



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

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

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

10/25/2021

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.

Comment cleared.

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.

GEFSEC

Thank you. Comment cleared.

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.

GEFSEC:

Thanks. Comment cleared.

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.

Comment cleared.

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

GEFSEC April 19

Thanks.

GEFSEC AB July 19

1. On **Project Information**: Kindly note that the expected implementation start has passed. Please correct the start and end date to align with the 60 month duration of the project.
2. In the **PPG**: The programming of funds should have some kind of information. Since this is an LDCF Project it should include a ?NA? item.
3. On **M&E**: It would seem that UNDP would provide some kind of execution function related to Monitoring of Risks. As per GEF policy, Agency should ideally remove this from the M&E Budget.

Monitoring all risks (UNDP Risk Register); UNDP Country Office; 2000/year

4. On the Budget:

1. The Project Budget table is missing. Can we please request the Agency to include in the Portal so that we can review it there?
2. We reviewed the budget table uploaded in Portal and would like to have the following comments:

- Purchase of motore vehicles is typically not permitted under LDCF. The Agency is requested to explore co-financing for vehicles and utilize the funds for more strategic activities under the project.
-
- Consultants for MTR/TE should be charged to M&E but not PMC.
-
- Please clarify what Miscellaneous expenses of the project management team cover? They should be charged under PMC.
-
- Please indicate Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency for each of the line item in the budget tab.
-

•5. Gender

•Gender equality: The project submission includes a number of relevant entry points and actions to address gender equality. In addition, it has uploaded a fairly comprehensive gender analysis and action plan. The section on gender, however, does not include any references or information/summary of these efforts. In addition, reviewing the indicators provided in the gender action plan there seems to be limited evidence that this project will pursue actions or monitor progress related to the closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources (as indicated in the tick boxes/gender tags). Please provide summary of the gender analysis as well as the

project's actions to address gender and provide further information on how the project expects to closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources.

-
- GEFSEC August 25, 2021
- Thanks for your responses. **The justification to purchase vehicles and the revised budget for vehicle procurement is fine now.** All comments are addressed except the budget table is not pasted in the portal entry in Annex E. Please attach the budget table and resubmit the project.

ANNEX E: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

ANNEX F: (For NGI only) Termsheet

Instructions. Please submit an finalized termsheet in this section. The NGI Program Call for Proposals provided a template in Annex A of the Call for Proposals that can be used by the Agency. Agencies can use their own termsheets but must add sections on Currency Risk, Co-financing Ratio and Financial Additionality as defined in the template provided in Annex A of the Call for proposals. Termsheets submitted at CEO endorsement stage should include final terms and conditions of the financing.

ANNEX E: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

ANNEX F: (For NGI only) Termsheet

Instructions. Please submit an finalized termsheet in this section. The NGI Program Call for Proposals provided a template in Annex A of the Call for Proposals that can be used by the Agency. Agencies can use their own termsheets but must add sections on Currency Risk, Co-financing Ratio and Financial Additionality as defined in the template provided in Annex A of the Call for proposals. Termsheets submitted at CEO endorsement stage should include final terms and conditions of the financing.

-
- GEFSEC September 24, 2021
- Please address the following outstanding comments from PPO.

- On M&E: the M&E budget in the Prodoc was already updated and the item ?Monitoring all risks? by UNDP was removed. However, the M&E budget under Section 9 of the Portal entry has not been changed. Please request UNDP to update this Portal's M&E budget accordingly.

- On Gender: we can't locate any changes in response to her comment on gender.

- - GEFSEC October 26
- We are still not able to find all the details in the attached prodoc. There is information in page 47, but the gender section is blank in the prodoc and also in the portal entry. Since this is a policy requirement, please provide a summary of findings of gender analysis and gender action plan in the portal itself.

Agency Response

UNDP response, 27 October 2021

A gender analysis was undertaken for the project, and the full Gender Analysis and Action Plan has now been submitted as an annex. A summary of the gender analysis and action plan has now been added to the portal. The Project Document (ProDoc) has been reuploaded to the 'Roadmap' section as well.

UNDP response, 11 Oct 2021

1. On M& E, the table was updated and revised in the Section 9.

2. Gender

The title of the section on Gender equality and Women's Empowerment that had been merged with the earlier section in the Prodoc has been corrected. Noting that the section on gender in the Prodoc did not sufficiently reflect the gender analysis and action plan that was provided as an annex, we have rectified this as suggested by the reviewer as follows:

? The section (pg. 47) now includes specific references to and a summary of the efforts proposed under the gender action plan and gender analysis.

? We have also provided information on how the project expects to close gender gaps in terms of access to and control over natural resources and information with cross-references to the relevant outputs.

? The recommendations of the gender analyses and the ways they have been integrated into the proposal have been summarized in the Prodoc (Pg 48-49)

Agency Response

1. **Implementation start dates:** Thank you for flagging this oversight. The start and completion dates have been changed to 1st January 2022, and is now reflected in the CEO Endorsement request, and new expected dates for MTR and TE have been added to the Prodoc.

2. We are unable to revise the PPG grant table on the portal. Please see screenshot below:

F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required

PPG Amount (\$) PPG Agency Fee (\$)

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	PPG(\$)	Agency Fee(\$)
UNDP	LDCF	Ethiopia	Climate Change		200,000.00	19,000.00
Total PPG Amount(\$)					200,000.00	19,000.00

3. **M&E and execution functions:** Agreed. This has been removed from the M&E budget as suggested (see pg. 56 of ProDoc).

4. a. **Budget table:** Thank you for pointing this out. The table has been uploaded. The uploaded budget table also reflects changes and clarifications made below to address comments raised by the reviewer under 4(b).

4b.

(i) **Motor vehicles:** We acknowledge LDCF restrictions for the purchase of motor vehicles, and took this into account when budgeting for vehicles. We also considered that the project will not be able to function without transport as sites are often remote and sparse. The 4x4 vehicles will be paid for by co-finance (from UNDP TRAC resources). These have absorbed most of UNDP co-finance for the project. These vehicles will be mostly used for transport of staff and materials to sites across different regions. However, given the long distances between the project sites (the project is being implemented in a total of 11 regional states and several woredas within them), these vehicles will not be able to serve the day-to-day and frequent visits to project sites within each of the woredas. Project implementation will not be possible without local transport, and motorcycles provide a cost-effective option due to low running costs, availability of local mechanics for service and repair and less pollution compared to larger vehicles.

We have therefore requested GEF to fund procurement of motorcycles per woreda to cover the gap that UNDP co-finance will not manage to cover. This is a necessary investment as it will enable field staff to perform their functions effectively. The alternative would be for them to use public transport but, poor public transport connectivity between sites is the biggest challenge in implementing field based activities. Please note that public transport to field sites is largely limited to privately operated 'Bajaj' three wheel vehicles. Some of the project sites have few such vehicles for hire and where available, they can be unreliable and will not be able to navigate the terrain in some of the project sites. Please see table below showing an assessment of the vehicle situation in each project site if hiring is to be considered. Hiring cars will be far too expensive for regular travel as envisaged by the project. Thus, we think motorcycles and two pick-up trucks are the best arrangement to accommodate the policy of the LDCF and the need to realistically get project activities implemented on the ground.

(ii) **MTR and TE Consultants:** The budget for MTR/TE Consultants have now been removed from the LDCF PMC budget and have been allocated to the UNDP-TRAC co-finance. Kindly note that the project does not have a stand-alone M&E component.

(iii) **Miscellaneous expenses** of the project management team: We note that the budget note incorrectly refers to the project management team for miscellaneous, instead of the miscellaneous expenses incurred at the field (woreda level). This is not a PMU expense. As a field-based project, we expect a number of minor unanticipated expenses and deviations from expected costs to arise, and have created a small buffer under each component to cover for these. Corrections have been made to the budget notes for clarity. It now reads: 'Miscellaneous unforeseen expenses at the woreda /field level'.

(iv) **Executing agency** receiving funds from the GEF agency is the Environment and Climate Change Commission (EFCCC). This has now been included for each of the line items in the budget table.

5. Gender

The title of the section on Gender equality and Women's Empowerment that had been merged with the earlier section in the Prodoc has been corrected. Noting that the section on gender in the Prodoc did not sufficiently reflect the gender analysis and action plan that was provided as an annex, we have rectified this as suggested by the reviewer as follows:

The section (pg. 47) now includes specific references to and a summary of the efforts proposed under the gender action plan and gender analysis.

? We have also provided information on how the project expects to close gender gaps in terms of access to and control over natural resources and information with cross-references to the relevant outputs.

? The recommendations of the gender analyses and the ways they have been integrated into the proposal have been summarized in the Prodoc (Pg 48-49)

13 SEPT 2021 (JP)

the table of project budget is now reflected in the relevant Annex box.

Name of Project Site	Use of public transport	Vehicle for Hire	Type of Vehicle	Daily Cost (US \$)	Other details
Somali (Arara, Qudhac, Ramole, 4 and 7 Kebeles)	Extremely difficult to use public transport	Possible to get from Regional Capital	4X4 Cruiser or Motorcycle	100 (Toyota Land Cruiser, fuel and Driver's DSA inclusive)	Project sites are located in very remote areas and it is very difficult to access them particularly during the rainy season without the use of motorcycles or 4 X 4 trucks. The road to project sites is dry weather mud road. Qudhac Ramole for instance is about 140km away from Jigjiga (Regional Capital) with over 90kms dry weather mud road

<p>Afar (Chisa, Gachine Town, Debel and Leykuma Kebeles)</p>	<p>Extremely difficult</p>	<p>Possible to get from nearest town</p>	<p>4X4 Cruiser or Motorcycle</p>	<p>90 (Toyota Land Cruiser, fuel and Driver?s DSA inclusive)</p>	<p>The project sites are in extremely remote areas and vehicles are not available for hire in the project sites if not from the nearest town. Awash, close to 103 kms away from Gachine site. There is very little or no public transport available and can only be traversed by motorcycles or 4 x 4 trucks</p>
<p>Amhara (Asheti Leba Gedel, Wey Beyign, Desemne and Mendel Amba Kebeles)</p>	<p>Extremely difficult</p>	<p>Possible to get from Regional Capital</p>	<p>4X4 Cruiser or Motorcycle</p>	<p>90 (Toyota Land Cruiser, fuel and Driver?s DSA inclusive)</p>	<p>The poor condition or total absence of approach roads to the sites necessitates the use of 4 x 4 vehicles or motorcycles to traverse the terrain. there is also very little or no public transportation system. The project sites are in extremely remote areas and vehicles are not available for hire in the project sites if not from the Regional Capital. Bahrdar</p>

Beneshangul Gumuz (Babi Shenkor, Tanguto, Gemed Metsimetsinare and Sherkole Belmiyo Tenze Goja Kebeles)	Extremely difficult	Possible to get from Regional Capital	4X4 Cruiser or Motorcycle	100 (Toyota Land Cruiser, fuel and Driver?s DSA inclusive)	The project sites are in extremely remote areas and vehicles are not available for hire in the project sites if not from the Regional Capital, Assosa, close to 90kms far away from Sherkole woreda. There is very little or no public transport available in projects sites which are quite remote. Most routes comprise of bumpy and rocky terrain and can only be traversed by motorcycles or 4 x 4 trucks
Gambella (Olan, Ogngne, Konde Kebeles and Nginngang Town)	Extremely difficult	Possible to get from Regional Capital	4X4 Cruiser or Motorcycle	100 (Toyota Land Cruiser, fuel and Driver?s DSA inclusive)	The project sites are in extremely remote areas and vehicles are not available for hire in the project sites if not from the Regional Capital, Gambella, 180kms away from Jore Woreda. Very swampy road to project sites, even difficult for traversing with 4X4 trucks. Motorcycle is best transportation means
Dire Dawa (Kebele 06 and 09)	Relatively accessible	Possible to get from Regional Capital	Bajaj	50 (fuel and Driver?s DSA inclusive)	Sites usually face flooding and filled with muddy slopes, hence difficult to employ public transportation system with unreliable navigation through the rugged terrain
Addis Ababa (Chefe Meda, Demeka and Happy Village Ketenas)	Relatively accessible	Possible to get from Regional Capital	Bajaj	50 (fuel and Driver?s DSA inclusive)	Bajaj transportation can be used but unreliable to navigate through the rugged terrain

<p>Harari (Erer Hawaye, Erena Weldya, 15 and 16 Kebeles)</p>	<p>Difficult terrain to traverse with public transport</p>	<p>Possible to get from Regional Capital</p>	<p>4X4 Cruiser or Motorcycle</p>	<p>100 (Toyota Land Cruiser, fuel and Driver?s DSA inclusive)</p>	<p>Sites usually face flooding and filled with muddy slopes, hence difficult to employ public transportation system. The project sites are in extremely remote areas and vehicles are not available for hire in the project sites if not from the Regional Capital, Harar, 111kms away from Erer Woreda</p>
<p>Oromiya (Burika Ela, Nedir, Abadir and Msira Kebeles)</p>	<p>Difficult terrain to traverse with public transport</p>	<p>Possible to get from nearest city</p>	<p>4X4 Cruiser or Motorcycle</p>	<p>90 (Toyota Land Cruiser, fuel and Driver?s DSA inclusive)</p>	<p>There is very little or no public transport available to the projects sites which are quite remote. Most routes comprise of bumpy and rocky terrain and can only be traversed by motorcycles or 4 x 4 trucks. The project sites are in extremely remote areas and vehicles are not available for hire in the project sites if not from nearest city, DireDawa, about 128kms far from Gursum Woreda</p>

<p>SNNP (Degakedida, Fulasa Deketa, Negele Wedesh and Tetali Bitora Kebeles)</p>	<p>Extremely difficult</p>	<p>Possible to get from Regional Capital</p>	<p>4X4 Cruiser or Motorcycle</p>	<p>90 (Toyota Land Cruiser, fuel and Driver?s DSA inclusive)</p>	<p>There is very little or no public transport available to the project sites which are quite remote. Most routes comprise of bumpy and rocky terrain and can only be traversed by motorcycles or 4 x 4 trucks. The project sites are in extremely remote areas and vehicles are not available for hire in the project sites if not from nearest town, Hosaina, close to 57kms away from KedidaGamela Woreda</p>
<p>Tigray (Marta, Sebiya, Miha and Welel Kebeles)</p>	<p>Extremely difficult</p>	<p>Possible to get from nearest town</p>	<p>4X4 Cruiser or Motorcycle</p>	<p>100 (Toyota Land Cruiser, fuel and Driver?s DSA inclusive)</p>	<p>There is very little or no public transport available to the projects sites which are quite remote. Most routes comprise of bumpy and rocky terrain and can only be traversed by motorcycles or 4 x 4 trucks. The project sites are in extremely remote areas and vehicles are not available for hire in the project sites if not from nearest town, Adigrat, close to 15kms away from Gulomeheda Woreda</p>

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.

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.

Yes, the project is recommended for circulation to Council for 4-week review and subsequent endorsement by the GEF CEO.

GEFSEC AB July 19 2021

The Agency is requested to address additional comments made under the GEF Secretariat Comments box above.

•**GEFSEC August 25, 2021**

•Thanks for your responses. All comments are addressed except the budget table is not pasted in the portal entry in Annex E. Please attach the budget table and resubmit the project.

•

•**GEFSEC September 24, 2021**

•Please address the following outstanding comments from PPO.

- On M&E: the M&E budget in the Prodoc was already updated and the item ?Monitoring all risks? by UNDP was removed. However, the M&E budget under Section 9 of the Portal entry has not been changed. Please request UNDP to update this Portal?s M&E budget accordingly.

- On Gender: we can?t locate any changes in response to her comment on gender.

•

•**GEFSEC October 25, 2021**

•The two outstanding comments have been addressed and therefore the project is recommended for endorsement.

•

•**GEFSEC October 26**

We are still not able to find all the details related to gender analysis in the attached prodoc. There is information in page 47, but the gender section is blank in the prodoc and also in the portal entry. Since this is a policy requirement, please provide a summary of findings of gender analysis and gender action plan in the portal itself.

•**GEFSEC October 27**

•The section on gender has been added in the portal now. The project is cleared for CEO endorsement.

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)	7/7/2021	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	7/19/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/25/2021

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The LDCF project "Enhancing Adaptive Capacity of communities by up-scaling best practices and adopting an integrated approach in Ethiopia" (GEF ID 10174), will support adoption of integrated and innovative approaches to scale up community-based adaptation projects in rural and peri-urban areas across Ethiopia. The project will advance participatory approaches to engage vulnerable communities including farmers, pastoral and agro-pastoral groups in designing and implementing immediate adaptation priorities as well as building their long term resilience.

The project will be implemented on a strong baseline of previous LDCF and other climate fund investments. It will aim to scale up best practices with an added value of facilitating integrated landscape level adaptation planning and design of solutions. Through \$10 million funding from the LDCF the project will directly benefit 225,000 persons in 41 kebeles and ketenas, from 22 woredas and 11 regions/cities of Ethiopia that are highly vulnerable to climate change. 6,450ha of land including about 2,000 ha of land under agriculture and agro-forestry, 4,000 ha of scrub-grassland landscapes and 450ha of peri-urban landscapes will be brought under climate-smart agriculture and landscape restoration measures. About 18,000 persons will receive training and capacity building during the course of the project. Most of these will be community members and grassroots level technical staff at the kebele and woreda level.

The project has four, closely integrated components to achieve its outcomes. The first focuses on institutional and technical capacity development leading to gender-responsive vulnerability and needs assessments and integration of climate information with extension support. This will ensure that in the long term, government agencies mainstream climate change adaptation in their programmes and projects at the woreda and kebele level. The second component facilitates access of communities to climate-smart technologies, which are critical for widespread adoption of on-ground, cost effective adaptation measures by communities. The project's third component supports institutional capacities for integrated land use planning and management with support from GIS and mobile based ICT technologies. These measures address the need for long

term resilience by restoring and protecting ecosystem processes at the landscape scale. The fourth component addresses the need for innovation and private sector engagement in climate change adaptation to ensure financial sustainability of livelihood diversification and viability of alternative livelihoods. The component will link communities to financial services and by identifying and strengthening value chains that facilitate farmers and livestock owners' access to markets and provide opportunities for entrepreneurs? peri-urban communities to diversify incomes.

The project will result in the increased capacities of communities, government institutions and the private sector to use climate information and technologies to plan, design and implement effective adaptation. It builds on successes and experiences from past projects and effective collaboration and coordination with on-going initiatives. By embedding the project in established national, regional and local level institutional structures and processes, and by linking communities to markets and value chains, the project not only facilitates sustainability but scaling up as well. The project will leverage new, mobile ICT based spatially explicit technologies to streamline planning, monitoring and reporting and to allow communities, specifically women and vulnerable groups to actively participate and lead project implementation. The emphasis on integrated landscape level interventions is innovative in the target regions which will ensure that both national and regional agencies leverage emerging spatial and mobile information and communication technologies to efficiently plan and implement restoration and protection of ecosystem services for long term resilience.

The proposed LDCF project will focus on training-of-trainers for decision-makers within woredas and cities, ensuring both sustainability and replication of adaptation interventions in communities. This approach comprises of i) strengthening institutional and technical capacities in the use of GIS and mobile ICT technologies for gender-responsive planning, investments and coordination of policies and programmes; ii) building capacities of communities in using forecasts and innovative technologies for climate smart agriculture and cost effective adaptation and resilience building; iii) leveraging spatial technologies to plan, implement and monitor integrated landscape restoration and management and iv) attracting private sector involvement in both rural and urban/peri-urban areas by capitalizing on available income generation opportunities, nurturing entrepreneurship and building partnerships with financial services and businesses that help diversify resilient livelihoods.

The project has duly factored in all the risks including those from the COVID-19 pandemic. With its strong community focus and importance given to their participation in developing adaptation solutions and creating resilient livelihood opportunities, it will also directly support resilient recovery of local communities.

Finally, the project will demonstrate strong complementarity between GEF and other climate funds GCF and AF which will be co-financing nearly \$55 million dollars to scale up adaptation action in the country. It will thereby contribute to GEF's strategy of

strengthening collaboration, coherence and complementarity with climate funds, particularly the GCF.

Based on this, the project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.