatory planning will be first of its kind in the targeted region. While these do indicate innovation, it is likely that the solutions to be identified under component 2 may be best practices and not necessarily innovative solutions. The PIF has referred to innovation across a number of sections which is undermining the importance of innovation in the project. For example- the PIF states

However, the existing baseline does not benefit from the capacity required to identify and implement innovations required to address existing and emerging climate change challenges. It could simply be solutions for climate challenges instead of innovation.

Similarly under livestock production, agriculture and water management innovation the various practices listed are indeed relevant and potentially effective in the region, but they are not necessarily innovative.

The agency is requested to revisit the overemphasis of innovation across the project document.

Private sector: Thanks for the clarification. The agency is requested to include the typologies in the PIF also. The agency is requested to review the project output 2.1 in particular which says - **Concrete investments identified and implemented to strengthen private sector resilience. This refers to private sector very generically and do not align with the outcomes of component 2.** The agency is requested to make the reference to private sector more specific in this output.

Venture Capital typically means equity funds with an expected return on investments which LDCF cannot finance. I believe the PIF refers to grants or seed funds to support to pilot new approaches or solutions. The agency is requested to clarify this further.

Agency Response

25 October

Innovation

The overemphasis on innovation has been addressed in the PIF and changes highlighted in yellow.

Private sector

Typologies are described in the private sector engagement section (Part II, question 4) of the PIF and output 2.1 has been revised.

Financing pilot activities

‘Venture capital’ has been substituted in the PIF.

Previous review

Innovation and technology transfer:

This project represents a first attempt to establish innovative programming designed specifically to address the unique conflict and adaptation challenges faced in the North Darfur, particularly conflicts between private livestock and agriculture production sectors as they struggle to address challenges associated with increased competition for resources altered and diminished due to climate change.

As for specific livestock and agricultural practices to be employed, please See Component 2, Output 2.1. Innovations will focus upon reducing pressures on limited resources to assist producers to lower their risks and exposure to climate change impacts. Final practices will be determined and applied based upon full stakeholder engagement. This will be facilitated by extension officers who will be capacitated through project interventions. The process of identifying specific innovations and changes to current unsustainable practices will be supported by FAO global experts who will draw upon best international principles and practices that may be adapted and applied to best suit local conditions, and is an integral and important part of the APFS approach deployed by the project. A detailed listing of project innovations will be determined and detailed during the PPG phase.

Importantly, innovations will track with the assessments and land use management agreements established under Component 1. By linking innovations to these Component 1 activities, project interventions will be tailored to the context, adapting knowledge and decision-making frameworks.

Private sector engagement:

“Private producers” are farmers and ranchers who produce commodities. These farm and ranch businesses focus upon the production and sale of agriculture and livestock goods. They are often motivated by both profit and household subsistence. As detailed in the PIF, private producers in the Sudanese context cover three general categories: pastoralists, agro-pastoralists, and sedentary farmers.

“Private enterprise” incorporates the broader private sector associated with livestock and agricultural production. Private enterprise may be inclusive of private producers and private merchants. Merchants supply private ranchers and farmers with goods and services. This may include production inputs such as feed, fertilizer, and equipment and/or the sale and marketing of farm and ranch commodities.

Assisting private producers to identify and implement improved practices is the primary project objective. However, private producers along with private merchants, government extension officers and government regulators determine pricing, marketing and other value chains issues. This combination of actors ultimately determines and incentivizes the adoption of improved practices.

APFS in Project Area:

Agro-pastoral Field Schools (APFS) do not exist in the project area. These will be established using models adapted from FAO's regional experience. Technical and other support can be provided through an existing FAO-facilitated regional network of APFS practitioners throughout the Sahel.

Venture Capital:

LDCF funds will provide venture capital to individual farmers and ranchers. This is reflected in the budget allocation under Component 2 which states that LDCF funds will be utilized for concrete investments. Access to these funds will be limited to farmers and ranchers participating in the APFS. As noted above, specific innovations to be trialed will be clarified during the PPG phase and fully identified and implemented through the APFS during project implementation. In FAO's experience, simply identifying "best practices" and providing private producers with information regarding "best practices" is not enough to stimulate actual adoption of best practices. Private producers do not generally have the financial capital required to adopt "new" practices and/or may be risk averse to attempt new practices. The project will therefore provide necessary capital to private producers through the APFS system. This will make certain that individual "early adopters" are incentivized to try new practices. This will also make certain that new practices are guided by training received through APFS. Production innovations will be

conducted and scrutinized through the APFS by participants, extension officers, and project technical support. This approach will help to lower the “entry level” risks for early adopter and make certain delivery is achieving intended benefits, results are monitored, and lessons captured for upscale.

