

Increased resilience and adaptive capacity of the most vulnerable communities to climate change in Forested Guinea

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10160

Countries

Guinea

Project Name

Increased resilience and adaptive capacity of the most vulnerable communities to climate change in Forested Guinea

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

7/16/2021

Review completed by PM

11/14/2022

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

GEFSEC 5Nov2022:

Cleared

GEFSEC 7Dec2021:

On project information: the expected implementation start/ completion dates do not match the duration of the project ? please adjust the expected implementation start and the expected completion date, so the elapsed time between one and another is 60 months.

Agency Response

UNDP, 4 November 2022: The expected implementation start and completion dates have been adjusted accordingly (March 2023 to March 2028, 60 months).

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
GEFSEC 15Oct2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 22July2021:

Please note the comments in Part II on knowledge management, and include relevant considerations in this section.

Agency Response

UNDP, 23 September 2021: The knowledge management and sharing activities are located in the output 1.5 knowledge platform and replication strategy. This section has been completed (see page 14 of the CEO endorsement request).

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 15Oct2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 22July2021:

Section E of Part 1 indicates this project includes non grant instruments. Please note that indicating "yes" to this question is relevant only for projects that will be supported under the GEF Non-Grant Instrument window, which is not the case for this project as it is supported by the LDCF. Please revise the response to this question from "Yes" to "No".

Agency Response

UNDP, 23 September 2021: This was a mistake at submission in the portal. Corrected.

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

GEFSEC 5Nov2022:

Cleared

GEFSEC 7Dec2021:

- Unable to locate any co-financing letters translated in English. Please upload English translated versions.
- Unable to locate the UNDP co-financing letter. English translated version is required.
-

GEFSEC 22July2021:

Please complete the section "Describe how any Investment Mobilized was identified". Please also provide a description of changes from the PIF.

Agency Response

UNDP, 4 November 2022: A translation in English of the co-financing letters is now part of the re-submission.

UNDP, 23 September 2021: Two sections (how investment was identified and main changes from the PIF) have been added in pages 4 and 5 of the CEO endorsement request.

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

GEFSEC 5Nov2022:

Cleared

GEFSEC 7Dec2021:

There is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 4.9%, for a co-financing of \$27,100,00 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,327,900 instead of \$1,000,000 (which is 3.7%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution should be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please consider opportunities to either increase the co-financing portion and/or by reduce the GEF portion.

GEFSEC 15Oct2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 22July2021:

With regards to the project budget uploaded as an Excel document in the Road Map section with the title "PIMS 6016 New GEF templated by Jul 9 2021":

- Please provide further information on Materials and Goods required for Component 1 (row 7), including the type and further cost breakdown of seeds and agriculture tools totaling \$620,000 for all years.
- There appears to be a miscalculation in row 9. The description in column P indicates \$7,000 for year 1 and a total of \$32,000, while column I indicates \$77,000 for year 1 and column N indicates a total of \$102,000.
- In row 16, we note the indication of 2 vehicles at \$80,00, as well as the purchase of 9 motorcycles at \$270,000 indicated in row 18. We also note row 10 includes \$62,100 for use of vehicles and fuel charge, and several other rows indicate further expenses for use of vehicles. This seems excessive, particularly the purchase of 2 new vehicles at \$40,000 each, as well as 9 motorcycles. Please consider opportunities to reduce.
- With regards to row 25 and the vulnerability study and mapping of climate risks valued at \$350,000, this seems quite high. Please consider opportunities to reduce or explain this amount, and ensure a thorough dissemination and uptake strategy is budgeting within this amount including with national and subnational government officials, private sector actors and local community groups and individual producers.

Agency Response

UNDP, 4 November 2022: The PMC co-financing has been revised and corresponds to 5% of the component co-financing. The components' co-financing is 26,750,000 USD,

the PMC co-financing is 1,350,000 USD (5% of the component's co-financing) for a total project co-financing of 28,100,000 USD.

UNDP, 23 September 2021: The Excel document has been updated:

- Row 7: improved seeds represents 100,000\$ per year starting in year 2 (an average of 4\$ per kg, and 50kg needed per ha, and an objective of 500 ha per year); and the agricultural tools (tiller, seed drill, seed cleaner, ridgers etc.) represent a total of 230,000\$ as follow: 70,000 \$ in year 2, 70,000 \$ in year 3, 70,000 \$ in year 4 and 20,000 \$ in year 5.
- Row 8: There is no miscalculation. In year 1 (column I), there is an expense of 70,000\$ for material (computer, printer, etc.) and expenses of 7,000\$ for local radios and communication tools. Hence a total of 77,000\$ in year 1. In years 2 to 5, there are only expenses for local radios and communication tools of 25,000\$ (7,000 \$ in year 2, 6,000 \$ in year 3, 6,000 \$ in year 4 and 6,000 \$ in year 5). Hence the total amount is 102,000\$.The description in column P has been revised accordingly to clarify.
- Rows 17, 19 and 26: After careful deliberation the number of vehicles have been reduced. The project will purchase only 1 vehicle and 4 motorcycles that are essential and required at minimum given the remote location of the targeted project interventions. The budget for use of vehicle and fuel charge has accordingly been reduced to 70,000\$.
- Row 25: the vulnerability study itself costs 200,000\$ as it covers a territorial approach (the whole forested Guinea) and a sectorial approach focused on agriculture. The budget for the dissemination and uptake strategy is 100,000\$, as it includes material production for farmers and 5 workshops at the local level in the communes, 1 at the regional level and 1 at the national level. Hence the total of this key activity is now 300,000\$.

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

GEFSEC 22July2021:

Yes

Agency Response

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
GEFSEC 22November2021:

Cleared, pending further comment by policy colleagues.

GEFSEC5Nov2021:

The indicators annex in excel approved at the PIF stage indicates 650,000 direct beneficiaries, but the figure within the CEO Endorsement table indicates only 42,000. Please revert to the figure already approved at the PIF stage, and also double check all other indicator figures.

GEFSEC15Oct2021:

Thank you for the increase to number of hectares. Since the comment below made on 22 July, the Portal has developed the ability to indicate the CCA Core Indicators directly into the CER. Kindly do so and thank you for your understanding.

GEFSEC 22July2021:

We note there are indicator figures for the Trust Fund indicator 11. Please remove figures for this Trust Fund indicator in order to avoid double counting with the indicator figures conveyed in the CCA Results Framework which has been provided as a document uploaded in the Road Map section.

Please upload an updated CCA Results Framework as a document in the Road Map section, reflecting any updates on expected results levels for each indicator. In doing so, we suggest considering opportunity to increase the level of ambition for the number of number of hectares (CCA core indicator 2) from the level of 10,000 indicated at the PIF stage. CCA Results Framework as a document in the Road Map section, reflecting any updates on expected results levels for each indicator. In doing so, please consider opportunities to increase the level of ambition for the number of number of hectares (CCA core indicator 2) from the level of 10,000 indicated at the PIF stage.

Agency Response

UNDP, 12 November 2021: the number of directly beneficiaries has been updated to **651,800 people**, which corresponds to the 14,000 households directly supported by the project (equivalent to 118,680 people with an average of 6.9 people per households in rural Forested Guinea), and also to the 33,120 entrepreneurs trained and supported,

and also the 500,000 beneficiaries of the climate information services introduced by this project.

The difference between the total number of direct beneficiaries (core indicator 1) in GEF Portal which is 618,680 vs the core indicators excel file which is 651,800 is, we believe, due to the different computation between the two. In the first, 33,120 entrepreneurs trained and supported are not counted toward core indicator 1 whereas the latter does. The excel file has also been submitted in the 'roadmap' section of GEF Portal for ease of reference of the reviewer so as to review the beneficiary figures.

25 October 2021: This is noted. Core indicators have been entered into GEF Portal directly. The increase has already been incorporated into the Results Framework from the previous round.

UNDP, 23 September 2021: Figure for the Trust Fund indicator 11 has been removed.

The CCA results frameworks has been updated and the indicator on the number of hectares under CSA practices has been made consistent throughout the CEO endorsement request: 20,000 ha.

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

GEFSEC 5Nov2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 15Oct2021:

Thank you for the indication that the comments on climate adaptation rationale considering a scenario of RCP 8.5 has been added to page 8 of the CER. However, page 8 of the CER appears as a table for section. Please clarify what specific section was added to and highlight the new text in yellow. Also, please ensure all essential information is included in the GEF CER and not just the UNDP PRODOC, including/particularly as to how the project interventions are designed to address these scenarios of climate impact.

