



Towards a climate-resilient family farming model in Togo

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11549

Countries

Togo

Project Name

Towards a climate-resilient family farming model in Togo

Agencies

IFAD

Date received by PM

3/22/2024

Review completed by PM

3/26/2024

Program Manager

Jason Spensley

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

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:

A) Yes

B) 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

23 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

Yes.

Please outline how this project will be complementary and avoid duplication with the 2 other projects that have been recently submitted and are seeking PIF approval for this work program, which are as follows:

- ID 11548 (UNDP) LDCF and GET LD "[Strengthening the resilience of natural and agro-ecosystems and communities to climate change in Central Togo](#)

- ID 11577 (BOAD) LDCF "[Accelerating the transition to resilient and low carbon cities in Togo: Kpom? Green City Initiative \(KGCI\)](#)

Agency's Comments

April 1st 2024:

Complementarities are now described in PIF Section B. "Project description" as well as "Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project" and in the project summary.

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

23 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

(i) Output 3.1: This output is welcome. Please be sure to build on existing taxonomies of climate adaptation businesses, including that of the GEF supported ASAP taxonomy of Adaptation SMEs (<https://climateasap.org/the-asap-taxonomy/>), and the recently published report of climate resilience businesses by GARI and partners (<https://img1.wsimg.com/blobby/go/66c2ce28-dc91-4dc1-a0e1-a47d9ecdc17d/downloads/GARI%202024.pdf?ver=1711122784102>). Please also include within this output an activity to proactively engage with GARI and the partners who produces these reports to share the learning and types of MTPEs by presenting in forums, sharing published case studies, etc, as well as to collaborate with GARI and the partners who prepared these reports in order to strengthen their ongoing work with perspective and learning from the perspective of MTPEs in Togo.

(ii) Output 3.2: We welcome the focus on micro lending to help remove the barrier of access to capital for small holder farmers to transition to climate resilient practices. Please expand on the state of the microfinance sector in Togo, and how microfinance institutions will be supported to create lines of credit for climate resilient solutions. For example, we encourage consideration of the project to (i) provide a grant based guarantee to microfinance intuitions (MFIs) to de-risk their creation of such a line of credit and pass on this risk reduction with favourable terms to their clients; (ii) provide an interest rate buy down to make the loans more accessible to climate vulnerable small holder farmers and MTPEs; and/or provide technical assistance to MFIs to improve their lending decision making and monitoring processes for efficiency and impact monitoring which can also reduce costs and better terms for producers.

(iii) Output 3.2: Please ensure to align the activities of this output with other activities through this project to strengthen the capacities for farmers and MTPEs in a set of commercially viable climate and resilience solutions, for which some may wish to seek micro loans to invest in the inputs required for their transition.

(iv) Output 3.2: The budget for this activity seems to be very limited, especially to provide a guarantee or interest rate buy down. We view this element to be so important that it merits consideration of opportunities to expand the scope of this output by increasing the LDCF finance for it (even if necessary at the expense of budget of other outputs of other components), and/or ensure adequate co-finance.

(v) The future narratives section is appreciated. For narrative 4, is this supposed to read "extreme rainfall vulnerability" or "extreme rainfall variability"?

Agency's Comments

April 1st 2024:

(i) Thanks for the suggestion. Please, see edited text in Section B -Project description ? under Component 3 & Output 3.1. A specific activity on engagement with GARI and partners has also been added under output 3.1.

(ii) Thanks for the suggestion, additional text was added on the state of the microfinance sector in Togo, please see: A. Project Rationale, Section 3. Baseline. The way microfinance institutions will be supported, is now detailed under section B-Project description ? Component 3-Output 3.2.

(iii) Alignment with other activities is now detailed under section B-Project description ? Component 3/Output 3.2.

(iv) PROMIFA, an IFAD-supported project implemented by the MAEDR, is expected to contribute to this component up to 15,1M\$. The two initiatives will work closely to implement this specific component.

(v) We do confirm that it's ?Extreme rainfall variability?, as stated in figure 6.

