



Strengthening agricultural resilience through transformational livelihood adaptation in Liberia (SARTLA)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11447

Countries

Liberia

Project Name

Strengthening agricultural resilience through transformational livelihood adaptation in Liberia (SARTLA)

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

10/18/2023

Review completed by PM

12/1/2023

Program Manager

Olusola Uchenna Ikuforiji

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

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

29Oct2023 :

Yes. The project information table is also correctly populated.

Agency's Comments

Agency's Response 01 December 2023

Generic comments/requests:

1) Kindly note that new responses in this document are highlighted in Magenta, and new changes made in the PIF in response to this second round of comments are also highlighted in Magenta.

2) With apologies, you will see that 2 PIF documents and 2 meta/core indicators documents were uploaded. Please consider the later version (with [GEF submission] at the end of title) final and for your review.

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Noted

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

29Oct2023 :

Yes

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Noted

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

29Oct2023 :

a) In general yes. The project aims to build climate resilience in the agricultural and ecotourism sectors of Liberia through systems-based, transformational adaptation. However, the ecotourism element of the objective is not clear from the project components. We suggest revising the objective..

b) Yes

27Nov2023 :

Thank you for the additional details and revision of the project objectives and design to better articulate the ecotourism dimension in building resilience. We note the change in project title as indicated in the project summary , "Strengthening agricultural resilience through transformational livelihood adaptation in Liberia (SARTLA)", however SAETRA is referenced in key parts of the PIF, particularly in the stakeholder engagement section. Please harmonize.

We also note that the proposed beneficiaries (core indicators) in the revised PIF are same as the old PIF in spite of the reduced budget. Please confirm and reflect changes as applicable.

01Dec2023:

Thank you for addressing the comments. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

The need for clarity on the ecotourism component of the objective is well noted. The objective has been revised (as below) to better articulate that ecotourism is being used as a tool for resilience in rural communities, as opposed to strictly focusing on increasing resilience of the sector itself.

Revised Objective: Building climate resilience in natural-resource dependent rural communities of Liberia through systems-based, transformational adaptation in the agricultural, fisheries and ecotourism sectors. (Page 3)

Ecotourism: The main objective of the project SARTLA is not to develop a large ecotourism industry in Liberia, or to specifically focus on building the resilience of the ecotourism industry. We understand that the inclusion of the term 'Ecotourism' in the title may have given the impression that the project is the case; however, the project instead proposes to develop ecotourism as an alternative climate-resilient livelihood generation activity for the target affected communities (Ecotourism livelihood development is identified as a priority adaptation and mitigation action linked to forest conservation under the NDC, while creating an enabling environment for developing tourism is listed as a priority action under the Pro-poor Development Agenda). This forms part of a broader livelihood development strategy that includes market and value chain development. The project components and activities have been designed with this objective in mind. We also understand that Liberia doesn't have sufficient tourism/ecotourism infrastructure developed at the moment and developing such infrastructure/intervention is beyond the scope of this proposed project. The project components and activities have been designed to take advantage of ecosystem restoration and conservation activities of this project to develop small scale ecotourism-based livelihood generation activities. Such livelihood activities would complement the restoration/conservation efforts and contribute to the sustainable value chains as part of the systems-based approach, thereby incentivizing ongoing buy-in to the proposed sustainable land management practices (see adjustments on Page 21). Title has been adjusted to remove the implication that the project will directly target building resilience in the sector.

Agency's response: 1 Dec 2023

Title has been harmonized throughout.

The need to adjust beneficiary numbers is well noted. The targets, along with the areas of restoration and the number of enterprises targeted has been adjusted accordingly.

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

Secretariat's Comments

29 Oct 2023 :

Yes, we note the project's plan to include -specific considerations of gender dynamics in the project target systems, and mobilizing direct investment into gender-responsive interventions that specifically target empowerment of women and other vulnerable groups. However, please further strengthen the mainstreaming of gender elements across all the project components which should reflect the gender needs in target sectors and

intervention areas. A gender assessment and analysis should be prepared to further inform the project design.

Knowledge management: There is an output related to knowledge, however, the mechanism for establishing an effective knowledge management and learning system across the project is not clearly incorporated in the design. Please elaborate.

We note the funding allocated to M&E in the project information table, however the proposed activities are not fully reflected in the project description or components. That said, there's reference to a long-term monitoring programme to track project performance indicators and identify best practices for high-impact investments specific practices in output 1.4. Please further clarify the linkage to the M&E.

27Nov2023 :

Thank for the additional details and clarification. Comment cleared subject to preparation of the gender assessment and knowledge management plan at CEO stage.

Additional PPO Comments :

Knowledge Management: Please include plans to develop and implement a communication strategy for the project, including outreach, awareness raising and dissemination of project outputs/results/lessons.

01Dec2023:

Thank you for addressing additional comments. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Gender: the need for a gender assessment is well noted and has been planned as part of the PPG phase of project development. The gender assessment will guide specific entry points for integrating gender-responsiveness into the project components.

Knowledge Management: The specific processes for establishing the long-term knowledge management and learning platform (under Output 1.5) requires deeper engagement with local stakeholders ? particularly the EPA who will play the key coordinating role at the central government level. It is intended that the platform will build on existing systems wherever possible ? particularly the EPA's Environmental Knowledge Management System ? as well as leveraging the efforts of other recent projects that are also contributing to the knowledge system at a more sector-specific level (particularly related to the coastal zone). Under the systems-based approach, the proposed project will seek to integrate lessons across multiple sectors into a single, coordinated knowledge system. Additional detail has been added to the PIF to describe these elements of the design consideration (Page 19).

M&E: A section on M&E has been added after Component 3 (Page 27). The long-term monitoring programme will be partly integrated into the project M&E ? in that it will

monitor the project indicators ? but is also intended to stand alone in the long term to follow and track the success of interventions beyond the project period, particularly for NbS that often only fully yield their benefits beyond the 5-year project period.

Agency's response: 1 Dec 2023

Output 1.5 has been adjusted to include a general communication strategy. (This has also been reflected on Page 19 of the offline PIF document, uploaded to Roadmap section)

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

29Oct2023 :

a) Yes

b) Yes

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Noted

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

29Oct2023 :

In general, yes. The proposal adequately describes the climate vulnerabilities and adaptation rationale for the interventions for the fisheries and agriculture sectors. We also recognize that the project interventions would indirectly impact and potentially contribute to developing ecotourism, however the proposal doesn't provide sufficient adaptation related-justification for LDCF investment in the sector; particularly on the vulnerabilities of communities that rely on the ecotourism sector for their livelihoods. The rationale that an underdeveloped tourism industry represents a barrier to adaptation in Liberia could be further strengthened. Please consider elaborating further..

b) Please provide a brief articulation of "enablers".

27Nov2023 :

Thank you for the additional details. Comment cleared

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Ecotourism: Please refer to the response to comment 3.1 for details on the nature of proposed Eco-tourism Activities under the project. The justification for LDCF investment in the sector centers on its role as a climate-resilient alternative livelihood. The vulnerability being targeted is not specifically of those already engaged in ecotourism, but the communities in general that rely on natural resources of their livelihoods. Given that unsustainable livelihood practices are a core driver of environmental degradation, which exacerbates climate vulnerability in rural communities of Liberia, an alternative livelihood strategy that reduces pressure on scarce resources and incentivizes conservation is essential to building sustainable resilience through nature-based solutions. Ecotourism falls under this umbrella.

The inclusion of ecotourism as a core livelihood option stems from the significant, yet largely untapped, potential of the sector in the country. Liberia has abundant natural resources, boasting two natural forest reserves, wetlands and mangroves, and biological and landscape diversity. Currently, one of the most attractive natural sites for ecotourism in Liberia is the Kpatawee Waterfalls, which is managed by a local community, demonstrating the potential for community-based development of the sector. While the barriers facing ecotourism are well recognized, examples such as the Kpatawee Waterfalls demonstrate that options are available for overcoming the barriers ? especially when targeting local and/or regional, as opposed to international tourism. This site is popular among Liberians who regularly engage in events and activities, despite limited basic facilities and services. Other natural sites in Liberia that have ecotourism potential are the cultural villages (e.g. Behsao), Edina and Libassa lodge. Libassa lodge already sees some ecotourism attraction. In 2014, international tourism generated US\$91 million for Liberia [1]. Nevertheless, Liberia tourism/eco-tourism potential is grossly under-utilized.

Ecotourism in the region will create significant employment potential while also boosting the local economy. It has the potential for generating income for conservation programs for regional ecosystems and supporting local communities living in remote and rural areas through direct and indirect income. The implementation of ecotourism can lead to increased economic value of the ecosystem services that protected areas provide. By building ecosystem resilience, the quality of natural capital improves thereby creating

incentives for local stakeholders to participate and build constituencies for conservation, locally, nationally, and internationally. If implemented well, ecotourism also promotes sustainable use of natural resources and reduces threats to biodiversity. Potential ecotourism actions are identified below (Included on page 21):

- ? Develop tourism experiences/products, and a certain percentage of the revenue earned will be spent on tour guides, local communities, attraction sites, lodges, eating houses and souvenir shops. Another metric for measuring the success will be monitoring the number of livelihood opportunities created for women and youth, to ensure that this ecosystem will sustain beyond the duration of this project.
- ? Technical training and capacity building towards biodiversity knowledge in flora and fauna of Coastal and inland counties.
- ? Empower the community towards ownership of enterprises thereby having climate resilient jobs and reducing their dependence on agricultural produce and fisheries.
- ? Training for women-led private sector entities/consortia in business management, entrepreneurship, marketing, and branding while also providing vocational skills through partnerships with TEVET.

Enablers: Several enablers have been described after the barriers. (Page 13 in the word document uploaded but also in GEF portal itself)

[1] <https://faolex.fao.org/docs/pdf/lbr190132.pdf>

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

29Oct2023 :

- a) The project proposes a systems-based approach to leverage best practices from multiple sectors in a single, integrated system. While comprehensive in itself, there's no indication of why the approach was selected over other potential options. Please address.
- b) Yes
- c) Yes.
- d) Yes

27Nov2023 :

Thank you for addressing the comment. Cleared.

Additional Comments on stakeholders:

Stakeholder Engagement: It is noted that the project has provided additional information on stakeholder consultation in project design. However, the submitted information is hard to follow (i.e. screenshots from zoom meetings) in the portal section on stakeholder engagement. Please consider providing a more succinct summary and list of names and dates of consultations.

01Dec2023

Thank you for providing additional details on knowledge management. Comment cleared.

02Dec2023:

- Stakeholder Engagement: We note the removal of the screenshots from the portal section, however please provide a brief summary and list of names and dates of consultations in the portal section. Kindly elaborate more clearly and indicate representatives of different stakeholders groups. Please also write in full the acronyms

04DEC2023

Agency has provided details on stakeholder consultations included list of stakeholders met.

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Noted. Additional detail on the reasoning for selecting the systems-based approach has been added to the end of the 'Project Approach' sub-section of the ToC. (Page 15)

Agency's response: 1 Dec 2023

The stakeholder report has been refined to include a short overview and summary tables. The workshops minutes have also been adjusted to clarify the attendance.

Agency's response: 04 December 2023

The design of the project was informed and guided by close engagements with key stakeholders throughout the development process. This approach used three primary channels of engagement, namely two engagement workshops in June and July 2023, weekly coordination calls throughout the design process and a questionnaire distributed to stakeholders in June 2023. These followed internal Government-UNDP meetings that, prior to the design of the PIF, identified and agreed on the sectoral focus of the project. Specifically, UNDP and EPA at the country level had a meeting on 23 March to agree on the project sectoral focus as well as a road-map for PIF development, including timelines. Following these basic engagements to frame the project direction and approach,

stakeholder engagements were held to inform project design. A summary of the engagement process is now included in the Portal as requested, while Annex G of the PIF provides details.

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

29Oct2023 :

a) We note that the project objective in the TOC is different from that in the information table. Please reconcile. Also add a discussion in the TOC narrative on why the project's casual pathways are necessary to achieve the project objective, particularly with regards to the ecotourism sector.

b) Outputs

1.4 Please clarify how the capacity development will be integrated into the core training mechanisms within the Ministry of Agriculture's extension service programme. Provide additional explanation on the refresher training for existing staff. How would this be ensured beyond the project?

1.5: Please provide additional clarity on the long-term monitoring programme.

2.2 Please clarify the adaptation benefits to the communities through the proposed unique travel experiences within the natural spaces

3.1 Please provide additional explanation on the challenge program funding windows including the timeline, and call for proposal mechanism

27Nov2023 :

Thank you for addressing the comments and additional details on ecotourism activities and the proposed challenge program funding window. Comment cleared subject to further explanation at CEO stage.

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

A) The Objective statement has been revised (see response to 3.1 above) in the ToC diagram (Page 16) and is now aligned across all instances in the PIF. An additional statement on the causal pathways has been added to the end of the ToC narrative, integrated with the response on the selection of the systems-based approach (comment 4.2) (Page 15).

B)

1.4: There is an existing Central Agriculture Research Institute in Liberia which provides training in extension services. The training programmes initiated through this project will be integrated with into the CARI systems. Through their operation, CARI is expected to provide refresher trainings for extension services beyond the project life span. (Clarified on pages 18 and 19).

1.5: Additional details on the long-term monitoring programme available at this stage have been added to the Output description (Page 21). This includes details of integration with the project M&E, the role of EPA in maintaining the system beyond the project and detail on the knowledge management systems that will be targeted. During the next phase of project development, further engagements will be held to identify additional partners (for example research institutes) that could be brought on board for long-term monitoring.

2.2: The adaptation benefits of ecotourism development come from several factors, which have been further described in the PIF (Page 21) as follows: Development of the ecotourism sector and capitalizing on the global demand for sustainable tourism offerings will have multiple adaptation benefits, including: i) incentivising the conservation of natural spaces and the ecosystem services that safeguard communities from climate change impacts; ii) driving local demand for sustainably produced products ? thereby strengthening value chains and incentivising the climate-resilient practices promoted under Component 1; iii) attracting tourism income into the local economy, building overall community resilience.

3.1: Additional detail has been added (Page 24) as follows:

Call for proposal mechanism process includes shortlisting ventures based on 5 criteria;

1. Whether business/venture is registered;
2. Has financial/revenue statement and
? Reported the last 12 months of sale
? Requested an amount from the Growth Accelerator Programme
3. Has been in business for at least 6 months
4. Owner(s) have a full-time employment status in the business venture;
5. Business/venture is working in the sector for which call for proposal has been made

Previously, in 2021 for the first cohort, a five-member Independent Investment Committee (IIC) made up of stakeholders from the Central Bank and business community were setup to screen and select 10 semi-finalists. For final pitching event, business development workshops, bootcamps and training were also conducted for the semi-finalist. During the final pitching event, semi-finalists pitched their growth plan to a six-person high-level judging panel comprising of senior experts in development, agriculture, banking, education, and law. The high-level judging panel assessed the semi-finalists based on 6 criteria;

1. Business model strength;
2. Financials;
3. Investibility;
4. Marketing plan;

5. Implementation plan; and
6. Scalability

Of the 10 semi-finalists, 5 finalists were selected for Cohort-I.

The Call for Proposal mechanism for SARTLA project is expected to be similar to Cohort-I. Timeline for the proposed GEF project is expected to be during the first 12-18 months (Year 1 and Year 2 of project implementation period) so that there is enough time to implement the selected ventures and achieve intended impact within the project implementation period. More accurate timeline will be scoped out during PPG phase.

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

29Oct2023 :

No Please address the comment on the lack of directly targeting climate vulnerability drivers as relates to the ecotourism sector and consider restructuring and strengthening. The incremental reasoning will benefit from clear alignment with GEF 8 LDCF priorities such as scaling up finance, whole of society approach and private sector and innovation.

27Nov2023 :

Thank you for addressing the comments. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Please see responses on ecotourism under Questions 3.1 and 4.1. The livelihood development approach adopted for the ecotourism components of the project are designed a part of the system-based approach, tying in closely with the three LDCF priority areas with which the project will align. Specifically, ecotourism is envisioned to be a component of the private sector engagement to scale finance for adaptation, as well as forming a key aspect of the whole-of-society approach, creating interconnected livelihoods and value chains that incentivize collective action.

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

29Oct2023 :

a) No. Please indicate where the institutional arrangement and coordination framework for this project is described in the PIF, to enable review of the same.

c) Yes

d) Not fully. Please address as per comments in 3 above

27Nov2023 :

Thank you for addressing the comments. cleared

Additional PPO comments: In section 'Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project', we note that UNDP is expected to play an execution role in this project, however, the LoE does not refer to UNDP as the executing partner, neither there is a letter of support from OFP for this. Please consider removing any mention of UNDP executing the project (this can be re-instated during the implementation phase if needed but by following the established procedure for an Implementing Agency to carry out executing functions).

01Dec2023:

Thank you for addressing the comments. Cleared

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Institutional Setting: The institutions that will be engaged in implementation, along with their individual roles, are outlined in the Stakeholders table (Page 27). Additional details have been added to outline the overall implementation and oversight roles.

Knowledge and Learning: Please see responses to Comment 3.2 above.

Agency's response: 1 Dec 2023

The mention of UNDP as provider of execution support has been removed. Following the indication of capacity gaps that may negatively affect project implementation, the PPG phase will make a detailed assessment of these gaps and options for entities to provide any support needed in line with the GEF policy and in consultation with the GEF Secretariat.

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

29Oct2023 :

a) Yes. Please revise the sectors coverage indicated in meta information to include Fisheries sector as well

b) Yes

27Nov2023 :

Comment cleared

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Well noted. Fisheries has been extracted from Agriculture and added under ?Other?.

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

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments N/A

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

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

29Oct2023 :

a) Yes

b) No. Please include risks that may affect the project preparation and implementation phases.

c) An Environment and Social screening checklist was submitted.

27Nov2023 :

Thank you for addressing comments. cleared

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

The risks that affect project preparation and implementation are included in the table on Page 28 to 30. Additional risks related to project preparation have been added.

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

29Oct2023 :

- a) Yes the project aims to promote innovate financial mechanism to unlock private sector engagement in the agriculture and fisheries sector, while deploying nature based solutions and climate resilient practices.
- b) Yes
- c) Partly unclear. Please explain further how this project will improve policy coherence in the sectors presented.

27Nov2023 :

Thank you for the additional details. Comment cleared subject to further explanation at CEO stage.

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Policy Coherence: The project does not target changing policies to ensure coherence, but rather focuses on building institutional capacity for cross-sectoral coordination and

integrated management of the agro-ecological landscape through the establishment of a coordination mechanism under Output 1.1 of PIF. Moreover, whilst the project is not direct targeting policies, the interventions will make important contributions to policy implementation across agriculture, fisheries and ecotourism sectors, among others, and lessons from these initiatives will create an evidence based (Output 1.5) that will inform future policy coherence if the need exists.

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

29Oct2023 :

Partly. The proposal mentions the alignment with two LDCF priorities of private sector/innovation and scaling up finance. The project also has the potential to align with the whole of society approach, given its multi-sectoral and integrated approach, please consider adding this and embed it in the project rationale and components.

27Nov2023 :

Thank you for addressing the comment. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Noted. The 'whole of society' approach has been added (Page 30) and the concept has been brought into the project approach description. (Page 15)

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

29Oct2023 :

Yes, the proposal lists relevant national policies and strategies. Please provide a sentence or two on how the project aligns with these national priorities.

27Nov2023 :

Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

A note has been added for each policy/strategy to clarify how and where the proposed project aligns or contributes to the strategy objectives (Page 31).

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 N/A

Agency's Comments N/A

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

29Oct2023 :

Yes

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Noted

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

Secretariat's Comments

29Oct2023 :

Not fully. The proposal mentions a stakeholder engagement workshop conducted in June 2023. Please consider submitting a report of this workshop including list of participants.

27Nov2023 :

Thank for providing additional details on stakeholder consultation process. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Well noted. A report on stakeholder engagement workshops has been added to the package in Annex G pages 37 to 42 and included in the Stakeholder section in the GEF portal

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 Comments

29Oct2023 :

Yes

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Noted

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

29Oct2023 :

Yes

Agency's Comments

Agency's Comments: 28 Nov 2023

Noted

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments **Yes**

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Noted

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments N/A

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments N/A

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments N/A

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 Yes.

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

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Noted.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?(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,

27Nov2023 :

Yes, the new LOE for the revised PIF has been submitted.

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Noted.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Yes

27Nov2023 :

Yes

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Noted.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Yes

27Nov2023 :

Yes

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Noted.

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 N/A

Agency's Comments N/A

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

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Noted.

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

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

Noted.

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments N.A

Agency's Comments N/A

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments N/A

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 N.A

Agency's Comments N/A

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

Not yet. The OFP has submitted a request for the agency to revise the budget and scope of the project. Agency is requested to submit revised PIF and new LoE.

27Nov2023 :

Yes, PIF and PPG recommended for technical clearance. Agency has revised the PIF budget, and project design adopts an integrated approach that is technically sound to address the adaptation needs of the target community.

01Dec2023:

Yes. Agency has addressed all comments including PPO's.

02Dec2023:

Agency to fully address comments on stakeholder engagement.

Agency's Comments

Agency's response: 27 Nov 2023

The budget has been adjusted to \$10M and the PIF has been adjusted accordingly. A new LoE has been provided.

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	11/1/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/28/2023	

PIF Review

Agency Response

Additional Review (as necessary)

12/1/2023

Additional Review (as necessary)

12/2/2023

Additional Review (as necessary)