



Sahel RESILAND Program: Building Resilience through Sustainable Natural Resource Management

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11743

Countries

Regional (Chad, Mali)

Project Name

Sahel RESILAND Program: Building Resilience through Sustainable Natural
Resource Management

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

9/19/2024

Review completed by PM

11/5/2024

Program Manager

Jason Spensley

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

PFD

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Program Information

a) Is the Program Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat's Comments

Sept 27, 2024:

Yes

Agency's CommentsThank you.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Sept 27, 2024:

Yes

Agency's CommentsThank you.

2. Program Summary

a) Does the program summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the program objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Is the program's geographical coverage explicit, as well as the covered sectors? Does the summary explain how the program is transformative or innovative?

Secretariat's Comments

4 Nov 2024:

Cleared

1 Nov 2024:

A) Given there is no LOE for Niger at this time, please remove any and all references to Niger from all program documents, as a LOE is not provided from Niger at this time. If the OFP of Niger elects to include Niger in the future, references to Niger can be included in an amendment or child project to this program.

B) Given there are currently only 2 countries in this program (Chad and Mali) the budget proposed for regional coordination (it is actually bilateral at this stage) is very high. Please reduce the budget for component 1 and refer to it as bilateral rather than regional. Similar to the comment above, if a third or more countries area added to this program at a later time, then this the budget can be increased accordingly and this can be referred to as regional.

C) Similarly, given a LOE has not been provided for Mali at this stage, please reformulate the section on regional context to refer only to the current 2 target countries of this program, which are Chad and Mali. Similar for the formulation in the section on "Natural Capital", "Need for Scales Action", any reference to "three countries", etc. Please review all text to ensure it is clear that this program is currently only focused on Chad and Mali, as that is the extent of the LOEs provided.

October 27, 2024:

(i) Thank you for the added general contextual information on how climate impacts are impacting the target population. Projects seeking LDCF funding typically consider specific information on the scale of the anticipated impacts of specific climate hazards that the project will help local populations adapt to. RCP 8.5 and 4.5 scenarios looking 30 years ahead are advisable. The project would be strengthened by further consideration and some articulation of the range of anticipated climate impacts, based on future scenarios, that the target population in the 3 focus countries will likely have to adapt to.

(ii) Given only 3 of the 5 countries of the Sahel will utilize their LDCF Allocation for this PFD, it is not appropriate for the LDCF allocation for these 3 countries to cover the cost of coordination among 5 countries, as well as associated activities in countries that have not provided an LOE and LDCF allocation. Please adjust the all coordination activities, and all relevant sections of the program, and associated budget accordingly.

Sept 29, 2024:

(i) Please strengthen the summary to articulate the climate problem and clear linkage to the program objective of increasing climate resilience of the vulnerable communities. We recognize the importance of regional coordination ; however stronger focus on reducing vulnerability to specific current and anticipated climate risks of vulnerable populations and their livelihoods is essential.

(ii) Given the stated importance of regional coordination among countries of the Sahel, we note only 3 countries are included in this project. Please explain why only 3 Sahel countries should use their national LDCF cap to cover t

he cost of coordination among all Sahel countries.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

(i) Project summary updated in the portal entry and the attached program document.

(ii) The proposed program will support the Sahel countries (Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, Mauritania, and Niger) in meeting their Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) adaptation and mitigation commitments and objectives under the countries' National Adaptation Plans. While the proposed program's LDCF regional component will support all five Sahel countries, and LDCF investment financing will be provided directly to three of the most vulnerable Sahel countries (Chad, Mali - and subsequently Niger), the program will also be complemented by ongoing and new World Bank projects, with co-financing of over \$470 million that is directly supporting all five countries in the Sahel. This co-financing will help to cover costs of coordination and regional participation in the program, ensuring all Sahel countries have adequate participation.

Response to comments from October 27, 2024:

Thank you.

(i) the program background has been updated to reflect additional contextual information and climate scenarios. The changes are also reflected in the Program Concept Note.

(ii) the program has been updated to better reflect that it will only operate in 3 countries. The program is being submitted for Chad and Mali, with Niger to be included in the June work program. This was agreed upon with the governments.

Response to comments from November 1, 2024:

A) The Sahel Resilance Program Concept Note and Annex II have been updated throughout to remove references to Niger as a program country project at this stage.

B) Component 1 budget has been reduced and bilateral references have been incorporated throughout the Sahel Resilance Program Concept Note and Annex II.

C) Both Sahel Resilance Program Concept Note and Annex II have been updated throughout to clarify that the program covers only Chad and Mali.

3 Indicative Program Overview

- a) Is the program objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- b) Are the components and outcomes sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the program objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the program components and appropriately funded?
- d) Are the GEF program Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 5%? If above 5%, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat's Comments

4 Nov 2024:

Cleared.

1 Nov 2024:

Given LOEs have only been provided for Chad and Mali, and not for Niger, as indicated above, please revise the Program section and all other relevant sections to only refer to the current 2 focus countries of Chad and Mali.

Oct 27, 2024:

- (i) The Program Objective has not been revised. It still reads as "To enhance regional coordination and access to improved climate knowledge services in the Sahel and increase the resilience of targeted communes through the adoption of climate-smart landscape restoration practices." Therefore, comment "i" below from Sept 29 is still relevant.
- (ii) Please clarify how the terminology of the relevant outcomes under components 1 and 3 have been revised to reflect the explanation in the response below.
- (iii) Please note the comment above under "Program Summary" that coordination activities can only be supported for the 3 countries that are the focus of this project.

Sept 29, 2024:

- (i) The stated objective of this project is not aligned with the mandate of the LDCF, which this PFD is seeking funding from. Therefore, substantive reformulation would be required for this project to be focused directly and explicitly on the objective of climate adaptation and resilience. The currently stated primary and ultimate objective of regional coordination and access to improved knowledge services can potentially be viewed as part of the solution to reducing climate vulnerability through reducing

exposure and/or sensitivity to current and anticipated impacts of climate hazards, and/or more likely improving the adaptive capacity of target populations, but regional coordination and access to climate info are not objectives in the own right that the LDCF can support.

(ii) Please clarify the difference between the outcome "Sustainable climate smart landscape management practices adopted" featured under both components 1 and 3 in the component table.

(iii) Component 1: It is understood that regional and integrated coordination on climate information is crucial for the Sahel. However it will be important to clarify how such a coordination platform would provide concrete support for adaptive capacity building, particularly at the local levels. For example, how will multi-country and national information systems be fit for purpose, for example by being adapted to local contexts and accessible to the unique contexts of differing local populations) to meet the varying data and accessible needs to differing vulnerable marginalized populations?

(iv) Component 1: Moreover, how will the project ensure that local actors have access to sufficient information, expertise, and financial resources to implement climate resilient initiatives, rather than rely on top-down coordination?

(v) Component 1: Please also be more explicit about how the project will manage data ownership and data sharing among countries and partners.

(vi) Component 2: In addition to capacity building efforts at the regional and national levels, please revise to ensure substantive support for capacity building at subnational levels, including of local communities (including women groups, stallholder farmers, nomadic groups etc.), and/or training programs designed to build skills for example on landscape restoration and sustainable livelihoods natural resources management and climate information services.

(vii) Further, please consider opportunities to strengthen psychological resilience and community cohesion among local resource users and producers as a strategy to strengthen adaptive capacity.

(viii) The PFD indicates in section C that "It will prioritize private sector engagement to mobilize finance and strengthen the implementation of nature-based solutions". However, the approach for engaging the private sector is yet to be clearly articulated in the PFD. Under Component 3, there's reference to community investments to strengthen community capacities in a host of agro-sylvo-pastoral production systems, however its not clear how finance will be mobilized or what innovative financing mechanisms would be deployed. A strategy on private sector engagement to mobilize finance and implement NBS for climate adaptation and resilience is required at this stage of the project cycle. For example, how will accessible microfinance and microlending be advanced for smallholder farmers and micro enterprises to gain

access to accessible capital to transition to more climate resilient practices; and how will micro enterprise (including women and youth owned) be strengthened: and how can psychological resilience and community cohesion in a context of trauma be strengthened along side microlending and micro enterprise support?

(ix) Please provide an estimate figure for Core Indicator 5.

(x) Given youth migration and unemployment is one of the key challenges facing the region, and this is exacerbated by increasing climatic risks, please clarify the youth engagement strategy, including ensuring an inclusive participatory process that would improve specific outcomes for them through youth entrepreneurship, for example.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

(i) The PDO has been updated to better align with LDCF mandate and objectives.

(ii) Under component 1, short-term outcomes would include improved national capacity and enabling environment for landscape management, as well as improved regional awareness and capacity for transboundary landscape restoration. In the medium-term, there would be increased collaboration among Sahel countries on landscape restoration, and in the long-term there would be increased resilience of transboundary landscapes. The Component 1 outcome will modified to *?increased resilience of regional / transboundary landscapes in the Sahel.? Please also see the revised TOC.*

(iii) This has been clarified, describing how this component will enhance transboundary landscape restoration across Sahel countries, where each country's government agencies will benefit from technical support and capacity building for integrated landscape planning. Staff in the agencies at both the central and field levels will benefit from investments in improved equipment and infrastructure and improved and more accessible data to support timely decision-making related to landscape restoration.

(iv) Component 1 will provide information tools and infrastructure to support national agencies and actors in the Sahel in decision making and in particular, natural resource management and landscape interventions. These tools will inform policy makers, promote practitioners' networking and collaboration, and capacity building, and also enable reaching out to a large number of beneficiaries. The Component will provide opportunities to create and foster partnerships among countries around issues of common interest. Critical climate resilient initiatives in turn will be implemented with both LDCF and IDA financing in each of the five Sahel countries.

(v) Based on findings from World Bank experiences from similar regional platforms and IEG assessments, effective regional platforms (a) understand the importance of joint advocacy efforts to mobilize resources and scale and galvanize action up to senior policy levels, (b) incorporate

both the regional and national components under one project with national annual work plans to ensure sufficient funding for regional actions and synergies; (c) use regional platforms to monitor and evaluate intervention-related biophysical changes at the regional level; (d) understand the critical need for well-funded and communication in natural resource management interventions to inform policy maker, promote practitioners' networking and capacity building, and reach out to a large number of beneficiaries, and (e) house digital platforms within a single institution to ensure sustainability. Building on these lessons and experience, it is expected that the Pan African Agency will serve as a regional platform for sharing data and promoting common policy and practice among the five countries of the Sahel. It will also work to harmonize with national data platforms in the Sahel countries. The regional platform's key purpose is to stimulate collaboration and joint efforts around landscape restoration in the Sahel countries. It is integrated into the design and budgets of other national projects under the RESILAND Sahel Program to ensure availability of funding.

(vi) Component 2 has been revised based on comments to include activities the subnational level. Please see updates components and program description, (additional information is in paras 17, 23, 26, and 27, as well as page 17, of Sahel Resiland Concept Note)

(vii) Thank you. additional information reflected in the program description and in the concept note (See updates in para 23 of Sahel Resiland Concept Note.)

(viii) thank you. component 3 updated to reflect that the program aims to support the normative principles of productive alliances to facilitate access to markets for producer organizations. This includes the identification of private sector partners, buyers and off-takers and matching them with producer organizations and enterprises. Additionally the section on private sector in the program concept note (page 19) has been updated to reflect private sector approach.

(ix) Core Indicator 5 updated.

(x) Section on youth engagement strategy clarified in the Program document (please see paras 26 and 27 of Sahel Resiland Concept Note)

Response to comments from October 27, 2024:

Thank you.

(i) PDO updated. System error reverted the PDO in the Table.

(ii) For component 1, the short-term outcome in TOC was revised to reflect 'Improved regional awareness and capacity for transboundary landscape restoration, via annual fora and fit-for-purpose information platform.' Also, the component 1 medium-term outcome was revised to reflect 'Increased resilience and strengthened livelihoods via adoption of landscape restoration practices' and 'Increased collaboration among program-supported Sahel countries on landscape restoration.'

The long-term outcome was revised to reflect ?increased resilience of regional / transboundary landscapes in the Sahel.? The TOC has also been updated to reflect the regional nature of Component 1 and the national/local investments in Chad, Mali, and Niger in Components 2 and 3.

(iii) This has been clarified in 2(ii) above.

Response to comments from November 1, 2024:

Noted. Please see response to comments above.

4 Program Outline

A. Program Rationale

a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the program design?

b) Has the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other program outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) Is the baseline situation and baseline projects and initiatives well laid out and how the program will build on these?

d) Have lessons learned from previous efforts been considered in the program design?

e) For NGI, is there a brief description of the financial barriers and how the program ? and the proposed financial structure- responds to these financial barriers.

Secretariat's Comments

1 Nov 2024:

Cleared

Oct 27, 2024:

B) Please provide further information on key stakeholder groups (including beyond private sector and youth) and their expected roles to program outcomes, as well as further details on consultations during PFD development and plans to develop a Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

Sept 27, 2024:

(Ai) Given the fragile state of the Sahel, please explain more prominently (in the PFD) the conflict and security concerns in the rationale as a driver of vulnerability in the region, including how the program's climate smart landscape restoration and regional coordination interventions are expected to address these concerns in a transformative and sustainable manner. Please also indicate in the risks table how the political and governance risk, which is rated high, will be mitigated.

(B) No. Please see the comments above on private sector and youth.

D) N/A

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

(a) Section on conflict and security concerns updated in the program document (See paragraphs 4 and 32 of the Sahel Resilance Concept Note)

(b) noted. please see responses to comments above.

Response to comments from October 27, 2024:

Thank you.

B) As per World Bank requirements, the child projects will each develop stakeholder engagement plans and gender action plans. Please that given the existing operations in the 3 countries, such instruments are already in place which will be updated to additionally reflect the GEF activities. The child project descriptions have been updated to include additional information on Key stakeholder groups. (See pages 12 ? 14 of Annex 2 Child Project Descriptions. See also pages 18-19 of Sahel Resilance Program Concept Note).

5 B. Program Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the program logic, including how the program design elements are contributing to the objective, a set of identified key causal pathways, the thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences?

c) Are the program components described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the program approach has been selected over other potential options?

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Have the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline programs been described? Is the program incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)?

e) Are the relevant levers of transformation identified and described?

f) Is there an adequate description on how relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) will contribute to the design and implementation of the program and its components?

g) Gender: Does the description on gender issues identify any differences, gaps or opportunities linked to program objectives and have these been taken up in component description/s?

h) Are the proposed elements to capture, exchange and disseminate knowledge and lessons learned adequate in order to benefit future programs? Are efforts for strategic communication adequately described?

i) Policy Coherence: How will the program support participating countries to improve, develop and align policies, regulations or subsidies to not counteract the intended program outcomes?

Secretariat's Comments

4 Nov 2024:

Cleared.

1 Nov 2024:

Given LOEs have currently only been received for 2 countries and the LOE from Mali has not been received at this stage, please revise the TOC and all other sections to refer to those 2 countries.

Oct 27, 2024:

A) Please revise the ToC and all relevant sections to reflect the focus of this program on the 3 countries for which LOEs and LDCF allocation have been provided.

B) Only very limited information has been added on how this program will coordinate both regionally and nationally with the GEF Trust Fund and GEF-LDCF funding projects for the GGW. Additionally, the 3 sentence paragraph added appears to speak in the future tense about coordination with the GEF funded projects. Please expand.

(D) Please clarify how Gender elements have been strengthened across all components, and how KM products will capture good practices and lessons learned from a

gender perspective and ensure their wide dissemination among the child projects and beyond. Please include in the development of the results framework that there are indicators to capture gender-specific results, for example, number of women-led FACIs, # of women accessing financial mechanisms, etc. In the development of the Gender Action Plan, please budget related activities and ensure that in developing the monitoring and reporting plan / framework, that gender-specific results are monitored and reported on regularly.

Sept 29, 2024:

(Ai) The statement of long term outcomes/impacts seems to be broader than the mandate of the LDCF, which this PFD is seeking funds for. Please revise the TOC accordingly.

Aii) Please clarify the set of countries that the first bullet in the ToC problem statement is referring to.

B) Please explain in detail how this program would learn from and build on the set of previous and current projects supporting the GGW financed by the GEF Trust Fund, GEF LDCF, and GCF.

C) Please see the comments above on project components 1, 2 and 3.

G) Please provide greater information on how gender considerations will be fully integrated in the program, including engagement of relevant gender oriented organizations in its design, as well as its implementation in all countries,

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Ai) & Aii) The program ToC has been revised to better reflect alignment LDCF.

B) the description of institutional arrangement and cooperation with other initiatives has been updated to reflect lessons learned from previous and current projects.

C) comments addressed above and in the revision of project components.

G) Gender sections revised to reflect how gender considerations are reflected throughout the program and at the implementation level in countries.

Response to comments from October 27, 2024:

Thank you.

A) The TOC has been revised and updated.

B) Additional information has been added to reflect coordination and partnership with GEF Agencies, UN organizations and key NGOs also working on the GEF- and LDCF-funded GW program and to improve landscape management in the Sahel (please also see paragraph 39-40 in the Sahel Resiliand Program Concept Note).

D) Components are being designed to fully incorporate gender elements, e.g., under Component 2, national community development plans will ensure training, capacity building, and awareness raising activities are targeted towards women, while under Component 3, national community investments such as agro-sylvo-pastoral production systems that will generate income and reduce food insecurity for vulnerable populations, will focus on women. Each child project is developing a gender action plan (see page 18 of Sahel Resilant Program Concept Note) to: (i) map and fortify initiatives led by women and women entrepreneurship in targeted communes; (ii) provide technical and financial support to women in rural communities; (iii) promote women's ownership of the land in rural communities; (iv) reduce vulnerability and exposure to gender-based violence; and (v) promote gender equity as a core dimension for tackling climate change issues and sustainable land management. Strengthening of women's local associations, cooperatives, and other organizations and groups will also enable connections with transnational gender networks, fortifying civil society organizations (CSOs) and non-government organization (NGOs) operations. The program's regional component, under Component 1, will ensure that lessons learned and knowledge gained from supporting women's participation throughout the program's child projects are systematically shared among program stakeholders at climate fora, roundtables and other learning events, as well as via knowledge products. Gender action plans will also budget for monitoring and reporting of gender-specific results to ensure these lessons and knowledge can be shared broadly. Lastly, indicators measuring peoples' increased resilience to climate risks will be disaggregated for gender (see pages 4 and 5 of Sahel Resilant Program Concept Note). Additional information as also available on on page 19 of Sahel Resilant Program Concept Note, also re KM see page 9 in the Sahel Resilant Program Concept Note.

Response to comments from November 1, 2024:

Noted. ToC updated.

5.2 Program coherence and consistency

a) How will the program design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and allow for adaptive management needs and options?

b) Is the potential for achieving transformative change through the integrated approach adequately described? How is the program going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

c) Are the countries or themes selected as child projects under the program appropriate for achieving the overall program objective?

d) Are the descriptions of child projects adequately reflective of the program objective and priorities as described in the ToC?

e) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate to meet the program objectives?

Secretariat's Comments

Oct 28, 2024:

Cleared

Sept 27, 2024:

A) Please see the comments above about how this program will strengthening financing for local populations to adapt to current and anticipated impacts of climate hazards.

B) A financial and technical sustainability strategy is absent, beyond the life of the LDCF financing being sought.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

b) section on technical sustainability strategy has been updated in the program description and the concept note.

5.3 Program Governance, Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Programs

a) Are the program level institutional arrangements for governance and coordination, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has a program level organogram / diagram been included, with description of roles and responsibilities, and decision-making processes?

b) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed initiatives, projects/programs (such as government, private sector and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the program area, e.g.).

Secretariat's Comments

1 Nov 2024:

At the time of CEO Endorsement, please ensure a robust financial sustainability strategy for after the GEF funding.

Oct 27, 2024:

Given the responses to these comments, please ensure a robust strategy to ensure the financial and technical sustainability of the existing Pan African Agency of the GGW, after the resources from this program.

Sept 27, 2024:

A) Implementation Framework: Please further clarify the mandate and governance structure of Pan African agency in the PFD. Would this agency be established operate solely under this program and how would it interface with the Pan-African Agency set up under the GGW?

Aii) Importantly, what are the specific and explicit approaches to ensure the sustainability (financial and technical) of the regional center and coordination beyond the GEF LDCF financing from this program?

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

A) The program's regional agency/regional coordination unit is expected to be the Pan-African Agency of the GGW, which was founded in 2010 to strategically coordinate the implementation of the initiative and to bolster efforts in resource mobilization. Additional information available in the program description and in para 37 of the Sahel Resilance Concept Note.

Aii) The project is not creating a new regional coordination unit, but rather working with and building the capacity of an established regional agency to foster program sustainability.

Response to comments from October 27, 2024:

Thank you. Agreed. The sustainability of the Pan African Agency and the broader Program will be prioritized.

Response to comments from November 1, 2024:

Noted.

5.4 Program-level Results, Monitoring and Reporting

a) Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified? Does the PFD describe how it will support the generation of multiple environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF program?

b) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

c) Are the program's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) / adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

d) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the program at the global, national and local levels sufficiently described?

e) Is the described approach to program level M&E aiming to achieve coherence across child projects and to allow for adaptive management?

Secretariat's Comments

1 Nov 2024:

Cleared

Oct 28, 2024:

On the description overview table: M&E costs are around 5.7% which is above the average 2% for projects above USD 10 million. Please address.

Sept 27, 2024:

B) Please address the comment above on a missing core indicator 5 on private sector.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Core indicator 5 updated.

Response to comments from October 27, 2024:

Thank you. The financing per components has been revised to ensure M&E is about 2%.

5.5 Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks and impacts adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

Oct 28, 2024:

Cleared

Sept 29, 2024:

The risks table is not complete. Please complete for innovation.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Innovation risk added in the GEF portal and the program concept note.

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the program adequately aligned with Focal Area and IP Elements, and/or LDCF/SCCF strategy?

***For IPs: is the program adequately aligned with the Integrated Program goals and objectives as outlined in the GEF 8 programming directions?**

Secretariat's Comments

Sept 29, 2024:

Yes

Agency's CommentsThank you.

b) Child project selection criteria: Are the criteria for child project selection sound and transparently laid out?

Secretariat's Comments

Sept 29, 2024:

Yes

Agency's CommentsThank you.

6.2 Is the program alignment/coherent with country / regional / global priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)?

Secretariat's Comments

Sept 28, 2024:

Cleared

Sept 27, 2024:

(i) Alignment with Countries NDCs, NAPs : Thank you for showing the program's alignment with the GEF-8 programming strategies including the priority areas of the LDCF. Please clarify how the proposed program harmonizes with and contributes to achieving the priority areas articulated in respective country's strategies (NDCs, NAP, NAPA) including sectoral plans.

Agency's CommentsThank you.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat's Comments

Sept 29, 2024:

See comments in other sections.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Comments addressed in other sections as requested.

7.2 Environmental and Social Safeguards

Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal? (annex D)

Secretariat's Comments

Sept 29, 2024:

Yes

Agency's CommentsThank you.

8 Other Requirements

Knowledge Management

8.1 Has the agency confirmed that a project level approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been included in the PFD?

Secretariat's Comments

Sept 29, 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

9 Annexes

Financing Tables (Annex A and Annex H)

9.1 GEF Financing Table:

a) 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):

Country STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

4 Nov 2024:

Cleared

1 Nov 2024:

Please ensure this is revised to only reflect the 2 counties that have provided LOEs.

Oct 27, 2024:

Please not comments above about revising all relevant sections, including the budget, to ensure the program activities and use of funds is focused on the 3 countries that have provided LOEs and LDCF allocation.

Agency's Comments

Response to comments from October 27, 2024:

Thank you. Sections above revised as requested. Please also note that there are only 2 LOEs at the moment. Niger has agreed with to use \$5million of it's LDCF allocation for the child project. That said, the government will provide the letter at a later date. As such we are proceeding with the 2 countries (Chad and Mali), and will submit the Niger child project for consideration at the June 2025 council along with an amendment to the program.

Response to comments from November 1, 2024:

Noted. Please see response to comments above.

Non-STAR Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsYes

Agency's CommentsThank you.

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
IP Set Aside

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
IP Contribution

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

For Child Project Financing information (Annex H)

b) Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? Are the IP contributions aligned with the Program? The allocated amounts (including Agency Fee) match those in LoE?

c) Project Preparation Grant Table: Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? The allocated amounts (including PPG Fee) match those in LoE? Is the requested PPG within the authorized limits set in Guidelines? (pop up information?) If above the limits, has an exception been sufficiently substantiated?

d) Sources of Funds Table: Are the allocated sources of funds for each and every one of the three STAR Focal Areas within the Country's STAR envelope by the time of the last review?

e) Indicative Focal Area Elements Table: (For IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area element corresponds to the respective IP?

f) (For non-IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area Elements are aligned with the respective Program?

g) Co-financing Table: Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing provided and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

Sept 29, 2024:

Yes

Agency's CommentsThank you.

9.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG): if PPG for child projects has been requested: has the PPG table been included and properly filled out adding up to the correct PPG and PPG fee totals as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's Comments

Sept 27, 2024:

PPG is not requested.

Agency's CommentsThank you.

9.3 Sources of Funds for Country STAR Allocation

Does the table represent the sum of STAR allocations sources utilized for this program?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

9.4 Indicative Focal Area Elements

For non-IP Programs

Does the table contain the sum of focal area elements and amounts as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9.5 Indicative Co-financing

Are the indicative amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequate and reflect the ambition of the program? Has the subset of co-finance which are expected to be investment mobilized been identified and defined (FI/GN/01)?

Secretariat's Comments

Sept 29, 2024:

Yes

Agency's CommentsThank you.

Annex B: Endorsements

9.6 Has the program and its respective child project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat's Comments

6 Nov 2024:

The executing entity of the two child projects are still mixed up, and there is also inconsistency of executing entity names between the PFD and the child projects. Please request correct the two child project entries to make sure consistency with the LOEs and with the PFD.

Oct 27, 2024:

1. The LoE for Chad is in French, please provide an English translation of the original.
2. Also regarding the LOE for Chad GEFID 11744:

i. Title of child project differs between LoE and Portal's child project entry, probably due to a mistranslation from the LoE. Please either obtain revised LoE or correct child projects' title to match with LoE.

ii. Executing agency in PFD is displayed as 'Chad Ministry of Environment' while in the child project information is 'Federal Ministry of Environment'. The word Federal seems to be missing from the PFD entry.

iii. Project financing amount requested in the child project entry is less than corresponding amount in the LOE, but agency fee is more than in LOE. Please obtain a revised LOE or correct child project's financing request.

Sept 27, 2024:

No. We note there is only submission of the LoE from Chad OFP.

All LOEs will be required to continue with the review process.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

LOE from Chad updated and LOE from Mali included in the roadmap.

Response to comments from October 27, 2024:

Thank you.

1. The LOE for Chad has been updated with the revised numbers and the translation is available in the roadmap.

2.

i. Chad project title updated to match the LOE.

ii. Executing agency on updated letter is "Ministère de l'Environnement, de la Pêche et du Développement Durable" or the "Ministry of Environment, Fisheries and sustainable development". The Executing agency has been updated accordingly.

iii. Amounts in the LOE and the portal are matching with the updated letters.

Response to comments from November 1, 2024:

Noted. LOEs have been updated from Oct 27. Discussed bilaterally with GEF SEC to indicate where the LOEs are in the system.

Response to comments from November 6, 2024:

Thank you. Executing Entity updated as per LOEs for all projects across child projects and PFD.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Sept 27, 2024:

No. See comment above on LOEs.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

LOEs updated

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

Secretariat's Comments

Sept 27, 2024:

See comment above on LOEs.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

LOEs updated

Annex C: Program Locations

9.7 a) Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the program interventions will take place?

Secretariat's Comments

Sept 27, 2024:

Geo referencing is not provided.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Map included in the GEF portal and in the program concept note.

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes* (*only for non IP programs)

9.9 a) Does the program 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.

b) Does the program provide a detailed reflow table to assess the program capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Additional Annexes

10 GEFSEC Decision

10.1 GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the program recommended for clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

6 Nov 2024:

The LOEs still have errors.

4 Nov 2024:

Recommended by the PM for clearance, pending any further comment from colleagues on policy alignment.

1 Nov 2024:

Further comments need to be addressed.

Oct 27, 2024:

Comments need to be addressed.

Sept 27, 2024:

Substantive reformulation would be required and comments addressed for this PFD to be eligible for LDCF finance.

Agency's Comments

Response to comments from October 27, 2024:

Thank you. Comments addressed above.

Response to comments from November 1, 2024:

Thank you. Please see response to comments above.

Response to comments from November 6, 2024:

Thank you. PFD and Child projects updated to match the LOEs.

10.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency(ies) during the child project development.

Secretariat's Comments At the time of CEO Endorsement and further Child project development, please ensure a robust financial sustainability strategy for after the GEF funding.

Agency's Comments

10.3 Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	9/27/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/27/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/1/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/4/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/6/2024	