

Enhancing Adaptive Capacity of communities by up-scaling best practices and adopting an integrated approach in Ethiopia

Edit and Submit CEO Endorsement

Basic project information

GEF ID

10174

Countries

Ethiopia

Project Name

Enhancing Adaptive Capacity of communities by up-scaling best practices and adopting an integrated approach in Ethiopia

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/10/2020

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Aloke Barnwal

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

Yes, the project remain aligned with LDCF programming strategy of GEF 7.

GEFSEC April 19, 2021

Please revise the Rio Marker of the project to CCA 2 since adaptation is a principal objective of this project. Currently, it says CCA 1 which is for significant objective projects.

Agency Response

The programming directions have been revised to CCA2 as suggested (see pg. 1, CEO-ER)

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 Yes. The design is appropriate. It adopts a comprehensive and integrated approach to address diverse climate vulnerability issues facing Ethiopia across woreda, kebele and city levels. The project also proposes to engage with communities, small businesses and policy makers as part of its integrated approach.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please attach the evidence of approval of the GCF and AF funding to Government of Ethiopia. These two and the co-finance from Govt. of Italy is classified as Grant in the portal entry, however, in the multiyear work plan excel file, these sources are classified as "in-kind". Please confirm and make it consistent.

GEFSEC April 19

Thanks. The PMC portion of the co-finance is very low. It should be proportionate to the ratio of the GEF PMC and GEF Project Finance. That is, the ratio of PMC and GEF finance is 425353/8932420 which is nearly 4.8%. Similar ratio is expected for the Co-finance PMC budget and total co-finance also. Please revise. For more details, please refer to para 5 page 49 of GEF's policy guidelines.

Agency Response

The multi-year workplan has been corrected to reflect that this is grant finance - public investment

The evidence of the approval of the GCF and AF funding is now attached.

May 2021- The correct PMC to co-financing ratio has been applied, matching the ratio used for GEF finance, of 4.8%discrepancy has been corrected. Please see table B., Pg.1-3 in the CEO-ER.

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 Yes.

Agency Response

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 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

Please attach the LDCF indicators sheet providing details of the core indicators and all other sub-indicators as per template provided by the GEF Secretariat.

GEFSEC April 19

Thanks. The total number of beneficiaries under core indicator 1 is different in tracking tool and in the project document. Tracking tool mentions 338,328 beneficiaries whereas the project document says 225,000.

It is likely that the same beneficiaries are targeted under 1.1.1, 1.1.2 and 1.1.3 which adds up to the core indicator 1 and therefore result in double counting. If this is the case, please split the beneficiaries exclusively across the three outputs. We understand that some beneficiaries may benefit under all the three outputs. However, the current excel

sheet isn't able to factor this issue in calculating core indicator 1. We will work on it to revise. For the time being, please split the beneficiaries across different outputs and make a comment that same beneficiaries may benefit under different outputs.

Agency Response

This has now been attached with this resubmission.

Please note that the results framework has been revised (pg. 51 ProDoc), where the CRGE strategy was missing from the policies/plans to mainstream climate change

May 2021 - The inconsistency has been noted. Revisions have been incorporated into the core indicator sheet and the CEO-ER, Annex F, pg.48. There is now consistency across all documents. We have also indicated in the core indicator sheet where same beneficiaries may benefit under different outputs.

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

Yes. The impact of climate change on agriculture sector and livelihoods of communities is well described with relevant climate data. The root causes of limited adaptive capacity of communities and institutions are also elaborated well which include limited knowledge of best adaptation practices, access to finance, access to climate information and engagement of communities and the private sector.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The baseline is elaborated well with a clear intention of scaling up best practices and addressing the gaps to enhance resilience of vulnerable communities.

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

The description is adequate. The use of GIS and Artificial Intelligence (Drones) technologies is a welcome introduction in the project. The focus on building capacity of relevant institutions and technical staff will be transformative if done well. We have one question in this regard. Given that this will be a new technology application, will the project demonstrate application of these in the project or will it just focus on training only. It would be better to demonstrate and build capacity using a learning by doing approach. Please clarify.

The project's focus on livelihood diversification is also welcome. Please provide some examples of these alternate livelihood options and also elaborate how will the project ensure that these livelihoods will be climate resilient and also not lead to mal-adaptation in long term.

A core part of the project is ensuring that climate information is integrated in planning and decision making. Please clarify if there is sufficient infrastructure in the targeted regions for climate and weather data. Or, will the project support in developing relevant infrastructure or use any co-financing projects for the same?

GEFSEC April 19

Thanks for detailed responses. Comment cleared. Please add the below clarifications (particularly , the examples) in the main project document also.

Agency Response

1. GIS Technologies

Indeed the project will do both demonstration and hands on training in the use of these technologies. We refer to highlighted text on page 27 of the ProDoc and Pg. 18 of the CEO Endorsement Request where this has been made explicit. Kindly also note that the technology referred to is mature and has extensively been used in similar contexts across the world. Furthermore, the type of drone selected is a capable yet entry-level and beginner friendly unit. A new model of this drone has recently been released which even further enhances its capabilities.

2. Infrastructure for climate data

An earlier project on Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems to Support Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change was recently completed in Ethiopia and provided infrastructure that will support the information needs for this project. **We therefore do not envisage any investments in weather and climate infrastructure through this project.** The climate information needs for this project will be addressed through output 1.1 which will train staff in the National Meteorological Agency in the use of R-instat software to produce the climate information products required. R-instat utilises climate information generated by the National Meteorological Agency in combination with publicly available and global datasets and downscaled models. Component 2 focuses on utilising the outputs of output 1.1 in the Participatory Integrated Climate Services for Agriculture (PICSA) approach. NMA will be assisted in the dissemination of their forecasts, including outputs of R-instat (Output 2.3). The project will work with on-ground extension staff and communities on its contextual application (Output 2.1, and 2.2). The proposed PICSA approach will add value to the PS NP programme and the Lowlands project by building capacities in the use of PICSA by extension agencies.

3. Alternative livelihood options:

The options proposed vary by site, with a focus on entrepreneurship and marketing in the peri-urban sites and on food-processing, post-harvest technologies and value addition to agricultural produce in the rural sites. Kindly see section 3 in the Feasibility Study (annex 13 pg 32) for a more detailed description of the strategy. Examples. 1) rearing small ruminants; 2) poultry for meat, eggs and rearing of pullets; 3) apiculture; 4) dairy and related activities and 5) backyard poultry. All these activities will be linked with markets and value chains. These will also be supported in terms of functional literacy training and training in basic business accounting. Entrepreneurships will be further supported through mentorship and incubation. To prevent mal-adaptive practices, proposed activities will not be conducted in isolation. They will be linked to interventions such as establishment of community based forest and natural resource management committees, water and irrigation user groups. This will prevent any form of resource over-exploitation and also ensure necessary measures are in place to ensure the activities are not vulnerable to climate change impacts.

May 2021 - The separate strategies for introducing livelihood alternatives for peri-urban and rural communities with examples have been added to the pro-doc as suggested. Please see Section III Strategy, pg 18.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The incremental reasoning is provided for each component. However, the section will benefit from a short description of how and what each co-financing will complement LDCF activities under each component.

GEFSEC April 19

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Specific ways in which baseline projects will complement LDCF activities have now been highlighted in the ProDoc (pages 33-37). We have summarized these in the CEO ER (pages 20-23)

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

yes.

Agency Response

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

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

NA

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Yes.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Risks are well elaborated. As per GEFSEC guidelines regarding COVID-19, please provide an analysis of the COVID-19 context of the projects, risks and opportunities. Risks are well elaborated but a more detailed context analysis and opportunity analysis of how this project could contribute to green and resilient recovery is requested.

Please resubmit and include the Checklist for CEO Endorsement Template duly filled out for this project. This is in relation to the recent audit report of UNDP and the template agreed between UNDP and GEF Secretariat. Please attach the template as an Annex in the portal.

GEFSEC April 19

Thanks. Audit Checklist is added. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

1. COVID-19 analysis: Kindly refer to revised Annex 9b in which additional analysis has been added.

2. Audit Checklist: The Audit Checklist for CEO Endorsement Template has been included in this resubmission.

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

Yes.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

yes.

Agency Response

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

Yes.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

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

Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Following Annexes need to be added:

- LDCF indicators tracking sheet
- CEO Endorsement Checklist (ref: UNDP Audit report)
- Evidence of GCF and AF co-financing.

GEFSEC April 19

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

The following annexes have been included in this resubmission:

- LDCF indicators tracking sheet

- CEO Endorsement Checklist

- Evidence of GCF and AF co-financing

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/work-program-documents/GEF_LDCF_SCCF_26_compilation_council_comments_0.pdf

Please provide a response to Germany and US Council members' comments on the project. Please attach it as project Annex.

GEFSEC April 19

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Responses to Germany and US Council members are provided as Annex 22 to the Prodoc

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/web-documents/10174_STAP_Screen.pdf

Please provide a response to STAP's comments in the project document Annex.

GEFSEC April 19

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Responses to STAP's comments are provided as Annex 22 (same with Response to council comment) to the Proposal Document.

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 Yes.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

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 NA

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 NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The Agency is requested to address the comments made in the review sheet.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	3/20/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/20/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**