



Third Additional Financing to the Food Systems Resilience Program (FSRP)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11576

Countries

Sierra Leone

Project Name

Third Additional Financing to the Food Systems Resilience Program (FSRP)

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

3/22/2024

Review completed by PM

5/6/2024

Program Manager

Aloke Barnwal

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

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

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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 Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

The project objective is fine. The components and outputs supported by the LDCF is complementary to IDA financing in addressing food security issues in SL which are exacerbated by climate change.

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Knowledge Management- the PID mentions support to strengthen knowledge management and research capacity. However, it lacks any details on how knowledge would be created, shared and managed under the project. Please add some details on the proposed mechanisms and structure for knowledge management under the project.

Gender dimensions are generally included in the PIF with a focus on mainstreaming gender in interventions. Please indicate if the project would strive to create specific opportunities to empower women in decision making and adopting climate resilient livelihoods and agriculture solutions.

GEFSEC May 6, 2024

Thanks. Comments cleared by PM.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Addressed (activity 2). Specific information and activities will be added during preparation.

GAP will be prepared at the endorsement stage. More examples of gender engagement and proposed interventions are included in the PIF portal entry.

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

Yes.

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

The adaptation context is described well with clear description of current and future climate vulnerabilities.

Please add a paragraph on the barriers that are limiting adaptation action. The PID/PIF mentions lack of public funding in agriculture sector, but it is not clear if this barrier is also extended for adaptation investments.

The PIF/PID also mentions poor farming practices but doesn't link it with climate vulnerability (it does link with increased GHG emissions).

Please add additional barriers which the project would address e.g. lack of climate advisory services, lack of integrated landscape and value chain based approaches, private sector engagement, etc.

GEFSEC May 6, 2024

Thanks. Comments cleared.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Paragraph on the barriers and information on link of poor farming with to link with climate vulnerability are added in the PCN (see TC version)

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

Please add a few specific stakeholders that the project would prioritize in its engagement approach. The approach is described well but lacks specificity.

GEFSEC May 6, 2024

Thanks for adding the table on consultations held in designing the project in the PIF. The comment is cleared.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Stakeholder consultation information added in the PIF portal entry.

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

In the TOC, we recommend a set problems/issues/barriers below "Activities" to depict the change better. The current TOC doesn't articulate climate change vulnerability as a driver for the project.

Also a narrative just below the TOC on how the LDCF would be incremental to this TOC and to the program objectives would be useful.

GEFSEC May 6, 2024

Thanks. The narrative is useful and makes the link with climate vulnerability and adaptation explicitly. No further comments.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

TOC and narrative updated in the PCN and Portal entry

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

Yes, but please refer to the comment above.

GEFSEC May 6, 2024- cleared

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

Please refer to the comment related to Knowledge Management earlier. Please provide some additional details related to KM.

GEFSEC May 6, 2024- cleared.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Addressed under activity 2 of the PCN

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

Agriculture and food security is the primary focus of the program along with NBS. We recommend increasing the % for agriculture sector by reducing the share proposed for DRM.

There is no target set for Core Indicator 4 despite a strong focus on strengthening capacity of agri extension service providers. Please add. Please note that these are separate from beneficiary farmers.

GEFSEC May 6, 2024- Please reduce the core indicator 1 beneficiaries to avoid double counting.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Percentage for agriculture increased.

Core indicator 4 targets set as 10% of beneficiaries (21000 male and 15000 female) in the core indicator section. Target will be revised at the endorsement

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

Secretariat's Comments

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

As required at the PIF stage, please add a climate risk and opportunity analysis for this project. The agency may indicate potential climate risks to project activities and outcomes and risk management measures. Please refer to GEF and STAP guidance for the same.

GEFSEC May 6, 2024

Thank you. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

Yes.

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

Yes. However, please revised the focal area code for this project. The entire investment is tagged to CCA 1.1. The project would mobilize large scale financing (IDA) for adaptation and therefore fits well for CCA 1.2 also. We recommend splitting the funds across these two focal area codes in the table titled "Indicative Focal Area Elements".

GEFSEC May 6, 2024

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Focal area elements revised accordingly.

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 Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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 NA

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

Please provide as indicated in the previous comment related to this.

GEFSEC May 6, 2024- comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Stakeholder consultation updated as indicated above.

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 CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

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 NA

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 Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.
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 Yes

Agency's Comments

LOE from the country OFP uploaded in the roadmap.

Thank you.

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

LOE from the country OFP uploaded in the roadmap.

Thank you.

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

LOE from the country OFP uploaded in the roadmap.

Thank you.

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 Comments

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 Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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 Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

No. There is no OFP LOE. The agency is requested to resubmit the project along with the LOE.

GEFSEC May 2, 2024

Please address the technical comments provided by the PM in the review sheet. Also, please address the below comments from PPO in the PIF, and return the project through the portal at the earliest.

1. On Environmental and Social Safeguards : We note that the WB attached the Appraisal Environmental and Social Review summary Appraisal stage and the overall ESF risk of the program is classified as substantial. However, the overall ESS risk and the environment and social risk in the Key risks section in the Portal said "moderate" risk in environmental and social risk. Please make these risks consistent with the World Bank's Appraisal Environmental and Social Review summary Appraisal stage.

2. On Risks: In the Key Risks section, please consider providing an assessment of the risk and anticipated measure to provide context for the identified rating.

3. On Stakeholder Engagement: Agree with PM that Agency should add a few specific stakeholders that the project would prioritize in its engagement approach, including also

additional information on their relevant roles to project outcomes. Moreover, the Agency states that it has consulted with IPLCs and CSO in project design but does not provide any details on these consultations, including names and dates.

4. On gender: We agree with the PM. In addition, please ensure to address the digital divide between women and men, being a common challenge in rural areas, in Component 1. Please, ensure that the plans and strategies developed are gender responsive, and in all activities engaging stakeholders, please ensure that gender experts and representative of women's groups/women's networks are involved.

Please ensure that all KM and communications products feature good practices and lessons learned on gender mainstreaming/women's empowerment.

Under M&E, ensure that gender dimensions are integrated, monitored, and reported on, and that the Gender Action Plan is budgeted.

5. Please update the title of the project, in the portal, to match what was endorsed in the Letter of Endorsement.

GEFSEC May 7, 2024- Please address the following additional comments and resubmit the project at the earliest.

- Reduce core indicator 1 to avoid double counting with core indicator 4.

- Please upload a high resolution TOC diagram. It's blurry- especially activities and barriers boxes. Also, there is a typo in the first Activity Box. "Dood" is written instead of "Food". Please correct.

- Figure 1 and 2 in the PIF is missing. Please upload. We can see them in the PCN/PID.

GEFSEC May 8, 2024

Thanks. All comments are cleared and the project is recommended for technical clearance.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

LOE uploaded in the project roadmap.

Comments from May 2, 2024:

Thank you.

1. mis-selection. Rating adjusted

2. Risk section updated as requested. Please note that the World Bank provides a preliminary risk assessment and detailed risk mitigation is developed during project preparation. Please also note the risk categories for the world bank don't correspond to those requested by the GEF 100%.

3. Information is provided in the updated PIF portal entry

4. More information is provided in the PIF portal entry; GAP will be prepared at the endorsement stage, this comment will be addressed.

5. Project title updated.

Comments from May 7, 2024:

- Core indicator 1 reduced as suggested to avoid double counting.
- TOC graph re-uploaded in the narrative and in the roadmap. Typo corrected.
- Figure 1 and 2 are available in the public document labeled "Project Document" in the roadmap. Please note that the system fails to save anytime we try to upload the figures in the PIF.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	3/22/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/30/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/2/2024	

PIF Review

Agency Response

Additional Review (as necessary)

5/6/2024

Additional Review (as necessary)

5/7/2024