Images:

Images have been re-inserted into the portal and we hope they can be properly viewed.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Broadly, the three complementary components could deliver the desired project outcomes. However, how the components will support innovation and private sector engagement is not clear. For example, output 2.1 suggests investment to strengthen private sector resilience. It is not apparent from the project description if there is private sector operations in the target region and if yes, what are their barriers and how the project will help address these barriers to provide them better market access. Please refer the comment in section 1 in this context.

The agency is also requested to look at the indicators and assess if they are mutually exclusive. For example, indicators i and ii of component 2 seems to be overlapping.

Table B indicates that 5000 hectares of degraded agriculture and grazing land will be managed through the project. The detailed description of the outputs indicate that the interventions will focus primarily on climate resilient cropping, cropland management, irrigation, small dams and reservoirs and water harvesting. All these options have the potential to enhance agriculture yield and also support livestock management to some extent. However, there is limited reference to land and water conservation in the region which has seen significant decrease in rainfall over last few decades due to climate change.

Overall, it is unclear from the proposal how the project will avoid degradation of agriculture and grazing land. The focus seems to be more on utilizing the existing land and water resources for enhancing agriculture and livestock production. Without the former, the interventions may not be sustainable. The agency is

recommended to focus more on comprehensive sustainable land management practices. This will also ensure stronger alignment with CCA objective 2 of mainstreaming adaptation with GEF's focal area of land degradation and biodiversity.

GEFSEC 24 October:

Please refer to the comment above on private sector. No further comments.

Agency Response

25 October:

Addressed above.

Private Sector Resilience:

Please see response above. The project targets private sector livestock and agriculture producers. The barriers section has been modified to more clearly stipulate private producers inclusive of pastoralists, agropastoralists, and sedentary farmers.

Market Access:

Market access will be improved through value chains, financial coping strategies, and better business practices. This will include working with private merchants engaged in agriculture and livestock product marketing and sales.

Indicator Overlap Under Component 2:

The indicators were clarified as follows:

Indicator One states: Number of livestock and agricultural producers engaging in APFS programming;

Indicator Two: Number of APFS participants reporting improved levels of economic, environmental, and social well-being;

Indicator Three: Number of livestock and agricultural producers adopting project identified climate resilient production methods.

These three indicators will allow the project to better track participation, impact, and outscaling.

Indicator One measures the number of private producers who choose to engage in APFS. This will provide the project with an understanding of whether APFS was properly designed to address producer interests.

Indicator Two measures whether APFS engagement resulted in desired economic, environmental and social well-being improvements.

Indicator Three measures how many producers actually adopt project identified production improvement practices, inclusive of both APFS participants and non-participants. This third indicator will allow the project to understand whether APFS resulted in production shifts and how well APFS identified innovations were outscaled. Indicator 3 will also help to inform the results of Outcome 3. However, it is better placed as a measurement of APFS effectiveness.

Table B Coverage:

The project can realistically achieve a target of 5,000 ha. With co-financing though, therefore the direct consequential benefit can be estimated to be around 10,000ha. No change to this estimate is being made at this point in time.

Comprehensive Sustainable Land Management:

As noted above, the project under Component 1.2 will set in place land-use management agreements designed to build landscape level resilience. This will ensure that innovations implemented under Component 2 are well-informed and focused upon contributing to the achievement of comprehensive and sustainable land use management objectives.

The land use-management agreements will be based in part upon the concept of sustainable production intensification. The FAO concept of Sustainable Production Intensification is part of FAO's vision for sustainable food and agriculture (SFA), is firmly in line with the global initiative of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and utilizes FAO's Sustainable Food and Agriculture approach, which is based on five principles: (i) Improving efficiency in the use of resources is crucial to sustainable agriculture; (ii) Sustainability requires direct action to conserve, protect and enhance natural resources; (iii) Agriculture that fails to protect and improve rural livelihoods, equity and social wellbeing is unsustainable; (iv) Enhanced resilience of people, communities and ecosystems is key to sustainable agriculture; and (v) Sustainable food and agriculture requires responsible and effective governance mechanisms.

This clarification has now been added to the PIF to make certain Output 1.2 fully considers these concerns. This includes specifying that proposed land-use management agreements will be designed to sustainably increase productivity of fragile productive landscapes and both avoid and reduce degradation of agriculture and grazing lands. This will include identifying within the land-use management agreements a focus upon comprehensive sustainable land management practices to make certain the project is fully aligned with CCA Objective 2 regarding land degradation and biodiversity.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

A co-finance of \$8 million grant is proposed by FAO. It is requested to elaborate more on this co-finance and how it will complement the proposed LDCF project.

GEFSEC 24 October:

The agency is requested to elaborate on the FAO co-financing of \$8 million in the question below Section C. We would like to know if it is an FAO fund or other donor fund to FAO. Is it a specific program/s or a trust fund.

GEFSEC 27th October:

Given that FAO is an executing agency for the co-financed projects, the co-finance table should include the name of the donors. (Italy and Netherlands). Please revise.

Agency Response

29 October:

The co-financing table now explicitly mentions the donors of the FAO executed projects.

25 October:

Please, note details are provided in section 1.2 and 1.4 of the PIF. Relevant text has been highlighted in yellow for ease of reference. In sum, the USD8M results from:

- the Dutch Development Cooperation funded project *Building Food System Resilience in Protracted Crises*. The activities of this project complement components 1 and 2 of the LDCF project for an estimated total value of USD7,420,000. The project is executed by FAO, though financed by the Dutch Development Cooperation; and

- the Ministry for Environment, Land and Sea of Italy funded project *Strengthen the Sudan Meteorological Authority's hydro-meteorological network and climate services*. The project worth USD580,000 is executed by FAO and mobilised in full as co-financing.

Both projects add up to a USD8M co-financing executed by FAO and granted by Dutch and Italian bilateral donors.

Co-Financing Clarification:

Additional language has been provided with respect to the co-financing. Both sections 1.2 (baseline projects and programs) and 1.4 (Additional cost reasoning) of the PIF have been revisited.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The project is aligned with the LDCF allocation for Sudan.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The agency is requested to provide information about the core indicators in the template for LDCF/SCCF shared by the GEF Secretariat. As these indicators are not yet embedded in the portal, the agency needs to attach this as a separate document.

GEFSEC 24 October: We are not able to see the core indicator and metadata worksheet in the portal. Can you please upload it again?

October 27:

Meta-information- Given a distinct focus on water resource management, the PIF can attribute some percentage to water resource management in the list of sectors.

Core indicators:

The project has a strong focus on capacity building and training of various stakeholders on use of innovative decision making tools, technologies and business models. Therefore the project is likely to deliver core indicators 4 also.

Also output 3.1 in the PIF indicates that the project will strengthen national level resilience policies and a specific indicator is also proposed in the table. However, indicator 3 in the core indicators list doesn't have any target. This is inconsistent and the agency is requested to review and correct this.

Agency Response

28 October:

Points well taken and appreciated. The Excel document has been revised in order to reflect water resources management in the meta-information worksheet and integrate targets for core indicators 3 and 4 along indicators 1 and 2.

25 October:

The Metadata Worksheet has been uploaded again in RoadMap/Documents.

Core Indicators:

The LDCF core indicators metadata worksheet has been uploaded in the Portal.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The climate vulnerability of the targeted migratory route is elaborated well. The cause of conflict between the three communities has been identified as diminishing resources which is further threatened due to climate change, particularly drought like situation in the region.

The project aims to target specific climate change impacts (drought) on the livelihoods of these communities i.e. agriculture and livestock to make them climate resilient.

The agency is requested to look at this issue more holistically by also looking into other possible solutions for climate resilience of the communities. For example, the project could also collaborate with government and other funding agencies to support diversified livelihoods which are less sensitive to climate change, social protection and strengthening social and economic infrastructure (e.g. health, market access, etc.). These will complement well with the core project activities and provide more options for vulnerable communities to adapt to changing climate for long term benefits.

Agency Response

Holistic Approach to Climate Resilience:

The project intends to approach this issue - and inclusive of diversified livelihoods - through Component 1 activities and subsequently apply these holistic approaches through Component 2 interventions. It applies the holistic approaches fully integrating and complementing baseline investments, such as the *Building Food System Resilience n Protracted Crises* investment in Darfur.

Output 1.2 has been modified to make certain alternative and improved livelihood options are incorporated within the financial coping strategies to be delivered.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. The baseline projects are described well with detailed explanation of how the proposed project will build on these projects.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. The outcomes are described. However, it needs to factor in the comments provided in section 1, 2 and 1 of Part II.

Agency Response Please see answers to previous questions.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The agency is requested to elaborate on the role of co-financing and how the LDCF funds will add value to their interventions to support climate change adaptation. This is in line with GEF's guidelines on incremental cost particularly the point on "negotiation of the role of co-financing". Please correlate this comment with the comment on co-financing question.

Agency Response

Incremental Costs and Role of Co-Financing:

Language provided in Section 1.4 of the PIF has been expanded upon.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The total number of direct beneficiaries estimated is 50,000 people which seems to be reasonable for the project funding size and the complexity of the project.

There is inconsistency in number of women to be benefited from the project. While the core indicators state 25,000 women (50%), the section on gender suggests that the target will be 40% women.

In addition, given that there are a large number of women headed households in the target region (as described in the proposal), can the project target more women than men? The gender ratio is rarely in favor of women in such programs despite that they are more vulnerable. There is a great opportunity in this program to benefit more women than men. The agency is requested to review this.

Agency Response

Gender Equality:

Errors have been corrected. This point is well taken, and therefore, the project commits itself to directly benefit at least 25,000 women. During PPG, the gender assessment will allow for a greater tailoring of project activities to benefit women more directly.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

While the potential of sustainability and up-scaling of the results of the project is well described, the innovation aspect is relatively weak throughout the project concept. The agency is requested to strengthen it with more specific examples of possible innovation in technologies or business models while supporting private sector. There is some element of innovation through the use of planning and conflict resolution through the VGGT tool and APFS.

GEFSEC 24 October: No more comments in this section. Please refer to innovation comments made earlier.

Agency Response

25 October:

Comment on innovation addressed in PIF.

Innovations:

As noted, the project targets the private sector. This includes a direct targeting of private producers and ancillary support from broader business enterprises.

Potential innovations have been more fully detailed and added in the PIF. Please see Component 2.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. Stakeholders to be engaged in the course of the project is elaborated well.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Marginalization of women due to social structures and disproportionate rights over resources has been described well. This is potentially the driver for general vulnerability and lack of empowerment of women in the region.

The agency is requested to elaborate a bit more on direct impact and vulnerability of women due to climate change in the region.

GEFSEC 24 October- GEFSEC would like to see the details in the full scale proposal as mentioned by the agency in the response. For the PIF the response is sufficient.

Agency Response

25 October:

This request is well received and will be addressed in full during PPG.

Gender Specific Climate Change Impacts:

At this point, gender data is sparse. As noted in the PIF, a project specific gender mainstreaming plan will be developed during PPG phase. This will include a comprehensive assessment of gender specific climate change impacts. The mainstreaming plan and full project document will detail actions to be taken under each component and necessary budgetary provision as appropriate. Specific targets will be set during project design (PPG phase) and reflected in the results framework to ensure inclusion and participation of women and girls both in site-based project activities (such as the development of alternative income generating activities, conservation actions, and activities aimed at capacity enhancement), as well as ensuring that opportunities are created for women to take up positions of leadership within the management hierarchy of the project governance structures. In addition, the assessments and profiles to be completed under Component 1 activity will be certain to dis-aggregate and highlight issues based upon gender. This will include a detailing of gender specific climate change impacts and specific programming to address these impacts. Also, the APFS programming will have gender specific action. This will include the design and implementation of APFS for women cohorts that provide an opportunity to address issues of marginalization, social structures, and disproportionate resource rights as the reviewer mentions.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please refer to comment on the Question 1 regarding private sector. The reference to private sector has been for multiple set of stakeholders including individual farmers and livestock producers. Individual producers are more of direct beneficiary population than private sector. It seems that private sector in terms of business entities is less present in the region due to widespread conflicts.

The agency is requested to elaborate and articulate the engagement with private sector stakeholders better.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement:

As described above and detailed in the stakeholder analysis, the project will target private producers. These stakeholders are beneficiaries and they are also very much private business interests fundamentally concerned with “investment”, “risk”, “profit” and “loss”. The project is also inclusive of private enterprises such as merchants engaged in the provisioning of agriculture and livestock goods and services. Through value chains, financial coping and alternative livelihood strategies, farmer field schools, sustainable land-use management agreements, and other efforts, the project will identify how private producers and suppliers of agriculture/livestock sector goods and services can be better aligned to incentivize the adoption of improved practices. These issues will be more fully described as well in the PPG Stakeholder Engagement Strategy.

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The risks are defined well. The agency is requested to review the impact and probability ratings again as in many cases they are not consistent with the description. For example, probability rating of risk number 3 seems to be high.

The probability of animal disease is rated 5. If the risk is so high, the project should have specific activities to address this issue of disease control as part of adaptation measure. Just monitoring the situation may not help in addressing the risk.

Further, it is not clear why there is a separate risk on climate change in the table. Climate change is the major driver of the project so it's well understood across the project. The agency may like to remove this or elaborate it better.

Finally, the agency is requested to elaborate the political risk of the project and its mitigation strategy. Especially, given the current political turmoil, this risk assessment is necessary.

Agency Response

Risk Table Adjustments:

The risk table has been adjusted based upon recommendations.

The current political situation has been reflected with the following language included:

Recent political changes in Sudan will likely generate some adjustments in terms of governance. However, the fundamental concern of the government and represented stakeholders regarding the importance of addressing the barriers and challenges covered by this project will likely remain high with strong support consistent.

Climate change has been removed as a risk per request and probability ratings have been revised.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The institutional arrangement for project coordination is described well. The project lists the GEF projects in the country and possible ways of engaging with those projects e.g. lesson sharing, inputs, etc. Cross field visits or exposures could also be proposed as a specific means of sharing experiences.

In terms of coordination, the project proposes to engage the GEF Agencies involved in the project. However, it has not articulated how this engagement will happen during the project implementation. For example, a steering committee is proposed. Will the GEF Agencies be part of the steering committee? The agency is requested to elaborate more on this as significant past investments have been made by the GEF. It is critical to avoid duplication, scale up successes from other projects and overall ensure best value for money.

Agency Response

GEF Agency Coordination:

GEF agencies are not part of the Steering Committee. However, FAO has strong working relationships with each of the GEF agencies and these agencies will be consulted with and invited to larger events organized by the proposed project during both the PPG and full implementation.

Detailed institutional arrangements and implementation arrangements will be developed during PPG. This has now been fully reflected within the PIF with the following language included:

The final project document will reflect a coordination mechanism to make certain that this proposed project is well aligned with and benefiting from engagement with the on-going suite of GEF financed initiatives. Coordination will make certain that other GEF projects are engaged through invitation to participate in appropriate capacity building efforts and the provision of outputs and knowledge products. Coordination will also include regular meetings and discussions to be facilitated by this proposed project between executing agencies responsible for implementation of the various GEF financed initiatives. The specific coordination mechanisms will be reflected in the final project document's management description and reflected in the stakeholder engagement strategy designed during the PPG.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The project is quite consistent with national priorities related to climate change and development.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

A specific project component is included in the project focusing on knowledge management. The proposal to disseminate knowledge regionally using existing South-South cooperation mechanism is welcome.

The project should consider converting knowledge products in a form and language to ensure dissemination is more effective.

In addition, as part of the knowledge management, FAO should collaborate effectively with other GEF Agencies who may have already generated a number of knowledge products or sharing mechanisms. It is recommended that knowledge management forms core of the coordination arrangements with other agencies.

Agency Response

Language of Knowledge Products:

The PIF has been adjusted accordingly. Also the coordination with GEF Agencies has been added as suggested by the reviewer in a previous comment.

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The agency is requested to address the revised set of comments and resubmit the PIF for consideration.

27 October: Please address two additional comments under co-financing and indicators.

30th October: All comments have been addressed and the project and PPG is recommended for clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		