



# Rural Resilience and Livelihood Improvement Project (RRLIP)

Review CEO Approval and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11669

**Countries**

Timor Leste

**Project Name**

Rural Resilience and Livelihood Improvement Project (RRLIP)

**Agencies**

ADB

**Date received by PM**

9/1/2024

**Review completed by PM**

9/6/2024

**Program Manager**

Yuki Shiga

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

MSP

## CEO Approval Request

### Part I - General Project Information

**1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

**2. Project Summary.**

**a) 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?**

**b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project, is well written and is it within the max. of 250 words?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2024.10.11: cleared

2024.10.4:

'Urban focus', both in Portal and tracking tool, still shows 'true'. Please update both.

2024.9.6:

- While meta-information mentions project has an urban focus, this focus is not clearly articulated in the project summary.

This Project has an urban focus.

true

Agency Response

ADB 08 Oct 24

DONE. Updated both portal and tracking tool. Attached is the 24-10-08 version.

ADB 26 Sep 24

The selection of 'urban' focus was a typo error. The project is focused into rural areas only.

The meta-information in the tracking tool has been modified accordingly.

### 3. Project Description Overview

- 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?**
- c) **Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and appropriately funded?**
- d) **Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- e) **Is the PMC equal to or below 10%? If above 10%, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

### 4. Project Outline

#### A. Project Rationale

- a) **Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?**
- b) **Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**
- c) **If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2024.10.4: Cleared

2024.9.6:

- While background information on Manatuto (e.g., population, poverty level etc.), Please elaborate on the justification for selecting Manatuto among the Timor-Leste's municipalities identified as the highest priority (such as Dili, Oecussi etc.). Please include climate rationale and elaborate it directly in the Portal (not as an attached document).

- Table numbers in the description and captions does not seem to be align. Please see below excerpt as an example.

The southern midland and coastal regions receive more rainfall and a longer wet season, starting earlier in November and extending through to May. Rainfall intensities are considerably higher in the zone. This is an issue in terms of flooding, river channel stability, and landslide risk. Table 1 and Table 2 provide a summary of the climate characteristics and climate trends for each of the three zones in Manatuto.

Table 2: Summary of climate characteristics for each climate zone in Manatuto

Climate variable	North Zone	Central Zone	South Zone
Terrain height	0–500 m	500–1,500m	0–500 m
Annual average temperature	25°C to 27°C	20°C to 23°C	24°C to 28°C
Maximum temperature	30°C to 32°C	24°C to 27°C	28°C to 33°C
Minimum temperature	20°C to 24°C	17°C to 19°C	18°C to 23°C
Annual average rainfall (max-min)	1,230 mm	Annual average rainfall (max-min)	1,230 mm
Daily maximum rainfall (1981-2021)	82 mm	140 mm	184 mm
10% AEP daily rainfall	70 mm	116 mm	134 mm
Rainfall season	Dec to Apr	Dec to Apr	Dec to May
Annual actual evapotranspiration	1,030 mm	1,390 mm	1,460 mm
Annual PET	2,260 mm	2,240 mm	2,240 mm

Table 3: Summary of Trends in climate Indices, based on rainfall and evapotranspiration data for each zone

Parameter	Description of Trend over 1981–2021		
	North Zone	Central Zone	South Zone

## Agency Response

ADB 26 Sept 24

An explanation of how and why Manatuto was selected is provided in the main text.[\[df1\]](#)

Done.

(Note on data: Late in the project preparation, the 2022 census data was released. This updated data was used in some assessments, yet some assessments and reports had already been completed, and based on data from the 2015 census. **It is important to note that with regards to Manatuto Municipality the figures (population, poverty levels, food insecurity levels) are almost unchanged.** The latest data, where possible, is now

integrated appropriately into the submission documents The use of slightly different data bases may cause some minor inconsistency in figures throughout the proposal.)

Table numbers are aligned.

## **5 B. Project Description**

- 5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?**
- b) 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?**
- c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks are properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**
- d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?**
- e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?**
- f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?**
- g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this MSP)?**
- h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?**
- i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component description/s?**
- j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**
- k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?**
- l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2024.10.11: cleared

2024.10.4:

Outcome 3: Please consider Core Indicator 5 and its sub-indicators.