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

Secretariat's Comments

23 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

This is good integration of gender perspectives in project components and outputs. Please ensure that when developing the Gender Action Plan, the GAP addresses women's lack of access to land tenure, financial resources, and that includes gender specific actions to empower women in decision making and capacity building activities. Under M&E, please ensure that gender-related results are monitored and reported on, and the GAP is budgeted.

Agency's Comments

April 1st 2024:

Comment well noted. These considerations will be taken into account during PPG. The GAP will be developed by a gender specialist, as part of the PPG Team.

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

23 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

A) Please note the comment about encouraging options to increase finding for component 3.

B) Yes

C) Yes

Agency's Comments

April 1st 2024:

A) Please, see response above: under 3.1. (iv).

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 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

23 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

A) Please clarify and expand on this

C) Please clarify and expand on this.

D) Yes

Agency's Comments

April 1st 2024:

A) Please see additional text in Section B. Project description, under Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.

C) Complementarities are now described in Section B. Project description, under Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.

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

23 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

A) Yes

B) The current level of impact ambition is low. Please increase the expected impact levels, especially for core indicators 1 (beneficiaries). Please also strive for 50% female beneficiaries.

Agency's Comments

April 1st 2024:

B) The current level of direct beneficiaries is increased from 11,500 to 15,000. The project also strives for 50% of female beneficiaries. Please, see revised core indicators.

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

26 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

23 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

A) Yes

B) Please strengthen brief articulation of the innovation and private sector engagement aspects of this project.

C) Yes

Agency's Comments

April 1st 2024

B) Please, see text added under section- ?Innovation and progress towards broader transformation-Value chain? & under ?Replication and scaling-up potential?

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 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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 March 2024:

Yes

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 March 2024:

N/A

Agency's Comments

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 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

23 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

We note the significant co-finance from MAEDR. Please strive to increase the number of sources of co-finance, as there is currently only 2.

Agency's Comments

April 1st 2024:

The number of co-financing sources was increased to 3 . Please, see revised table on Indicative Co-financing.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

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 CommentsN/A

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 March 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

23 April 2024:

Well noted. Please note that technical clearance of this PIF and potential inclusion of this project in the June 2024 Workplan for the LDCF is pending resubmission of this completed LOE. Please endeavor to have this complete LOE submitted asap for the project to be considered for inclusion.

26 March 2024:

Letter of Endorsement removed the following footnote that conditions the selection of the executing partner to the following: "Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate?". Agencies were informed that LoEs "with modifications cannot be accepted and will be returned?". While the removal of the footnote seems to be trivial, it is not: this footnote reduces the chances of having an executing partner that does not meet the fiduciary and procurement standards required to safely execute the project. Please get an email from the OFP accepting this footnote to be part of the LoE (this is an alternative to request a new LoE).

Agency's Comments

April 1st 2024:

The email is being requested from the OFP.

April 25th 2025:

New LOE submitted.

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 CommentsN/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:

No. Please provide.

Agency's Comments Information added as requested.

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

23 April 2024:

Cleared

26 March 2024:

We note that the project overall ESS risk is classified as high/substantial, and IFAD attached the project's Environmental and Social safeguards Screening checklist. During the project preparation stage, a detailed Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) and an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) will further detail environmental and social risks, mitigation measures, and budget. However, the environmental and social risk in the "Key Risk" section in the Portal indicates that the risk is moderate. Please make these risk rating consistent and revise. Please note that environmental and social risk in the Key Risk section in the Portal is not residual risk, but is identified risk.

Agency's Comments Noted thanks, the environmental and social risk in the Key Risk section of the Portal is now aligned to IFAD's ESS screening checklist.

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

23 April:

All comments are cleared by the PM, pending resubmission of the complete LOE, and further review by colleagues for policy alignment.

26 March 2024:

Not yet. Comments need to be addressed to improve the project.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

April 23, 2024:

Please ensure that when developing the Gender Action Plan, the GAP addresses women's lack of access to land tenure, financial resources, and that includes gender specific actions to empower women in decision making and capacity building activities. Under M&E, please ensure that gender-related results are monitored and reported on, and the GAP is budgeted.

Agency's Comments Well noted. The GAP will be budgeted for in the CEOR budget, and gender related results will be monitored and reported on.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	3/26/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/23/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/25/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		