

Building smallholder farmers resilience through climate smart agriculture techniques in Oio and cacheu north regions in Guinea Bissau

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11010

Countries

Guinea-Bissau

Project Name

Building smallholder farmers resilience through climate smart agriculture techniques in Oio and cacheu north regions in Guinea Bissau

Agencies

BOAD

Date received by PM

4/14/2022

Review completed by PM

6/16/2022

Program Manager

Yuki Shiga

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

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

Yes, it is aligned with the GEF-7 LDCF strategy (CCA-1 and CCA-2).

Agency Response

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 Yes.

Agency Response

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 05.31.2022:

Cleared.

04.19.2022:

There is no proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. The GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional.

Agency Response Thanks. A revised Financing plan has been provided
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

05.31.2022:

Cleared.

04.19.2022:

- MSP financing ceiling is \$2 million. As such, please limit the project financing or change the project type to FSP.

- A GEF-7 LDCF country cap is \$10 million. Guinea-Bissau already has a PIF approved GEF-7 LDCF project worth \$6,734,250 (GEFID 10105). As such the maximum cost for any additional GEF-7 project is \$3,265,750 (current proposed project: \$3,275,500, overshooting by \$9,750), even if the project was submitted as FSP.

Agency Response Thanks. A revised financing plan has been provided

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 05.31.2022:

Cleared.

04.19.2022:

Please refer to the comment under the section for Table D.

Agency Response Thanks. A revised financing plan has been provided

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 06.04.2022:

Cleared.

05.31.2022:

PPG limit is US50k for MSPs. Please update PPG as well as PPG fee accordingly.

04.19.2022:

PPG limit is US50k for MSPs. The limit for FSPs depends on the project size. Please refer to policy and guidelines on project and program cycle:

<https://www.thegef.org/projects-operations/policies-guidelines>

Agency Response Thanks. A revised budget is submitted

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

06.10.2022:

Cleared.

06.04.2022:

- Core Indicators: Cleared.

- 'SCCF-A' still seems to be 'true'; as this is LDCF project, this should be 'false'. Please uncheck 'SCCF-A'.

LDCF true	SCCF-B (Window B) on technology transfer false	SCCF-A (Window-A) on climate Change adaptation true
------------------	--	---

05.22.2022:

- Please refer to two comments provided on 04.19.2022, as Core Indicators 1,3 and 4 seem to be still '0'. Please have a consistent values between different sections of the PIFAR (e.g., 'Core Indicator 1: Direct beneficiaries' is indicated as 9,800 in Section 1.a.6.)

Core Indicators - LDCF				
CORE INDICATOR 1	Total	Male	Female	% for Women
Total number of direct beneficiaries	0	0	0	0%
CORE INDICATOR 2				
Area of land managed for climate resilience (ha)	150.00			
CORE INDICATOR 3				
Total no. of policies/plans that will mainstream climate resilience	0			
CORE INDICATOR 4				
Total number of people trained	0	0	0	0%

- Please uncheck 'SCCF-A'.

LDCF true	SCCF-B (Window B) on technology transfer false	SCCF-A (Window-A) on climate Change adaptation true
------------------	--	---

04.19.2022:

- Please also consider Core Indicators 1, 3 and 4, which are currently all indicated as

??. Direct beneficiaries are indicated as 9,800 in Section 1.a.6. Training (Core Indicator 4) seems to be integral part of Component 2, particularly under ?2.1.1 Technical capacity building trainings for farmers' on climate-smart farming techniques?. In addition, policies/plans (Core Indicator 3) are important in terms of sustainability beyond the designated project duration, and keeping the momentum. For example, PIF mentions ?Local and regional planning will be supported to introduce ecosystem protection and the adoption and scaling up of sustainable agriculture techniques?. Can this ?planning? be further elaborated in the PIF and considered as Core Indicator 3?
- Please further elaborate on how Core Indicators were calculated/estimated.

Agency Response

Justifications for indicators:

The Core Indicators 1,3 and 4 were determined based on the available feasibility studies undertaken in the project zone, which determined the vegetative cover of the project area, as well as lessons learned from similar projects in the region (eg. cost per surface area) and available budget. At this stage, the following activities are planned on 150 hectares: water and soil conservation works in cultivated fields, agroforestry, prohibition and assisted natural regeneration, zero-tillage, reforestation, planting in protected communal, village and community forests. Gabion thresholds are planned on 100 hectares.

Core Indicator 11 was determined based on the demographic distribution in the project zones of OIO and Cacheau. For instance, there are 1,400 households in the project areas with an average of 7 members per household.

Sub-indicators and a target for Core Indicator 6 Greenhouse gas emission mitigated will be determined at a later stage in project development when further studies in the project area will be carried out.

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

06.04.2022:

Cleared.

05.31.2022:

- Thank you for updating the images in the attached document. Please also update the images in the PIFAR (Portal) where possible.
- Please elaborate also on the root causes, or highlight/indicate the changes made.

04.19.2022:

- Images in the PIF are broken throughout the document and unable to review.
- Please elaborate also on the root causes.

Agency Response The PIF in PDF format is submitted as a supporting document to keep the quality of the images

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

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

06.04.2022:

Cleared.

05.31.2022 /04.19.2022:

- PIF states: ??combination of traditional practices and innovative approaches??. Please elaborate and deepen this important discussion. Also please provide any examples/candidates of this combination to be taken up in the project.
- Please develop and include theory of change by refereeing to STAP primer on ToC (<https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer>).

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

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

Yes.

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

06.04.2022:

Cleared.

05.31.2022 /04.19.2022:

Please align the description in this section (1.a.6.) with Core Indicators. Please also refer to the comment(s) in 'Core Indicator' section of this review sheet.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

06.10.2022:

Cleared.

06.04.2022:

- Innovation; Local ownership; Replication: Cleared.

- Financial mechanism: There seems to be no further elaboration provided on financial mechanism. Please provide elaboration on this mechanism, or indicate where this has been added.

05.31.2022 /04.19.2022:

- Innovation: Innovation discussed in this PIF requires further elaboration. PIF states: ?Innovation is a major feature of the project due to the focus on the resilience of different technologies and the fact that the project's approach will synergistically reach different intervention areas?. Please deepen the discussion on this statement, particularly on ?synergistically reach different intervention areas?.
- Local ownership: PIF states: ?promoting local ownership by communities and end-users?. While training and capacity building mentioned in the PIF is important in promoting local ownership, please further elaborate on the ?incentives? for them to further promote their ownership and involvement.
- Replication: PIF states: ?The introduction of climate-smart agriculture in rural households has great potential for replication?. Please further elaborate and deepen the discussion on this, particularly on the rationale.
- Financial mechanism: PIF states: ?Once the financial mechanism is in place, ?? Please explain this financial mechanism. Is this developed under the proposed project or by co-financing, or by other means? Please elaborate on what this is and how it is related to the proposed LDCF project.

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

06.04.2022:

Cleared.

05.31.2022 /04.19.2022:

A map seems to be broken.

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

06.17.2022:

Cleared for PIF. The project should ensure meaningful consultations with IPLCs and civil society organizations during the PPG stage and need to document these

consultations and develop a stakeholder engagement plan prior to CEO endorsement in line with GEF policies on stakeholder engagement and environmental and social safeguards.

06.14.2022:

The project indicate that Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, Civil Society organizations and Private sector Entities have been consultations during the project identification phase.

Please ask provide brief information on any stakeholder consultations during project design.

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

06.16.2022:

Cleared. Further elaboration provided under Section 1.a.

06.14.2022:

The project indicates that it will undertake a gender vulnerability assessment at the project preparation phase. As the project's focus and objective -- "Build smallholder farmers resilience through climate smart agriculture techniques" have very important gender equality dimensions, the Agency is requested to reflect key gender perspectives in the project components - outputs and indicators as relevant at the CEO endorsement stage, based on the gender vulnerability assessment and gender analysis. This is key to gender mainstreaming and a best practice.

The Agency is also requested to respond to the question "Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?"

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

06.10.2022:

Cleared.

06.04.2022:

There seems to be no further elaboration or explanation provided re private sector engagement. Please provide elaboration/explanation on this, or indicate where this has been added.

05.31.2022 /04.19.2022:

- It is mentioned 'no' under 'Will there be private sector engagement in the project?'; however, it is mentioned 'yes' to 'private sector entities' under 'Stakeholders' section.
- Please briefly explain the rationale behind your answer in Section '4. Private sector engagement'.

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

06.04.2022:

Cleared.

05.31.2022 /04.19.2022:

Please also discuss COVID-19 risks and opportunities.

Agency Response

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

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

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

06.04.2022:

Cleared.

05.31.2022 /04.19.2022:

Please also discuss how the project will learn from other relevant projects and initiatives.

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

06.10.2022:

Cleared.

06.04.2022 /05.31.2022 /04.19.2022:

Please provide ESS screening information of the project.

Agency Response

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

06.16.2022:
Cleared.

06.14.2022:

The sum of each component (PPG + GEF Project Financing + Agency Fee ? \$50,000 + \$2,000,000 + 163,500 = \$2,213,750) is different than the total amount in the table and in the text of the letter (\$2,163,750). It seems to forgot to include the PPG. Please get either a new LoE or an email from the OFP (which needs to be appended to the documents? tab) clarifying that the total amount is \$2,213,750. ?

06.04.2022:

PPG is updated in the endorsement letter. However fee seems to be not. 'Fee' in the endorsement letter must be the total of Agency fee + PPG fee = 160,000 + 3,750 = 163,750.

05.31.2022:

Please refer to comment in PPG section. PPG limit is US50k for MSPs. Please update PPG as well as PPG fee accordingly in the letter.

04.19.2022:

\$ in the OFP endorsement letter does not much \$ in the PIF. Please check and revise if necessary.

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

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

06.17.2022:

This PIFAR is recommended for technical clearance.

06.14.2022 /06.04.2022 /05.31.2022 /04.19.2022:

Not yet. Please refer to the review items and resubmit for consideration.

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	4/19/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/31/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/4/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/10/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/14/2022	

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval