

# Introducing systemic climate resilience methodologies in infrastructure investment planning

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10935

**Countries**

Global (Antigua and Barbuda, Egypt)

**Project Name**

Introducing systemic climate resilience methodologies in infrastructure investment planning

**Agencies**

UNIDO

**Date received by PM**

3/17/2022

**Review completed by PM**

6/9/2022

**Program Manager**

Jason Spensley

**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

13June2022:

Cleared

10June2022:

On the executing partner: kindly note that WRI can?t be categorized as a ?Donor Agency?, please request the agency to correct for ?CSO?.

19May2022:

Cleared

21March2022:

Project Information section: CCA Rio Marker should have a value of ?2?

Agency Response

CCA Rio Marker value has been changed to 2.

Response to 10Jun22:

WRI has been changed to CSO

**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

19May2022:

Cleared

21March2022:

The table B Outputs column seem to mostly list activities. Please revise the outputs to ensure they are articulated as such.

**Agency Response**

Project outputs have all been revised. Please see Table B. New outputs have also been revised under the proposed alternative scenario.

<b><i>Original Output</i></b>	<b><i>New output</i></b>
Output 1.1: Policy frameworks for Systemic Resilience Methodologies and Metrics are introduced/strengthened in the selected national and subnational planning institutions.	Output 1.1: Metrics and strengthened policy frameworks for systemic climate resilience methodologies developed.
Output 1.2: Analysis of the investment planning in infrastructure processes in selected countries and municipalities by introducing Systemic Risk Assessment and Investment Prioritization Tool (SRAT).	Output 1.2: Infrastructure investment planning analyses via the Systemic Risk Assessment and Investment Prioritization Tool (SRAT) prepared.
Output 1.3: Selected national and municipal planning institutes are supported to establish Systemic Resilience Methodologies	Output 1.3: Establishment of systemic climate resilience methodologies in selected national and municipal planning institutes.
Output 1.4: Key stakeholders' awareness is raised, including training on CCRI's Guidelines to incorporate Systemic Resilience Methodologies (including gender dimensions) in the selected national and subnational planning institutions.	Output 1.4: Improved stakeholder awareness, including training on CCRI's Guidelines to incorporate systemic climate resilience methodologies (including gender dimensions).

<p>Output 2.1: Climate-resilient infrastructure planning in two national pilots is implemented by demonstrating the SRAT to identify future risks to their infrastructure networks and prioritize critical investments based on exposure and economic/social value at risk</p> <p>Output 2.2: Climate-resilient infrastructure planning in a subnational pilot implemented by demonstrating the Systemic Risk Assessment and Investment Prioritization Tool (SRAT).</p> <p>Output 2.3: Lessons learned from the climate-resilient infrastructure planning pilots (national and subnational) are derived.</p> <p>Output 2.4: Knowledge about best practice examples for climate-resilient infrastructure planning in selected countries and municipalities are disseminated amongst stakeholders through CCRI's Systemic Resilience Forum and other avenues.</p>	<p>Output 2.1: Implementation of climate-resilient infrastructure planning in two national pilots, demonstrating the SRAT ability to identify future risks to infrastructure networks and prioritize critical investments based on exposure and economic/social value at risk</p> <p>Output 2.2: Implementation of climate-resilient infrastructure planning in a subnational pilot, using outputs from the Systemic Risk Assessment and Investment Prioritization Tool (SRAT).</p> <p>Output 2.3: Deliver report on lessons learned from the climate-resilient infrastructure planning pilots (national and subnational).</p> <p>Output 2.4: Knowledge shared and capacity built for local and global stakeholders about best practice for climate-resilient infrastructure planning in selected countries and municipalities, through CCRI's Systemic climate resilience Forum and other avenues.</p>
<p>Output 3.1: Strategy for upscaling and structuring the CCRI's capital phase denominated League of Investment Funds for Resilience (LIFR).</p> <p>Output 3.2: Establish the LIFR modalities to set up technical assistance to support participating funds to deploy capital to replicate Systemic Resilience Methodologies and Metrics piloting of solutions.</p> <p>Output 3.3: Distill learning from implementing CCRI and UNIDO solutions through case studies in selected pilots to validate and strengthen CCRI's Guidelines and Systemic Resilience Methodologies and Metrics approaches.</p>	<p>Output 3.1: Prepare strategy for upscaling and structuring the CCRI's capital phase denominated League of Investment Funds for Resilience (LIFR).</p> <p>Output 3.2: Establishment of the LIFR modalities to set up technical assistance supporting participating funds to deploy capital to replicate Systemic climate resilience Methodologies and Metrics piloting of solutions.</p> <p>Output 3.3 Case studies distilling learnings from implementing CCRI and UNIDO solutions in selected pilots to validate and strengthen CCRI's Guidelines and Systemic climate resilience Methodologies and Metrics approaches prepared.</p>

**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

13June2022:

Cleared

10June2022:On co-financing: There are 4 entries of unknown (TBD) ministry's co-financing. Please remove these entries. At CEO endorsement submission, report them as confirmed co-financing.

21March2022:

Please briefly explain why there are two sources indicated from the Green Climate Fund, one which is grant and the other in-kind.

With regards to the Co-financier "Coalition for Climate Resilient Partners", please clarify if this is the CCRI itself, or a set of different partners. If it is a set of different partners, please indicate who they are.

#### Agency Response

Green Climate Fund will directly procure services in support of implementing the project therefore this relates to the in-kind category for GEF co-financing.

Co-financing will come from entities that have joined CCRI. As CCRI is not a legal entity, the co-financing will be committed by entities contributing resources under the CCRI towards project coordination and delivery, research and development and knowledge management.

Response to 10Jun22:

Two entries for SCCF Country 2 has been corrected to reflect Egypt's commitment letter. The remaining two LDCF entries have been removed. Co-financing figures have been corrected accordingly.

#### 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

19May2022:

Cleared

21March2022:

Please explain the discrepancy in budget amount for each country.

Agency Response

The difference in allocation has been suggested in line with the expected scale of the work required - therefore budget needed to deliver the work in Egypt would be a fair bit larger than the requirement for Antigua and Barbuda and Kampala due to the difference in size and scope of the jurisdictions in question.

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

21March2022:

N/A

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**21March2022:**

N/A

Agency Response

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**21March2022:**

Yes.

Agency Response

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**21March2022:**

Yes.

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**21March2022:**

N/A

Agency Response

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**21March2022:**

N/A

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

**21March2022:**

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

**3June2022:**

Cleared

**19May2022:**

Thank you for the updated impact figures.

With regard to the gender breakdown of beneficiaries from SCCF finance, please strive for greater gender balance or briefly explain why this is not possible in this particular case.

With regard to the targeted amount of hectares from SCCF finance, this is still extraordinarily high and would require further documentation.

**21March2022:**

The number of direct beneficiaries and people trained are both low. Please significantly increase, especially for number of beneficiaries.

Please strive for gender balance for number of beneficiaries and people trained.

The number of hectares is for SCCF is extremely high. Please ensure this is realistic and/or explain.

Agency Response

**Response to 19 May 2022:**

Hectares have been recalculated at 69,499 ha. This figure is more targeted to hotspots and areas at risk, with at least three infrastructure projects supported in each country. Paragraph 91 has been updated as well as Table 3.

Number of beneficiaries have been increased on the understanding that the targeted population will benefit from resilient infrastructure. Total beneficiaries for Antigua and Barbuda, Egypt and Uganda will be recalculated during PPG as national and subnational interventions are confirmed. Paragraph 92 and Table 3. Global Adaptation Benefits, has been amended to reflect this.

91. The project will provide direct adaptation benefits to the private sector as well support the implementation of National Adaptation Plans. A preliminary assessment of the global adaptation benefits has been completed and calculated that the project will contribute to a combined 69,449 ha of land managed for climate resilience. This calculation was completed based on the inhabited land in each country and where infrastructure networks are based with attention to hotspots and areas at risk, with the assumption that the project will support at least 3 infrastructure projects in each country.



92. The total number of people trained has been calculated at 1150 (675 male and 475 female). These figures are based on those in government who are directly trained and benefit from applying the systemic resilience assessment tool, metrics and guidelines. The discrepancy in gender reflects the local reality in terms of sectoral representation of women in each country. Total beneficiaries for Antigua and Barbuda, Egypt, and Uganda have been calculated at 6000 (3000 male and 3000 women), assuming at least 3 infrastructure project per jurisdiction of which there will be beneficiaries. This figure will be recalculated during PPG as national and subnational areas for intervention are confirmed.

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Women</b>
Core Indicator 1: Total number of beneficiaries	6000	3000	3000
SCCF	4000	2000	2000
LDCF	2000	1000	1000
Core Indicator 2: Area of land managed for climate resilience (ha)	69,449		
SCCF	60,000		
LDCF	9,449		
Core Indicator 3: Total no. policies/plans that will mainstream climate resilience	13		
SCCF	10		
LDCF	3		
Core Indicator 4: Total number of people trained	1150	675	475
SCCF	950	550	400
LDCF	200	125	75

Please note as well that GEBs also reflect a broadening of scope to country level for Uganda with areas for intervention to be confirmed during PPG.

**Response to 21 March:**

Number of beneficiaries for Uganda have been increased on the understanding that the targeted population will benefit from resilient infrastructure in Kampala. Total beneficiaries for Antigua and Barbuda and Egypt will be recalculated during PPG as national and subnational interventions are confirmed. Paragraph 92 and Table 3. Global Adaptation Benefits, has been amended to reflect this:

92. The total number of people trained has been calculated at 1150 (675 male and 475 female). These figures are based on those in government who are directly trained and benefit from applying the systemic resilience assessment tool, metrics and guidelines. This has been split this across each country/location, with Egypt having the most due to its size of government offices/teams, and Kampala (Uganda) having the least, because of its municipality size. Within the context of Kampala, the targeted population benefiting from the enhanced resilience of infrastructure is expected to be at least 2000 people (1000 male and 1000 female). Total beneficiaries for Antigua and Barbuda, Egypt, and Uganda will be recalculated during PPG as national and subnational areas for intervention are confirmed.

	Total	Male	Women
Core Indicator 1: Total number of beneficiaries	2950	1550	1400
SCCF	950	550	400
LDCF	2000	1000	1000
Core Indicator 2: Area of land managed for climate resilience (ha)	3,456,043		
SCCF	3,446,594		
LDCF	9,449		
Core Indicator 3: Total no. policies/plans that will mainstream climate resilience	13		
SCCF	10		
LDCF	3		
Core Indicator 4: Total number of people trained	1150	675	475
SCCF	950	550	400
LDCF	200	125	75

Number of direct beneficiaries is understood to be policy makers and officials using each of the tools. This will be a relatively small amount as indicated. Indirect beneficiaries are significantly higher, as they will be based on large populations benefiting from the enhanced resilience of infrastructure networks. Also, worth noting one pilot will be based in a city rather than country.

Hectares have been recalculated at 3,465,493 ha. This figure is more targeted to hotspots and areas at risk. Paragraph 91

91. The project will provide direct adaptation benefits to the private sector as well support the implementation of National Adaptation Plans. A preliminary assessment of the global adaptation benefits has been completed and calculated that the project will contribute to a combined 3,456,043 ha of land managed for climate resilience. This calculation was completed based on the inhabited land in each country and where infrastructure networks are based with attention to hotspots and areas at risk.

#### **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

**9June2022:**

Cleared

**21March2022:**

Regarding the meta-info for SCCF should mark as ?true? the line on SIDS.

Additionally, if Meta-info indicator for NAPs is checked, then Table A needs to also include CCA-3.

#### **Agency Response**

SCCF has been marked as ?true? for the line on SIDS. Meta-info indicator for NAPs has been unchecked. NAPs will inform this project, however, this project will not be dedicated directly to NAPs.

#### **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

**19May2022:**

Cleared

**21March2022:**

A) We appreciate the limited information provided in paragraphs 2 to 8 on climate hazards and (current and anticipated impacts) in the 3 focus countries. This section would be strengthened by expanding on the this information considering modest and severe forward looking scenarios, as well as sharpening the impacts and their current and anticipated impacts specifically on infrastructure investment, which this project aims to help address.

•B) The PIF refers frequently to "systemic resilience", suggesting that it will focus on a broad suite of risks, whereas it is actually focused only on resilience to physical climate risks. In the interests of being accurate, we suggest referring to this in the project title as well as elsewhere in the PIF, as "systemic climate resilience" instead.

C) Please clarify the tools and methodologies to be piloted on actual infrastructure in the countries as part of this project.

•D) Is the intent to focus only on new infrastructure, or also retrofitting of old infrastructure, to build resilience to climate risks?

E) Will climate-resilience of infrastructure be focused on grey solutions or also the use of nature-based infrastructure?

•F) Will cost-benefit analyses for various options to address physical climate risks (and under different climate change scenarios) be included in the economic modeling? If the modeling shows that additional costs may be incurred to "climate-proof" infrastructure, what incentive will planners have to invest in it, given that in some cases severe climate impacts may be projected to be decades in the future?

Agency Response

**A) We appreciate the limited information provided in paragraphs 2 to 8 on climate hazards and (current and anticipated impacts) in the 3 focus countries. This section would be strengthened by expanding on the this information considering modest and severe forward looking scenarios, as well as sharpening the impacts and their current and anticipated impacts specifically on infrastructure investment, which this project aims to help address.**

The following additions have been inserted into this section.

4. Analysis of climate change for the islands projects accelerated coastal erosion and inundation, lower average annual rainfall, increased rainfall intensity causing flooding, prolonged periods of drought, and an increase in tropical cyclones frequency and intensity. Under a high emissions (RCP8.5) scenario, the mean annual temperature is projected to rise by about 2.8°C on average while annual precipitation is projected to decrease by about 20% on average by the end-of-century (i.e. 2071-2100). If emissions decrease rapidly (RCP2.6), the temperature rise is limited to about 0.9°C, with little projected change on average for annual precipitation.

5. Tropical cyclones have made landfall in Antigua and Barbuda on multiple occasions and on average, there is a 33% chance of at least one hurricane affecting (passing within 120 miles) of Antigua and Barbuda in any given year. (Antigua and Barbuda Meteorological Services) It is anticipated that the total number of tropical cyclones may decrease towards the end of the century. However, it is likely that human-induced warming will make cyclones more intense; an increase in wind speed of 2-11% for a mid-range (RCP4.5) scenario or about 5% for 2°C global warming.

9. According to analysis from the German Climate Service Center (GERICS) of 32 Global Climate Models (GCMs),

Egypt is expected to experience a change in annual mean temperature from 1.8°C (RCP 2.6) to 5.2°C (RCP 8.5) by the 2080s. Heat waves will also increase significantly in their severity, frequency and duration, with heat waves expected to last an additional 9 days to as much as an additional 77 days. Rainfall trends in Egypt are highly variable. Analysis from the GERICS GCMs indicate that the reduction in precipitation, observed over the past 30 years, is expected to continue by the end of the century. While overall, annual mean precipitation is expected to decrease, the intensity of heavy rain events is expected to increase by the 2080s in all scenarios.

10. Increased temperatures and degraded agricultural conditions will adversely affect working days, impacting livelihoods and economic resilience of vulnerable groups. Most of the country's population and infrastructure are concentrated in the Nile Delta and along the Mediterranean coast, making the country additionally vulnerable to the impacts of sea level rise, particularly inundation and saltwater intrusion. The Egyptian Government is focused on advancing the country's disaster risk management (DRM) efforts and capabilities. The country's National Strategy for Adaptation, to Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction includes plans for risk reduction, mitigation, and adaptation across different sectors. In order to strengthen DRM in the country, the department requires additional financial resources and institutional capacity. These priorities include, strengthening regional coordination and investment in technological innovations to address water scarcity; exploring disaster risk financing and insurance mechanisms; enhancing early warning systems; and, building the capacity and financial resources of its Information and Decision Support Center. Additional areas of needed investment include strengthening the country's early warning system; developing disaster risk financing mechanisms; and, integrating resilience into urban infrastructure investments.

15. Under a high-emission (RCP8.5) scenario, monthly temperature change is expected to increase by 1.8°C for the 2050s and by 3.7°C by the 2090s. Similarly, RCP8.5 scenarios predict a significant increase in the intensity and frequency of extreme rainfall events between the current and the midcentury period across large parts of the country,

alongside increased likelihood for water scarcity in other areas. Without investment in climate resilient infrastructure, increased intense rainfall events, with the possibility of higher rainfall for some areas will lead to the heightened risk of flooding, loss of life, and damage to property and infrastructure. Additionally, the likelihood of increased aridity and drought stress is expected to lead to water scarcity in some areas, resulting in increased demand for water, raising and the potential for conflict and biodiversity loss. Higher temperatures with increased aridity may also lead to livestock stress and reduced crop yields, placing pressure on livelihoods and economic and social resilience.

16. The Ugandan Government has taken significant steps to advance its Disaster Risk Management (DRM) and climate resilience. The country's Disaster Management Policy was adopted in 2011 and outlines DRM priorities, which include strengthening institutions and financing for climate change adaptation; developing multi-sectoral adaptation plans; implementing programs to reduce the socio-economic impact of climate change and natural disasters; and increasing community-level resilience to climate change.

**B) The PIF refers frequently to 'systemic resilience', suggesting that it will focus on a broad suite of risks, whereas it is actually focused only on resilience to physical climate risks. In the interests of being accurate, we suggest referring to this, in the project title as well as elsewhere in the PIF, as 'systemic climate resilience' instead.**

Noted. The document has been revised to use the term 'systemic climate resilience'.

**C) Please clarify whether the tools and methodologies be piloted on actual infrastructure in the countries, as part of this project, and to what extent.**

To support response for C,D,E and F and ease of reference, here is paragraph 23 which explains tools and methodologies:

23. This project will focus on Antigua and Barbuda, Egypt, and Uganda. This approach builds on the project team's existing work in Jamaica, where the team is advancing the first ever pilot deploying systemic climate resilience methodologies, metrics and guidelines in infrastructure investment planning. To understand whether these methodologies can be deployed at scale, globally, this project chose these three jurisdictions because of their diversity: they represent different levels of market maturity and economic development, variations in scope (national and subnational, economic and population size, productive sectors), geographic location, climate risks, and are of interest to private investors. These three locations, in addition to the ongoing work in Jamaica, will provide an opportunity to learn from and exchange between diverse experiences, allow for the testing of the approach, and provide private investors with multiple options to mobilize capital. The main target groups include relevant government Ministries and Departments involved in formulating and developing infrastructure investment plans. This includes the Ministry of Planning and Economic Development of Egypt (MPED), the Department of Environment (DOE) and the Ministry of Works, Antigua and Barbuda and the Kampala Capital City Authority.

The tools and methodologies as described above, pertain to national planning and adaptation appraisal processes. They will lead to a portfolio of proposed investments, however, the scope of this project does not extend to piloting on actual infrastructure.

Responses to D, E and F have been added as a new paragraph marked as "24".

**D) Is the intent to focus only on new infrastructure, or also retrofitting of old infrastructure, to build resilience to climate risks?**

The tools and methodologies will focus on prioritizing infrastructure investment based on protecting and enhancing the maximum amount of value at risk. This will encompass investment in both existing as well as new infrastructure.

**E) Will climate-resilience of infrastructure be focused on grey solutions or also the use of nature-based infrastructure?**

An adaptation appraisal will be conducted as part of each pilot project to ensure both green and grey solutions are considered as part of the invest prioritization.

**F) Will cost-benefit analyses for various options to address physical climate risks (and under different climate change scenarios) be included in the economic modeling? If the modeling shows that additional costs may be incurred to ?climate-proof? infrastructure, what incentive will planners have to invest in it, given that in some cases severe climate impacts may be projected to be decades in the future?**

Cost benefit analyses will be undertaken through the adaptation appraisal as well. Planners will be incentivized towards more resilient option through access to the CCRI's League of Investment Funds (LIFR) which provides catalytic capital and a de-risking facility for infrastructure investments that take specific measures to ?climate proof? as part of the project design. LIFR is not part of the scope of this project but will be an added benefit available to investors and governments that choose to apply CCRI tools and solutions

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**21March2022:**

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

**21March2022:**

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**21March2022:**

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

**21March2022:**

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

**21March2022:**

Yes

Agency Response

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



Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
**21March2022:**

Yes

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  
**21March2022:**

Yes.

Agency Response  
**Stakeholders**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
**10June2022:**

1. On stakeholder engagement: It is noted that the project includes indicative information on key stakeholders to be engaged in project preparation. In addition to this information, the project should provide information on any stakeholder consultations carried out during project design. The project indicates that consultations have been carried out with civil society organizations, and please provide information and detail on the consultations carried out during project design.

**19May2022:**

This explanation and addition is noted. Please spell out the acronym "GEEW" in the PIF and comment sheet, and provide a brief explanation about what type of "GEEW" organizations are being referred to.

**21March2022:**

Please indicate if there has been, and/or is anticipated to be, engagement with NGOs and community support organizations, as well as organizations focused on the wellbeing of women and girls and gender mainstreaming.

### Agency Response

Indeed, Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) organizations will be included as part of this project. GEEW Organizations have been added to the Stakeholder Table and these groups will be consulted during PPG and will be expanded on through the completion of a Gender Analysis Report and Gender Mainstreaming Action Plan.

In the stakeholder engagement table, further clarification of the types of stakeholders engaged has been included under the second column as follows:

"Gender focal points and associations that promote Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (e.g. gender focal points in ministries, women's right groups, women business / finance associations)".

In addition to the amendment to the stakeholder engagement section, the below additions have been made under Section 3. Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women Section.

An acronym for gender equality and empowerment of women has been added under paragraph 100 as follows:

100. UNIDO recognizes that gender equality and the empowerment of women (GEEW) have a significant positive impact on sustained economic growth and inclusive and sustainable industrial development, which are key drivers of poverty alleviation and social progress. Commitment of UNIDO towards gender equality and women's empowerment is demonstrated in its 2019 policy on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women which provides overall guidelines for establishing a gender mainstreaming strategy.

Explanation of the types of GEEW organizations referred to has also been added under paragraph 110 as follows:

110. Consequently, during the project's PPG phase, the project will actively seek to further gender-mainstream the whole project cycle. To this end, a gender analysis will be conducted to identify entry points for defining gender mainstreaming action plan and gender-sensitive project outcomes, outputs as well as activities, and the project log-frame will be refined to reflect key gender dimensions of the respective outputs, activities, indicators and targets. Additionally, relevant representation from gender equality and women's empowerment groups and institutional focal points (e.g. gender focal points in ministries, women's right groups, women business / finance associations) will be informed and consulted on gender-related activities

Please also note to the change of scope in Uganda, the stakeholders have been updated and further reconfirmed during PPG phase.

#### **Response to 10Jun22:**

During the project design phase, the project team has consulted Ministry of Health, Wellness & The Environment, Antigua and Barbuda, as well as Ministry of Planning and Economic Development, Egypt, which has been confirmed with issuance of letters of endorsement. As part of development process of CCRI's Systemic Resilience Assessment and Investment Prioritization Tool, numerous stakeholders were consulted including civil society organizations, e.g. Climate Policy Initiative (CPI), Global Centre on Adaptation (GCA), E3G, WEF, FSD Africa, Adrain Arsht-Rockerfeller Foundation Resilience Centre.

#### **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

#### **10June2022:**

1. **On Gender: The project includes detailed substantive presentation of gender issues and provide some indication of how gender perspectives will be captured in the project components. It also specifies that at the inception phase, it will undertake a detailed gender analysis and gender mainstreaming action plan for the incorporation of gender perspectives across the project components. The project also indicates that "when data-collection or assessments are conducted, especially for monitoring and evaluation gender dimensions will be considered. This can include sex-disaggregated data collection, performing gender analysis." Given these very substantive plans to incorporate gender issues throughout the project, it is natural to expect a Yes answer to the question below (see green arrow). The Agency has put No. Please clarify.**

#### **21March2022:**

Yes.

Agency Response **Response to 10Jun22:**

Thank you. It has been changed to YES.

**Private Sector Engagement**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**19May2022:**

Cleared

**21March2022:**

•Please clarify if the work with infrastructure construction firms/engineering firms will ensure through the procurement process that they are including consideration of climate risk in their design standards, materials and building codes.

Agency Response

Below text has been inserted.

119. Under the scope of this project, infrastructure construction/ engineering firms will be involved in the development of methodologies for assessing the resilience of infrastructure systems and adaptations options available to enhance this. As such, the scope down not extend down to individual asset design and structuring.

**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

**21March2022:**

Yes.

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  
**21March2022:**

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  
**21March2022:**

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  
**21March2022:**

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

**21March2022:**

Yes.

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

**13June2022:**

Well noted and cleared. We note that LOEs have been provided for Antigua and Barbuda and Egypt, and one additional country will be identified during the project preparation phase. We kindly request the Agency to provide an LOE for the additional country prior CEO Approval.

**10June2022:**

On the Letters of Endorsement and programming or resources: As stipulated in the review sheet, we take note that additional countries will be identified during the project preparation phase and we kindly request the agency to provide Letters of endorsement, in addition to the one provided by Antigua & Barbuda (\$390,000), prior to CEO Approval of this MSP.

**9June2022:**

We note that two additional countries (in addition to Antigua and Barbuda) will be selected during project preparation, and that one of these two additional countries will be a Least Developed Country. As such, the Letters of Endorsement from the respective Operational Focal Points for the two additional countries will be provided prior to CEO Approval.

**21March2022:**

No. Please upload the endorsement letters from the 3 national GEF Operational Focal Points.

## Agency Response

**21March2022:**

The nature of the overall programme is international with the global methodology intended to be tested in selected countries (Antigua and Barbuda, Egypt and Uganda). Consultations have happened with each country indicated in the PIF with their inputs reflected. GEF Operational Focal Point Letter for Antigua and Barbuda has been uploaded and additional endorsement letters are expected during PPG on a timeline consistent with each country's approval process.

**09June2022:**

Although consultations have occurred with Egypt and Uganda and they have expressed interest in being part of this project, they are unable to provide the GEF OFP letters before the deadline. Therefore, mention of these countries has been removed or amended in the PIF. Amendments are highlighted in green for easy reference.

In addition to Antigua and Barbuda, two countries will be confirmed during the PPG phase. One of these countries will be an additional country under SCCF and the second will be a country under the LDCF. Criteria defined in the new paragraph 13 will be used to help identify these countries.

**Response to 10Jun22:**

Please kindly note that meanwhile we have received the Letter of Endorsement for Egypt. The PIF has been updated accordingly and all changes have been marked. The missing LoE for the third country to be selected will be obtained during the PPG phase and prior to CEO Approval.

**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

**21March2022:**

N/A

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

**13June2022:**

**This project is recommended for PIF approval.**

**21March2022:**

Not yet. A set of comments need to be addressed by the Agency.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**9June2022:**

We note that two additional countries (in addition to Antigua and Barbuda) will be selected during project preparation, and that one of these two additional countries will be a Least Developed Country.

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>3/23/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/23/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/19/2022</b>	



**PIF Review**

**Agency Response**

<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>6/9/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>6/11/2022</b>

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**