GEFSEC 22July2021:

We note the optimistic projection that Forested Guinea will warm by 1.5 C by 2050 and 2.0 C by 2070. Kindly indicate what RCP modeling scenario this level of temperature increase is based on. We also strongly encourage including analysis of the risks of climate hazards and impacts based on a more pessimistic scenario (perhaps 4.5 RCP and 8.5 RCP to 2050 as UNDP has used in other recent LDCF projects including ID 10178 for South Sudan), to be able to identify a range of potential impacts from climate hazards to be addressed by this project. In doing so, please expand on the anticipated impacts from specific climate hazards that this project is designed to address, and more directly correlate the interventions to cost effective ways to address these impacts. In other words, please deepen the explanation of the specific nature of the climate problem this project aims to address in order to ensure the interventions are targeted for maximum climate adaptation impact.

The focus and further information on expanding access to microfinance for smallholder farmers and SMEs to invest in their climate adaptation and resilience is appreciated. Please note the comments in section 3 of Part 1 below to be addressed in this and other sections on ensuring accessible microfinance loans to local producers for them to be able to invest in climate adaptation and resilient action, including through guaranteeing lines of credit or other means of supporting microfinance partners to be able to develop and provide accessible lending products of this nature.

Agency Response

25 October 2021, Please see Part II Project Justification > 1a. Project Description section of the CER in GEF Portal. The analysis concerning the RCP8.5 scenario have been highlighted under Section A.1, sub-section A.1.A in para 2, as well as the relevance of the action under Section A.1.C, barrier 1 in last para.

UNDP, 23 September 2021: The projection mentioned are based on 4.5RCP. Analysis from 8.5 RCP have been added page 12 to 14 in the PRODOC and mentioned page 8 of the CEO Endorsement request. Anticipated impacts of climate change (under 4.5 and 8.5RCP) are presented in section D and summarized in table 11 of the PRODOC.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 22July2021:

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
GEFSEC 5Nov2021:

Cleared.

GEFSEC 15Oct2021:

Thank you for the explanation below. However, please clarify what section is being referred to by page 14-15 in the CER, as new text does not show on what we see to be these pages. Please also ensure all relevant explanatory information appears in the GEF GEF, and not just the UNDP PRODOC.

GEFSEC 22July2021:

With regards to component 2, Output 2.1, given the challenge of access to capital for financial institutions to create lines of credit at accessible terms for small holder farmers and SMEs, please expand the explanation of how the guarantee to partner microfinance institutions will be funded and how LDCF project funds will be used to do so. For example, what is the rate of funds anticipated for the MFI to provide for the lines of credits vis-?-vis funds for the guarantee to be provided by the project. We encourage consideration of opportunities to provide a grant based guarantee to partner microfinance institutions targeting microlending products for climate change adaptation and resilience actions, either directly supported by this project or with partners. In case it is helpful for learning and knowledge sharing in final preparation of this project and its implementation, we offer the following examples by which guarantees of this nature has or is being achieved:

(i) Microfinance for EbA project which started in Latin America and has supported in West Africa: <https://unepmeba.org/>

(ii) Current project under preparation: <https://www.thegef.org/project/blended-finance-facility-climate-resilience-coffee-and-cacao-value-chains-cc-blend>

Agency Response

25 October 2021: Please see Part II: Project Justification > 1a. Project Description of the CER in GEF Portal. Information is highlighted under Section A.3, Component 2, Outcome 2 under Output 2.1.

UNDP, 23 September 2021: The partner microfinance will benefit from the LDCF project through 2 main activities:

- ? First, the project will provide technical assistance to develop innovative credit products and low value grant instruments to derisk credit lines.

- ? Second, the project will support the development of innovative credit products and the establishment of grants mechanism for the acquisition of CSA equipment to de-risk credit products for MFIs. The grants will enable the purchase of inputs for CSA practices and will be given directly to the beneficiaries. They will be monitored closely. The objective behind the establishment of such instruments will be to incentivize uptake of credit for CSA as a result of the lower interest rates in comparison to those currently prevalent in the field, which are in the order of 3.5 to 4% per month. Through the establishment of such instruments in partnership with banks, the project will aim to lower interest rates to approximately 1.5 to 2% per month. See pages 42 and 43 in the PRODOC (pages 16 and 17 in the CEO endorsement request).

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 22July2021:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 22July2021:

Please note the comment above in Part II on need to provide further information on Co-financing.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC5Nov2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 15Oct2021:

Please note the comment above with regards to question 7 of Part I on core indicators, and kindly including the indicator figures information in the newly established operability of the Portal.

GEFSEC 21July2021:

Please note the comment above with regards to question 7 of Part I on core indicators.

