

# Planning and implementing Ecosystem based Adaptation (EbA) in Djibouti?s Dikhil and Tadjourah regions

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10180

**Countries**

Djibouti

**Project Name**

Planning and implementing Ecosystem based Adaptation (EbA) in Djibouti?s  
Dikhil and Tadjourah regions

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

12/3/2021

**Review completed by PM**

9/9/2022

**Program Manager**

Tshewang Dorji

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF**   
**CEO Endorsement**

**Part I ? Project Information**

**Focal area elements**

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
GEFSEC, 1/26/2022 - Yes.

GEFSEC, 5/10/2022: Cleared. Thanks

Updates: GEFSEC, 5/16/2022:

1. Thank you for revising the figure to use entire GEF-7 LDCF allocation. In this regards, kindly submit the revised LoE that accurately reflects revised amount for both GEF Financing and Agency fees.
2. Under Table A of the CEO Endorsement Request form, please reflect the focal area outcome
3. Also, on the project information of the CEO Endorsement Request form, expected implementation start and end dates are missing. Please include it and ensure that it matched the duration stipulated
4. On execution arrangements, please update that Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development under the ?other Executing Partner (s) as the document suggest.

GEFSEC, 7/10/2022: Cleared. Thanks

Regrettably, the minor amendment of the project of revised figure of \$8052 couldn't be considered. This is because the use of GEF-7 financial resources were finalized in June 2022 (before the end of GEF-7). As this is GEF-7 project, necessary document for amendment couldn't be obtained before the end of GEF-7.

Therefore, kindly revise the budget in line with the fund approved during the PIF stage, and send the updated CER on the portal. Also, kindly remove the revised LoE (uploaded on July 7, 2022) from document section of the portal, so as to avoid confusion

Regrettably, the minor amendment of the project of revised figure of \$8052 couldn't be considered. This is because the use of GEF-7 financial resources were finalized in June 2022 (before the end of GEF-7). As this is GEF-7 project, necessary document for amendment couldn't be obtained before the end of GEF-7.

Therefore, kindly revise the budget in line with the fund approved during the PIF stage, and send the updated CER on the portal. Also, kindly remove the revised LoE (uploaded on July 7, 2022) from document section of the portal, so as to avoid confusion

GESEC, update: 8/2/2022:

Regrettably, the minor amendment of the project of revised figure of \$8052 couldn't be considered. This is because the use of GEF-7 financial resources was finalized in June 2022 (before the end of GEF-7). As this is GEF-7 project, necessary document for amendment couldn't be obtained before the end of GEF-7.

Therefore, kindly revise the budget in line with the fund approved during the PIF stage and the updated CER on the portal. Also, kindly remove the revised LoE (uploaded on July 7, 2022) from document section of the portal, so as to avoid confusion

GESEC, 9/8/2022: Cleared. Thanks

GEFSEC, update: 9/16/2022:

Under the project information, it was noted that the starting date of the project (June, 3 2022) has already passed. Please amend the future date

#### Agency Response

#### **Responses 6 July 2022**

1. 1 Revised LoE has been submitted through the platform

2. Focal area's outcomes added in table A in the platform
3. Implementation start (October 2022) and end (September 2028) dates included in the platform and reflected in CEO ER and Prodoc
4. Well noted with thanks. Name of ministry updated in the platform

**Response 25 August 2022**

Well noted. Total budget revised and prodoc/CEO ER updated accordingly. Total PPG funds and associated agency fees amount to 219,000 usd and total project funds and associated agency fees (9.5%) amount to 9,772,875 usd. Therefore, total resources amount to **9,991,875 usd** as per initial Letter of Endorsement at PIF stage.

On the Revised LoE Letter, its not possible to delete it from the Agency level, however we have requested GEF ITS to delete it on our behalf.

**Project description summary**

**2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
GEFSEC, 1/26/2022 -

GEFSEC, 4/7/2022 - Please refer to Question 3, part II below

GEFSEC, 5/10/2022: Cleared. Thanks

Agency Response

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Co-financing**

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/27/2022 -

- Please change "source" of co-financing to "GEF Agency" for IFAD.

- In kind cannot be categorized as Investment Mobilized. Please clarify or justify how an in kind contribution is investment mobilized?

GEFSEC, 5/10/2022: Cleared. Thank you for the clarification.

Update, GEFSEC, 5/16/2022:

1. It was noted that Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (letter dated Nov 2021) is allocating \$800,000 as grant through GCF's NAP project. According to the co-financing letter, we understand that the ministry was planning to submit a NAP project to GCF. Has the GCF approved the project? As per the Co-financing policy, ?confirmed? co-financing may be reported at this stage with a co-financing letter from the funding source. If the GCF approved this NAP project, we suggest UNEP issue a co-financing letter confirming the GCF approval of the project, disbursement timeframe, and complementarity between the 2 projects.

2. On the PMC Proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 4.86%, for a co-financing of \$17,912,500, the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$870,548 instead of nothing. As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

GEFSEC, 7/18/2022: Cleared. Thanks

## Agency Response

### **Response03/02/2022**

Noted with thanks, change has been made to revise the source of co-financing from IFAD and to align the definition of investment mobilized.

### **Response 6 July 2022**

1. The GCF NAP proposal is still under development with support from UNDP Djibouti, it will be submitted to the GCF and should be approved in 2022. Therefore, we have deleted the NAP project from the confirmed co-

financing plan and adjusted all financial and budget figures in the CEO ER and Prodoc (see yellow highlights).

2. Well noted, co-financing contribution to PMC have been increased proportionally to 5% (814,000 usd) as per guidance provided. This amount is similar to GEF grant contribution to PMC

#### **GEF Resource Availability**

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/31/2022 - Yes.

Note - the total resources seem to add up to \$9,991,875 -- NOT \$10,000,000. Please advise whether I am mistaken.

GEFSEC, 3/9/2022 - As this the end of GEF-7, it would be wise to revise this request for the entire amount that the country is eligible for, otherwise it will lose the balance (in this case \$8,000).

GEFSEC, 4/7/2022 - Total eligible amount for the GEF-7 is \$10,000,000. Welcome to use the balance amount, if needed.

GEFSEC, 5/10/2022: Cleared. Thanks.

#### Agency Response

##### **Response 03/02/2022**

Yes this is correct. Total PPG funds and associated agency fees amount to 219,000 usd and total project funds and associated agency fees (9.5%) amount to 9,772,875 usd. Therefore, total resources amount to **9,991,875 usd**.

##### **Response 06 May 2022**

Noted with thanks. Total budget has been increased to reach USD 9,999,927. Please refer to green highlights in excel budget table

#### **Project Preparation Grant**

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
GEFSEC, 1/26/2022 - No. The table is cut off, please advise.

GEFSEC, 3/9/2022 - Cleared. Thanks

Agency Response

**Response03/02/2022**

The table is included in Annex C of the CEO ER. It has been updated to include the latest expenditure to date. Issues with formatting in the platform should be solved

**Core indicators**

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?  
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
GEFSEC, 1/31/2022 - Yes.

GEFSEC, 5/10/2022: Cleared. Thanks

Agency Response

**Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/31/2022 - Yes, this is well described.

Agency Response

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
GEFSEC, 2/1/2022 - Clarification requested. There are a few projects listed in this section which are listed as providing co-financing but for which the timelines are not compatible with the proposed initiative, which has an implementation period of 6 years and will likely not begin implementation until the end of 2022. Some of the initiatives

end in 2024, which make them eligible to be listed as baseline projects, but not to provide co-financing. Please clarify.

GEFSEC, 5/10/2022: Cleared. Thank you for the clarification

## Agency Response

### Response03/02/2022

For improved clarity, the CEO ER section has been slightly reorganized and divided in two sub-sections, one covering the co-financing initiatives and the other the baseline initiatives. Co-financing rationale has been highlighted in yellow for each of the co-financing initiatives in CEO ER

All co-financing initiatives identified will run for at least two years after the start of the proposed LDCF project. Earliest end dates are planned for 2024 with the possibility of no-cost extensions to be granted.

A summary table has been developed to clarify the section on ?incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing?. Please refer to p60 of the CEO ER. The Prodoc has been revised accordingly (see p103)

The EU ADIL initiative aims at strengthening the country?s decentralization process and building local authorities? capacities to plan, fund and implement their prerogatives including reforestation. It will therefore directly support the achievement of the proposed LDCF project?s ecosystem restoration activities which will start in the second year of implementation (2024). In addition, the local adaptation planning activity led by the proposed LDCF project starting in 2025 will directly be supported by ADIL?s achievement in terms of improved local authorities? planning capacity

PROGRES initiative focuses in Gobaad plain on improving access to water resources and climate-resilient land management. It will directly support the implementation of the proposed LDCF project?s activities in the region. It will contribute, in the first two years of LDCF project implementation,

to the achievement of the LDCF project objectives linked to improved gardens? water-access, reforestation and promotion of climate-resilient livelihood.

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion



GEFSEC, 2/1/2022 -

- The ToC is very blurry and difficult to read. Please amend.
- It seems that the barriers and preferred solution portions are duplicated? Please correct me if I'm mistaken, but it makes the two sections very difficult to read.
- Urban planning is mentioned as a barrier and also part of the preferred solution, but is not specifically articulated in part of the project design at all. Please clarify.

GEFSEC, 4/7/2022 - Thank you for the response. Please provide clarification on the following

- Component 1 & 2: Welcome proposal to conduct proposed vulnerability assessment for the two project sites. Please clarify on how the proposed assessment under the Outcome 1 & 2 is going to be linked with proposed development of Local Adaptation Plan under outcome 3.
- Secondly, it is encouraging to note the project will work with local traditional chiefs and the Regional Council of Dikhil (RC) to set up protected reforestation areas along the wadi banks. In this regards, kindly strengthen mechanism to ensure that plantation on the public land survives in the face of harsh environmental climatic condition. It is not difficult to initiate planation, but experience suggest that it needs dedicated care to ensure it survives to deliver expected project outcome. We would encourage you to explore ways to foster partnership with the local communities that can facilitate ownership of the reforestation with the view to improve survival. This may include support to set up local/community cooperative/groups that would manage plantations well beyond project duration and provide employment opportunities for local communities.
- Third, In addition to planting local and climate resilient species for reforestation, saplings with economic value to the local people might motivate wider participation and foster partnership with local communities, especially when complimented by support for marketing and priduction. In this regard, fodder and fruit bearing trees/plantations are much welcomed, as it would provide additional nutritional or revenue streams for the local community and will contribute to success of the project.
- Notes that FAO has published a study which demonstrate the technical and economic feasibility of producing charcoal from *prosopis* in both Tadjourah in As Eyla. Therefore, it may be redundant to pilot in both areas. Findings from one pilot site should be adequate to inform replication in all areas, unless the situations are very different.
- The GEF is of the view that procuring a car from the project may not be a best way to use the project fund, especially as there is huge unmet need for climate adaptation investment for the larger benefit of the communities. In this regard, some information on

transportation arrangement with the baseline project will be useful, especially those that are contributing as co-financing support

- Component 3: On the proposed ecosystem valuation study, it might be encouraging to collaborate with IISD's [Nature-Based Infrastructure Global Resource Centre](#) with the view to improve cost-effectiveness of the project. Also, we would humbly suggest engaging faculties from tertiary education sector, if possible, to help long-term capacity building on the EbA in the country.

- On the awareness campaign, it may be worth pointing out that single appearance on TV, few times on radio and one large scale sensitization would not suffice. Therefore, we would request you to come up with concrete action for sustained messaging that target diverse audience, including policy makers and planners.

- On the exit strategy, it would be useful to start thinking about it since the beginning of the project to consider key elements that would impact the overall sustainability of the project. The exit strategy can be adopted much later at an appropriate time.

GEFSEC, 5/10/2022: Cleared. Thanks

Update GEFEC, 5/16/2022. Thank you for providing additional clarification. Please provide additional clarification as follows:

1. Welcome change of prosopsis conversion to take full advantage of proof of concept conducted by FAO. In this regards, kindly update such changes in the budget section (UNEP Budget Line 2118), where it is still reflected as ?pilot project?
2. Appreciate an effort to collaborate with IISD and local university. In this regard, we would humbly suggest you consider allocating modest amount of resources towards output 3.2, if appropriate.
3. On Project vehicle, as you are aware, the use of GEF funds to purchase vehicles is strongly discouraged. Such costs are normally expected to be borne by the co-financed portion of PMCs. Any request to use GEF funding to purchase project vehicles must be justified by the exceptional specific circumstances of the project/program. Please provide justification in separate document and upload it on the portal. We highly welcome that MEDD is willing to providing vehicles that were acquired through LDCF-2 projects. This may be able to address the need of car for PMU.
4. Also, the project vehicle and fuel have been charged to the components. If vehicle is going to be approved, the budget for such allocation has to be from the PMC, and not from component as currently reflected.

Update GEFEC, 7/18/2022

1. Thank you for updating reference to pilot project under BL 2118

2. 2. Acknowledge that allocation of the fund for collaboration of UNEP global initiatives with TEEB, IISD and National university under BL2119. This is a good approach as it opens up avenues for sustained capacity at the national level, especially to explore opportunities for experts at the national level that would respond to the need of long-term monitoring and evaluation of the impact of this EbA project. It is in this context that we suggest reflecting IISD and national university, upon consultation, as the project partner under the Table 8 of the main prodoc. However, If there is no buy-in by the national university to be project partner, we would fully understand as well.
3. 3. Thank you for the uploading the justification on the portal. On the justification for vehicle, while we fully understand the need for regular travel of the project team and key experts the project sites, we want to arrive at the best possible travel solution within the context of standing practice. The revised excel file on the budget dated July 6 sheet 'New UNEP Budget' shows the request of \$70,00 for the project vehicle. The same file with sheet 'Cost per output+ coffin' shows that GEF grant of \$50,000 for the project vehicle. It is our understanding that the requested amount for the vehicle is \$50,000. We would also encourage you to explore different types of vehicle that would satisfy the project need, while bringing down the cost. The current proposed budget is too high. Please explore the options and suggest a revise figure. Also, we may not be able to support travel need of the UNEP from the project component through project vehicle.
4. 4. Thank you for making necessary adjustment of the budget line among the project components.

GEFSEC, 7/28/2022: Cleared. Thanks

#### Agency Response

##### **Response03/02/2022**

ToC in CEO ER and Prodoc has been amended accordingly. We have done our best to resolve issues linked to formatting in the platform

The problem statement, preferred solutions and barriers sections have been revised and adapted to avoid duplication and improve the flow and clarity of the sections

The lack of urban planning is directly addressed by component 3 of the project which will support:

- ? the development of a climate risk and vulnerability analysis of the city of Tadjourah (3.1)
- ? the cost-benefit and economic valuation analyses of adaptation option to inform local and urban planning (3.2)
- ? the development of local adaptation plan for the city of Tadjourah (3.3)

**Responses 06 May 2022**

- The detailed assessments of the wadis (activities 1.1.1 and 2.1.1) and the capacity need assessments (activities 1.4.1 and 2.4.1) developed both in Tadjourah and Dikhil regions will inform the multi-sectoral climate change risk and vulnerability assessments and maps (output 3.1) as well as the adaptation plans (output 3.3) that will be produced in those same regions. Reference to those links have been added both in Prodoc (p99 and 101) and CEO ER (p50). Please see green highlights.

- According to stakeholder's consultations, national expert's feedback and past experiences, the most relevant sustainability mechanism to ensure plantation survival on public land would be to build ownership and capacity within the Regional Councils (RCs) so they can take over the activity post-project under the regular monitoring of the Ministry of Environment. Reforestation and land management is part of the RC responsibility. Their capacity for maintenance of tree plantation will be strengthened through training on replantation and prevention of illegal logging as well as securing transportation means to the sites after the project's end (please see green highlight p46 of CEO ER and 80 of Prodoc). The RC will be capacitated and encouraged to continue working with local communities on the implementation of those activities.

In Dikhil, tree planting will essentially take place within individual fields, therefore trees will be maintained by the community after the project ends.

Awareness raising and training to individual farmers will be delivered on this throughout the project; please see table p.56 of the CEO End and p104 of prodoc for details on all the training interventions planned under the project. In addition to secure long-term commitment and funding for the management and protection of replanted areas as well further replantation work, those activities will be integrated in the local adaptation plans developed under output 3.3 (see green highlights p49 of CEO ER and 122 of Prodoc).

- Noted with thanks. A paragraph on this is already included p83 of Prodoc (see green highlights). Additional references to climate-resilient local fodder and fruit bearing trees and their economic and nutritional co-benefits to communities have been integrated to the CEO ER p46 and Table 7 (p51) and Prodoc in description of output 1.2 p79 and activity 1.2.2 p84 (see green highlights).

- Prosopis invasion is a severe problem in both target areas, activities about conversion of prosopis into charcoal is relevant to address one of the main drivers of deforestation in project areas. Main results of FAO study have been highlighted in the project baseline (see green highlights p30 of CEO ER and 48 of prodoc). This intervention will not be a pilot test but a concrete activity as a community center will be set up to ensure the sale of prosopis-made charcoal in project sites. Reference to pilot has therefore been deleted from both documents.

- Please note that a vehicle is a means of getting things done, just like computers and office furniture is needed. Past experiences in implementing LDCF projects in Djibouti showed the importance of regular travels to project sites for the success of activities. Target communities are living in scattered and remote places with very difficult access and no public transport. Transportation means need to be secured for project team, experts, local authorities and central government to be able to provide appropriate support to communities and implement activities on the ground.

The best option proposed based on project needs and cost-efficiency would be to purchase one car in Djibouti and complement it with two motorcycles in the regions. The motorcycles will be used during project implementation by the project regional focal points and be handed over to the Regional Councils post-project as part of the sustainability strategy to control illegal logging and reforestation activities. A small budget for truck rent will also be added to the budget for transportation purposes in the region to support agriculture and reforestation activities. The budget change is reflected in green in the budget file (which includes also a budget to change to increase to the total GEF 7 allocation possible, as per the last review sheet comment).

We have considered other vehicle arrangement options. Relying on co-financing initiative is not realistic as most of them do not have the same project sites or target communities. Renting a car with driver is very expensive in Djibouti (more than 200 usd per day). At this rate and to ensure regular travel of project team to the sites a budget of at least 80,000 usd will be needed. Please note that cars purchased at the beginning of the project LDCF-2 have reached their natural lifespan given the country's harsh environmental and road conditions and we not be able to support the full implementation of this new project.

- A reference to a possible collaboration with IISD and national university to improve cost-effectiveness and build in country capacity building has been added to the description of output 3.2. See green highlights p50 of CEO ER and p97 of Prodoc.

- We agree with you but would note that Output 3.4 is about conducting an awareness campaigns *that includes* 1 national tv campaign, 2 radio campaigns per region, MEDD website and other relevant communication systems like pamphlet and flyers, documentaries to showcase the impacts of the project, etc. We have clarified in the Output description p50 and Table 7 of the CEO ER as well as p102 of Prodoc that the

awareness raising strategy will be developed based on behaviours that need to be adapted.

Please also note that target communities and government staff will be sensitized and trained throughout the project span as this will be done on a continuous basis during the implementation of key activities including climate-resilient agriculture and reforestation activities.

Please refer to the new table p.56 of the CEO End and p104 of the prodoc for details on training sessions for decision-makers.

- The exit strategy includes a rolling training programme for Regional Council officers; and developing a mainstreaming strategy for accessing climate change finance in Djibouti from public and private sources. The project's sustainability and exit strategy will be further developed under Activity 3.5.4, including responsibility parties, budget and source of funding to implement it. Appendix 4 (workplan and timetable) was adapted to start the process on Year 1 also see green highlights in p103 of Prodoc and p51 of the CEO Endorsement.

#### **Responses 6 July 2022**

1. The reference to pilot has been deleted in the budget
2. A lumpsum of 100,000 usd BL2119 is planned for the implement activity 3.2.1 around conducting an ecosystem valuation study on ecosystem services provision.
3. Justifications along the lines of the explanations provided in the last review sheet have been uploaded on the platform. They highlight the particularly harsh/extreme road and environmental conditions in country as well as the impossibility to rely, for the 6 coming years of project implementation, on vehicles bought by the project LDCF-2 in 2014 and reaching the end of their lifespan.
4. Project vehicle (BL 4201) and fuel (BL 5101) have been transferred to PMC as per request. See yellow highlights in the budget (Appendix 1 of Prodoc) . Truck rental BL2123 have been kept as part of components 1 and 2 as they will directly support the implementation of reforestation activities in the project sites.

#### **Responses 27 July 2022**

1. IISD and national university have been added to table 10 of Prodoc on pre-identified project partners (please see yellow highlights in the pdf document).
2. The original travel solution was the purchase of two cars to support project implementation in the regions for a total budget of 100,000 usd. This solution was

revised based on the first review sheet received by the Secretariat. The new solution involved the purchase of one car at the central level and two motorbikes to support implementation at the regional level for a total budget of 70,000 usd. After recent additional discussions with the government, the cost of the car is further reduced to 35,000 usd which we understand is enough to cover the cost of a pick-up vehicle adapted to the difficult country context. Budget (green highlights) and language of the justification document has been adapted accordingly.

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 2/1/2022 - Yes, this is well articulated.

Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 2/1/2022 - There is some rationale for additionality of the LDCF financed activities under Components 1 and 3. More detail would be appreciated for Component 2. In addition, it isn't clearly outlined in this section where the LDCF finance is going above and beyond the existing and/or parallel initiatives -- the information in this section seems to present that all the initiatives are related and synergistic but a clearer and more simplistic articulation of how the co-financed initiative finances X,Y,Z activities and the LDCF-financed activities either build on that or somehow increase impact of these activities would strengthen the section.

GEFSEC, 5/10/2022: Cleared. Thanks

Agency Response

**Response03/02/2022**

Section 5 of the CEO ER on ?incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing? has been adapted accordingly. A summary table has been developed to clarify the rational and articulation of co-financing initiative vis a vis the project. Please refer to p60 of the CEO ER. Changes have been reflected accordingly in the Prodoc (p103).

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 2/1/2022 - Yes, this is well described.

Agency Response

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 2/1/2022 - Yes.

GEFSEC, 5/10/2022: Cleared. Thanks

Agency Response

**Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/10/2019 - Yes. A preliminary geo-reference on the two target locations is provided.

GEFSEC, 5/10/2022: Cleared. Thanks

Agency Response

**Child Project**

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

**Stakeholders**



**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?  
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the  
implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of  
engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/24/2022 - Yes. This is well developed.

Agency Response

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender  
differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so,  
does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators  
and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/7/2022 - Yes. This is well developed.

Agency Response

**Private Sector Engagement**

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier  
and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and  
environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were  
there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/7/2022: Yes,. This is well articulated.

Agency Response

## **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/7/2022: Yes.

Agency Response

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/26/2022 - Yes. The proposed project is well aligned with relevant national policies and plans. The project will also inform the ongoing in-country NAP process in several ways. Vulnerability assessments and local plans developed through this project will be fed into and inform the NAP.

GEFSEC, 4/7/2022. Please explain how the implementation of project activities aligns with laws governing land tenure of the country?

GEFSEC, 5/10/2022: Cleared. Thanks

Agency Response

**Response 6 May 2022**

A section on 'access to land and land management' can be found in Appendix 13: Gender Assessment and Action Plan. See green highlights p310 of Prodoc

A short paragraph has been added in the section: 'consistency with national priorities' of the CEO ER p86.

**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed 'Knowledge Management Approach' for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/26/2022- Yes, this is well developed and can serve as a good example of best practice.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/26/2022 - Yes.

Agency Response

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 2/2/2022 - Yes.

Agency Response

**Benefits**

**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/26/2022 - Yes, this is well articulated.

Agency Response

**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/26/2022 - No. Pls see below:

1. Annex C: The table is not visible.
2. Annex D: The image is broken and does not display. This may be a problem on our end, but pls review.
3. Annex E: Please attach in a viewable format. The graphic is tiny and unreadable.

GEFSEC, 4/7/2022

Please upload excel file for budget and workplan, if possible.

GEFSEC, 5/10/2022: Cleared. Thanks

Update GEFSEC, 5/16/2022

1. The table is off margins. It is required that the table fits within its margin. Please adapt the format so that it fits within the margin.
2. Financial expert/specialist should be charged to the PMC and not to the components.
3. Regional focal points have been charged to the component. Please kindly elaborate on what these expenses entail. Kindly note that, as per guidelines, government staff salaries are not eligible for GEF funding.
4. Office equipment should be charged to the PMC and not the components.
5. On the budget for vehicle, please refer under Question 3, part II above.

## Agency Response

### **Response03/02/2022**

Issues with visibility and formatting are linked to the uploading of the annexes in the platform. We have tried to address them. If issues are still encountered, the relevant Annexes can also be found in the following documents:

- The table of Annex C is available in Annex C of the CEO ER
- The image of Annex D is available in section 1b. Project Map and Geo-Coordinates p71 and Annex E p102 of the CEO ER

The table of Annex E (Project Budget) can be found in Appendix 1 of the Prodoc

### **Response 6 May 2022**

Last excel version of the budget has been uploaded in the platform

### **Responses 6 July 2022**

1. Table formatting adjusted as per request
2. The project financial officer position (BL 1102) is included under PMC. The national and international climate finance experts (BL 1208) are consultants delivering project output 3.5 activity 3.5.2. ?conduct detailed financial analysis and prepare recommendations to increase climate change finance in Djibouti from public and private sources.? They are therefore included under component 3
3. Project?s regional focal points (BL 1222) will be in charge of supporting and following-up the delivery of on the ground activities in the regions. They will be project?s staff recruited by the project executing agency (Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Developed) and hosted by the regional councils. We confirm that we do not permit salary top ups of government staff, as per GEF rules.
4. Part of the office equipment was already included in PMC, the rest of BL 4102 was moved from outcome 2 to PMC (see yellow highlight in Budget table of Appendix 1 of Prodoc)
5. Well noted with thanks

### **Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 2/2/2022 - Cleared. Thanks

Agency Response  
**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 2/2/2022 - Yes

Agency Response  
**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GESFSEC, 2/2/2022 - Yes.

Agency Response  
**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 2/2/2022 - Yes.

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 2/2/2022 - No please provide.

Agency Response

**Response03/02/2022**

The document has been updated and is included in Annex C of the CEO ER.

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 2/2/2022 - No, the JPG or file seem to be broken, please replace.

GEFSEC, 5/10/2022: Cleared. Thanks

Agency Response

**Response03/02/2022**

We have uploaded again the image in the GEF platform, if still not visible, please refer to Annex E of the CEO ER.

**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 2/2/2022 - Not yet. Please refer to the flagged items and resubmit.

GEFSEC, 4/7/2022 - Not yet. Please refer to the flagged items and resubmit.

GEFSEC, 5/10/2022: Recommended for CEO endorsement

GEFSEC, 5/16/2022: Please address comments under Question 1 of part I, question 3 of Part II and Annex section

GEFSEC, 7/18/2022: Please address comments under question 3 of Part II

GEFSEC, 7/28/2022: I recommend

GEFSEC, 9/16/2022: Update. Please address comment under question 1 of the part I

GEFSEC, 8/2022: Please address the comment under question 1 of part 1

GEFSEC, 9/9/2022: The agency has revised the CEO Endorsement Report and budget to remain inline with approved PIF

GEFSEC, 9/20/2022: I recommend

#### Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>First Review</b>	2/2/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	4/7/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	5/16/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	7/18/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	7/28/2022	

#### CEO Recommendation

#### Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The Republic of Djibouti is a Least Developed Country located in the Horn of Africa. Like rest of the LDCs in African continent, Djibouti it is highly vulnerable to impacts of climate change. Within the country, Dikhil and Tadjourah-Ville are the two poorest regions, yet, with strong potential for agriculture and vibrant economic activity. This project seeks to address high level of vulnerability to climate change in these communities by Planning and implementing Ecosystem based Adaptation (EbA). To achieve this, the project will combine a mix of green solutions and grey infrastructure



with activities that enhance climate resilience, restore degraded ecosystems while reducing pressures and stresses on ecosystems through three components as follows:

#### **COMPONENTS AND RESULTS**

- **Component 1:** Resilience to droughts and floods in rural areas of Dikhil region;
- **Component 2:** Resilience to floods in Tadjourah Villes; and
- **Component 3:** Capacity-building, knowledge and awareness-raising

The project will build capacity of the local authorities for adaptation planning in key sectors; design and implement concrete green and grey adaptation technologies, and generate and disseminate new knowledge on adaptation ? in particular EbA ? to form an evidence base that can inform policy as well as future projects and development initiatives.

The project has been designed with a strong focus on gender equality and empowerment as well. Overall, it will directly benefit 207,306 people (53% women), enable the climate resilient management of 338 ha of land, and train 868 (44% women) people about climate risks and adaptation measures. The project will also mainstream climate resilience into 2 policies/plans.

On COVID-19, the project is expected contribute to strengthening the overall resilience of local communities, thus aligning with the ?Build Back Better? approach.