

Building Community Based Integrated and Climate Resilient Natural Resources Management and Enhancing Sustainable Livelihood in the South-Eastern Escarpments and Adjacent Coastal Areas of Eritrea

Basic Information

GEF ID

10789

Countries

Eritrea

Project Title

Building Community Based Integrated and Climate Resilient Natural Resources Management and Enhancing Sustainable Livelihood in the South-Eastern Escarpments and Adjacent Coastal Areas of Eritrea

GEF Agency(ies)

FAO

Agency ID

GEF Focal Area(s)

Multi Focal Area

Program Manager

Jason Spensley

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

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

GEFSEC 29March2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 26April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 29March2021:

As conveyed in Question 1 of Part 2, the outcomes and outputs would be sharpened by greater articulation of the climate

adaptation problem that is trying to be solved. Please provide further analysis of the current and anticipated impacts of specific climate change hazards to be addressed through this project. In doing so, please refer to at least two climate scenarios regarding the extent of these anticipated impacts, using best available information.

Please consider opportunities to strengthen early warning technologies, infrastructure and capacity to use them through this project, as a way to address the impacts of droughts, floods and extreme heat on agriculture and fisheries production and post production. In doing so, please consider opportunities for more explicit references particularly in components 2 or 3, and possible budgetary implications.

With regards to Output 2.2.5, please provide a definition of what specifically is referred to by “stress tolerant/NUS varieties. In doing so, please also confirm if GMO varieties will be considered or not.

With regards to Output 3.4 on post harvest technologies, please ensure to maximize opportunities for private sector engagement, investment and cost sharing, given the income generation potential of these facilities.

- With regards to component 4, the level of budget dedicated to knowledge management seems relatively high (\$2.5 million), without proposing a clear strategy and explanation. Please reduce the budget or provide a thorough description of why this level of funding is required and the impact it will produce.

Please consider opportunity for partnerships for inclusive finance institutions or others to provide accessible credit to smallholder farmers, fishers, or SMES related to pre or post harvest activities in these sectors. Please see further information on this consideration with regards to the private sector engagement question in section 2.

- Project management costs: We note the level of project management costs is under 5%, which is potentially surprising for a project proposed for almost seven (7) years. The co-financing for the PMC is also very low. Without co-financing in cash from FAO, it appears GEF finance is being requested to cover the full amount of the PMC, which would not be acceptable. Please (i) increase PMC co-financing, and (ii) ensure the level of PMC is adequate for the duration of the project.

Agency Response

- Climate scenario assessments have now been included in the PIF – see Part II section 1 under climate trends and impacts.

- References to climate information systems have been included under the Comp 2 and 3 (see yellow highlights in the revised PIF in the Roadmap section) and budgetary resources have been reallocated from Comp. 4, which will also cover the establishment of meteorological stations in the targeted area (under Output 2.2.2). A thorough climate risk assessment and opportunities for enhancing climate information systems (vertically and horizontally) will also be undertaken during PPG.

- As for Output 2.2.5 GMO varieties are currently not considered. Furthermore, the Government’s reply to this is as follows: In relation to GMO, we are not in favor of that at this point in time, but by making intensive risk assessment, we may consider such varieties, provided that no detrimental effect on human health and the environment.

- Output 3.4 on post-harvest technologies is an important element of the project in terms of strengthening community resilience by improving food preservation and enabling value addition, thereby creating opportunities for local private sector development. The LDCF funding will be used to finance the incremental costs associated with these technologies and the private sector involvement will be duly considered in this regard.

- The budget under Component 4 has been reduced to US\$ 750,000.

- Efforts to strengthen credit opportunities for smallholders is considered by the project, including in terms of collaboration with relevant initiatives (e.g. IFAD, AfDB, EU, etc) – see also our responses to comments in the sections below.

- The PMC in the PIF is currently at 5% (we have double-checked the numbers). PMC co-finance has now been increased. However, if the GEFSEC suggests to increase PMC, we can do so but would like to know what would be acceptable here – for instance 7% PMC for a 7 year project?

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

GEFSEC 26April2021:

Cleared as adequate at this stage. However, we understand co-financing will be actively sought to be significantly increased at PPG stage prior to consideration for CEO Endorsement, including in addition to sources from the partners other than the Government of Eritrea.

GEFSEC 29March2021:

The level of co-financing from partners other than the Government of Eritrea seems quite low. Please consider opportunities to increase from a range of partners. Moreover, we note the indication that "FAO has initiated discussions with a number of key investments being initiated in the country and it is expected that some of these initiatives will augment the project's co-finance, including the investment mobilized. Additional co-finance will be further explored during PPG." It is preferable that at least some of this co-finance is indicated at the PIF stage.

Agency Response

- We are confident that the project will receive co-finance from a few relevant donor-supported initiatives that are under development (yet to be approved such as the IADP)/being initiated in the country (IFAD, AfDB, EU). A meeting with the Government is also scheduled during the week of 26-30 April to discuss this further and we are waiting to hear back from potential co-financiers.

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

GEFSEC 30April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 26April2021:

With regards to table D and E: there is still a mix up between what is stipulated in the Letter of Endorsement and the portal. The amounts allocated to Land Degradation in LoE are allocated to Climate Change in Portal, while those allocated to Climate Change in LoE are allocated to Land Degradation in Portal. Please amend.

GEFSEC 29March2021:

Please note the Agency Fee amount is missing at the top of the PIF. Please complete.

We note there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. Please amend the financing of PMC to increase the portion covered by co-finance.

In tables D and E, there has been a mixed up between what is stipulated in the Letter of Endorsement and the portal. Please review carefully and amend accordingly.

Agency Response

We confirm that the information in table D and E in the Portal is correct and the LoE has now been revised accordingly and uploaded with this submission.

- The Agency Fee has now been included.

- PMC co-finance has been increased.

- Please note that the only difference between tables D and E, and the LoE is with respect to the Agency Fee column. The table in the LoE combines the Agency Fee (project financing + PPG) for each focal area whereas the tables D and E list the agency fee separately for project

financing and PPG.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 29March2021:

Yes

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 29March2021:

Yes

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 29March2021:

Yes

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 29March2021:

N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 29March2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 29March2021:

Yes

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

GEFSEC 29March2021:

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

GEFSEC 26April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 29March2021:

We take note of the selected core indicators and targets. Please provide explanation on how the targets were calculated, and in particular for the following Trust Fund indicators: 3.1: 1,000 ha of agricultural lands restored; 3.2: 1.000 ha of forest and forest lands restored; 4.1: 15,000 ha of terrestrial landscapes under better management for BD; 4.3 222,000 ha of terrestrial landscapes under SLM; and 5: 1,000 ha of marine areas under improved management.

As per GEF guidance for multi-trust fund projects, the targets for GEF Core Indicators should be inclusive of the LDCF financing. As such target for hectares under "land managed for climate resilience" (LDCF/SCCF Core indicator 2) should be included also under GEF Core Indicator 4.; and similarly for Core Indicator 11 for beneficiaries (LDCF/SCCF Core indicator 1).

•

Agency Response

- We have consulted with the government on this and the targets at this stage are indicative but refer to the total area covered by the proposed project as well as the interventions planned within the targeted landscape.
- We have adjusted the GEF and LDCF Core Indicators accordingly.

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

GEFSEC 29March2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 26 April 2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 29 March 2021:

The climate adaptation problems are reasonably clearly articulated, including in the section on "Climate Trends and Impacts". In particular, we note the articulation of types of hazards and types of impacts from these hazards. However, the PIF would be strengthened by more in-depth analysis and articulation of these hazards and their impacts. Based on best available information, please provide more specific information in terms of figures and visuals to sharpen understanding of the current and anticipated impacts of specific climate hazards on key economic activities in the target areas, including agriculture and fisheries.

Please provide an indication of the number of people living in the target areas, based on best available information, in order to gain a clearer sense of the reasonable impact potential in terms of numbers of people.

Agency Response

- A climate scenario analysis has been added to the Climate Trends and Impacts subsection. Please also note that we aim to undertake an in-depth climate risk assessment during PPG.

- The population within the project area has now been included in section on "Project targeted areas" (estimated population of 218,915, covering more than 330 villages).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 26April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 29March2021:

There is a long list of projects considered in the baseline. However, some of these projects are relatively old (SIP project from GEF4 for instance) and other will be closed at the beginning of the projects (several projects closing in 2021 or 2022). We suggest including a synthesis of lessons and best practices in the text and include the list of projects that will not be active at the beginning of this project in annex. See notably the strong IFAD portfolio. (Incorporated) There is a long list of projects considered in the baseline. However, some of these projects are relatively old (SIP project from GEF4 for instance) and other will be closed at the beginning of the projects (several projects closing in 2021 or 2022). We suggest including a synthesis of lessons and best practices in the text and include the list of projects that will not be active at the beginning of this project in annex. See notably the strong IFAD portfolio.

Please consider referencing the following GEF LDCF supported project and its complementarity: Mainstreaming Climate Risk Considerations in Food Security and IUWRM in Tsilima Plains and Upper Catchment Area (<https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/#/pif/detail/ee95fc3f-df7c-e811-8124-3863bb2e1360/view>).

The notion of vulnerability (of communities) to multiple threats is indeed not well defined. Please do so.

Theory of Change: we appreciate the presence of a ToC with explanation of the pathways for change.

Agency Response

- Well noted. The GEF funded-projects that are not expected to be active at the time of implementation of the proposed project are now only listed in section 6 of the PIF. As suggested, we have included additional IFAD and EU investments, also given their relevance as potential co-finance.

- The above-mentioned LDCF project is already referenced in the PIF (see section 6).

- Community vulnerability has been further elaborated in the subsection "Project target areas" (revisions are highlighted in yellow in the PIF uploaded in the Roadmap section).

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 29March2021:

GEFSEC 29March2021.

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 26April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 29March2021:

The justification for the Biodiversity strategy is rather weak. The benefits for globally important biodiversity are not described. We cannot see which biodiversity of global importance is taken into account. Please complete these considerations, with reference to aspects such as KBAs, NBSAP, national strategy on protected areas, etc.). It is important to either demonstrate the project will benefit biodiversity of global importance, or you can use the marginal adjustment to transfer the resources to Land Degradation. As the PIF is currently designed, the project seems very Land Degradation oriented; with a lesser focus on climate change adaptation, and very little on biodiversity.

With regards to Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN), the LDN targets are mentioned, but are not use to justify the interventions and the selected landscapes. To be revised.

•

Agency Response

- The section on BD has been further elaborated and an output on PAs (Output 2.1.4) has been added. The section on CCA has also been further detailed.

- The link between LDN targets and project interventions have been revised.

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

GEFSEC 29March2021:

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

GEFSEC 29March2021:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 26April2021:

Cleared as sufficient at this stage. During PPG and prior to CEO Endorsement, please advance and strengthen elements related to innovation and private sector engagement as commented below and elsewhere in this review sheet.

GEFSEC 29March2021:

While we appreciate challenges with the limited nature of the commercial finance sector in the country, please consider potential to create or partner with emerging commercial Equity Funds or other investment vehicle in nature-based solutions and/or climate resilient enterprises. Examples of equity funds and other investment vehicles to consider exploring collaboration with that currently being supported by the GEF including with the Global Resilience Partnership and UNDP <https://www.thegef.org/project/resilience-peace-stability-food-and-water-security-innovation-grant-program>; with Conservation International and the Lightsmith Group: <https://www.thegef.org/project/structuring-and-launching-craft-first-private-sector-climate-resilience-adaptation-fund> and <https://www.thegef.org/project/adaptation-sme-accelerator-project-asap>; and/or with the Southpole Group and WWF: <https://www.thegef.org/project/investment-readiness-landscape-resilience-fund>. Of course, others exist beyond just these three example that may merit consideration for collaboration through this project.

Agency Response

- Well noted and the initiatives referenced above will be taken into consideration as opportunities for scaling up investments in the interventions proposed by the project. Particularly the UNDP and GRP-implemented "Resilience for Peace & Stability, Food and Water Security Innovation Grant Program" is of key relevance as it also includes Eritrea as a potential target country. We will reach out to UNDP/GRP in the early stages of the PPG phase to explore opportunities for collaboration. We also note that while the business environment and commercial finance sector have been constrained, there are a number of initiatives under development in Eritrea that aim to address barriers for private sector development/commercialization and in which the proposed project will collaborate with and seek synergies – a sentence has been added to section 7 under scaling up (highlighted in yellow).

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

GEFSEC 29March2021:

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

GEFSEC 30April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 26April2021:

There is still no description of any consultations with civil society organizations in the project identification. It still mentions consultations with only government entities: “from Ministry of Land, Water and Environment, Ministry of Local Government, Ministry of Agriculture and the Forestry and Wildlife Authority.” Consultations with communities and civil society will be key in a project of this nature with the objective to “enhance resilience of vulnerable agro-pastoralist and fishing communities”. Please either describe consultations conducted with CSOs or uncheck the mark regarding consultations with these stakeholders

GEFSEC 29March2021:

Please provide the date of meetings held with stakeholders and the main outcomes. To the extent available, please also provide the number of participants.

We note the box has been checked indicating that civil society organizations were consulted during the project identification phase. However, the descriptive text indicates that due to the pandemic, consultations were limited and only government actors was consulted. Please clarify, and if relevant, uncheck the mark regarding consultations with Civil Society.

Agency Response

We have unchecked the box and provided a short justification in the PIF.

- Information on stakeholder meetings (dates, number of participants and outcomes) has been included in section 2.
- The box has been unchecked. As noted in the PIF, consultations were constrained by the ongoing pandemic and country-wide lockdowns during PIF formulation.

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

GEFSEC 26April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 29March2021:

It is well noted that this project plans to carry out a gender analysis and assessment during the PPG phase and that it is planning to engage with Eritrea's National Union of Eritrean Women (NUEW), as a key partner, to ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment is integrated into project activities. The submission, however, includes only very limited information on gender, especially related to the project components. Please as Agency to provide further information on gender dimensions related to the project objective and components.

Agency Response

Duly noted. Ensuring gender equality and women's empowerment is a critical element of the project and gender dimensions have been further detailed in the description of project components/activities (see yellow highlights in the revised PIF in the Roadmap section).

Private Sector Engagement

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

is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach:

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 26April2021:

Cleared as sufficient at PIF stage. As indicated in the Agency response below, please continue to advance and include opportunities to strengthen opportunities to improve access to finance for investing in climate resilient solutions with the private sector.

GEFSEC 29March2021:

In order to address the challenge of smallholder farmers and MSMEs to access credit for investing in climate resilient practices, land degradation neutrality, and provision of climate adaptation goods and services, please consider opportunities to partner with equity funds or and financial institutions accessible capital, For example, please consider if there is potential to partner with microfinance institutions by guaranteeing a line of credit for lending products targeting nature-based solutions climate resilience. In doing so, please see here for example: <https://www.thegef.org/project/blended-nance-facility-climate-resilience-coffee-and-cacao-value-chains-cc-blend?>

Agency Response

-This is well noted. However, the current business environment still poses some challenges to the development of MSMEs such as limited access to finance and difficulties in accessing markets. Nevertheless, a number of government and donor-supported initiatives aim to address those challenges and the proposed project will collaborate with those (such as the IGREENFIN, SMCP, EU project, IAPD, etc.) to strengthen lending and credit opportunities for small-scale agribusinesses. During PPG, the project will explore opportunities, for instance through the Government's Savings and Micro-credit Program or the IGREENFIN and perhaps in collaboration with the Commercial Bank of Eritrea, to understand the feasibility for establishing credit lines to innovative and sustainable/climate resilient enterprises.