Agency Response

25 October 2021: This is noted. Core indicators have been entered directly into GEF Portal.

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

GEFSEC 22July2021:

With regards to innovation and financial sustainability, please provide further explanation of how the focus on strengthening the microfinance sector to provide accessible capital for transition to climate adaptation and resilience practices will be innovative and contribute to financial sustainability of localized adaptation action.

Agency Response

UNDP, 23 September 2021: Further explanation has been added pages 21 and 22 of the CEO Endorsement request.

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
GEFSEC 22July2021:

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
GEFSEC 5Nov2022:

Cleared

GEFSEC 7Dec2021:

It is well noted that the project submission includes a Stakeholder Engagement Plan. However, please provide further information on the stakeholder consultations carried out during project preparation.

GEFSEC 5Nov2021:

Cleared.

GEFSEC15Oct2021:

Thank you for the information on stakeholders engaged in the UNDP Produc. We are unable to find this in the CER, so please indicate where this is located in the CER.

GEFSEC 22July2021:

Please provide a detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase. Please ensure this includes detailed on engagement with specific local communities, as well as private sector actors including institutions who will be involved in the microfinance activities outlined in Project Component 2.

Agency Response

UNDP, 4 November 2022:

To formally launch the project design process, institutional and national representatives from relevant ministries, governmental agencies, civil society and financial partners who were convened into a virtual kick off meeting (25/06/2020) organised by UNDP to inform participants about the project; present consultants responsible for the development of the project document and provide opportunities for participants to share their suggestions. Thus, stakeholders at various levels: geographic (Forested Guinea and Conakry), governmental, institutional and development sector of the country were engaged during the design phase. In total, 387 people from the Prefectural, Rural communities, villages, sectoral and Research Centres levels were consulted through meetings and/or focus groups (33 in total) as follows:

? At the local level, 166 people governmental, local authorities, regional and prefectural services of agriculture, animal husbandry, beekeeping, crafts and weather services, associations and villagers representatives were met in the administrative centers of seven (7) targeted prefectures (Kissidougou, Gu?ck?dou, Macenta, Nz?r?kor?, Yomou, Lola, Beyla).

?, representatives as well as territorial administrators, heads of prefectural and regional services for the environment, water and forests;

? At the municipal level, (92) people representatives of the communities (mayors, municipal councillors, heads of Districts/neighbourhoods and sectors), close supervisory authorities (sub-prefects and assistant sub-prefects), municipal /sub-prefectural officials (general secretaries, receivers, civil status officer, water and forestry, agriculture and livestock officers, resource users, representatives of CSOs) were in 8 rural municipalities Y?nd?, Nongoa, Balizia, S?r?dou, Koul?, Di?ck?, Kokota, Bossou, Nionsomoridou);

? At the village level, 110 people including heads of sectors, heads of districts, notables, religious leaders, NGOs representatives, groups' members, youth and women's organizations, and resource users met in six villages (Bailian, Kolladou, Tokpata, Diawassou, Kissibou) met;

? At the research level, 19 researchers and technicians of the Agronomic Research Center for Forest Guinea (CRA-GF) Seredou, Bossou Environmental Research Center and Mont Nimba Environmental Management Center and Simandou) met.

Themes addressed in the discussions were among others the organization and functioning of local decision-making structures; past and ongoing projects in the region, peacebuilding and conflict dynamics and resolution processes, modes of land acquisition and transmission; institutions responsible for land management and use, channels of communication with communities; possible roles, concerns and power relations in resource management. The needs, priorities, interests of these various stakeholders which were gathered further informed and guided the context analysis and the development of the project.

In terms of financing, consultations were carried out with 17 private sector actors including banking and microfinance institutions as well as 74 actors from the local community businesses as :

? Five (5) banking institutions met:

- o 3 in forested Guinea (Ecobank in Gueckedou, Soci?t? G?n?rale and Afriland First Bank in Nz?r?kor?),
- o 2 in Conakry (FBNBank and Afriland First Bank);

? 12 microfinances institutions met:

- o 3 in Kissidougou (MUFFA, CR?DIT RURAL DE GUIN?E ET FINADEV),
- o 2 in Gueckedouou (CR?DIT RURAL DE GUIN?E ET FINADEV),
- o 3 in Macenta (MUFFA, CR?DIT RURAL DE GUIN?E ET FINADEV),
- o 4 in Nz?r?kor? (MUFFA, CR?DIT RURAL DE GUIN?E FINADEV ET YETE MALI),

- o The general management of the following institutions CR?DIT RURAL DE GUIN?E, FINADEV, YETE MALI and WAKILI) were also met in Conakry;

? Six (6) focus groups organized to inform and identify the needs and priorities of local communities including men, women and youth members of groups, Unions and Association as well as plan their engagement in the project thus ensuring their ownership of the project:

- o in Kissidougou: one (1) group discussion with 31 participants involved in agricultural activities (rice, corn, fonio and market gardening);
- o in Gueck?dou: two (2) group discussions conducted with 18 participants engaged in agricultural activities (rice, corn, fonio, coffee and market gardening),
- o in Macenta: One (1) group discussion conducted with 25 participants engaged in agricultural activities (coffee, banana, tuber rice, corn, fonio, and market gardening).

25 October 2021: The full stakeholder engagement plan has been re-uploaded as an annex to the 'Roadmap' section of the GEF Portal for this project. The executive summary has been provided in the Part II Project Justification > 2. Stakeholders of CER in GEF Portal.

More precisely, in the uploaded document, the stakeholder engaged during the project design phase has been provided under Chapter: Stakeholder Analysis, Sub-section B, with additional highlights in the last para.

UNDP, 23 September 2021: The stakeholders engaged during the PPG have been detailed in Annex 6 pages 113 to 130 of the PRODOC. The full report on consultations is also attached to the submission.

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

GEFSEC 5Nov2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC15July2021:

Similar to comments above, please include relevant information in the CER.

GEFSEC 22July2021:

Please include the Gender Analysis documentation in this sector and/or indicate where it is provided in the uploaded documents.

Agency Response

25 October 2021. The Gender Analysis Summary has been included in the Part II Project Justification > 3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment of CER in GEF Portal.

The full Gender Analysis and Action Plan (GAAP) has also been uploaded as an annex to the 'Roadmap' section of the GEF Portal for this project.

UNDP, 23 September 2021: The Gender Analysis is provided p.133 of the PRODOC PIMS 6016

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

GEFSEC 5Nov2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 15Oct2021:

Thank you for this relevant information below. However, similar to comments above, it is a requirement to include all relevant information in the CER.

GEFSEC 21July2021:

Please provide further information on the plans and extent of consultation and agreement reached with different microfinance actors.

Agency Response

25 October 2021

The responses above have been included in Part II Project Justification > 4. Private Sector Engagement of the CER in GEF Portal. Additionally, please see this information in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan which has been uploaded as an annex to the "Roadmap" section of GEF Portal.

UNDP, 23 September 2021: The following information are in the page 117 of the PRODOC. The following consultations have been carried out:

? 5 banking institutions have been met: 3 in forested Guinea (Ecobank in Gueckedou, Societe Generale and Afriland First Bank in Nzérékoré). 2 in Conakry (FBNBank and Afriland First Bank).

? 12 microfinances institutions have been met: 3 in Kissidougou (MUFFA, CR?DIT RURAL DE GUIN?E ET FINADEV), 2 in Gueckedouou (CR?DIT RURAL DE GUIN?E ET FINADEV), 3 in Macenta (MUFFA, CR?DIT RURAL DE GUIN?E ET

FINADEV), 4 in Nz?r?kor? (MUFFA, CR?DIT RURAL DE GUIN?E FINADEV ET YETE MALI). The mission also met in Conakry with the general management of the following institutions CR?DIT RURAL DE GUIN?E, FINADEV, YETE MALI and WAKILI).

? 6 Focus groups have been organized:

- o In Kissidougou: 1 group discussion with 31 participants involved in agricultural activities (rice, corn, fonio and market gardening)
- o In Gueck?dou: 02 group discussions conducted with 18 participants engaged in agricultural activities (rice, corn, fonio, coffee and market gardening)
- o In Macenta: 01 group discussion conducted with 25 participants engaged in agricultural activities (coffee, banana, tuber rice, corn, fonio, and market gardening)
- o In Nz?r?kor?: 02 discussions were held with 28 participants involved in agricultural activities (coffee, bananas, tuber rice, corn, fonio, and market gardening).

The institutions met have agreed in principle to participate in the development of these new products that take climate change into account. They agreed to participate in the development of new CSA credit products with all that this may entail: definition of credit conditions (guarantee, repayment frequency, ...) and credit rates adapted according to the market study. However, given that microfinance institutions do not yet offer credit products adapted to the CSA, they didn?t want to sign written agreement at this stage.

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

GEFSEC 15Oct2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 22July2021:

Please include in this section consideration of the risk of the COVID-19 pandemic to project implementation, and measures to address these risks during implementation,

including in terms of risks to human health through project activities and risks to closures and cancellations due to social distancing requirements.

Please also consider the risk of lack of access to capital for local producers, SMEs and small scale farmers to invest in and financially sustain business creation and agriculture transition actions encouraged through this project, and how this risk will be addressed through the project.

Agency Response

UNDP, 23 September 2021: The risk of the COVID-19 pandemic has been added in pages 27 and 28 of the CEO endorsement request. The risk of Inadequate support and lack of access to capital for local producers, SMEs and small-scale farmers to invest in and financially sustain business creation and agriculture transition actions has also been added.

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
GEFSec 7 November 2022:

Recommended for clearance

GEFSEC 5 Nov 2022:

The GEF Secretariat Project Manager and LDCF Manager recommend the preferred option be for UNDP to self execute the following functions, on an exceptional basis give the unique context of this project:

- procurements involving international purchases;
- Recruitment of consultants (national and international);
- Organization of international travels;
- Evaluation and audit related compliance processes.

An extensive analysis of options has been conducted by the Agency, and no other viable options were identified, except execution of these functions by UNOPS which is prohibitively expensive in this case as UNOPS does not currently have in country presence.

Please resubmit as such.

GEFSEC 7Dec2021:

With regards to the request for UNDP to perform direct execution services, we encourage further consideration of the possibility for this function to be performed by another partner, be they a national public agency, an international organization or otherwise. For example, we note project ID 10600 for Guinea implemented by FAO is planning to have 3 national executing agencies, the primary one which will be the Ministry for Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD); with involvement of two other agencies for specific activities as co-executing partners, who are the National Agency for Local Financing (ANAFIC) and the National Agency of Rural Promotion and Agricultural Support (ANPROCA). Is this also a viable option for this project?

GEFSEC 22July2021:

Cleared

Agency Response

•**UNDP, 7 November 2022:** This is noted, the documents included in the submission reflect the execution arrangement with those specific execution support from UNDP on an exceptional basis. The request for execution support attached to the submission and signed by the Guinea OFP includes those specific services and related cost, which will be covered by UNDP's own resources.

UNDP, 4 November 2022: Various options for implementation arrangements were identified during the PPG, including through the government partners mentioned above. UNDP confirms that all the government partners considered would not allow a full national implementation modality without requiring third-party execution support services. This is due to known fiduciary and procurement risks, such as (i) weak accounting and financial systems, (ii) lack of internal audit, (iii) lack of asset management; and (iv) lack of written procurement rules and procedures. Following the political events of September 2021 and the transitional government put in place, those risks remain valid and have exacerbated due to changes in personnel. An analysis of third party execution support arrangement is attached to this re-submission. In the analysis, the following operations from the project pose operational/fiduciary risks that require third party support:

- procurements involving international purchases;
- Recruitment of consultants (national and international);
- Organization of international travels;
- Evaluation and audit related compliance processes.

These operations are critical to mitigate risks and cover project activities and services worth an estimated USD 3,344,180 (approx. 36% of the USD 9.25 million project budget). The options identified (presented in the annex and summarized in the table below) considered the following:

- i) The third-party entity has a representation and/or operational capacity in Guinea;
- ii) The government must remain the Implementing Partner and main party executing the project;
- iii) The option must comply with the GEF requirements by allowing the separation of oversight and execution functions.

Table: Options for third party execution support services explored during the PPG

•

S.No	Entity type	Entity Name	Pros	Cons	Cost[1]
------	-------------	-------------	------	------	---------

1

GEF Agency

UNDP

- ? Application of UN standards for procurements and HR processes
- ? Access to UNDP vendor list, LTAs and rosters
- ? Extensive experience in GEF projects and requirements
- ? Direct payment possible to limit risks of funds lost
- ? Cost effective (less than 1% of total project cost)
- ? Requires strict separation of oversight and execution support functions within UNDP Country office
- ? Project team placed in the IP

- ? Presence in Guinea and prior experience in the target region (Forested Guinea)
- ? International NGO with presence in Africa, Asia and Latin America and with relevant technical capacity in agriculture, water resources management and climate resilience
- ? International standards for procurement
- ? Lack of experience in GEF projects and requirements
- ? Cost implications for the project
- ? No incentive to build long-term capacity of the government to reduce reliance on execution support services in the future
- ? Project team placed in the

•? Application of UN standards for procurements and HR processes

•? Access to UNDP vendor list, LTAs and rosters

•? Extensive experience in GEF projects and requirements

•? Committed to building government capacity to reduce reliance on execution support services in the future

•? Project team placed in the IP, but carry FAO contracts

•? FAO indicated they were not in a position to provide only execution support services to the IP

•? Declined to provide an estimated cost for the services

•? Application of UN standards for procurements and HR processes

•? Access to UNOPS vendor list, LTAs and rosters

•? Representation in Guinea, though with capacity constraints

•? Significant cost implications for the project

•? Lack of specific experience in GEF projects and requirements in Guinea

•? No incentive to build long-term capacity of the government to reduce reliance on execution support

•? Requires UNOPS

(including USD 516,950 for UNOPS personnel, USD 360,684 in operational costs, and USD 235,279 in indirect costs)

Of the four options, two are not practically feasible as GRET and FAO were not inclined to provide those execution services and one, UNOPS, is seen as financially prohibitive due to the costs quoted. From a risk management and cost effectiveness perspective, the provision of execution support services by UNDP appear more practical with no impact on the project budget. This solution will allow the government to recruit the Project Management Unit directly while UNDP will provide targeted support in weak or risky business areas while investing in building the governments capacity to rely less on those type of execution support services.

If none of the above option is agreeable to the GEF, UNDP will need to consider a cancellation of the project as UNDP will not be able to provide the assurance required by Council without the above safeguards in place. UNDP would like to request the GEF secretariat to provide their guidance on its preferred option and next course of action to further the submission of the Guinea project.

A request for the provision of execution support services by UNDP to the project is attached to this re-submission.

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
GEFSEC 15Oct2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 22July2021:

Please provide a thorough analysis of potential for overlap and complementarity with the GCF funded National Adaptation Planning process in Guinea, which is also being implemented by UNDP. See here:

<https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/adaptation-planning-support-guinea-through-undp>

Agency Response

UNDP, 23 September 2021: An analysis has been added page 32 of the CEO endorsement request. **The projet entitled ?Supporting the Achievement of National Development Policies by Building Climate Adaptive Capacity and Planning in Guinea? (funded by GCF)** aims to raise the adaptive capacity of Guinea to cope with

impacts of climate change through the establishment of research, public and private partnerships mechanisms that facilitate CCA. It was launched in April 2021 for a duration of 2 years. This GCF project will work at the national level (CCA mainstreaming into sectoral planning and budgeting, operationalization of the National Climate Committee, national M&E framework on CCA, etc.) and will mainly produce studies and will involve mining industries, whereas the LDF project is focused on the forested Guinea and will produce both knowledge and capacities development for integrating CCA at local level (component 3), will involve microfinance institutions in supporting CCA actions (component 2) and will implement concrete activities on the field (component 1 - training of farmers, CSA practices dissemination etc.)

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

GEFSEC 15 Oct 2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 22 July 2021:

Please clarify where the knowledge management and sharing activities are located in the project design, including their relationship to specific outputs. We encourage considering a specific component or outcome related to knowledge management, sharing and learning. Please also clarify the budget that will be dedicated to this.

Please indicate how this project and its relevant actors will engage actively in knowledge sharing with others beyond this project, in order to share and learn for the benefit of this project and the broader community undertaking similar activities. This is particularly relevant for Component 2 and its focus on microfinance, given the rapidly evolving nature of this field and useful learning being gained by others that would be of relevance to this project. Please indicate what specific forums and networks this project will engage in, including for example the European Inclusive Finance network as one possibility, which also engages with actors and for benefit in developing countries including LDCs (see here: <https://www.european-microfinance.org/>).

Agency Response

UNDP, 23 September 2021: The knowledge management and sharing activities are located in output 1.5 Knowledge platform and replication strategy. A 4th component

was not created in order to keep the logical structure approved at PIF stage. Activities and budget related to this are summarized in the following table:

Knowledge management Plan and Budget:	
Activities related to knowledge management, sharing and learning	Budget (in USD)
Development of a training program to individual capacity building in CSA	66,000
Development of a Replication Strategy and Action Plan to scale-up and mainstream CSA practices	61,700
Capitalization process : data collection and production of thematic practical sheets for good CSA practices, Set up an online platform with the guidelines for the development of a CSA package including finance and "toolbox", production of case studies and articles	200,000
Communication for knowledge sharing	32,000
Attendance to forums and networks, and organization of a national workshop to share lessons learnt	25,000
Total	384,700

The project and its relevant actors will engage actively in knowledge sharing with others beyond this project. The project will engage in specific forums and networks for microfinance such as the microfinance African week <https://www.ada-microfinance.org/evenements/semaine-africaine-microfinance>, and the African Microfinance Transparency. It will also shared case study from component 2 to the Portail FinDev (<https://www.findevgateway.org/>).

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

GEFSEC 21July2021:

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
GEFSEC 22July2021:

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
GEFSEC 5Nov2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC15Oct2021:

To the extent feasible, we encourage indication of socioeconomic benefits, including quantitative, beyond the CCA indicator targets already indicated in the CCA results framework.

GEFSEC 22July2021:

Please include in this section a concise description of the contribution of this project to recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic.

Further, to the extent feasible, we encourage indication of quantitative socioeconomic benefits beyond the CCA indicator targets already indicated in the CCA results framework.

Agency Response

25 October 2021: socioeconomic benefits, including quantitative, have been added in the CER under Part II Project Justification >> 10. Benefits of CER in GEF Portal ? please refer to the table under para on Economic Benefits.

UNDP, 23 September 2021: A section has been added on page 38 of the CEO endorsement request: The project will contribute to recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic, as it aligned with the Economic Response Plan to the health crisis COVID-19 (Primacy, 2020) and the Response Plan to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on food security (FAO, 2021) :

Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic in Guinea	Contribution of the project to recovery
Deterioration of the living conditions of households: according to a survey carried out by the Ministry of Finance, 73% of households fear a lack of food or resources to feed their family; 44% skipped meal and 29% have experienced hunger.	Through CSA dissemination, the project will strengthen resilience of farming systems and food production. This will concern 14,000 households. Support to food crops and market gardening will directly contribute to food security.
The socio-economic impact of COVID-19 in Guinea (United Nations System, april 2020) mentioned the loss of informal employment in the agricultural sector, and increase of poverty.	The project will support 2,400 small business, and will increase productivity and revenue of farmers. They will be more resilience in case of climate and health crisis.
Potential new waves of COVID-19 can occur and increase negative impacts	By setting an example and applying the sanitary rules in all project activities, the project will contribute to the dissemination and application of sanitary measures of protection against covid-19 recommended by the Ministry of Health.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

•**GEFSEC 5Nov2022:**

Cleared

GEFSEC 7Dec2021:

With regards to the budget in Annex E:

1. The design of the budget table is off margins. Please request the agency to make column one smaller so that the entire table fits in the

CEO Endorsement format. The same comment applies to the numbers in the table. We will be in a position to offer further comments by the resubmission.

2. We note the indication of purchase of several motorcycles. As indicated in a previous comment, please identify opportunity to reduce the number of motorcycles for this project and adjust the budget accordingly.
3. We note that key project staff (project manager, financial officer) have been charged to the project components (i.e. Project Manager. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the execution of the project (including key project staff) should be charged to PMC (PMC GEF portion and/or the co-financing portion of PMC).
4. Please include all M&E costs in the M&E column within the budget table in Annex E in the portal submission, totaling the same amount as included in the M&E budget in section 9 - \$221,750.

Agency Response

UNDP, 4 November 2022: Comments noted and addressed as follows:

1. The formatting issues have been fixed.
2. The number of motorcycles has been further reduced to 2 motorcycles.
3. The key project staff (project manager, financial officer) have been moved to the Project Management Component.
4. All M&E costs are integrated in the M&E column within the budget table

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 21July2021:

The project results framework is provided in Annex A.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 14Nov2022:

Please check the UNDP Audit Checklist and UNDP Prodoc as "Public" category of documents, so these can be sent to the Council for review.

GEFSec 7Nov2022:

Recommended for clearance

GEFSEC 5Nov2022:

Please resubmit ASAP with the partial self execution as specified above in the coordination section.

GEFSEC 7December2021:

Please address the further policy oriented comments.

GEFSEC 22November2021:

Addressed

GEFSEC 5Nov2021:

Please address the comment on indicators, ensuring that all indicator figures indicated in the CEO Endorsement request document are equal or greater than those approved at the PIF stage and/or provide explanation as relevant.

GEFSEC 22July2021:

Please address the comments provided.

Agency Response UNDP 12 Nov 2021: noted, thank you. This has been addressed.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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
GEFSEC 5Nov2021:

Cleared

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 5Nov2021:

Cleared

Agency Response
Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

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

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/22/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/15/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/5/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/22/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/7/2021	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations