

Adaptive Agriculture and Rangeland Rehabilitation Project (A2R2) - Somalia

Basic Information

GEF ID

10792

Countries

Somalia

Project Title

Adaptive Agriculture and Rangeland Rehabilitation Project (A2R2) - Somalia

GEF Agency(ies)

IFAD

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 24April:

Cleared.

GEFSEC 30March2021:

The proposed project is aligned with the BD Focal Area with proposed activities under BD 1.4 (Mainstream biodiversity across sectors, landscapes and seascapes through Sustainable Use of Plant 1. Biodiversity considerations area mainstreamed throughout the technical components, but the only quantified output is “850 ha of forests restored”, which seems relatively low given the proposed allocation of \$5.8 million from the BD focal area. Please, provide more details on specific actions related to biodiversity conservation and additional estimates of quantitative outputs that can better justify the investments.

Agency Response

23 April 2021:

Pages 36-37

Of \$5.8 million proposed allocation for BD Focal Area, \$1.65 million is allocated to restoring 850ha of forests (See Table B. Indicative Project Description Summary).

The proposed project will directly and/or indirectly contribute to enhancing BD through the following activities:

1) The project will enhance BD in 71,550ha of forests and rangelands. Under Component 2, in addition to restoring 850ha of forests through ANR and reforestation of native species, the project will promote BD by restoring 15,500ha of degraded rangeland, natural grass and shrublands, and increasing productivity and BD of 55,200ha of rangelands, through an analysis of the state of biodiversity, reseeding drought-resistant native species and ANR, developing participatory water and pastoral plans, and supporting the establishment or the reinforcement of conflicts resolution mechanisms on use of land and water.

2) The project will develop georeferenced BD-tracking systems and strengthen institutional capacity and policy environment to achieve LDN and conserve BD. Under Component 3, the project will establish LDN and a participatory BD M&E system, reinforce institutional actors' capacity on M&E of and SDG-related to LDN and BD, establish NRM coordination mechanism so as to land degradation and biodiversity mainstreamed into local, national and federal strategies and plans, and support addressing LDN and BD in the implementation of the ND P-9 and other strategies and plans.

3) BD in agriculture will also be enhanced. Under Component 1, the project will train small-scale farmers and pastoralists by introducing adapted and productive agro-ecological approaches and techniques for soil, water and BD conservation and equip them to facilitate adoption of climate-smart,

productive agroecological approaches and techniques through farmer field schools. Through the diversification of production systems using both commercial and traditional varieties, local agrobiodiversity will be conserved and enhanced.

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

055050 001-110001

GEFSEC 29April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 24April2021:

We note the reference in the response below to Outcome 1.3, as well as Outputs 1.3.1 and 1.3.2, focused on developing a microfinance mechanism. However, they do not seem to be included in Table B. Please ensure this is included in a resubmitted PIF, or indicate where it is located in the PIF.

GEFSEC 30March2021:

Please provide a more elaborated articulation of the project objective, including by expanding on "...through sustainable natural resource management".

As it is currently written, output 1.3.1. could be understood to identify and support profitability of sources of income, whether they are climate-proof or not. Also, is this output focused on MSMEs or any source of income? Please clarify.

The proposal relies on "coaching, strengthening management capacities and direct and indirect incentives" which will support communities to transform their landscape. Nevertheless, the proposal is vague regarding the kind of "coaching" and incentives that can be promoted and sustainable, given the local context of fragility and high-intensity conflict. Please explain further the considered incentives (based on which mechanism concretely) and how they are integrated in the long-term investment strategy that the project aims to develop.