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

GEFSEC 26April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 29March2021:

- Please provide greater analysis about the risks and mitigation measures for a lack of post-project investments and the challenges to financial sustainability. For example, beyond external funds, please include a review of public expenses on agriculture, planning, etc., to also include the solutions at domestic level, including but not limited to PES.

Agency Response

We have expanded on the mitigation measures to address the above under the risk “Lack of investment after project may reduce sustainability of project outcomes” – please refer to the text in the risk table highlighted in yellow (PIF in Roadmap section).

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

GEFSEC 26April2021:

Cleared as adequate at PIF stage. Please note comment below in yellow highlight to be addressed during PPG.

GEFSEC 29March2021:

Please clarify where the Project Management Unit and the Project Implementation Unit will be based.

We note national ministries and government agencies are identified as main executing partners. We note national ministries and government agencies are identified as the main executing partners.

During the PPG phase, please conduct and a deeper analysis of stakeholders to consider their involvement in project implementation, including NGOs, farmer organizations, private sector. As a strong example, please see the IFAD project under the GEF6 Resilient Food Systems Program).

Agency Response

- The exact location of the PMU and PIU will be determined during PPG.

- In-depth stakeholder consultations will be undertaken during PPG, as noted in the PIF. In a meeting to discuss this review, the Government reiterated the critical importance of a wider and deeper stakeholder analysis during PPG, particularly at the community/project site-level, which unfortunately was not possible during the PIF preparation due to COVID-related lockdown and restrictions.

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

GEFSEC 29March2021:

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

GEFSEC 26April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 29March2021:

Please see the comment in response to question 2 in section 1.

We note with appreciation that that section 8 of the PIF on Knowledge Management (pages 76-78) elaborates on knowledge management activities, including “dissemination of best practices and lessons learned, training and knowledge materials and guiding document through workshop, seminar, conference, and electronic and print media for the wider impact”, establishment of Learning platform/forums, and “development of mechanisms for inter-regional knowledge sharing (including in terms of best practices for catalyzing private sector investments), peer-to-peer learning, systematic long-term approaches to capacity building, and dissemination of useful information”. Please ensure these activities are adequately incorporated and reflected in the Outcome and Outputs of Component 4.

Agency Response - The activities under Component 4 have been further detailed (changes are highlighted in yellow in the PIF document in the Roadmap section).

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

GEFSEC 26April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 29March2021:

We note the project overall ESS risk is rated as low risk and FAO has attached the Project Risk Certification. The submission, however, does not include a ESS risk screening document. Considering that there is a potential risk regarding conflicts over land use and access to natural resources particularly related to vulnerable local communities/indigenous peoples, women and youth, please submit the ESS risk screening document.

Agency Response

- The ESS screening document has been uploaded in the Roadmap section.

art 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

GEFSEC 29March2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 29March2021:

N/A

Agency Response

EFSEC 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

GEFSEC 28April2021:

There are two remaining specific comments to be addressed by the Agency.

GEFSEC 30April2021:

All comments are deemed to be cleared by the PM and this project is recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 26April2021:

As indicated in response to the question on coordination above, during the PPG phase:

- We understand co-financing will be actively sought to be significantly increased at PPG stage prior to consideration for CEO Endorsement, including in addition to sources from the partners other than the Government of Eretria.
- Please conduct and a deeper analysis of stakeholders to consider their involvement in project implementation, including NGOs, farmer organizations, private sector. As a strong example, please see the IFAD project under the GEF6 Resilient Food Systems Program).
- Please advance and strengthen elements related to innovation and private sector engagement as commented below and elsewhere in this review sheet.
- Please continue to advance and include opportunities to strengthen opportunities to improve access to finance for investing in climate resilient solutions with the private sector.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/5/2021	4/23/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/28/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/30/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

