



Adaptive Agriculture and Rangeland Rehabilitation Project (A2R2) - Somalia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10792

Countries

Somalia

Project Name

Adaptive Agriculture and Rangeland Rehabilitation Project (A2R2) - Somalia

Agencies

IFAD

Date received by PM

10/18/2022

Review completed by PM

12/12/2022

Program Manager

Jason Spensley

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

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

8 December 2022:

Cleared

25 November 2022:

We note that at the time of PIF approval, the Rio Marker for Adaptation was indicated as 2, and now it is indicated as 1. Is there a specific reason that this has been lowered related to less adaptation impact anticipated? If yes, please explain in detail. If not, please consider reverting to the original level for adaptation impact PIF approval.

Agency Response

7 December 2022

The error in the system. The Rio marker for Adaptation is now converted back to 2.

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

18 January 2023:

Cleared

19 December 2022:

There are multiple differences between the total numbers stipulated in Table B and those provided in Annex E. Please see below all the items highlighted. Corrections are required so that all budget tables match.

25 November 2022:

Please explicitly indicate and explain the reason for any updates/changes made to the components, outcomes and outputs, as well as the GEF amounts for each, made from the time of the approved PIF to the CER. Comments on the project structure/design will be made when this comparison and explanations are provided, including as related to biodiversity and land degradation.

Agency Response

10 January 2023

Annex I - Budget (the correct numbering is Annex I, ~~not Annex E~~) Budget has been corrected to match the total figures stipulated in Table B. The "office renovation" budget line has also been removed from the Appendix E budget. All the budget tables match.

7 December 2022

A summary table of the logframe changes from the PIF to the CER with the justification for the changes is now inserted in section 8 of the CER.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

25 November 2022:

N/A

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

8 December 2022:

Cleared

25 November 2022:

We note with appreciation the increase in co-financing from the Agency.

However, we note with concern that

A) The investment mobilised co-financing from OFID, Italy Netherlands of \$10.5 million in the approved PIF appears to be totally gone in the CER. Is this the case? If so, please explain what happened, how this co-financing will be replaced, and any implications on the project design and expected impact. Please ensure every effort is made to recover this co-financing.

B) Almost all the co-financing comes from the Agency, and there is limited co-financing at all from other sources, with only one other source (SADAR) with \$500k in recurrent expenditure. This was not the case at PIF approval and is a significant concern and can impact CEO endorsement. Please make every effort to attract multiple sources of co-finance. This is especially important given this is a multi-trust fund project with \$17 million in GEF finance.

Agency Response

7 December 2022

A) At the time of the formulation of the PIF, the co-financing from OFID, Italy and the Netherlands of approximately US\$ 10 million was planned. However, due to the delays in concluding the key reforms that were expected by the key donors of the Government of Somalia, including the successful completion of the elections for the national leadership of Somalia including the President of the Federal Republic, mobilising supplementary grant co-financing from the targeted donors did not materialised.

The IFAD Country Team was able to quickly secure co-financing of US\$ 7 million for the IFAD The Enhanced Adaptation for Smallholder Agriculture Programme (ASAP+) and US\$ 16 million from the approved the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP). Consequently, the combined co-financing of US\$ 23 exceeds the targeted co-financing of US\$ 21 million in the PIF.

B) The co-financing structure and amount has been revised (reduction in the number of co-financing sources and increase in the overall investment mobilized) in accordance with the latest developments in the country of relevance to the project. We are pleased to confirm an additional source of co-financing from the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MoAI) in the amount of US\$230 000, despite the limited fiscal space in Somalia and in view of the escalating drought situation in the country resulting to the Government of the Federal Republic of Somalia refocusing substantially the budgetary resources to address food insecurity and fighting Al Shabaab. Additional efforts to diversify the partnership through co-financing sources will be made in the context of GEF-8 project (discussions on-going).

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
25 November 2022:

Yes

Agency Response 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
18 January 2023:

Cleared

19 December 2022:

Regarding the PPG, please provide additional details on what the expense category entail and which activities are funded through these items. It is not possible to assess what ?administrative costs?, ?cooperating institution? or other category include. Additional details will allow us to confirm that all expenses are eligible for GEF funding.

Agency Response

10 January 2023:

Additional details have been added to Annex C ? Status of Utilization of PPG, as attached.

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

18 January 2023:

Cleared

19 December 2022:

The target under core indicator 11 (People benefiting from GEF-financed investments) in the core indicator table does not match with the results framework target. Please revise accordingly.

25 November 2022:

The expected number of people trained in the approved PIF of 96,200 is now indicated as 0 in the CER. We assume this is a typo. Please correct.

Agency Response

10 January 2023

The result framework has been completed so that the core indicator 11 (72,000 HHs or 424,800 persons (women > 50%) match with what is indicated in the Results framework target (Development objective)

7 December 2022

This is a typo and is now corrected in the CER and the portal.

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

8 December 2022:

Cleared

25 November 2022:

We note that significant information on current and anticipated climate hazards that was included in the approved PIF were not included in the CER. Please explain why this is the case? Was that information found to be faulty or no longer relevant to the project? Please keep all relevant information from the PIF in the CER, or there is not a net elaboration in the CER, as this document needs to be complete on its own.

Agency Response

7 December 2022

Thank you for the comment. The new information and data from the design process are considered together with the information from the PIF that is now brought back into the section.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

25 November 2022:

Yes

Agency Response

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

25 November 2022:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8 December 2022:

Cleared

25 November 2022:

There is no further elaboration since PIF approval. Please elaborate in the CER.

Agency Response

7 December 2022

In recognition of the importance and relative novelty of the joint multi-Trust-Fund programming approach, careful attention has been paid to ensuring full integration and benefits associated with the mainstreaming approach. Several changes made in the wording of Output descriptions reflect this enhanced and integrative logic. Special attention has been paid to ensuring alignment with LDCF guidance, details of which are presented in Table 6 of CER.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

25 November 2022:

Yes

Agency Response

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

25 November 2022:

Yes

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

8 December 2022:

Cleared

25 November 2022:

No, there is no further elaboration on these aspects. Please elaborate.

Agency Response

7 December 2022

Further elaboration is made in the relevant CER section highlighting the changes (please see separate document attached under the list of documents).

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

25 November 2022:

Yes

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

25 November 2022:

N/A

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
8 December 2022:

Cleared

25 November 2022:

There are general references to stakeholders of private sector, CBOs, NGOs, farmer field schools, microfinance institutions, and IDPs. Please name each of the stakeholders consulted explicitly, within these broad categories, and how each will be involved (or not) in the project.

Agency Response
7 December 2022

Stakeholder consultation details are now further outlined in a new Table 12.

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
25 November 2022:

Yes

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
25 November 2022:

Yes

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
8 December 2022:

Cleared

25 November 2022:

No there has not been elaboration on these elements since PIF approval. Please elaborate.

Agency Response
7 December 2022

Additional risks and mitigation measures have been elaborated in Section 14 "Risks" in the table on Risks and Mitigation Measures

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

25 November 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

25 November 2022:

Yes

Agency Response

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

25 November 2022:

Yes

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

25 November 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
25 November 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
8 December 2022:

Cleared

25 November 2022:

Not really. Please expand on the correlation between the project interventions, through the outcomes and outputs, produce specific socio-economic benefits, and how those relate to the GEBs and adaptation impacts of this project.

Agency Response
7 December 2022

Section 19 of the CER is now updated with further details on the socio-economic benefits of the project in relation to the GEBs

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

18 January 2023:

Cleared

19 December 2022:

GEF funds cannot be used to renovate an office. This item has to be removed from the budget.

The comments of 8 December 2022 are addressed.

8 December 2022:

A) Thank you for providing a clearer version of the budget table. However, some of the cells in column B "Detailed Description" are not large enough to show the full text, so the full description cannot be read. Please ensure all text can be viewed.

B) Please provide a response to point C in the comment made on 7 December 2022 (it seems the Agency responded to point D but not point C). In doing so, please provide information about whether the expenses under "works" will include both labour and equipment.

25 November 2022:

Annex E: Project budget table -

A) This table is too small to be read in the CER. Please resubmit this annex with larger font so it can be viewed as a PDF.

This said, we were able to provide initial comments on the budget by focusing in on specific cells, and as such can provide the following comments to be addressed:

B) Please provide more detail on the significant \$ value item (\$696,991) of "Drill and test pump 9 deep boreholes...". For example, will equipment will be sought and with what specifications. Will the cost be just for equipment or also labour, etc.? Please provide a breakdown of this item.

C) For all the items listed under the expenditure category of "works", please indicate if equipment will be purchased and if so provide a breakdown of expenses.

D) Regarding CBT Stipends under sub total for vehicles, please explain what the \$363,000 is for and indicate this in the budget.

E) Under contractual service - individual, note \$192,000 is to "recruit integrated water resource management specialist". Is this really just to recruit them? Please clarify if its for their recruitment, or their pay. If its for their pay, why are they not listed under consultants?

Please provide a breakdown indicating their monthly pay. Also, what does "NTA" mean in this context?

F) We note there are no national or international consultants listed. Is this the case? If so, why?

Agency Response

10 January 2023

The budget line ?office renovation? has been removed

12 December 2022:

A)the budget have been uploaded again

B)Answer to point C: No equipment will be purchased. The works will be fully subcontracted to a service provider who will hand over the completed activities e. g. Functioning Boreholes.

7 December 2022

A) The table is re-fixed with larger font size.

B) It is one contract for Works - meaning that service provider will do all the works and the final product is working boreholes, inclusive of labour and equipment

C) This is coming not under Vehicles but under Grants. The amounts represent the stipend to be given to the participants @ \$150 Unit Cost x 2,420 participants of Trainings.

E) This was transferred from contractual services to consultants. This is consultant's honorarium calculated at: US\$4000/month x 12 months x 4 years. NTA means national technical assistance (i.e. national consultant).

F) There are several activities that are listed under 'Contractual Services' Company? most of which will ideally be contracted to national or international consultants.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
25 November 2022:

Cleared.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
25 November 2022:

Please address comments.

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
25 November 2022:

All comments were responded.

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
25 November 2022:

N/A

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

25 November 2022:

N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

25 November 2022:

N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

25 November 2022:

N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

25 November 2022:

Cleared.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
25 November 2022:

Cleared

Agency Response

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
25 November 2022:

N/A

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
25 November 2022:

N/A

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
25 November 2022:

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

18 January 2023:

All comments have been addressed.

8 December 2022:

One comment is remaining. Once this comment is addressed, then final review for policy alignment will be conducted.

25 November 2022:

Not yet. Several comments need to be addressed.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	11/28/2022	12/7/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/8/2022	12/12/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/12/2022	1/17/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/19/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/18/2023	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

This MTF FSP is recommended for final CEO Endorsement, pending any final comments from PPO on policy adherence.