We note the focus of output 1.3.1 to increase profitable climate proof sources of income; output 1.3.2 to coach poor households in entrepreneurship; etc. However, there is very little no mention of how this project will overcome the barrier of these MSMEs accessing capital to invest, which appears to be a significant omission. Especially considering the scale of GEF financing sought. please consider inclusion of an outcome and output(s) to address this barrier, with relevant reassignment of budget as needed. Just as an example, 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 if there is potential to partner with microfinance institutions by guaranteeing a line of credit for accessible lending products targeting nature-based solutions and climate resilience. Please see here for example: <https://www.thegef.org/project/blended-nance-facility-climate-resilience-coffee-and-cacao-value-chains-cc-blend>? Additionally or alternatively, while we appreciate challenges with the limited nature of the commercial finance sector in the country, please consider potential to create or partner with an emerging commercial Equity Funds or other investment vehicle in nature-based solutions and/or climate resilient enterprises. Examples 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-rst-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>. In the narrative of this PIF, please also consider any barrier(s) related to accessing capital for MSME (including smallholder farmers) in climate adaptation, LDN, and biodiversity.

Among the problems leading to the environmental degradation, the PIF mentions the importance of local governance issues including increased insecurity, concentration of grazing due to war and conflict, and the break-down of traditional participatory approaches to the management of forests and rangelands. However, it is unclear how the project will ensure 'concerted, planned and participatory actions for the restoration of rangelands together with the reinforcement of pastoralists' and agropastoralists' technical and land management

capacities". Please clarify how the proposal will concretely overcome these important barriers.

Given LDCF finance is sought for Component 3, please strengthen climate adaptation and resilience focus of this component. Alternatively, please eliminate LDCF finance for this component.

The description of how COVID19 pandemic is currently effecting Somalia, as well as the risks of the pandemic on the project, are well noted. Please strengthen articulation of how the proposed project (PIF) will help in reducing the risk of emerging infectious diseases in the future, while increasing the resilience of the ecologic and socio-economy systems. In doing so, please consider relevance of the following possible approaches: Protect and restore natural systems and their ecological functionality; focus on production landscapes and land use practices within them to decrease the risk of human/nature conflicts; innovation in climate change mitigation and resilience; and engagement with the private sector.

Agency Response

23 April 2021:

Page 1. The new formulation of the project objective is as follow: "Enhancing the climate resilience of poor rural households in Somalia through sustainable natural resources management on multiple levels: improved water resources and rangelands management; eco-agriculture and climate-proof livelihoods; forest/habitat rehabilitation; improved governance and information systems for land degradation and biodiversity"

The **Outcome 1.4** (former Outcome 1.3) "Increased household incomes for the poorest households" has a new specific indicator which stipulates the kind of IGAs we are looking for:" Number of households investing in climate resilient practices, land degradation neutrality, and provision of climate adaptation goods and services"

The **Output 1.4.2** "Poor households trained, equipped and coached to undertake new income-generating activities as micro-entrepreneurs" are also climate proof oriented, and refers to the coaching which will be developed under the new **Outcome 1.3** "Microfinance mechanism supporting climate proof income-generating activities established and functional (please see below)

Page 3: A new outcome is defined in the project: **Outcome 1.3 "Microfinance mechanism supporting climate proof income-generating activities established and functional"**, with 2 outputs:

- **Output 1.3.1** "Microfinance mechanism designed and tailored poor households' needs in the context of the sustainable natural resources management (feasibility study)"
- **Output 1.3.2** "Partnership built with identified MFIs and NGOs to support capacity building and access to credit for poorest households"

Pages 35-36: The project's approach is first to undertake a preliminary feasibility study for the identification of a microfinance mechanism that would help poor households to create profitable climate proof sources of income (through IGAs or MSMSEs targeting nature-base

d solutions and climate resilience).

The study will be based on IFAD's experience in other regions (Syria, Sudan), on the analysis of the financial landscape in Somalia, particularly in light of the World Bank's programs (*World Bank. 2019. Somalia Capacity Advancement, Livelihoods and Entrepreneurship, through Digital Uplift Project*), as well as the international experiences supported by GEF. The study will identify the most relevant MFI(s) to partner with, and which can offer financial products adapted to the needs of the poorest stakeholders and the objectives of the project (eligible criteria will be defined, as well as procedures for individual and/or collective access to funds, etc). The study will also focus on assessing the capacity building needs of stakeholders, particularly women, as well as identifying NGOs that can support them in mobilizing credit and setting up their business/income generating activities.

