

Strengthening the Resilience of Climate-Smart Agricultural Systems and Value Chains in the Union of Comoros

Basic Information

GEF ID

10997

Countries

Comoros

Project Title

Strengthening the Resilience of Climate-Smart Agricultural Systems and Value Chains in the Union of Comoros

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP

Agency ID

UNDP: 6628

GEF Focal Area(s)

Climate Change

Program Manager

Fareeha Iqbal

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

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

5/9/22:

Cleared, thank you.

4/18/22:

Not yet.

a) Adjustments requested to Table A: Please note that LDCF objective CCA-3 only applies to enabling activities or projects that directly support the NAPs process, and therefore should not be used for this project. Did the agency mean to select objective CCA-2?

b) The title of the project in the Portal (currently: "Climate resilience of agricultural value chains and systems in Comoros") needs to be exactly the same as its title in the OFP's LoE (currently: "Strengthening the Resilience of Climate-Smart Agricultural Systems and Value Chains in the Union of Comoros"). Please ensure they are exactly the same. (The title can be amended during project preparation, if needed.)

c) The Executing Agency shown in the Portal (currently: "Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Environment, Tourism and Handicraft") needs to be exactly the same as shown in the OFP's LoE (currently: "National Directorate of Agricultural Strategies and Livestocks"). Again, this can be modified during project preparation.

d) The project title shown on the UNDP checklist is also different from that shown in the OFP's LoE. Please ensure they match.

e) Regarding item 8 of the UNDP Checklist (Oversight and Execution). The document should not state the following: "...the CO will prepare a request to the GEF for UNDP to undertake execution services under full CO support to NIM. (ii) If there is a need for the GEF Implementing Agency (in this case UNDP) to carry out executing functions, the request must come from the Government, not from UNDP. Please correct the wording.

f) Please note this PIF has been pasted in very small font. It is difficult to review, and will be hard to read when converted to pdf to post for Council review. We strongly suggest increasing the font size.

Agency Response

UNDP – 6 May 2022:

- a. Table A and Alignment with GEF focal are strategies adjusted to select Objective CCA-1 only.
- b. The title of the project has been changed to match that shown in the letter of endorsement: Strengthening the Resilience of Climate-Smart Agricultural Systems and Value Chains in the Union of Comoros
- c. The Executing Agency is changed to the National Directorate of Agricultural Strategies and Livestock, as indicated in the letter of endorsement
- d. The title of the project has been changed to match that shown in the letter of endorsement: Strengthening the Resilience of Climate-Smart Agricultural Systems and Value Chains in the Union of Comoros
- e. Sentence corrected as follows: “At the PPG stage the IP’s capacity will be reassessed and if High Risk rating is maintained the government will prepare a request to the GEF for UNDP to undertake execution services under Full CO Support to NIM”
- f. Font size has been increased.

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 5/11/22:

Cleared.

5/9/22:

Not yet. It is possible to include a clearer Theory of Change figure in the Portal entry? The current one is blurry.

4/19/22:

Not vet.

.....
a) The Theory of Change should be included in the Portal entry.

b) Please consider allocating a higher proportion of the project grant to support the investment component (Component 3) to deliver on-the-ground adaptation solutions.

Agency Response

UNDP – 11 May 2022:

Higher resolution Theory of Change figure has been included to replace the previous one. We have also shared the file via e-mail.

UNDP – 6 May 2022:

a) The Theory of Change is now included in the portal entry instead of an Annex.

b. Corrections were made to allocate a higher proportion (+\$1M for a total of \$6,062,582) of the project grant to component 3 by reducing the budget allocated to component 1 (-\$600,000 for a total of \$797,794) and 2 (-\$400,000 for a total of \$797,794).

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 4/18/22:

Yes.

Please see CEO endorsement stage comment.

Agency Response

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 4/18/22:

Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 4/18/22:

Yes.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

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 4/18/22:

Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 5/9/22:

Cleared, thank you.

4/18/22:

Not yet cleared. The value for Core Indicator 1 falls much below the level of expected impact we aim for from a grant of this size. Please aim for this project to directly benefit a much greater number of people.

Agency Response

UNDP – 6 May 2022:

The Core Indicator worksheet was revised to match with figures from the PIF.

Following a recent change in the selection of intervention sites requested by the Government and the increased budget for Outcome 3, the core indicators related to the total number of direct beneficiaries (Core Indicator 1) and total area of land managed for climate resilience (Core Indicator 2) had to be re-assessed and were revised upward.

The values for these core indicators are now:

Core Indicator 1: 98,188 direct beneficiaries (including 49,290 women and 48,898 men)

Core Indicator 2: 7568 ha

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 4/18/22:

Yes.

Agency Response

art 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

5/9/22:

Cleared for PIF stage. The information provided demonstrates that climate change is likely to affect key crops. However, much more detailed information will be needed by CEO endorsement. Please see CEO endorsement stage comments below.

4/19/22:

Further information is requested.

An important logical element is missing, i.e., assessment of what the impacts of climate change are likely to be on the crops chosen for value chain development. Even if there is no in-country observational evidence of impacts, scientific analyses of likely effects of changes in temperature and precipitation regimes on the various cash and other crops needs to be provided. Otherwise, it is unclear what "climate change adaptation" problem this project is being designed for (it cannot be centered around the issue of declining soil fertility as that is not necessarily climate change related). It is also not yet clear which crop value chains are being targeted. Similarly, issues faced by poultry and livestock that may be exacerbated by climate change need to be discussed.

Agency Response

UNDP – 11 May 2022:

Duly noted for CEO endorsement stage.

UNDP – 6 May 2022:

An assessment of the impacts of climate change on the crops selected for increasing the climate resilience of the value chain, as experienced by smallholder farmers, has been conducted and results summarized in the previous annex D. This information has been integrated directly into the document for ease of reference.

The only available data have been used to illustrate the evolution of yields for the main crops in Comoros from 1997 to 2004 (in tonnes/ha) and are presented in Table 3. Source of data: National Directorate of Agricultural Strategy, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Environment (Data for 1997 – 2002: IMF Mission, Data for 2004: FAO-2004 Agricultural Census Report).

On the comment "It is also not yet clear which crop value chains are being targeted"

The following information has been included in the description of the theory of change:

The project will seek on the one hand, to increase the climate resilience of the value chains of 19 crops commonly grown in the Comoros

and, on the other hand, to diversify the options of climate-resilient value chains through the climate and economic assessment of 9 new crops for a total of 28 crops. The target crops currently cultivated include the three (3) cash crops: vanilla, ylang-ylang, cloves, the five (5)

main food crops: banana, cassava, sweet potato, yam, and taro, and eleven (11) most commonly grown vegetables and fruits: tomato, cabbage, cucumber, lettuce, pepper, carrot, eggplant, potato, beans, watermelon, spinach. The nine (9) crops for potential development of new climate resilient value chains include ginger, low caffeine coffee, native bananas and yams, nutmeg, aloe vera, Indian borage, vetiver, and turmeric. The criteria for proposing these new crops include their hardiness in the current climatic conditions in the Comoros, their low occupation in terms of land area, and the possibility of developing agricultural value chains through processing and marketing aimed at export markets. The possibility of adding various aromatic and medicinal plants growing in Comoros will be investigated under the PPG phase. The climate risks for all these species will be assessed as part of the project preparation (PPG phase) based on future climate scenarios and available information from tools such as Ecocrop.

On the comment "Similarly, issues faced by poultry and livestock that may be exacerbated by climate change need to be discussed"

A few paragraphs on the vulnerability of livestock and poultry to the effects of climate change are added:

Climate change is a major global threat to the sustainability of livestock systems. Temperature fluctuations are the climatic factor having the most impact on livestock production and animal welfare, in addition to other factors like relative humidity, direct and indirect solar radiation and wind speed influence feed and water availability, fodder quality and disease occurrence. Continuous exposure of the animals to heat stress compromises growth, milk and meat production and reproduction. The capacity of an animal to mitigate effects of increased environmental temperature, without progressing into stress response, differs within and between species[1]. Comparatively, small ruminants are better adapted to hot environments than large ruminants and have better ability to survive, produce and reproduce in harsh climatic regions. Goats have numerous advantages that enable them to maintain their production under extreme climate conditions, the main one being their higher capacity than other farm-raised ruminants to effectively convert some feed sources into milk and meat. In addition, goats emit less methane than other domestic ruminants[2]. It has been found that tropical breeds are more adaptive to hot climates than high-producing temperate breeds. Selection of thermotolerant breeds, through identification of genetic traits for adaptation to extreme environmental conditions including high temperature, will contribute to increase the resilience of smallholder households to the effects of climate change. The review by Joy et al. 2020 which highlights such adaptation within and among different breeds of small ruminants challenged by heat stress may support the selection of adapted breeds.

Poultry is widely owned by rural households in Comoros, who raise mainly local breeds through semi-intensive (about 1000 heads per henhouse) and traditional (3 to 5 adults and a few chicken) poultry farming. Semi-intensive breeding is done on the ground most often in small unit henhouses made of corrugated sheets and wire mesh to improve ventilation. The supply of quality feed at an affordable cost is a major constraint. In traditional poultry farming, birds are free-roaming and feed on wild grain, insects, or kitchen or harvest residues, without the supply of water to drink. Rural poultry production mostly serves to supplement other farming activities in poor rural communities and contributes significantly as a source of scarce animal protein and income. Very few poultry farmers have had specific training in poultry farming.

Climate change is a severe challenge to poultry farming due to its negative effect on chicken growth and productivity which mainly depend on climatic conditions such as temperature and humidity. When faced with heat stress, chickens reduce their feed intake to regulate their

internal temperature which affects their growth and productivity[3], including egg production, weight, and quality, meat quality, semen quality, fertility and hatchability. Since high ambient temperature has an antagonistic effect on performance traits of the poultry, selection of birds for high performance has increased their susceptibility to heat stress.[4]

Surveys conducted in Nigeria have shown that medium and large farms more easily adopt modern strategies such as air and water ventilation as well as the use of low energy lighting while many small farms stick to traditional practices such as the stocking of local breeds, and that farmers who have experienced heat-related losses are more likely to adopt modern practices and multiple adaptation strategies, thus stressing the importance of extension services and training for smallholder farmers. Where modern strategies are inappropriate due to farm size, efforts to breed faster growing more adaptable breeds (higher tolerance of heat stress) could be helpful[5]. Yet, environmental modifications (early heat conditioning, open sheds and cooling systems) and nutritional strategies (early feed restriction, electrolyte, vitamin and mineral balance) cannot fully address the special needs of heat-stressed poultry. Exploring effective strategies including selecting specific poultry breeds with higher thermo-tolerance and productivity is crucial in hot regions.[6]

[1] A. Joy, F.R. Dunshea, B.J. Leury, I.J. Clarke, K. DiGiacomo and S.S. Chauhan. 2020. Resilience of Small Ruminants to Climate Change and Increased Environmental Temperature: A Review. *Animals* 2020, 10(5), 867; <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani10050867>.

[2] Darcan N. K. and N. Silanikove. 2018. The advantages of goats for future adaptation to Climate Change: A conceptual overview. *Small Ruminant Research*. Vol. 163: 34-38.

[3] Nyoni N., Grab S., Archer E. (2019) Heat stress and chickens: climate risk effects on rural poultry farming in low-income countries. *Clim Dev* 11: 83–90

[4] Kumar, M. P. Ratwan, S.P. Dahiya, A.K. Nehra (2021). Climate change and heat stress: Impact on production, reproduction and growth performance of poultry and its mitigation using genetic strategies. *J. Therm. Biol.* 2021 97:102867.

[5] Liverpool-Tasie L.S.O., A. Sanou, J.A. Tambo (2019) Climate change adaptation among poultry farmers: evidence from Nigeria. *Climatic Change* Vol 157: 527–544

[6] Nawab A., F. Ibtisham, G. Li, B. Kieser, J. Wu, W. Liu, Y. Zhao, Y. Nawab, K. Li, M. Xiao, L. An. 2018. Heat stress in poultry production: Mitigation strategies to overcome the future challenges facing the global poultry industry. *J. Therm. Biol.* 2018 Dec;78: 131-139.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/9/22:

Yes for PIF stage. Further analysis to be undertaken during project preparation.

4/22/22:

Yes, although the impacts of climate on crop yield and quality is not yet clear.

Agency Response

UNDP – 11 May 2022:

Duly noted on further analysis during project preparation.

UNDP – 6 May 2022:

Please refer to information added under Agency response to Part II Project justification, 1 on the assessment of climate change impacts on the crops selected

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/9/22:

Cleared.

4/22/22:

Not yet.

a) Further clarity is needed on the rationale for the project. Unless potential impacts of climate change on the crops are known and some likely link is established with adverse impacts (backed by scientific studies), it is not clear how adaptation strategies and measures can be determined.

b) The project intends to use vetiver for anti-erosion lining but the PIF states that it is hard to find in Comoros. Please discuss. Also, has the team conducted a climate risk screening for vetiver to ensure it can withstand current and projected climate? There have been instances of vetiver failure due to inability to cope with maximum temperatures at some locations.

c) Please clarify what the following means in the description for sub-component 3.2: "to encourage savings in SANDUKs as co-financing in the WB project".

d) Please discuss further the "counterpart" beneficiaries are expected to contribute for the on-the-ground adaptation measures. The purpose

of the LDCF investments should not be to pose a burden on vulnerable, poor communities. How will the project ensure that they do not have to incur additional financial strain in order to participate?

e) It is not clear how the proposed certification will assess adaptation measures as part of the "high-quality standards including climate-smart practices". Please discuss.

f) Please specify which crop value chains the project will focus on and discuss exactly how climate resilience will be integrated in the value chains and systems, including the specific points along the value chain.

Agency Response

UNDP – 6 May 2022:

a) Please refer to information added under Part I – Project Information 1.b.

b. Vetiver is already used on the island of Ndzuani for the extraction of essential oil and, successfully for more than a year, by some operators in the CRDE of Mrémani (Nyumakélé) as an anti-erosion line in small plots. Its use has not spread elsewhere in Ndzuani nor on the two other islands, due to a lack of knowledge of this species and the services it can provide. It is difficult to obtain strains of vetiver because the strains present are monopolized for the extraction of the essential oil by the operators of a small distillery.

Based on the information provided in the FAO ECOCROP tool, optimal conditions for the growth of vetiver require temperatures ranging from 22°C to 35°C and annual rainfall ranging from 500 to 2500 mm. The absolute conditions require temperatures varying from 12°C to 45°C and annual rainfall varying from 200 to 5000 mm. Mean projections of climate variables for 2030 and 2050 (see PIF Document Table 2) under the extreme RCP scenario 8.5 (GHG emissions increase) predict temperature ranges between a minimum of 23.6-24.4°C and a maximum of 28.7-29.5°C for 2030, and a minimum of 24.2-25.2°C and a maximum of 29.2-30.3°C for 2050, and precipitation ranges between 802.3 and 1584.4 mm for 2030, and between 788.2 and 1530.0 mm for 2050. Based on these projections, it is expected that growth requirements of vetiver are within the expected ranges of the climate variables related to temperature and precipitation, even under the worst-case climate change scenario, in the medium (2030) and in the long term (2050).

Before its use is recommended to farmers, tests will be carried out in the plots of the CRDEs in order to verify its adaptation to local conditions.

c. The sentence is re-written as follows: Project interventions will involve (a) raising smallholder farmers' awareness on savings and credit as a risk management approach, building on interventions planned under the WB IPDC project (identified as co-financing to this project) which aim to encourage savings in the micro-credit institution SANDUKs, and providing financial education.

d. The approach has been adjusted (financial contribution removed) to avoid imposing a financial burden on vulnerable communities. The project will thus adopt an approach where any project contribution for infrastructure (such as goat sheds, greenhouses and shade shelters) and equipment (such as micro-irrigation systems, small tools) will involve a counterpart (in-kind contribution as work) from the beneficiaries in order to promote ownership and maintenance. In addition, the income from part of the agricultural production linked to the use of the infrastructures will be allocated to the maintenance and renewal of the infrastructures. Maintenance will be carried out by an infrastructure

management committee comprising users supervised by CRDE staff, such that the government should not have to invest further beyond the project for their replacement.

e. The selected certification will define a set of criteria that will be integrated into specifications to be followed by the various actors involved in the various stages of the value chain. These criteria should include adaptation measures to ensure climate resilience. A national committee composed of independent experts will be responsible for verifying the compliance of the various stages related to production (including cultivation, harvesting, storage, processing, transport) with the requirements of the specifications for the product to be eligible for certification. The criteria to be met for certification will be distributed to the producers concerned.

f. The target crops currently cultivated include the three (3) cash crops: vanilla, ylang-ylang, cloves, the five (5) main food crops: banana, cassava, sweet potato, yam, and taro, and eleven (11) most commonly grown vegetables and fruits: tomato, cabbage, cucumber, lettuce, pepper, carrot, eggplant, potato, beans, watermelon, spinach. The nine (9) crops for potential development of new climate resilient value chains include ginger, low caffeine coffee, native bananas and yams, nutmeg, aloe vera, Indian borage, vetiver, and turmeric.

As part of output 1.3, the project will undertake a climate and socioeconomic vulnerability analysis for all sections of the targeted value chains. In order to identify the main issues affecting the value chains of targeted cash crop and market gardening and to better define the interventions needed to strengthen their resilience, the project will involve the value chains actors to document and assess climate, environmental, and socioeconomic vulnerability in all sections of the value chains. The vulnerability assessment will integrate the results of the assessments conducted by the CGIAR for tomatoes, bananas and manioc crops based on exposure to several factors related to climate change . The following text has been added in this section:

“As part of the vulnerability analysis, the project will develop value chain climate risk profiles. Assessments of the impacts of climate change often focus on production while neglecting the other components of value chains. However, successful adaptation requires thinking about how climate change will affect all aspects of the value chain. It is proposed to carry out this reflection with the stakeholders concerned by following the approach of climate risk profiles . Discussions will take place with value chain actors, i.e. producers, collectors, cooperatives and exporters, including the local populations involved, on their perception and experience of climate change and its impact on cultivation, harvesting, storage, transportation and processing of products. These discussions will also involve support and supervision structures for agricultural production in the field (CRDE) to consolidate understanding of the risks and effects/impacts of climate change on the different segments of the value chains. These consultations will help identify the individual and institutional actions and capacities needed at each level for the design and adoption of effective climate change adaptation measures, such as climate-smart agriculture practices or access to innovative information/communication tools or technologies that facilitate their adaptation. Solutions will be identified for each segment of the value chains – inputs, production, collection, storage, processing and marketing – to increase the adaptive capacity of value chain actors to climate change. This exercise will make it possible, among other things, to identify the most vulnerable actors (men-women-young people-people with disabilities) within each of the value chains.”

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/18/22:

Yes.

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

5/10/22:

Cleared for PIF stage.

4/22/22:

Not yet. Please see above comments.

Agency Response

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

5/9/22:

Cleared.

4/18/22:

Not yet. Please see comment on Core Indicators, above. Also, adaptation beneficiary information in section 6 of the PIF entry does not match that provided in the Core Indicators section.

Agency Response

UNDP – 6 May 2022:

Please refer to Agency Response on section related to Core Indicators above. The Tracking Tool has been updated in line with the revised values in the PIF.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/22:

Yes, working across crop value chains to build climate resilience would be innovative for Comoros.

Agency Response

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

4/18/22:

Yes

res.

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

5/9/22:

Cleared.

4/22/22:

It is well noted that the project includes information on planned stakeholder consultation during project development, including list of key stakeholder groups. The project should however provide additional information on the stakeholder consultation activities and findings during project design.

Agency Response

UNDP – 6 May 2022:

Extensive consultations were carried out during the development of the PIF with the following stakeholders: National Directorate of Agricultural Strategies and Livestock, National Institute for Agronomic, Fisheries and Livestock Research, Regional Directorates of Agriculture, Rural Economic Development Centers, National Meteorological Agency, University of Comoros, National Horticultural Center, Private Sector (Chamber of Commerce, INNOV'LAB), Development Partners (IPDC Project, AFIDEV, PREFER-IFAD, GCF watershed, Catastrophe), Decentralized structures (Town Halls and Communes), Farmers / Herders.

The consultations took place through workshops, meetings, interviews, and a questionnaire with farmers. The issues addressed by each of these consultations are presented in Annex E. Overall, they focused on the following aspects: Selection criteria for intervention sites, Risk assessment of the agricultural sector to climate variability, Evolution of the yield of the main crops in the agricultural chains, Proposals for measures to mitigate the effects of climate change on the agricultural sector, Capacity assessment of the DNSAE to pilot the project in

measures to mitigate the effects of climate change on the agricultural sector, Capacity assessment of the DINSAE to pilot the project in relation to climate variability, Studies and initiatives implemented or in progress in relation to climate variability, Identification of institutional, technical and technological capacity building needs, Main vulnerability risks in the project intervention areas, Promotion of agricultural entrepreneurship especially for young people and women, Innovative prospects for marketing at national and regional levels, Main speculations of agricultural value chains and their vulnerabilities, Socio-economic impacts of climate change. Farmers were specifically consulted on their perception and experience of the effects of climate change in the agricultural and livestock sectors and on their practices

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

4/22/22:

Yes.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/22/22:

Yes.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

5/9/22:

Cleared.

4/22/22:

Please undertake a climate risk screening and upload the report. The uploaded document on climate change impacts on crop is very general, does not cite specific published work, and does not consider projected climate change in Comoros.

Agency Response

UNDP – 6 May 2022:

A climate risk screening has been completed and is provided as a separate document (uploaded to the Roadmap section of the GEF portal).

Further description of climate change impacts on crops as experienced by farmers has been integrated in the section on Impacts of climate change / Effects of climate change on agroecosystems and agricultural practices as experienced by smallholder farmers (p. 8).

Information on projected climate change is provided in the section on Impacts of climate change (p. 6)

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

4/22/22:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

4/22/22:

Yes.

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

4/22/22:

Yes.

Agency Response

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/9/22:

Cleared.

4/22/22:

Not yet. As requested above, please undertake a climate risk assessment for the project, which considers potential impact of climate change on proposed project activities. This is a separate issue from the fact that the project intends to deliver adaptation benefits.

Agency Response

UNDP – 6 May 2022:

Please refer to Agency Response on Risk to Achieving Project Objectives.

art 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

4/22/22:

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

n/a

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

5/11/22:

Yes, cleared.

5/10/22:

Not yet. The agency is requested to include a sharper version of the Theory of Change.

4/25/22:

Not yet. Please address the review comments.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/18/22:

By CEO endorsement, please ensure:

- a) The PMC portion of co-finance needs to be real, available resources that can be applied towards management costs of the LDCF project.
- b) Please provide additional information on the stakeholder consultation activities and findings during project design.
- c) Please provide a robust analysis of the likely impacts of climate change in the medium in Comoros for each of the main value chains under consideration. This should inform the adaptation activities to be supported by the project, and the linkage should be clear. Please discuss these climate impacts in the wider context of various non-climatic challenges being faced so that integrated/holistic solutions can be developed for resilience.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/25/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/10/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/11/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval