

# Building climate-resilient livelihoods and food systems

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10793

**Countries**

Lesotho

**Project Name**

Building climate-resilient livelihoods and food systems

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

10/3/2022

**Review completed by PM**

11/22/2022

**Program Manager**

Jason Spensley

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

FSP

# PIF

## CEO Endorsement

### Part I ? Project Information

#### Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3 October 2022:

Yes

Agency Response

**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

5 November 2022:

Cleared

3 October 2022:

Please clearly indicate any changes made to the project structure/design from the approved PIF, including to the components, outcomes, outputs, and indicators. If any changes have been made, please explain why these changes are needed.

Agency Response

03 November 2022:

A table that compares and describes minor changes made to the project structure is now included in the project document section 1.8.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 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

22November2022:

Cleared

14November2022:

Please provide more info of each investment mobilized entry under Investment Mobilized description section.

We note one co-financing letter was provided by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security for multiple types of co-finance.

5 November 2022:

The co-financing letters are still not uploaded in the appropriate place in the CER. Please do so.

3 October 2022:

Please provide letters for all sources of co-finance.

We note with concern that the GEF Agency co-finance indicated in the approved PIF has been reduced from \$2 million to \$604,000. Please every effort is made to maintain the level of agency co-financing indicated in the approved PIF, and explain the reason and implications of any unfortunate necessary reductions in the CER.

## Agency Response

03 November 2022:

All co-financing letters, from the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS), the Ministry of Water (MoW) and FAO, were provided.

FAO co-financing total is \$2,195,000, slightly more than that indicated at PIF stage.

**18 November 2022:**

- Info on each investment mobilized now provided.
- Yes, there is one letter from the Ministry of Agriculture, as per accepted practice.

### **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

5 November 2022:

Cleared

3 October 2022:

Pending response to the comment above laying out all changes to the project structure that have been made from the PIF.

## Agency Response

03 November 2022:

Changes to the structure are described in section 1.8.

### **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

29 November 2022:

Cleared

28 November 2022:

Whereas there is an explanation of what HR inputs and contracts comprises, there is no description of what Non-expandable Procurement entails ? please amend.

14 November 2022:

PPG report: please clarify what (i) HR inputs; (ii) contracts and (iii) Non-expandable Procurement entails.

### Agency Response

**29 November 2022:**

Thank you for spotting this mistake. The cost associated with the capacity assessment of the Executing Partner was incorrectly charged to non-expendable procurement. Now correctly reflected under contracts. No non-expendable procurement line.

**18 November 2022:**

The HR inputs cover the costs associated with hiring PPG consultants. Specifically, the PPG document indicates the composition of the PPG team as follows: a GEF Project Design Specialist and experts in various areas such as Climate impact assessment, PPG Coordination/KM/stakeholder engagement, Policy and Institutions, Agricultural water management, Sustainable agriculture, Value-chain/Finance/Private sector, Gender and socio-economics and, lastly, Environment and social safeguards. Contracts line covers for the costs associated with the OPIM Capacity Assessment of the identified Executing Partner.

### 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

5 November 2022:

Cleared

3 October 2022:

We note with concern the significant reduction in impact ambition for core indicators 1 and 4 from the approved PIF to this version of the CER. We also note there has been a reduction in impact ambition from PIF to CER for other recent LDCF projects in which FAO is the Agency. Please make every reasonable effort to keep the same impact ambition levels as indicated in the approved PIF. If after all reasonable efforts an unfortunate reduction is necessary please detail why there has to be a reduction in impact anticipated at the PIF stage, including a detailed explanation of what conditions have changed that necessitate such a reduction in impact with the same budget amount from the LDCF.

#### Agency Response

03 November 2022:

Considering that the project will reach beyond the 8 selected micro-watersheds, the level of impact will be at least that estimated at PIF stage. Corrected.

#### **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

5 November 2022:

Cleared

3 October 2022:

Yes. However, there is some issues with the left hand margin in this section of the CER document (margin is too far to the left in some places and there double text overwritten in other places). Please fix this.

Agency Response Fixed, thanks.

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

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3 October 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

3 October 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

5 November 2022:

Cleared

3 October 2022:

Some of the climate information and justification that was included in the PIF has not been included in the CER (e.g. the useful table on key climate change hazards, the graphs on historical precipitation and temperature, etc.). For example, Why? As a result, the climate information and rationale is more limited in the CER than it could and should be. Please ensure the material on climate information and rationale is robust, and explain if any information needs to be removed that was in the PIF, and why.

Agency Response

03 November 2022:

A full climate risk assessment was conducted during PPG. A summary of the climate information, including graphs (climate variability and climate change projections and impacts), that expands and improves on PIF information, is presented under section 1.1 (paragraphs 12 to 21), with the full report in Annex I.

STAP recommended that we go beyond the simplified graphs and statements and present more than one scenario, which is what we have done.

A table summarizing climate hazards and impacts is included in the revised project document.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5 November 2022:  
Cleared

3 October 2022:

The section explaining "without the intervention" would be strengthened by a more in depth explanation of how food security, agricultural productivity, livelihoods, etc., will be highly vulnerable to climate impacts; as well as reflect on this in the section explaining "with the intervention".

Please note the comments above on co-finance.

Agency Response

03 November 2022:

This section has been strengthened. Please also see section 1.1 ? which provides a much detailed description (along with Annex I) of climate variability and change impacts ? and vulnerability of agri-food systems and livelihoods.

See above.

**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

5 November 2022:  
Cleared

3 October 2022:

Please expand on adaptation benefits, beyond simply listing the impact figures that are already indicated elsewhere in the CER.

Agency Response

03 November 2022:

Expanded, thanks.

**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

5 November 2022:  
Cleared



3 October 2022:

Regarding sustainability and potential for scale up, please expand on how specifically the "anchors" listed will result in sustainability and scaling up.

Agency Response

03 November 2022:

Subsection augmented as suggested ? to explain how the anchors will result in sustainability and scale-up.

**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

3 October 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

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

5 November 2022:

Cleared

3 October 2022:

We note there is a section of stakeholders titled "NGOs, CBOs, and Private Sector" and another labelled "Private Sector". Why is private sector listed twice? Please clarify or correct.

Agency Response Corrected.

**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

3 October 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

5 November 2022:

Cleared

3 October 2022:

This section is quite thin, particularly noting the comment in the PIF review sheet to strengthen private sector engagement aspects during project preparation. Please do so, and reflect this both in this section, as well as the project outcome and outputs. For example, there seems to be value and scope to expand on point "c - Finance". Also,

please note micro enterprises and smallholder farmers are also considered private sector actors.

Agency Response

03 November 2022:

The section has been strengthened, thanks.

**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

5 November 2022:

Cleared

3 October 2022:

Please include consideration of risks due to the COVID 19 pandemic.

Agency Response

03 November 2022:

Done, thanks.

**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

3 October 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

5 November 2022:

Cleared

3 October 2022:

Please ensure consideration of priorities emerging from Lesotho's adaptation planning process, including with support from GCF (see here:

<https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/strengthening-lesotho-s-capacity-advance-national-adaptation-planning-process>).

Agency Response

03 November 2022:

National adaptation planning with GCF support was delayed due to COVID-19. Was recently confirmed with Lesotho Meteorological Services (NDA).

Consideration of the National Climate Change Policy (2017-2027) has been included.

**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

3 October 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

3 October 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

3 October 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

5 November 2022:

Cleared

3 October 2022:

No. This section is very thin. Please strengthen.

Agency Response

03 November 2022:

The section has been strengthened.

## Annexes

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

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5 November 2022:

Cleared

3 October 2022:

Regarding the budget:

- Please explain why 3 different international consultant expertise are needed. Please reconsider the number, duration, and monthly cost, or detail the differing roles and need for each.
- The expense for Regional Technical Advisors is extreme. What is their specific role in this project, and how is it essential and different from all the other consultant and staff roles listed.
- Please clarify why have "community consultation logistics expenses" been placed under travel, and what this will involve specifically.

#### Agency Response

03 November 2022:

1. The project design had foreseen the engagement of Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) and two other international experts (value chain development and agriculture water experts). The identification of the experts was informed by the fact that the project puts a lot of emphasis on agrifood value chain development and agriculture water management for climate change adaptation. These areas of expertise and competence are seriously lacking in Lesotho, hence the need to engage international/regional expertise.

Point taken about the number and duration of the roles - reconfiguration of the expertise and competences of the CTA to include agriculture water management, elimination of the agriculture water management consultant and reducing the duration of the value chain, finance and private sector expert. ToRs of these positions are included in Annex P.

2. What is currently described as Regional Technical Advisors should rightly be called Regional Technical Multi-stakeholder Engagement Specialist based at district level. They are critical for facilitating stakeholder engagement, which is crucial for the successful implementation of the project - particularly in the development and implementation of the integrated catchment management and adaptation plans. ToR in Annex P.

3. The project foresees major investment in training and technical capacity development for beneficiary communities. This entails bringing beneficiaries to central places for training, which will invariably involve overnight stays given the terrain and associated complex travel logistic in these areas. The project also plans to facilitate peer to peer learning through farmer field schools, exchange visits beneficiary communities and study tours to areas of excellences. The proposed budget will cater for travel/transport reimbursements including payment of incidental allowances for overnight stays. This travel budget is therefore complementary to the training budget.

### **Project Results Framework**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

29 November 2022:

Cleared

28 November 2022:

Results Framework Table still is off the margins. Please amend ? otherwise the table will not be readable when posted on the web. Please let the GEF Secretariat know if you would like to be put in touch with GEF Portal IT staff in order to help ensure this formatting feature can be uploaded correctly.

14 November 2022:

- Results Framework table is off margin from the look of the Portal entry.

#### Agency Response

**29 November 2022:**

Re-entered. It looks to be within portal margins.

**18 November 2022:**

Results framework re-entered.

### **GEF Secretariat comments**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

22November2022:

Cleared, pending any remaining comments on policy alignment.

14 November 2022:

Please address the remaining comments highlighted in yellow.

5 November 2022:

Please upload the evidence letters for all sources of cofinance.

3 October 2022:

Please address all comments.

Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

22November2022:

Cleared

14 November 2022

Comment from German Council Member is not responded in Annex B ?  
please ask include.

Agency Response

**18 November 2022:**

Response to German Council Member included in Annex B.

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3 October 2022:

Yes

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**



Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3 October 2022:

Yes

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3 October 2022:

Yes

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

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 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 N/A

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	10/5/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	11/5/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	11/7/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	11/14/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	11/22/2022	

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**