



Strengthening the resilience of natural and agro-ecosystems and communities to climate change in Central Togo

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11548

Countries

Togo

Project Name

Strengthening the resilience of natural and agro-ecosystems and communities to climate change in Central Togo

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

3/23/2024

Review completed by PM

5/8/2024

Program Manager

Jason Spensley

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

26 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

26 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

(i) We note with appreciation the indication of scenarios with RCP4.5 and 8.5 to 2075. Please provide information on expected changes to the climate hazards and their specific impacts that this project will strive to adapt and build resilience to, on a shorter timeline, ideally looking 30 years ahead to 2050 or 2055? Please note that it is important to link the LDCF funded outcomes and outputs directly to these anticipated impacts and associated vulnerabilities of the target population.

- (ii) With regards to the threats and drivers, please strengthen the linkage of these to the climate change risk problem (impacts and associated vulnerabilities of people to current and anticipated climate hazards).
- (iii) So far, the level of information is very low on the context, the considered landscape, the nature of interventions (and theory of change needs to be revised). Please provide more substantive information on the context.
- (iv) The connection with existing projects and the Guinean Forests IP is absent GEFID 11392, GEFID 11147). Please address.
- (v) Several pieces of information already prepared for another GEF/UNDP project (GEFID 10416) should help to improve the current PIF and avoid duplication of outputs and activities, especially on institutional support.
- (vi) There is an important line of work on the reinforcement of smallholder farmers (role of extension services, producers organizations, Farmer Field Schools, research institutions?). The project needs more more baseline information on the potential partners to involve in this. Please expand on this.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 25 April 2024:

- i) Thank you for your comment. The expected changes to climate change hazards are presented in a fully revised sub-section 'Climate change projections', as part of the Rationale, which focuses on projections for the 2040s and 2050s.
- ii) As suggested, the linkages between threats and drivers, on one hand, and risks and vulnerabilities on the other, are strengthened and discussed in a new section on 'Impacts and vulnerabilities to habitat loss and degradation in a changing climate'
- iii) Thank you for this comment. The suggested information has been further detailed. The sub-section on 'Geographic and social context' has been expanded within the Project Rationale section of the revised PIF. The theory of change has also been revised at the output level (see indicative project overview), along with associated output descriptions. Reference to the project landscape(s), in terms of likely prefectures, has been added to the section on 'How the project will build on baseline and ongoing investments?'. The nature of interventions is elaborated in the section on core indicators.
- iv) GEFID 11392 and GEF ID 11147 have been reviewed, connection with this GEF 8 project identified, and their importance highlighted in the section on 'Coordination and cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects?', with care taken to avoid overlap (see response to 2 (v) below)
- v) Footnote 18 has been added, noting that care will be taken to ensure that national-level institutional strengthening is complementary to, and does not duplicate, support being provided under GEFID 10416. To this end, Project Implementation Reports from GEFID 10416 will be carefully reviewed

during the PPG process to further ensure there is no duplication by the present project. No overlaps at regional or local levels are expected, given that the projects are taking place in different regions.

vi) Potential partners have been identified in a newly added table on stakeholders (see Table 4) and cross referenced under Output 3.3.

3 Indicative Project Overview

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

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

26 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

(i) Component 1: Please check the risks of duplication with the GEFID11392 on institutional support (outputs 1.1 and 1.2).

(ii) Output 1.2: Multistakeholder platforms at landscape level are potentially welcome. Please, avoid duplication with other projects, including other GEF/FAO projects. Please, confirm how this will be achieved.

(iii) Outputs 1.1 to 1.4: To the extent that LDCF is supporting these outputs, please sharpen their focus on addressing specified climate risks and vulnerabilities.

(iv) Output 1.5: There are several existing strategies and action plans largely financed by the GEF enabling activities (NAP, NDC, LDN targets?). We wonder about the meaning and value of another ten-year climate regional SLM and intensification plan for agriculture. Moreover, this plan seems disconnected to the existing national framework related to Conventions. Please remove, reformulate, or justify this aspect. Please look carefully at existing climate adaptation plans and avoid any duplication.

(v) This same comment is applicable to the output 1.4: Why is there a need for yet another plan for ecological restoration? This would be in addition to AFR100, Bonn Challenge, REDD+, LDN?

Component 3

(vi) Output 3.4: Please clarify the institutional anchorage and the need for a strategy (one more?) to empower the micro, small, and medium enterprises. We wonder if this is the right strategy. We would prefer to see a bottom-up approach based on the existing and active partners. For that, a better information on the existing stakeholders should be available. Please revise as appropriate.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 25 April 2024:

(i) Similar to the response related to potential overlap with GEF Project 10416 (please see 2 (v) above), the present project's PPG process will ensure that any national-level support does not duplicate what is being provided through that project. In this case, regional-level support, particularly for regional-level governance frameworks for the Central Region may also likely be provided through 11392. The present project will benefit from this synergy, while focusing on identifying and addressing complementary policy and regulatory needs at landscape levels.

(ii) Additional details have been provided regarding existing coordination platforms (please see Table 3). The description of Output 1.2 has been revised to ensure complementarity with existing mechanisms, including those supported by other projects. Building on information presented in Table 3, duplication with other GEF projects will be avoided and incrementality ensured through an updated mapping out of existing and emerging consultation mechanisms, to be carried out during the PPG phase.

(iii) As suggested, Outputs 1.1 and 1.4 have been reviewed and revised to further address specific climate risks and vulnerabilities.

(iv) Thank you for this comment. With regard to this comment, and comment 3 (v) immediately below, the revised PIF has removed the two ten-year action plans (former Outputs 1.4 and 1.5) and has instead included smaller scale, but more detailed and operational, implementation plans for project landscapes (new Output 1.4). These local plans, developed in a highly participatory and gender inclusive manner, will provide detailed guidance for investments under Components 2 and 3. Importantly, they will be designed to pull together, integrate, and ensure local level consistency and synergies in implementation among all of the various national-level plans mentioned, thereby maximizing the potential global and national benefits of a landscape approach. Lessons learned will be shared with national teams responsible for implementation of the referenced plans. Multi-stakeholder platforms will play a key role in this process.

(v) See previous response, 3 (iv).

(vi) Work under Output 3.4 will build on ongoing support being delivered by the Ministry of Commerce, Crafts and Local Consumption. The work is described in the section on 'Coordination and cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects.' The Ministry of Commerce is also included as a stakeholder in Table 2.

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

Secretariat's Comments

26 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

(i) The role of women in the resilience of families against environmental change and shocks is not reflected in the result framework. Gender issues should be clearly expressed in the result framework and not only in the M&E. Women in rural Togo are key players for resilience and sustainability. To be reflected.

(ii) The importance of women in agriculture production, transformation, markets, and NRM (wood, water) should make them privileged beneficiaries of the project: 50% of women as beneficiaries does not seem a good start. To be revised.

(iii) UNDP is in general a strong agency for gender issues. If needed, we suggest involving more female staff and consultants in the project team.

(iv) Please ensure women's engagements in activities related to decision-making and capacity-building activities. In Outcome 3, please ensure that all outputs capture gender perspectives and benefit women. In Component 4, please ensure that gender equality considerations are captured in KM products developed. When developing the GAP, ensure that the activities are budgeted, monitored, and reported on.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 25 April 2024:

(i) A gender-responsive and inclusive approach is inherent in all project Outputs. This aspect has now been explicitly mentioned in the revised titles for Outputs 1.2, 3.1, 4.1 and 4.3.

(ii) Thank you for your comment. Acknowledging the importance of the role of women in agriculture, the project has increased the percentage of women targeted as direct beneficiaries. Project interventions will be designed to ensure that, at minimum, 60% of targeted beneficiaries will be women.

(iii) UNDP Togo's Gender Expert has contributed to the revision of the present document. Selection of the PPG team will prioritize inclusion of women consultants, as will the Project Management Unit (please see ?Implementation framework?)

(iv) Output 3.1 has been revised to ensure that gender-disaggregated data and information are used throughout the detailed design and implementation of Component 3. Gender equality considerations are further captured in KM products, and Outputs 4.1 and 4.3 have likewise been revised.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

26 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

The co-financing grant amount of \$1,000,000 from UNDP is categorized as "recurrent expenditures". Please note that grants are usually classified as "investment mobilized". Please revise this accordingly.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 25 April 2024:

UNDP's \$6 million co-financing grant (\$5 million from ISDB project and \$1 million from TRAC resources) is correctly categorized as "investment mobilized."

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

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

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

26 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

A) Please see the comments above in response to question 3.1 (in particular comments i and ii) on climate adaptation rationale.

B) Please expand on barriers and enablers directly related to achieving climate change adaptation and resilience.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 25 April 2024:

A) See responses above.

B) The section on barriers and enablers has been expanded to include discussion of specific aspects of climate change adaptation.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

26 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

Ai) Forest and agroforestry parkland restoration is not new in the region. Several initiatives and projects have generated knowledge and best practices. We take note of the output 1.3 to identify best practices in agriculture, agroforestry, and land restoration. However, a brief review of past projects should be done at PIF level (GEF and LDCF portfolio in Benin, Nigeria, Cameroon, Ghana, Cote d'Ivoire, GEF6 Resilient Food System, AVACLIM...). UNDP also managed several of these GEF and LDCF projects in the region and especially in Togo (GEFID 10416, 4026). Please, complete.

Aii) There is a missed opportunity to correct in exploring the Other Effective Conservation Measures (OECM) outside protected areas. Forest and agroforestry restoration techniques may potentially be included in OECM.

B) Please address comments above on climate resilience.

C) This project cannot be developed without making a connection with the GEF8 Guinean Forests IP, its regional coordination project, and the project in Togo,

developed by FAO (GEFID 11392 - Strengthening conservation and resilience of forest landscapes in the sub-humid mountainous zone of Togo). Please, explain how this MTF project will be complementary of the GEFID11392. Even if the Regional Coordination Project is not CEO endorsed (but already submitted, GEFID 11147), please anticipate the connection in terms of KM (agroforestry, landscape restoration, OECM, Protected Area Management?).

D) Yes

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 25 April 2024:

A.i) Thank you for the comment. These projects and others do indeed provide a valuable source of input regarding good and best practices related to forest and agroforest restoration as well as sustainable agriculture. These projects have had success with a variety of methods, including specific practices related to sustainable and climate-smart agriculture, innovations for value chains and the bio-economy and circular economy (honey, shea, n?r?, cashew nuts, etc.), crop association, composting and manure/organic fertilizer, improved fallow lands and integrated soil fertility management (ISFM). These practices are now referred to in the Outcome 3 description, with additional details provided in the Core Indicators descriptions. Lessons learned by these projects will be further examined during the PPG and will inform the present project design.

A.ii) OECMs have been incorporated into the description of Output 2.3.

B. Above comments on climate resilience (sections 2 i), 3.2 i) and 4A) have been addressed, as described above.

C. As noted above (question 2 iv.), GEF 11392 and 11147 concept notes / draft prodocs have been reviewed and their importance highlighted in the PIF. In particular, potential overlap between 11392 and the present project?s Outputs 1.1 and 1.2 will be addressed during the PPG.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

26 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

A) Theory of Change: we wonder the justification to make the distinction between the pathways 2 and 3 (components 2 and 3) to reach climate-smart and nature positive restoration and increased resilience, as both target the same agriculture, agroforestry, and forests systems and the same communities are concerned. Please, clarify.

B) Please see comments above on component and outputs.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 25 April 2024:

The project design follows the GEF-8 Programming Directions, which differentiate between the Objective to "Avoid and reduce land degradation through sustainable land management (SLM)" (Objective 1 of LD Focal Area Strategy) and "Reverse land degradation through landscape restoration" (Objective 2 of LD Strategy). Together, of course, progress towards both objectives is needed in order to achieve Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN), in this case at regional level.

The project retains this two-track approach even though some (though certainly not all) of the same localities will be implicated within each component. In the case of protected areas, only restoration work will be supported (under Output 2.4). At a more micro-scale, within the context of work taking place in productive areas of the landscapes, specific locations will be targeted for restoration and others for avoidance / reduction. These actions will be fully coordinated and implemented jointly in some locations. However, the substantive distinctions in terms of methodologies and approaches between restoration and avoidance / reduction will be retained, as will approaches to monitoring impacts.

With regards to the theory of change itself, both of the above outcomes do indeed contribute to achieving climate-smart and nature positive restoration and increased resilience; however, they do so according to distinct pathways, as identified in the theory of change diagram. The results of each will reinforce those of the other and of the remaining project components thus jointly contributing to the common project objective.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

26 April 2024:

We note further analysis will take place during the PPG phase and detailed analysis of the landscape of investment will be further described and elaborated upon in the submission of the CER.

26 March 2024:

Insufficient information is provided on how this project will build on ongoing investments, both GEF and non-GEF. Please expand.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 29 April 2024:

This confirms that further analysis will take place during the PPG phase and a detailed analysis of the landscape of investment will also be further described and elaborated upon in the submission of the CER

UNDP Response, 25 April 2024:

The section on 'How the project will build on baseline and ongoing investments?' has been redrafted and expanded. Further analysis will take place during the PPG phase and detailed analysis of the landscape of investment will be further described and elaborated upon.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

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

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

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

26 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

A) Limited information is provided on institutional setting, including potential executing partners, and a rationale. Please expand on this.

B) Yes

C) - We would like to see references on the PIF to the GEFID 11392 project 'Strengthening conservation and resilience of forest landscapes in the sub-humid mountainous zone of Togo' developed by FAO, as well as the GEFID Guinean Forests Integrated Program and its regional project developed by CI (even if it is pending), given that a connection about knowledge management seems natural (agroforestry, landscape restoration, OECM, multi-stakeholder platform).

D) Yes

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 25 April 2024:

A. A sub-section describing the project's 'Implementation Framework has been added. Please see the last section of B. Project Description for the detail included.

C. The PIF now includes references to relevant aspects of GEFID 11392, including with respect to: knowledge management, OECM (see sub-section on coordination and cooperation with ongoing initiative and projects) and multi-stakeholder platforms (see sub-section on How the project will build on baseline and ongoing investments).

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

2 May 2024:

Cleared

26 April 2024:

a) The level of impact ambition as indicated in several of the indicators is still quite low, particularly in terms of number of beneficiaries (and particularly in relation to similar projects of other GEF Agencies). Please strive to increase the impact ambition in the indicators at PIF stage and resubmit.

b) The level of 40% female beneficiaries and people trained in the LDCF indicators is not acceptable, particularly for this type of project and given the importance of women in relevant activities. Please strive for a minimum of 60% female.

26 March 2024:

(i) Please provide expected impact level for all relevant indicators. Outcome 4 indicates that the number of beneficiaries will be confirmed during PPG phase. Please provide an expected amount at PIF stage.

(ii) This section needs to be completely re-written: The proposed text does not justify the selection of the core indicators and targets selected, particularly for GET core indicators 1, 3, and 4. Please, revise.

(iii) There is a tentative of explanation of the core indicators under the table on CI. However, we would need an explanation of the definition of SLM and the main technologies or approaches developed. Same thing on the GET CI 3 on restoration.

(iv) The number of direct beneficiaries from the LDCF support for climate adaptation and resilience is low. Please increase.

(v) The number of hectares across indicators also seems quite low. Please seek to increase impact ambition.

(vi) The 30% sector focus of LDCF finance allocated to other/restoration should be allocated to nature based management.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 29 April 2024:

a) Thank you for the comment. As recommended, the project has increased both GEF (CI #11) and LDCF (CI #1 & CI #4) core indicators of number of beneficiaries, all targeting at minimum 60% women. GEF Core indicators #3, #4 and LDCF Core Indicator #2 have also increased in ha targeted.

b) LDCF CI #4 has an increased number of beneficiaries (a, above) and includes a target of at minimum 60% women.

UNDP Response, 25 April 2024:

(i) Project target for direct beneficiaries is 10,000. It will be determined during PPG phase the # of beneficiaries for learning products (Outcome 4), value chains (Outcome 3), Climate adaptation and resilience (Outcomes 1-3).

- (ii) The discussion of core indicators has been expanded with further details provided for each core indicator.
- (iii) The revised discussion of core indicators elaborates on some of the key approaches that are expected to be used within the context of achieving each indicator's target.
- (iv) The number of expected beneficiaries has been revised upwards to 15,000 and an explanation of the numbers provided.
- (v) The target for land and ecosystems under restoration has been increased from 5,000 ha to 7,000 ha. The target for landscapes under improved practices has been increased from 30,000 ha to 35,000 ha.
- (vi) As suggested, 30% of the Component 2 LDCF budget on restoration has been moved to Component 3 LDCF budget that focuses on nature-based management.

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

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

- a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?**
- b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat's Comments

8 May 2024:

Cleared for further review by policy alignment/PPO colleagues.

3 May 2024:

The justification provided by the Agency in the review sheet stresses that the overall rating relies on UNDP's internal policy and guidance under which project activities are screened for their inherent (pre-mitigation) social and environmental risks regardless of planned mitigation and management measures. While this is acceptable for social and environmental aspects, Overall risk and every other risk category

should be rated based on their residual risk, as per the approach taken under the GEF risk appetite (GEF/C.66/13). This requires to provide risk ratings on the basis of the residual risk after accounting for the risk to the project outcomes based on the anticipated/actual implementation of mitigation measures. Please adjust the risk rating on this basis as appropriate.

26 March 2024:

•Please review and confirm the Overall risk currently marked as High for the project under the Key Risks section, in light of the fact that any rating indicates the *residual* risk to achieving project outcomes after accounting for the implementation of anticipated mitigation measures.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 7 May 2024:

We have reviewed the risk ratings based on residual risks and have updated the overall risk rating of the project to Substantial. We have also added risk description and have added more detail regarding the mitigation measures that will be implemented to address residual risks.

UNDP Response, 25 April 2024:

According to UNDP's internal policy and guidance, project activities are screened for their inherent (?pre-mitigation?) social and environmental risks regardless of planned mitigation and management measures. This means that risks should be identified (i.e., a ?Yes? in the Checklist) and quantified as if no mitigation or management measures were to be put in place. The ?manageability? of the identified potential risks is then considered in subsequent steps.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

26 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

(i) Please expand on innovative elements of this project.

(ii) Very little is said about private sector engagement in this project. Please expand and ensure robust private sector engagement elements.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 25 April 2024:

i) The project's approach to identifying and diffusing innovation is described in the sub-section on 'How the project will build on baseline and ongoing investments?'. UNDP Togo's Accelerator Lab is expected to provide technical support and guidance to this process.

ii) A description of private sector stakeholders and engagement has been added to the section on 'Stakeholder roles and contribution?'. Please see the last paragraph in that section.

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

26 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

(i) Please provide further information, more than a cut and paste from the GEF8 programming strategies. This is the section in which we are expecting an explanation on the assumptions and strategic choices for restoration and SLM. Please, explain how the project will generate global environment benefits related to LD and BD focal areas.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 25 April 2024:

i) The section on 'Alignment with GEF-8 strategy?' has been revised to provide further explanation on the assumptions and strategic choices for restoration and SLM, as well information on the project generating GEBs

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

26 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

Please note and address comments above.

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

26 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

Please more explicitly indicate which of the Kunming Montreal GBF 23 targets will be contributed to and how.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 25 April 2024:

Thank you for this comment.

Please see the descriptions of the project's expected contributions to specific Kunming-Montreal GBF targets have been added to the revised PIF. Please see the related table in Section C: Alignment with GEF-8 programming strategies and country/regional priorities.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

26 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

26 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

(i) We understand that the field work will be done at PPG. However, the comparative advantage of UNDP on agriculture, agroforestry, and forest management in Togo should allow the GEF Agency to share a provisional list of main stakeholders with their roles, especially because the network of producer organizations and cooperatives is historically well organized in Togo. Please revise and complete.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 25 April 2024:

i) Identification of the main stakeholders, including their roles and responsibilities, is provided in the revised PIF. Please see 'Stakeholder roles and contributions' which includes Table 2 that further identifies stakeholders, roles, and responsibilities. Please also see Table 4: Key stakeholders involved in providing extension services to small-scale farmers.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

26 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

26 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

26 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

26 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

26 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

26 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

Co-financing to be confirmed at CEO endorsement stage. However, please ensure all expected co-finance is indicated at the PIF stage. Parallel financing from Islamic Development Bank, Plan International, GIZ, and TRACK resources from UNDP are potentially welcome. Please, ensure that UNDP co-financing is maintained from the PIF to the CEO endorsement stage.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 25 April 2024:

Confirming that all expected co-finance has been indicated at this PIF stage. Please also note that the description of the UNDP co-financing has been revised slightly to remove any uncertainty regarding its availability.

Annex B: Endorsements

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

Secretariat's Comments

26 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

26 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

26 April 2024:

Cleared, pending any further comment from policy alignment/operations colleagues.

26 March 2024:

Please note that the letter of endorsement only mentions STAR allocations despite the fact that the LDCF resources do not come from STAR allocations. This needs to be corrected please.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 25 April 2024:

A new Letter of Endorsement has been provided in response to this comment.

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

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

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

Secretariat's Comments

26 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

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

Secretariat's Comments

26 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

26 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

26 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

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

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

8 May 2024:

Recommended for technical clearance, pending any further comments from policy alignment.

3 May 2024:

Please address the remaining comment on risks.

2 May 2024:

Technically cleared, pending any further comments from policy alignment colleagues.

26 April 2024:

A significantly reduced set of comments remain.

26 March 2024:

Not yet. Please address all comments.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 7 May, 2024:

The remaining comment on risks has been addressed.

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

Secretariat's Comments

26 April 2024:

As commented above, please ensure further analysis will take place during the PPG phase and detailed analysis of the landscape of investment will be further described and elaborated upon in the submission of the CER.

Agency's Comments

UNDP Response, 29 April 2024:

As indicated in the above response to Comment 5.2, further analysis will take place during the PPG phase and a detailed analysis of the landscape of investment will also be further described and elaborated upon in the submission of the CER.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	3/26/2024	

	PIF Review	Agency Response
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/26/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/2/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/3/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/8/2024	