CORE INDICATOR  
5

Number of private  
sector enterprises  
engaged in  
climate change  
adaptation and  
resilience

0.00

SUB INDICATOR 5

	Total	Male	Female
5.1 Amount of investment mobilized (US\$) from private sector sources			
5.2 Number of entrepreneurs supported for climate adaptation or resilience	0		
5.3 Total financial value of lines of credit and/or investment funds			
5.4 Number of MSMEs incubated/accelerated with technical assistance, financial matchmaking, and/or direct financing			

2024.9.6:

- Project document states planning process will identify priority subprojects and other activities to be supported during project implementation and thus details cannot be provided. If that is the case, please provide justification for selecting one-step MSP which requires fully developed proposal at the time of submission. In addition, PPG could be requested to support the preparation of an MSP proposal. If the identification of project activities and details need to be carried out during the project implementation for a good reason, please provide further details (who, when, how etc.) and the timeline of the process. Examples of potential and possible subprojects and activities will be helpful. While the project document also mentions that Outcome 1 is primarily the planning process, details on how this process will be carried out nor identification of project activities is not included as an output.
- Outcome 1: The project document mentions about enhancing the village leaders' capacity, but not the actual farmers. What about the capacity building of actual farmers?
- Output 1.4: While project aims to address all sucos in the Manatuto (about 30), output 1.4 mentions 'completed capacity development 5 Farmer groups, suco development committees, and government staff trained'.
- Outcome 3: Please elaborate further on 'innovative agroforestry techniques', 'climate resilient crops and agriculture practices' and 'market development and linkage'. If not determined yet, what are the examples and what are the processes etc. involved in identifying them.
- Outcome 3: increased production, improved buying selling power, cost reduction etc. mentioned in the project document all appear to be important priorities for the communities. Please reflect this in the LDCF indicators as well as Annex C project results framework. For instance sub-indicator 1.6 Increased income, or avoided decrease in income.

- Gender: Please reflect gender equality considerations in the project components. For example, in Component 1, please ensure that climate and disaster assessments, landscape, and farm regulations plans are gender-responsive by, among others, ensuring women's and women's cooperatives' meaningful engagements in village committees and capacity-building activities. In Component 3, there are entry points to promote women's empowerment, such as new entrepreneurship and employment opportunities for women farmers, and ensure their meaningful participation in trainings and decision-making processes (Outputs 3.1., 3.3 and 3.4). Agency may wish to consider connecting with World Bank's Women Entrepreneurs Finance Initiative (We-Fi) [www.we-fi.org](http://www.we-fi.org) for relevant interlinkages with Component 3. Please increase the 30% target, considering the important roles and potential contributions of women in this sector, and to this project. Also, ensure that all KM products and activities capture good practices and lessons learned from a gender perspective, Output 1.7

- Gender: Please ensure that the activities developed in the Gender Action Plan are budgeted and that during project implementation, the PIRs, MTR and TE should include a review and reporting of the GAP and relevant gender dimensions of the project.

#### Agency Response

ADB 08 OCT 24

No change to core indicator nor its sub-indicators.

Core indicator no. 5 is not appropriate to this project. The project strategy is to support the communities in engaging in improved farming and value addition so as to promote more private sector engagement, however, the project will not directly support private enterprises.

Explanation has been provided in the main text in the sub-section on 'Private Sector'

ADB 26 Sept 24

Project design is complete at the overall project level. ADB has financed the preparation and all related assessments, as part of a larger package of program development..[df1]

The project activities, under Outcome 1, include participatory assessments, participatory planning, sub-project identification, participatory sub-project design and participatory implementation of sub-projects. The process is fully detailed and fully costed, with all inputs, activities, costs and timelines defined.

Implementation will consist of capacity development (Outcome 1) and series of 'sub-projects'. This implementation is an intensely consultative, organic and iterative process that can only take place once the full project team is in place, once the government has allocated full resources to the project, and once all decisions on resources, sequences, timelines have been made.

The process is elaborated in the main text and full details of the approach and criteria to planning, identifying sub-projects and designing sub-projects are set out in annexes I.b, I.c and I.d.

However, in order to demonstrate this approach, and develop the necessary capacity for implementation, 'model' sub-projects have been developed and designed. For water activities, the model design includes full details of parameters, specifications and estimated costs. For agricultural/livelihood projects, this includes full details of current challenges, alternatives for moving forward, approach to building resilience, capacity development and developing livelihoods. These models are:

- - Climate resilient water supply systems in Fatuwaque suco and administrative post of Siobada (sucos of Manlala, Leo Hat, Samoro);
- - Climate resilient farm models for low, mid, and high altitudes, and climate resilient agriculture and private sector development interventions in Cribas suco.

Done Detail and explanation on this has been added to the main document under the sub-heading 'Project strategy, activities and outputs'.

RE: Outcome 1: Thanks for the observation. Outcome 1 includes capacity development at municipal and group level.

Farmers and local farmer groups are trained under Outcomes 2 and 3, see notably:

Output 2.4 Local stakeholders and water managers trained on operation and maintenance to ensure subproject sustainability , and,

Output 3.4 Farmers and farmer groups trained to implement identified activities

No modification required.

RE Output 1.4. A typographical error has been corrected

RE: Outcome 3: Full details of alternative and innovative crops, techniques and practices are provided in Annex I d. This annex provides these for each of the three 'simplified' climatic zones in Manatuto.



Done A summary of the current challenges facing agriculture, and of the innovative/alternative techniques and practices to be supported by the project has been provided in new Box 2 in the main text

RE: Outcome 3: This has been added to the table of sub-indicators (Table 11) and to the LDCF indicators as set out in Annex C (lower part pertaining to LDCF).

In Annex C (upper part), ADB DMF, two of the eleven indicators focus specifically on this aspect, with:

- Outcome a indicator: Livelihood capital of 70% of households in Manatuto project areas increased by 10% (2024 baseline: 0)
- Indicator 3b. At least 20% farming households (of which 10% are households headed by women) in Manatuto reported improved access to markets (2024 baseline: 0).

The role of market/systems and the private sector, and the project approach to strengthening this role and impact, are detailed in Annex I.d. Further, a summary has been added in the main text under the description of Outcome 3 and the section on 'Private Sector'.

Done

RE: Gender:

Many thanks to the reviewer for the comment.

The reviewer is referred to the GAP in Annex K which sets out all the gender and women-focused activities. These are designed to address the issues and opportunities mentioned by the reviewer, under both Component 1 and Component 3. They also address other issues and seek to grab other opportunities.

The ADB team in Timor has a strong collaboration with development partners including the WB and will seek further synergies through this project, including on gender issues. The *Women Entrepreneurs Finance Initiative* (WEFI) is a collaborative partnership and ADB is an important partner, implementing WEFI activities for example in Cambodia, Indonesia and Viet Nam. WEFI has no activities in Timor-Leste as of yet. This situation will be monitored.

Recently, ADB has established a parallel financing relationship with this project and the Government of Australia's To'os ba Moris Di'ak (Farming for Prosperity) (TOMAK) Project. The TOMAK Phase 2 represents \$13.8 million in parallel co-financing to RRLIP. TOMAK has a very strong focus on women farmers ? 75% of the farmer groups established in Phase 2 are female only.

The 30% target in Outcome 1 indicates that 30% of all women will be reached through the project. This is considered realistic based on assessments and previous projects. The 30% target in Outcome 2 ensures that 30% of [df1] [JS2] [JS3] unskilled laborers employed in building infrastructure in Manatuto will be women. This is considered realistically ambitious based on assessments and previous projects.

It is noted that the sub- projects that are identified under Outcome 1 and designed and implemented under Outcomes 2 and 3 ? will prioritize positive impacts for women. One

important selection criteria is ?proposal with the highest benefit to women and endorsed by women;?.

Output 1.7 has been modified accordingly.

The reviewer is referred to the GAP in Annex K.

RE Gender: The project is categorized as effective gender mainstreaming according to ADB policy. Through this approach, gender activities are not separate activities but are part of general project activities. Hence, it is not practical to separate out the cost of gender actions.

Two important gender inputs are the international and national social and gender specialists, with an estimated total cost of approximately 300K over the project lifetime.

The gender action plan (Annex K) provides full details on all gender-related activities to be implemented and all gender related indicators/targets to be reached. These will be closely monitored.

No modification required.

RE; Gender. This has been clarified in the proposal text in the section ?gender equality and women?s empowerment?.

Note: In line with ADB requirements for this category of project, the GAP implementation will be monitored through the Gender Action Plan Monitoring Table. This is completed and reviewed by ADB at least annually. This reviews progress and issues and challenges for each action in the GAP.

Done

## **5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.**

- a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**
- b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**
- c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestyes

Agency Response

### 5.3 Core indicators

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 targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2024.10.11: cleared

2024.10.4:

Please provide sub-indicators in the Portal. Please see below example.

#### SUB INDICATOR 1

	Total	Male	Female
1.1 Number of direct beneficiaries from more resilient physical and natural assets	0		
1.2 Number of direct beneficiaries with diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income	0		
1.3 Number of direct beneficiaries from the new or improved climate information services including early warning systems	0		
1.4 Number of youth (15 to 24 years of age) benefiting from the project	0		
1.5 Number of elderly (over 60 years of age) benefiting from the project	0		
1.6 Increased income, or avoided decrease in income (per capita in \$ across all relevant beneficiaries)			

2024.9.6:

sub-indicators are not provided.

### Agency Response

ADB 08 OCT 24

#### Done

Note, the target for some indicators has been set at zero or set low due to lack of data at this point. Notably:

? Core 3: ?Total no. of plans and policies..?. Total count is over 60, but these are almost all small scale and at the suco level. Hence a representative target for 3 of ?one? has been adopted.

? Sub 1.6 is ?increased income...across all relevant beneficiaries??. The project has a target to increase the ?livelihood capital? of 70% of households in project area by 10%. The increase in income is not yet determined. Hence target for 1.6 is set as zero.

? Sub 4.1 "on youth". Youth is already counted in other sub-categories and should not be double counted.

ADB 26 Sept 24

A new sub-section providing information on the project contribution to GEF outcome indicators and sub-indicators has been added under the section "Core indicators" (see notably table 11).

Done.

This comment is addressed now in the core indicators section.

#### 5.4 Risks

**a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**

**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 and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2024.10.4: Cleared

2024.9.16:

Please provide an explanation of risk and mitigation measures for overall risk in the key risk table.

#### Agency Response

ADB 26 Sept 24

The Overall Risk Rating (Medium) is a composite risk assessment of all the individual risks (these are summarized in Table 10 and detailed in new Annex N). That is, each of the risks in Table 10 (and Annex N) contributes to the overall risk. The measures to mitigate each individual risk are also set out in Table 10 (and Annex N). Collectively, these measures will mitigate the composite overall risk rating.

Done. Explanation added in text, and new Annex N added.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

**6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or LDCF/SCCF strategy?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestyes.

Agency Response

**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 comment at CEO Endorsement Requestyes.

Agency Response

**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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestyes

Agency Response

**7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request2024.10.4: cleared.

2024.9.16:

It is well noted that the project has developed a detailed Community Participation Framework. The project also includes information on project management stakeholders and responsibilities. However, it seems that a broader Stakeholder Engagement Plan has not been provided outlining all relevant stakeholders' interests, roles and responsibilities related to project components and outputs, including relevant civil society organizations and community based organizations.

### Agency Response

ADB 26 Sept 24

Stakeholder engagement is key to project success. The project engages with a diverse set of stakeholders, but most notably with rural/remote communities and diverse ethnic groups. Given this focus, several tools have been developed to ensure appropriate and sufficient stakeholder engagement during project execution. These tools are described in the new Table 14. More details are provided in Annex L.

. The tools are: the Stakeholder Communication Strategy, the Community Participation Framework and the Ethnic Group Development Framework. The Gender Action Plan also covers some elements of stakeholder engagement. The contribution of each of these tools to the overall stakeholder engagement plan is described in Table 14 (new). Each tool focuses on specific sub-groups of stakeholders.

Done See revised section on Stakeholder Engagement section, the new Table 14, and the expanded Annex L.

### 8 Annexes

#### Annex A: Financing Tables

**8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: 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 comment at CEO Endorsement Requestyes.

### Agency Response

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestyes.

Agency Response

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)**

**a) Is PPG reimbursement requested and if so, is it within the eligible cap of USD 50,000?**

**b) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**8.3 Source of Funds**

**Does the sources of funds table match with the OFP's LOE? Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestyes.

Agency Response


**8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines? e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2024.10.4: cleared.

2024.9.6:

- Link to evidence (letters of co-finance) is not provided. Please see column 'uploaded letters of co-finance' from another project below for reference.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)	Upload letters of co-finance
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Finance	Grant	Investment mobilized	34,919,000.00	

- In order to ensure strong commitment from the private sector, could co-financing from them considered? This is also potentially beneficial in terms of project sustainability.

- Possibility of co-financing from and alignment with an Adaptation Fund project was mentioned during the earlier design phase.

Agency Response

ADB 26 Sept 24

Link to co-finance documentation attached. In fact an updated co-financing support document (signed Aide Memoire, which details the national government counterpart finance) is attached.

On private sector: The project aims to develop the private sector framework and develop private sector operations related to agriculture in rural areas of Timor-Leste for small holders. This will be seen through improved market conditions, livelihoods, etc. This will also connect, directly and/or indirectly) small holders to larger market and private sector players (ultimately large scale buyers and exporters).

However, these large scale players, are not at this stage seen as likely co-financers.

The role of market/systems and the private sector, and the project approach to strengthening this role and impact, are detailed in Annex I.d. Further, a summary has been added in the main text under the description of Outcome 3 and the section on ?Private Sector?.



Government and ADB continue to pursue Adaptation Fund co-finance. This is unlikely to be confirmed before the project start-up. If and when mobilized, this will be processed as *additional finance*.

Note: **with regards to co-financing**, subsequent to the first submission of the proposal, ADB has (i) mobilized \$13.8 million in parallel co-financing (not administered by ADB) from the Government of Australia supported Phase 2 of To?os ba Moris Di?ak (Farming for Prosperity) (TOMAK) Project; (ii) got very close to securing \$5.5 million from the following ADB administered Trust Funds: Japan Fund for Prosperous and Resilient Asia and the Pacific (\$3 million), and the Community Resilience Partnership Program Trust Fund (\$2.5 million). It is premature to produce co-financing commitment letters for these, however, they are noted after the Table in the Project Summary Section, and in Annex A.

#### **Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.5 a) Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestyes.

#### Agency Response

ADB 26 Sept 24

An updated GEF OPF Letter of Endorsement is attached. In the original letter, the OFP had unilaterally deleted the footnote, so was asked to prepare a new one with the footnote intact.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestyes.

#### Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestyes.

#### Agency Response

**8.6 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project before the PIF submission?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Annex C: Project Results Framework**

**8.7 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?**

**b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of the budget (too high? Too low?)**

**c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?**

**d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2024.10.11: cleared

2024.10.4: Please refer to 5B.

2024.9.6:

Please refer to 5B; increased production, improved buying selling power, cost reduction etc. mentioned in the project document all appear to be important priorities for the communities. Please reflect this in the LDCF indicators as well as Annex C project results framework. For instance sub-indicator 1.6 Increased income, or avoided decrease in income.

Agency Response

ADB 08 OCT 24

Done. See 5B.

ADB 26 Sep 24

This has been added table of sub-indicators (Table 11) and to the LDCF indicators as set out in Annex C (lower part pertaining to LDCF).

In Annex C (upper part), ADB DMF, two of the eleven indicators focus specifically on this aspect, with:

- Outcome a indicator: Livelihood capital of 70% of households in Manatuto project areas increased by 10% (2024 baseline: 0)
- Indicator 3b. At least 20% farming households (of which 10% are households headed by women) in Manatuto reported improved access to markets (2024 baseline: 0)

Done

**Annex E: Project map and coordinates**

**8.8 Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the project interventions will take place ?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2024.10.4: cleared.  
2024.9.6:

Reason why geo-referenced information is provided for Dili is unclear. Please elaborate on the project activities to be undertaken in Dili.

**Agency Response**

ADB 26 Sep 24

Information on Dili is provided as the nation's capital. No 'on-the-ground' activities will not take place in Dili.

The capacity development under Project Outputs (1.6 Climate adaptive farm management and market information system) and 1.7 (Knowledge and information generated through farm management and market information [df1] system disseminated) has a nationwide focus. This capacity will be established in Dili, and available for use for replication, dissemination and sustainability nationwide.

Also, as in future, under WHAIP (ADB financed), activities will take place in several municipalities across Timor-Leste, and the Project Management Office should be situated in Dili.

Annex E has been modified appropriately

**Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Screen and Rating**

**8.9 Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request yes.

**Agency Response**

**Annex G: GEF Budget template**

**8.10 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?**

**b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?**

**c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.11 a) 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.**

**b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.**

**c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Additional Annexes**

**9. GEFSEC DECISION**

**9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation Is the project recommended for approval**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2024.10.11:

This PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

2024.10.4 /9.6:

Not yet. Please refer to the review items and resubmit for consideration (please highlight the update).

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**9.3 Review Dates**

	<b>1SMSP CEO Approval</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>9/6/2024</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/4/2024</b>	

**1SMSP CEO  
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat  
comments**

<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/11/2024</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	