The outcome makes explicit the various incentives the project will propose: an improved access to financial services tailored to the needs and capacities of the target groups, particularly women. Stakeholders will also benefit from the support of specialized NGOs that will provide them with assistance in preparing their financial proposals to submit to MFIs as well as with technical capacity building to help them implement their businesses, training to access rural finance, technical capacity building.

Page 53: Additional considerations have been added in the **section 5 "Risks"**

Areas which are deemed unsafe will be avoided during implementation and project areas will be selected based on areas which are deemed safe.

The project will be implemented by IFAD on the ground **through reliable executing agencies to be identified during the full design phase:** Government institutions at the national and federal levels and well-established **and locally-accepted NGOs.**

IFAD will focus on empowering communities and promoting **strong stakeholder ownership.**

The project will provide a regionally tailored, sustainable approach to manage rangelands and forests by providing training to pastoralist community organizations, **establishing strengthened coordination mechanisms on natural resource management at federal, national and local levels,** and supporting the development and implementation of sustainable pasture management plans, which will take into account **specific measures to minimize human, and wildlife conflict.**

Project implementation will ensure that **customary dispute resolution mechanisms are used** to resolve any conflicts.

The LDCF finance has been removed for this component.

Page 39: The COVID-19 crisis and mitigation of future pandemics Section has been strengthened with project activities aligned with One Health Approach, habitat restoration, and outreach with health authorities in Somalia.

In the specific case of Somalia, the GEF project will build on experience from RLCA-19 regarding support and training of small-scale farmers in post-harvest practices to reduce post-harvest losses amongst the target communities and to ensure quality products (grading, storing, drying, etc.)

Outcome 1.3 was added in response to the first review, but it appeared at the end of Table B in the portal instead of between 1.2 and 1.4 as one would naturally expect. Table B has now been reinserted in the portal in the proper order.

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 24April2020:

We note IFAD's indication that it will seek to increase the currently unfortunately low level of co-financing during the PPG phase, including from Government. Please also actively seek to do so from bilateral donors, NGOs, private sector, and/or other sources of co-finance.

GEFSEC 1April2021:

The level of overall indicative co-financing for this project is low. (\$21 million in co-financing for a total of approximately \$17 million in GEF finance). Please consider and indicate opportunities for further co-financing.

Agency Response

23 April 2021:

It is extremely challenging to commit to greater co-financing in Somalia. However, during the PPG phase IFAD will seek to mobilize additional funding, including from Government.

28 April 2021

This was always IFAD's intention. The text below Table C was enhanced to clarify as follows: "*IFAD will seek to further increase co-financing during the design phase, from bilateral donors, NGOs, private sector, and/or other sources of co-finance. When the project activities will be more defined and precisely located, IFAD will be in a better position to identify and approach potential partners for co-financing the Project.*"

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

GEFSEC24April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 1April2021:

It appears the percentage of PMC is incorrectly calculated. Instead of 4.99%, it is 5.2%, as it has to be calculated from the sub-total (PMC is 'inclusive' of the GEF Financing). Such an increase in the PMC rate would require a justification to be considered. Please either revise the PMC accordingly, or provide a justification of this increase rate.

Agency Response

23 April 2021

The PMC has been revised.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 1April2021:

Yes

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 1April2021:

Yes

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 1April2021:

Yes

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
GEFSEC 1April2021:

N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
GEFSEC 1Aprilh2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
GEFSEC 1April2021:

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 1April2021:

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 24April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 21April2021:

The CCA indicators for LDCF finance are well noted. Please further consider if any policies/plans will be created to mainstream climate resilience through this project, including for example, through Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.3, 1.2.1 ,1.2.2, 4.1.3, or otherwise.

GEFSEC 1 April 2021:

The Area of Land Restored of 6850 Ha for Trust Fund indicator 3 seems low. Please consider opportunities to significantly increase.

Please indicate the climate change adaptation impact indicators by uploading the completed relevant sections of the LDCF/SCCF results framework via the documents upload function.

In multi-trust fund projects, the targets for GEF Core Indicators should be inclusive of the full project finance. As such, please ensure relevant LDCF figures for # of people impacted (TF indicator 11) and # of hectares under climate resilient management also in the relevant Trust Fund GEF indicators (TF indicator 3).

Agency Response

23 April 2021

The total area of land restored has been recalculated and is of a total of 12550 ha, including:

- 850 ha of forest restored
- 2200 ha of degraded rangeland restored
- 9500 ha of grassland restored

Additional BD activities have been identified in **Component 2** to reach the new quantitative objective.

The relevant sections of the LDCF/SCCF results framework has been attached as an Annex.

Last point: done

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 1April2021:

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 24April2021:

During PPG prior to CEO Endorsement, please deepen the analysis of the climate impacts indicated in table 1 from an RCP4.5 or lower vis-à-vis RCP 8.5 over time, and how the project considers the range of scenarios.

Also during PPG, please expand on table 1 by indicating the specific adaptation actions that will be implemented by this project in order to address the indicated anticipated impacts.

GEFSEC 1April 2021:

Please clarify the references to figure 4 on projected change in rainfall of very wet days. For example, which of the two figures show is for RCP 4.5 vs RCP 8.5?; and one of the two figures seems to show minimal increase from 200 to 2099. Also, both figures are quite blurry.

Figures 4 and 5 both refer to figures on the right and left (presumably referring to the sides of the page), but the two figures appear in the portal as being on top of each other. Please clarify. Perhaps it would be clarifying to refer to figure 4a, 4b, 5a, 5b?

We appreciate the inclusion of the table titled Sectoral Vulnerabilities. Please clarify if the vulnerabilities indicated in this table meant to be current or anticipated over time. With further regards to this table, given the focus on climate adaptation and resilience, this table and the PIF in general would be strengthened by indication of how the impacts (indicated as vulnerabilities) of the stated hazards are anticipated to change over time, based on different climate scenarios. Additionally, given the substantive focus of the project and its budget on hydrological infrastructure, please expand on the current and anticipated impacts of climate hazards (droughts, floods or otherwise) on this infrastructure. Also, we note one of the "sectors" listed is biodiversity. Please consider if biodiversity is most relevant to be indicated here as a sector; as a factor driving the vulnerability of each sector; or otherwise.

Agency Response

23 April 2021:

- The figures were clarified and enlarged to be more visible. Further write up for the analysis of the data in the figures have been done to better reflect change in drought and flooding over time until the end of the century.
- The table has been rearranged. Two paragraphs have been added before the table to reflect on the current impacts of extreme events so that the table focus only on future vulnerabilities.
- Biodiversity is no longer in the table as a sector. A paragraph on the impact of climate change on biodiversity has been added and is now regarded as a driver for other sectors.
- A paragraph on the impact of the 2019 floods in Somalia on infrastructure has been added with emphasis on the future projections. In addition, the development of an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) has been highlighted under component 1 as tool to mitigate risk on planned water infrastructure interventions.

28 April 2021

Agreed and done. A paragraph was added before Table 1 as follows: *"Through the design phase, with PPG funding, the analysis of climate vulnerabilities indicated in Table 1 will be refined, taking into account the full range of scenarios (from RCP 4.5 through RCP 8.5) and through time in order to optimize the project's approach vis-à-vis the range of scenarios. With exhaustive field visits, stakeholder consultations and cost-benefit analyses, Table 1 will also be enhanced to prioritize specific adaptation actions to be implemented with GEF/LDCF funding in order to address the indicated anticipated impacts."*

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 24 April 2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 1 April 2021:

The proposal mentions lessons from other projects but does not adequately elaborate how this new proposal builds up on those lessons, and also to include learning from other projects that have been undertaken with similar objective in other geographies and/or undertaken by other agencies in similar fragility contexts. Please consider expanding the incorporation of lessons learned into the project.

Specifically and as one example, please expand on how this proposed new project will build on and avoid any duplication with the GEF LDCF supported project that is currently under implementation, titled "Support for Integrated Water Resources Management to Ensure Water Access and Disaster Reduction for Somalia's Agro-Pastoralists"

Agency Response

23 April 2021:

Page 33: The table "Complementarity and contribution of existing projects to the A2R2 Project" has been added in continuity of the base line scenario to highlight how the project will benefit from lessons learnt from other projects. However, a lot more meetings and lessons will be drawn during the design phase in order to capitalise on all the experiences of similar projects implemented in Somalia and in other regions.

Page 34: The kind of coordination with the UNDP Project is presented in Table "Complementarity and contribution of existing project to the A2R2 Project" page 34.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 24 April 2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 1April2021:

Please note other related comments.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 1April2021:

Yes

Agency Response

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 1April2021:

Please see the comments in response to question 6 in part 1.

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 1April2021:

Please see comment in response to question 6 in part 1.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 29April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 24April2021:

Please note the further comments above in Q2 of part 1. The additions of innovation related to improving access to capital for MSMEs and small holder farmers seems to be missing from Table B.

GEFSEC 1April2021:

With regards to innovation in terms of financial instruments, financial sustainability and approaches to private sector engagement, please consider the comments provided in response to the question below on private sector engagement.

Agency Response

23 April 2021:

Page 47: With respect to terms of financial instruments, financial sustainability and approaches to private sector engagement, the Project will be innovative by designing and implementing a microfinance mechanism, involving MFIs as well as NGOs, adapted to the needs and capacities of local actors, especially women, and promoting environmentally friendly economic activities adapted to climate change

28 April 2021

Outcome 1.3 was added in response to the first review, but it appeared at the end of Table B in the portal instead of between 1.2 and 1.4 as one would naturally expect. Table B has now been reinserted in the portal in the proper order.

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 1April2021:

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 24April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 1April2021:

Please expand on the stakeholder consultations that have been consulted to date, including a full list of specific NGOs, private sector actors, "communities", or other civil society organizations, as well as the "key bilateral donors and IFIs present in Somalia". Kindly also provide greater specificity as to the actors who will be met with during the "detailed design", and confirm if this will be done during the project preparation phase.

Agency Response

23 April 2021:

The List of stakeholders/institutions consulted during PIF design can be found in Annex F.

The project will engage in extensive consultations with stakeholders at the local and national levels, civil society organizations and funding partners (bilateral and multilateral donors) during the full project design phase

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 21April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 1April2021:

We note with appreciation the extensive information provided in the PIF on the gender-related context in Somalia. Please describe plans to carry out gender analysis or equivalent socioeconomic assessments prior to CEO endorsement, including efforts to ensure that stakeholder consultations will be gender sensitive, and how the project will involve participation of relevant women organizations, groups, associations (including for example the Ministry of Women and Human Rights Development) during project development and implementation.

Agency Response

23 April 2021:

Page 50: A new paragraph has been added in the section 3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment to explain how IFAD will carry out the gender analysis:

The objective of the analysis to facilitate social inclusion, gender equality and the social and economic empowerment of identified target groups. The following steps will be followed:

1. Review the country context relevant to targeting and gender in relation to the project thematic focus.
2. Conduct a participatory gender-sensitive rural poverty and livelihoods analysis to identify and better understand the needs, priorities and expectations of poor rural people;
3. Identify key issues that may be addressed by the project, disaggregating data by sex and other relevant variables where possible.
4. Based on the IFAD's Policies on Targeting and on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, the gender analysis will: a) Define and profile project target groups, including the gender dimensions of rural poverty; b) Develop a targeting strategy to ensure that project design accommodates the needs and priorities of the target group and facilitates its participation in project interventions, and that the special concerns of vulnerable groups are taken into account; c) Develop a gender mainstreaming strategy, including implementation mechanisms, to ensure that the project identifies opportunities to support gender equality and women's empowerment and facilitates women's participation in project interventions; d) Provide inputs into the M&E framework, project logframe and learning systems to incorporate gender and social inclusion perspectives;
5. The gender analysis will, finally, identify implementation arrangements, risks and mitigation measures, costs and financing to ensure effective implementation of targeting and gender strategies.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 29 April 2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 24 April 2021:

Please note the Output on microfinance sector, including how it relates to private sector, appears to be missing. Additionally, we note this is referred to as Output 1.2 in the response below, but Output 1.3 elsewhere. Please clarify.

GEFSEC 1 April 2021:

It will be important to strengthen private sector engagement outputs in this PIF. Please note relevant comments above, particularly in response to question 2 of part 1.

Agency Response

23 April 2021:

As mentioned, and explained above the private sector will be strongly strengthened through the new outcome 1.2 on Microfinance.

28 April 2021

Outcome 1.3 was added in response to the first review, but it appeared at the end of Table B in the portal instead of between 1.2 and 1.4 as one would naturally expect. Table B has now been reinserted in the portal in the proper order..

The reference to "Outcome 1.2" in the earlier response was simply a typo.

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

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 1April2021:

Yes

Agency Response

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 29April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 24Apri2021:

As requested on 1April2021, please clarify who will be the lead Executing Partner(s) of the project. We note indication that the Ministry of Agriculture will be the "Lead Agency". Please clarify what exactly this means, including what their responsibilities will be in the project.

GEFSEC 1April2021:

Please indicate where the PCU will be housed.

Please clarify in the implementation section of the PIF who will be the Executing Partner(s) for the project. If there will be more than one Executing Partner, please indicate what their respective roles will be.

Please clarify in this section if IFAD has an office in Somalia.

Agency Response

23 April 2021:

Page 57: The PCU will be hosted by the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation.

The Ministry of Agriculture will be the Lead Agency for the A2R2 project and will work in close coordination with the Ministry of Livestock, Forestry and Range (MLFR), the Ministry of Women and Human Rights Development, and the Directorate of Environment and Climate Change in the Prime Minister's Office.

IFAD does not have an office in Somalia. Somalia is served by the IFAD Office in Cairo.

28 April 2021

Agreed and done.

In Section 2 "Stakeholders", the terminology was clarified in Table 5 "*The MoAI is expected to be the Project lead Executing Partner and host the Programme Coordination Unit (PCU), also convening the Project Steering Committee.*"

In Section 6 "Coordination", the proposed role of MoAI as host of the PSC was clarified: "*A Programme Steering Committee (PSC) is proposed to be established under the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MoAI) to approve the annual work plan and budget (AWPB) and review the annual project progress and financial reports. The detailed composition of the PSC will be agreed with the Federal Government of Somalia during design, however it is already agreed that the Directorate of Environment and Climate Change in the Prime Minister's Office and the Ministry of Finance would be represented.*"

Table 5 was also clarified to mention that both the Directorate of Environment and the Ministry of Finance would be represented in the PSC.

Consistent with comment below (with respect to the Letter of Endorsement that did not specify the MoAI as lead Executing Partner), wording was adjusted (e.g. "*The MoAI is expected to be the Project lead Executing Partner*"; "*Programme Steering Committee (PSC) is proposed to be established under the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MoAI)*").

In Part 1 "Project Information", the Project Executing Entity is presented as "*Proposed Lead Executing Entity: Ministry of Agriculture a*

nd Irrigation of the Federal Republic of Somalia (to be confirmed in the design phase and validated by the GEF Operational Focal Point)”.

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 1April2021:

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 24April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 1April2021:

We note the Knowledge Management section of this PIF indicates "The overall purpose of KM is to enable the country programme to build a credible knowledge base...". What country programme is being referred to here?

Is the intended objective of KM (conducted through this project) to build a knowledge base, or generate enduring impact as per the project objectives with the benefit of a strengthened knowledge base? Although this is a subtlety, please clarify to ensure the KM investment made through this project is articulated as a means to an end which is project impacts, rather than an end in itself.

Please clarify the intended beneficiaries and end users of the knowledge management strategy? What will the knowledge captured be transferred to the end users?

Agency Response

23 April 2021:

Page 64: The section on knowledge management has been revised for more clarity.

The overall purpose of KM is to enable the **project** to build a credible knowledge base.

KM objective is developed to support the achievements of the project objectives and the Section has been strengthened by specifying the methods, contents, products, channel and target audience.
audience.

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 1April2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Part 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 29April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 27April2021:

We note the response below that a new LoE will be presented by the time of CEO Endorsed clarifying the executing partner of the project, as at this point the LoE does not indicate who this partner will be. In the resubmitted PIF, please remove the current Executing Partner (Directorate of Environment, Office of the Prime Minister of Somalia, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation of the Federal Republic of Somalia and NGOs), and leave it either in blank or t.b.d.

GEFSEC 1April2021:

We note the PIF indicates the Executing Partners will be "Directorate of Environment, Office of the Prime Minister of Somalia, Ministry for Agriculture and Irrigation of the Federal Republic of Somalia (and NGOs)". However, the LOE does not indicate this. Please clarify.

Agency Response

23 April 2021:

We note that the LOE states that the project will be prepared and implemented by IFAD, and can assure you that this will be done in close collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MoAI) and the Directorate of Environment, Office of the Prime Minister of Somalia. IFAD will perform its role as a GEF Agency only and will not be involved as an executing partner of the project. We will ensure that

the LOE that will be submitted at the time of CEO endorsement will indicate the national executing partners of the project.

28 April 2021

Agreed and done.

In Part 1 "Project Information", the Project Executing Entity is presented as "*Proposed Lead Executing Entity: Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation of the Federal Republic of Somalia (to be confirmed in the design phase and validated by the GEF Operational Focal Point)*". (Completely removing reference to MoAI as the project's foreseen Executing Entity would have made it difficult to address earlier comment.)

Consistent with above, wording in Section 2 "Stakeholders" and Section 6 "Coordination" was adjusted (e.g. "*The MoAI is expected to be the Project lead Executing Partner*"; "*Programme Steering Committee (PSC) is proposed to be established under the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MoAI)*").

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 1April2021:

N/A

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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:

All comments have been addressed and the PM is recommending this PIF for technical clearance.

GEFSEC 27April2021:

Please address the remaining comments indicated above on 24 and 27 April 2021.

GEFSEC 1April2021:

Please address the comments indicated for each of the sections above in the review sheet as well as the PIF. In doing so, kindly attach a tracked changes version of the resubmitted PIF as a documents upload, so all revisions can be clearly spotted).

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 29April2021:

As indicated in responses above, please ensure the following points are addressed during PPG prior to CEO Endorsement:

- Please deepen the analysis of the climate impacts indicated in table 1 from an RCP4.5 or lower vis-à-vis RCP 8.5 over time, and how the project considers the range of scenarios.
- Please expand on table 1 by indicating the specific adaptation actions that will be implemented by this project in order to address the indicated anticipated impacts.

- We note IFAD's indication that it will seek to increase the currently unfortunately low level of co-financing during the PPG phase, including from Government. Please also actively seek to do so from bilateral donors, NGOs, private sector, and/or other sources of co-finance.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/2/2021	4/23/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/27/2021	4/29/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval